


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

https://archive.org/details/catholicencyclop0010unse_h6t4

The Catholic Encyclopedia

VOLUME TEN

Mass—Newman

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA

AN INTERNATIONAL WORK OF REFERENCE ON THE CONSTITUTION, DOCTRINE, DISCIPLINE, AND HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

EDITED BY
CHARLES G. HERBERMANN, PH.D., LL.D.
EDWARD A. PACE, PH.D., D.D. CONDÉ B. PALLEN, PH.D., LL.D.
THOMAS J. SHAHAN, D.D. JOHN J. WYNNE, S.J.
ASSISTED BY NUMEROUS COLLABORATORS

IN FIFTEEN VOLUMES
VOLUME X

New York
ROBERT APPLETON COMPANY

Nihil Obstat, February 1, 1911

REMY LAFORT

CENSOR

Imprimatur

✠ JOHN M. FARLEY

ARCHBISHOP OF NEW YORK

Copyright, 1911

BY ROBERT APPLETON COMPANY

The articles in this work have been written specially for The Catholic Encyclopedia and are protected by copyright. All rights, including the right of translation and reproduction, are reserved.

Contributors to the Tenth Volume

AIKEN, CHARLES F., S.T.D., Professor of Apologetics, Catholic University of America, Washington: Mencius; Monotheism; Nève, Félix-Jean-Baptiste-Joseph.

ÁLDÁSY, ANTAL, Ph.D., Archivist of the Library of the National Museum, Budapest: Matthias Corvinus; Munkács, Diocese of; Neusohl, Diocese of; Neutra, Diocese of.

ALMOND, JOSEPH CUTHBERT, O.S.B., Superior of Park's Hall, Oxford: Mechitar; Mechitarists.

ALSTON, G. CYPRIAN, O.S.B., Downside Abbey, Bath, England: Monasteries, Double.

AMADO, RAMÓN RUIZ, S.J., LL.D., Ph.L., College of St. Ignatius, Sarria, Barcelona, Spain: Minorca, Diocese of; Mondoñedo, Diocese of.

ARENDZEN, J. P., Ph.D., S.T.D., M.A. (Cantab.), Professor of Sacred Scripture, St. Edmund's College, Ware, England: Messalians; Mithraism; Nasoræans.

AUCLAIR, ÉLIE J., B.A., S.T.D., J.C.D., University of Laval, Montreal, Canada: Montreal, Archdiocese of.

AUGUSTINE, FATHER, O.S.F.C., Franciscan Capuchin Monastery, Dublin: Mathew, Theobald.

AUSTIN, SISTER MARY STANISLAUS, St. Catharine's Convent of Mercy, New York: Mercy, Sisters of.

AVELING, FRANCIS, S.T.D., London: Matter; Mivart, Sir George Jackson.

BACCHUS, FRANCIS JOSEPH, B.A., The Oratory, Birmingham, England: Mennas; Monasticism, II. Eastern Monasticism Before Chalcedon.

BARNES, Mgr. ARTHUR STAPYLTON, M.A., (Oxon. and Cantab.), Cambridge, England: Neophyte.

BARRETT, MICHAEL, O.S.B., St. Michael's Abbey, Farnborough, England: Melrose, Abbey of.

BARRY, WILLIAM, S.T.D., Leamington, England: Newman, John Henry.

BAUMGARTEN, PAUL MARIA, J.U.D., S.T.D., Domestic Prelate, Rome: Mirabilia Urbis Romæ; Monsignor.

BEECHER, PATRICK A., M.A., S.T.D., Professor of Pastoral Theology and Sacred Eloquence, Maynooth College, Dublin: Moriarty, David.

BENIGNI, UMBERTO, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Pont. Collegio Urbano di Propaganda, Rome: Massa Carrara, Diocese of; Massa Marittima, Diocese of; Mazzara del Vallo, Diocese of; Melfi and Rapolla, Diocese of; Messina, Archdiocese of; Mezzofanti, Giuseppe; Milan, Archdiocese of; Mileto, Diocese of; Mint, Papal; Modena, Archdiocese and University of; Modigliana, Diocese of; Molfetta, Terlizzi and Giovinazzo, Diocese of; Monaco, Principality and Diocese of; Mondovì, Diocese of; Monopoli, Diocese of; Monreale, Archdiocese of; Montalcino, Diocese of; Montalto, Diocese of; Montefeltro, Diocese of; Montefiascone, Diocese of; Montepulciano, Diocese of; Montes Pietatis; Moroni, Gaetano; Muro Lucano, Diocese of; Naples; Nardo, Diocese of; Narni and Terni, United Dioceses of; Nepi and Sutri.

BERTRIN, GEORGES, Litt.D., Fellow of the University, Professor of French Literature, Institut Catholique, Paris: Miracle Plays and Mysteries; Molière (Jean-Baptiste Poquelin); Montaigne, Michael Eyquen de.

BESSE, J. M., O.S.B., Director, "Revue Mabillon", Chevetogne, Belgium: Mendes de Silva, João; Mercedarians; Monasteries, Suppression of.

BESTE, KENELM DIGBY, S.J., St. Beuno's College, St. Asaph, Wales: Menevia, Diocese of.

BEWERUNGE, H., Professor of Church Music, Maynooth College, Dublin: Neum.

BIHL, MICHAEL, O.F.M., Lector of Ecclesiastical History, Collegio San Bonaventura, Quaracchi, Florence: Matteo of Aquasparta; Myron, Francis.

BOUDINHON, AUGUSTE-MARIE, S.T.D., D.C.L., Director, "Canoniste Contemporain", Professor of Canon Law, Institut Catholique, Paris: Mensa, Mensal Revenue; Metropolitan; Minor; Minor Orders; Monseigneur.

BRAUN, JOSEPH, S.J., Bellevue, Luxemburg; Mitre; Morse; Mozzetta.

BRÉHIER, LOUIS-RENÉ, Professor of Ancient and Medieval History, University of Clermont-Ferrand, Puy-de-Dôme, France: Michaud, Joseph-François; Montfaucon, Bernard de.

BROCK, HENRY M., S.J., Ore Place, Hastings, England: Mayer, Christian; Moigno, François.

BROSNAHAN, TIMOTHY, S.J., Professor of Psychology and Ethics, Woodstock College, Maryland: Mazzella, Camillo.

BURKE, EDMUND, B.A, Instructor in Latin, College of the City of New York: Musuros, Markos.

BURTON, EDWIN, S.T.D., F.R. Hist. Soc., Vice-President, St. Edmund's College, Ware, England: Matthew, Sir Tobie; Milo, Crispin; Monsell, William; Montfort, Simon de; Morton, John; Mush (alias Ratcliffe), John.

CABROL, FERNAND, O.S.B., Abbot of St. Michael's, Farnborough, England: Matins.

CAMPBELL, THOMAS J., S.J., Editor-in-Chief, "America", New York: Massé, Enemond; Ménard, René.

CANGIANO, VICTOR, C.S.C.B., Missionary Apostolic, Vice-Rector, St. Joachim's Church, New York: Missionaries of St. Charles Borromeo, Congregation of.

CASANOVA, GERTRUDE, O.S.B., Stanbrook Abbey, Worcester, England: Mechtilde, Saint.

CHAPMAN, JOHN, O.S.B., B.A. (Oxon.), Prior of St. Thomas's Abbey, Erdington, Birmingham, England: Maximus of Constantinople, Saint; Melchisedechians; Monarchians; Monophysites and Monophysitism; Monothelitism and Monothelites; Montanists; Nestorius and Nestorianism.

CHARLES, BROTHER, Principal, Cathedral School, Natchez, Mississippi: Natchez, Diocese of.

CLEARY, GREGORY, O.F.M., J.C.D., J.Civ.D., S.T.L., sometime Professor of Canon Law and Moral Theology, St. Isidore's College, Rome: Mastrius, Bartholomew; Medina, Juan de; Medina, Miguel de; Molloy (O'Molloy), Francis; Mullock, John T.

CLUGNET, JOSEPH-LÉON-TIBURCE, Litt.L., Paris: Medardus, Saint.

COGHLAN, DANIEL, S.T.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology, Maynooth College, Dublin: Murray, Patrick.

CORDIER, HENRI, Professor at the School for Oriental Living Languages, Paris: Mongolia.

CORLEY, JOHN LOUIS, LL.B., St Louis, Missouri: Missouri, State of.

CRAM, RALPH ADAMS, F.R.G.S., F. Am. Inst. Architects, President, Boston Society of Architects, Boston: Narthex; Nave.

CRIVELLI, CAMILLUS, S.J., Professor of General History, Instituto Científico, City of Mexico: Mendíburu, Manuel de; Mendieta, Jerónimo; Mexico; Molina, Alonso de; Morelos, José María; Motolinía, Toribio de Benavente.

CUSICK, PETER F., S.J., Professor of Chemistry and Geology, Boston College, Boston, Massachusetts: Molloy, Gerald.

CUTHBERT, FATHER, O.S.F.C., Crawley, Sussex, England: Massaia, Guglielmo.

D'ALTON, E. A., LL.D., M.R.I.A., Athenry, Ireland: Moore, Arthur; Moylan, Francis; Murray, Daniel.

DEGERT, ANTOINE, Litt.D., Editor, "La Revue de la Gascoigne", Professor of Latin Literature, Institut Catholique, Toulouse: Massillon, Jean-Baptiste; Mathieu, François-Désiré; Montesquieu, Charles-Louis de Secondat.

DELANY, JOSEPH, S.T.D., New York: Mercy, Corporal and Spiritual Works of; Negligence.

DEVINE, ARTHUR, C.P., St. Paul's Retreat, Mount Argus, Dublin: Miracles, Gift of.

DE WULF, MAURICE, Member of the Belgian Academy, Professor of Logic and Æsthetics, University of Louvain: Neo-Scholasticism.

DOHERTY, CHARLES J., K.C., D.C.L., LL.D., Montreal, Canada: Masses, Bequests for (Canada).

DOLAN, JOHN GILBERT, O.S.B., The Priory, Little Malvern, England: Muri (Muri-Gries).

DOMANIG, KARL, Ph.D., Honorary Imperial Councillor, Chief Director of the Imperial Collection of Coins, Klosterneuburg, Austria: Molo, Gasparo.

DONOVAN, STEPHEN M., O.F.M., Franciscan Convent, Washington: Michael of Cesena.

DOUCERÉ, VICTOR, S.M., Titular Bishop of Ternuti, Vicar Apostolic of the New Hebrides: New Hebrides, Vicariate Apostolic of.

DRISCOLL, JAMES F., S.T.D., New Rochelle, New York: Media and Medes; Moses Bar Cephas; Nabo (Nebo); Nathan; Nathanael; Nathinites; Nazarene; Nazarite; Nebo, Mount; Nemrod.

DRISCOLL, JOHN T., M.A., S.T.L., Fonda, New York: Miracle; Naturism.

DRUM, WALTER, S. J., Professor of Hebrew and Sacred Scripture, Woodstock College, Maryland: Massorah, Mathathias; Menochio, Giovanni Stefano.

DUBRAY, CHARLES A., S.M., S.T.B., Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy, Marist College, Washington: Mersenne, Marin; Naturalism; Nature; Necromancy.

DUFFY, PATRICK EDWARD, S.T.L., Mullingar, Ireland: Meath, Diocese of.

DUHEM, PIERRE, Professor of Theoretical Physics, University of Bordeaux: Nemore, Jordanus de.

DUTTON, JOSEPH M. F., Kalawao, Molokai, Hawaii: Molokai.

EATON, THOMAS J., M.A., Mobile, Alabama: Mobile, Diocese of.

ELGUERO, FRANCISCO, Morelia, Mexico: Michoacan, Archdiocese of.

ELLIOT, WALTER, C.S.P., New York: Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle.

ENGELHARDT, ZEPHYRIN, O.F.M., Watsonville, California: Membre, Zenobius; Monterey and Los Angeles, Diocese of.

ENGELKEMPER, WILHELM, S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis, University of Münster: Münster, University of.

ESPINOSA, AURELIO MACEDONIO, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Spanish, Leland Stanford University, California: Nevada.

FANNING, WILLIAM H. W., S.J., Professor of Church History and Canon Law, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri: Medicine and Canon Law; Midwives; Monastery, Canonical Erection of a.

FISHER, J. H., S.J., Woodstock College, Maryland: Médaille, Jean-Paul.

FLAHERTY, MATTHEW J., M.A. (Harvard), Concord, Massachusetts: Moore, Thomas.

FORBES-LEITH, WILLIAM, S.J., Boscombe, Bournemouth, England: Melrose, Chronicle of.

FORD, JEREMIAH D. M., M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Spanish and French, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Mena, Juan de; Menzini, Benedetto; Metastasio, Pietro; Morales, Ambrosio.

FORGET, JACQUES, Professor of Dogmatic Theology and the Syriac and Arabic Languages, University of Louvain: Melchers, Paul.

FORTESCUE, ADRIAN, Ph.D., S.T.D., Letchworth, Hertfordshire, England: Mass, Nuptial; Maurice, Roman Emperor; Melchites; Menaion; Metaphrastes, Symeon; Methodius I; Metrophanes of Smyrna; Michael Cærularius; Monasticism, III. Eastern Monasticism; Nectarius, Patriarch of Constantinople.

FOURNET, PIERRE AUGUSTE, S.S., M.A., Professor of History, Collège de Montréal, Montreal, Canada: Montboissier, Peter of.

FOX, WILLIAM, B.S., M.E., Associate Professor of Physics, College of the City of New York: Matteucci, Carlo; Montgolfier, Joseph-Michel.

FUENTES, VENTURA, B.A., M.D., Instructor, College of the City of New York: Medrano, Francisco; Meléndez Valdés, Juan; Mendaña de Neyra, Alvaro de; Mendoza, Diego Hurtado de; Montemayor, Jorge de; Moratín, Leandro Fernández de; Moreto y Cabaña, Agustín; Navarrete, Martín Fernández de.

GASQUET, FRANCIS AIDAN, O.S.B., S.T.D., Abbot President of the English Benedictine Congregation, London: Monasteries, Suppression of, in England under Henry VIII.

GANCEVIĆ, ANTHONY LAWRENCE, O.F.M., Ph.D., S.T.D., Zaostrog, Dalmatia: Medulić, Andreas; Miridite, Abbey of.

GARDNER, EDMUND GARRETT, M.A. (Cambridge), Barlow Lecturer on Dante, University College, London: Medici, House of; Meli, Giovanni; Nardi, Jacopo.

GARESCHÉ, EDWARD FRANCIS, S.J., St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri: Nacchiante, Giacomo; Nepveu, Francis; Neumayr, Franz.

GEDDES, LEONARD WILLIAM, S.J., St. Beuno's College, St. Asaph, Wales: Messias.

GERARD, JOHN, S.J., F.L.S., London: Monita Secreta.

GEUDENS, FRANCIS MARTIN, C.R.P., Abbot Titular of Barlings, Corpus Christi Priory, Manchester, England: Newhouse, Abbey of.

GIETMANN, GERARD, S.J., Teacher of Classical Languages and Æsthetics, St. Ignatius College, Valkenburg, Holland: Michelozzo di Bartolommeo; Miller, Ferdinand von; Mohr, Christian; Müller, Karl; Music, Ecclesiastical; Neumann, Johann Balthasar.

GIGOT, FRANCIS E., S.T.D., Professor of Sacred Scripture, St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, New York: Maunoury, Auguste-François; Merneptah I; Midrashim; Moab, Moabites; Moloch.

GILLET, LOUIS, Paris: Massys, Quentin; Meissonier, Ernest; Melozzo da Forlì; Memling, Hans; Mignard, Pierre; Millet, Jean-François; Montagna, Bartolomeo; Müntz, Eugène; Murillo, Bartolomé Esteban.

GLASS, JOSEPH S., C.M., S.T.D., President, St. Vincent's College, Los Angeles, California: Medal, Miraculous.

GOYAU, GEORGES, Associate Editor, "Revue des Deux Mondes", Paris: Mazarin, Jules; Meaux, Diocese of; Medici, Maria de'; Mende, Diocese of; Molai (Molay), Jacques de; Monstrelet, Enguerrand de; Montalembert, Charles-Forbes-René de; Montauban, Diocese of; Montmorency, Anne, First Duke of; Montor, Alexis-François Artaud de; Montpellier, Diocese and University of; Moulins, Diocese of; Namur, Diocese of; Nancy, Diocese of; Nantes, Diocese of; Napoleon I; Napoleon III; Nevers, Diocese of.

GRATTAN-FLOOD, W. M., M.R.I.A., Mus.D., Rosemount, Enniscorthy, Ireland: Messingham, Thomas; Monteverde, Claudio; Motet; Mura, Saint.

GREY, J. C., New York: Medellin, Archdiocese of; Monte Vergine.

GUTBERLET, CONSTANTINE, S.T.D., Protho-notary Apostolic, Professor of Theology, Apologetics and Philosophy, Seminary of Fulda, Germany: Materialism.

GUTHRIE, W. B., Assistant Professor, Department of Political Economy, College of the City of New York: Migration.

HAGEN, JOHN G., Vatican Observatory, Rome: Müller (Regiomontanus), Johann.

HAMILTON, GEORGE E., Washington: Morris, Martin Ferdinand.

HANDLEY, MARIE LOUISE, New York: Montañés, Juan Martínez.

HARRINGTON, THOMAS F., M.D., Boston, Massachusetts: Massachusetts.

HARRIS, WILLIAM RICHARD, S.T.D., LL.D., Editor of "Intermountain Catholic", Salt Lake City, Utah: Mormons.

HARTIG, OTTO, Assistant Librarian of the Royal Library, Munich: Navarre.

HASSETT, Mgr. MAURICE M., S.T.D., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Matricula; Monogram of Christ.

HEALY, JOHN, S.T.D., LL.D., M.R.I.A., Archbishop of Tuam, Senator of the National University of Ireland: Mayo, School of.

HENRY, HUGH T., Litt.D., Rector of Roman Catholic High School for Boys, Professor of English Literature and of Gregorian Chant, St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pennsylvania: Mass, Music of the; Miserere.

HOEBER, KARL, Ph.D., Editor, "Volkszeitung" and "Akademische Monatsblätter", Cologne: Maxentius, Marcus Aurelius; Maximianus, Marcus Aurelius Valerius; Maximinus, Caius Valerius Daja; Maximinus Thrax, Caius Julius Verus; Nero.

HOGAN, JOHN F. CANON, Professor of Modern Languages, Maynooth College, Dublin: Maynooth College.

HOLWECK, FREDERIC G., St. Louis, Missouri: Maternity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Feast of the; Michael the Archangel; Months, Special Devotions for; Most Pure Heart of Mary, Feast of the; Mount Carmel, Feast of Our Lady of; Name of Mary, Feast of the Holy; Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Feast of the.

HOWLEY, MICHAEL FRANCIS, S.T.D., Archbishop of St. John's, Newfoundland: Newfoundland.

HUDLESTON, GILBERT ROGER, O.S.B., Downside Abbey, Bath, England: Mellitus, Saint; Monasticism, IV. Western Monasticism; Monte Cassino, Abbey of; Montreuil, Charterhouse of Notre-Dame-des-Prés; Montreuil Abbey; Mont-St-Michel.

HULL, ERNEST R., S.J., Editor, "The Examiner", Bombay, India: Mysore, Diocese of; Nagpur, Diocese of.

HUNT, LEIGH, Professor of Art, College of the City of New York: Morghen, Raffaello; Nanteuil, Robert; Navarrete, Juan Fernández.

INGOLD, A. M. P., Director, "Revue d'Alsace", Colmar, Germany: Morin, Jean.

JACQUIER, EUGÈNE, S.T.D., Professor of Sacred Scripture, University of Lyons: Matthew, Saint; Matthew, Gospel of Saint; Matthias, Saint.

JENNER, HENRY, F.S.A., Late of the British Museum, London: Mozarabic Rite.

JOHNSTON, FRANK, Ex-Attorney General of Mississippi, Jackson, Mississippi: Mississippi.

JONES, ARTHUR EDWARD, S.J., Corresponding Member of the Minnesota, Ontario, and Chicago Historical Societies; Hon. Member of the Missouri Historical Society; Member of the International Congress of Americanists; Archivist of St. Mary's College, Montreal: Millet, Pierre.

JOYCE, GEORGE HAYWARD, S.J., M.A. (Oxon.), St. Beuno's College, St. Asaph, Wales: Morality; Mystical Body of the Church.

KEARNS, WILLIAM J., LL.B., Newark, New Jersey: New Jersey.

KEILY, JARVIS, M.A., Grantwood, New Jersey: Miles, George Henry; Moylan, Stephen.

KELLY, BLANCHE M., New York: Mercy, Brothers of Our Lady of.

KELLY, LEO A., Ph.B., Rochester, New York: Mouchy, Antoine de.

KEMPENEER, ALBERT CANON, Ph.D., Litt.D., Professor of Church History at the Seminary, Inspector of Episcopal Colleges, Mechlin, Belgium: Mechlin, Archdiocese of.

KENDAL, JAMES, S.J., Bulawayo, Rhodesia, South Africa: Monomotapa.

KENNEDY, DANIEL J., O.P., S.T.M., Professor of Sacramental Theology, Catholic University of America, Washington: Massoulié, Antoine; Mazzolini, Sylvester; Medina, Bartholomew.

KENNEDY, THOMAS, B.A. (National University of Ireland), London: Matthew of Cracow; Mayhew, Edward; Milner, Robert, Venerable; Missions, Catholic; Mozambique; Nagasaki, Diocese of; New Caledonia, Vicariate Apostolic of; New Guinea.

KIRSCH, JOHANN PETER, S.T.D., Domestic Prelate, Professor of Patrology and Christian Archæology, University of Fribourg: Matilda of Canossa; Methodius of Olympus, Saint; Micrologus; Migne, Jacques-Paul; Millennium and Millenarianism; Miltiades, Saint, Pope; Mombritius, Bonino; Monarchia Sicula; Muratori, Luigi Antonio; Muratorian Canon; Nabor and Felix, Saints; Nazarius, Saint; Nazarius and Celsus, Saints and Martyrs; Nazarius and Companions, Saints; Neckam, Alexander of; Neher, Stephan Jakob; Nereus and Achilleus, Domitilla and Pancratius, Saints and Martyrs; Neugart, Trudpert.

KLEINSCHMIDT, BEDA, O.F.M., Rector, St. Ludwig's College, Harreveld, Holland: Metal-Work in the Service of the Church.

KURTH, GODEFROID, Director, Belgian Historical Institute, Rome: Netherlands, The.

LACY, RICHARD, Bishop of Middlesbrough, England: Middlesbrough, Diocese of.

LAGARDE, ERNEST, M.A., LL.D., Professor of English and Modern Languages, Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Maryland: Mount St. Mary's College.

LANGOUET, A., O.M.I., Kimberley, South Africa: Natal, Vicariate Apostolic of.

LAUCHERT, FRIEDRICH, Ph.D., Aachen: Middendorp, Jakob; Miletus (Müller), Vitus; Moufang, Franz Christoph Ignaz; Movers, Franz Karl; Müller, Adam Heinrich.

LECLERCQ, HENRI, O.S.B., London: Maundy Thursday; Meletius of Antioch; Meletius of Lycopolis.

LEJAY, PAUL, Fellow of the University of France, Professor, Catholic Institute, Paris: Minucius Felix; Mirandola, Giovanni Francesco Pico della; Mirandola, Giovanni Pico della; Muret, Marc-Antoine.

LENNOX, PATRICK JOSEPH, B.A., Professor of English and Literature, Catholic University of America: Moore (Moor), Michael.

LE ROY, ALEXANDER A., C.S.Sp., Bishop of Alinda, Superior General of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, Paris: Mayotte, Nossi-Bé, and Comoro, Prefecture Apostolic of; Morocco, Prefecture Apostolic of.

LINDSAY, LIONEL ST. GEORGE, B.Sc., Ph.D., Editor-in-Chief, "La Nouvelle France", Quebec: Meilleur, Jean-Baptiste; Mercier, Louis-Honoré; Montcalm-Gozon, Louis-Joseph; Montmagny, Charles Huault de.

LINS, JOSEPH, Freiburg, Germany: Mecklenburg; Mehrerau; Meissen; Metz; Minden, Diocese of; Minsk, Diocese of; Misocco and Calanca, Prefecture Apostolic of; Mohileff, Archdiocese of; Montenegro; Moravia; Munich-Freising, Archdiocese of; Münster, Diocese of.

LÖFFLER, KLEMENS, Ph.D., Librarian, University of Breslau: Melanchthon, Philipp; Mone, Franz.

LORIGAN, JAMES T., Knoxville, Tennessee: Nashville, Diocese of.

MAAS, A. J., S.J., Rector, Woodstock College, Maryland: Maurus, Sylvester.

MacERLEAN, ANDREW A., New York: Melito, Saint; Melo, Diocese of; Méndez and Gualaquiza, Vicariate Apostolic of; Meredith, Edward; Mérida, Diocese of; Metcalf, Edward; Ming, John; Montevideo, Archdiocese of; Morris, John Brande; Motu Proprio; Mozzi, Luigi; Neville, Edmund.

McGAHAN, FLORENCE RUDGE, M.A., Youngstown, Ohio: Mercy, Sisters of, of St. Borromeo; Michael, Military Orders of Saint; Michelis, Edward; Mount Calvary, Congregation of; Name of Jesus, Religious Communities of.

McHUGH, JOHN A., O.P., S.T.L., Lector of Philosophy, Dominican House of Studies, Washington: Mystery.

McNEAL, J. PRESTON, B.A., LL.B., Baltimore: Neale, Leonard.

MACPHERSON, EWAN, New York: Massa Candida; Meignan, Guillaume-René.

MADDEN, MARIE REGINA, Brooklyn, New York: Names of Jesus and Mary, Sisters of the Holy.

MAERE, R., S.T.D., Professor of Christian Archæology, University of Louvain: Montault, Xavier Barbier de; Museums, Christian.

MAES, CAMILLUS P., S.T.D., Bishop of Covington, Kentucky: Moye, John Martin, Venerable; Nerinckx, Charles.

MAHÉ, CELESTIN, Monroe, Louisiana: Natchitoches, Diocese of.

MAHER, MICHAEL, S.J., Litt.D., M.A. (London), Director of Studies and Professor of Pedagogics, Stonyhurst College, Blackburn, England: Metempsychosis; Mind.

MARIQUE, PIERRE JOSEPH, Instructor in French, College of the City of New York: Mercadé, Eustache; Meun, Jean Clopinel de; Michel, Jean; Montyon, Antoine-Jean-Baptiste-Robert Auget, Baron de; Moréri, Louis.

MAXWELL-SCOTT, Hon. Mrs., London: Maxwell, William; Maxwell, Winifred.

MEEHAN, THOMAS F., New York: Meagher, Thomas Francis; Monroe, James; Mulhall, Michael George; Mulholland, St. Clair Augustine; Mullanphy, John; Newark, Diocese of.

MEISTERMANN, BARNABAS, O.S.F., Lector, Convent of S. Salvator, Jerusalem: Naim; Nazareth.

MENARD, SISTER MARIE, Nazareth, Kentucky: Nazareth, Sisters of Charity of.

MERSHMAN, FRANCIS, O.S.B., S.T.D., Professor of Moral Theology, Canon Law, and Liturgy, St. John's College, Collegeville, Minnesota: Massuet, René; Maurice, Saint; Maurus, Saint; Meinwerk, Blessed; Ménard, Nicolas-Hugues; Menas, Saint; Nausea, Frederic.

MOELLER, CH., Professor of General History, University of Louvain: Military Orders, The; Montesa, Military Order of.

MOLLOY, JOSEPH VINCENT, O.P., S.T.L., New Haven, Connecticut: Mathusala.

MONTES DE OCA Y OBREGÓN, JOSÉ M. I., S.T.D., LL.D., Bishop of San Luis Potosí, Administrator Apostolic of Tamaulipas, Domestic Prelate to His Holiness and Assistant at the Pontifical Throne, Knight Grand Cross of the Holy Sepulchre, Knight of Isabella the Catholic, K. C. of Charles the Third, Member of the Madrid Academy of Languages and History, San Luis Potosí, Mexico: Mexico, Archdiocese of.

MOONEY, JAMES, United States Ethnologist, Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington: Mataco Indians; Maya Indians; Mayo Indians; Mayoruna Indians; Mazatec Indians; Mbaya Indians; Mengarini, Gregorio; Menominee Indians; Miami Indians; Mission Indians (of California); Missions, Catholic Indian, of the United States; Mixe Indians; Mixteca Indians; Mocoví Indians; Montagnais Indians (Quebec); Moxos Indians; Mozetena Indians.

MOORE, THOMAS V., C.S.P., St. Thomas's College, Washington: Memory.

MORICE, A. G., O.M.I., Editor of "Le Patriote de l'Ouest", Duck Lake, Saskatchewan, Canada: Mazenod, Charles Joseph Eugène de; Micmacs; Missions, Catholic Indian (Canada); Montagnais Indians (Chippewayans); Nahanes.

MUNNYNCK, MARK P. DE, S.T.D., Professor of Philosophy, University of Fribourg: Mechanism.

NOLAN, RICHARD S., B.A. (Trinity College, Dublin), London: Masses, Bequests for (England).

NYS, DÉSIRÉ, S.T.D., Ph.D., President, Séminaire Léon XIII, University of Louvain: Minkelers, Jean-Pierre.

OBRECHT, EDMOND M., O.C.R., Abbot of Gethsemani Abbey, Kentucky: Melleray; Mellifont, Abbey of; Molesme, Notre-Dame de; Montmirail, John de; Morimond, Abbey of; New Abbey; Newbattle.

O'CONNOR, CHARLES AUGUSTUS, M.A., LL.B., Manchester, New Hampshire: New Hampshire.

OLIGER, LIVARIUS, O.F.M., Lector of Church History, College S. Antonio, Rome: Mendicant Friars; Minimi (Minims).

OTT, MICHAEL, O.S.B., Ph.D., Professor of the History of Philosophy, St. John's College, Collegeville, Minnesota: Matilda, Saint; Maximilian (Martyrs); Maximinus, Saint; Maximus of Turin, Saint; Mayor, John; Mayr, Beda; Mechtild of Magdeburg; Mège, Antoine-Joseph; Mendoza, Francisco Sarmiento de; Mendoza, Pedro Gonzales de; Mezger, Francis, Joseph, and Paul; Michael de Sanctis, Saint; Milic, Jan; Miræus (Le Mire), Aubert; Mittarelli, Nicola Giacomo; Molina, Antonio de; Molitor, Wilhelm; Moschus, Johannes; Mundwiler, Fintan; Muzzarelli, Alfonso.

OTTEN, JOSEPH, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: Mohr, Joseph; Mozart, Johann Chrysostomus Wolfgang Amadeus; Musical Instruments in Church Services.

OUSSANI, GABRIEL, Ph.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Early Christian Literature, and Biblical Archæology, St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, New York: Mecca; Mohammed and Mohammedanism; Moses of Chorene.

PACIFIQUE, FATHER, O.M.Cap., Micmac Mission, Restigouche, Canada: Memberton Indians.

PÉREZ GOYENA, ANTONIO, S.J., Editor, "Razón y Fe", Madrid: Molinos, Miguel de.

PÉTRIDÈS, SOPHRONE, A.A., Professor, Greek Catholic Seminary of Kadi-Keui, Constantinople: Metellopolis; Miletopolis; Mocissus; Modra; Musti; Myndus; Nacolia; Nazianzus.

PHELAN, PATRICK, Vicar General and Dean of the Archdiocese of Melbourne, Australia: Melbourne, Archdiocese of.

PHILLIPS, EDWARD C., S.J., Ph.D., Woodstock College, Maryland: Neri, Antonio.

POHLE, JOSEPH, S.T.D., Ph.D., J.C.L., Professor of Dogmatic Theology, University of Breslau: Mass, Sacrifice of the; Merit; Molina, Luis de; Molinism.

POLLEN, JOHN HUNGERFORD, S.J., London: Molyneux, Sir Caryll; More, Henry; Morris, John.

POPE, HUGH, O.P., S.T.L., S.S.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Collegio Angelico, Rome: Monica, Saint.

POULAIN, AUGUSTIN, S.J., Paris: Mohammedan Confraternities.

RAINER, Mgr. JOSEPH, V.G., P.A., Rector, St. Francis Provincial Seminary, Professor of Sacred Scripture and Hebrew, St. Francis, Wisconsin: Milwaukee, Archdiocese of.

RANDOLPH, BARTHOLOMEW, C.M., M.A., Teacher of Philosophy and Church History, St. John's College, Brooklyn, New York: Mission, Congregation of Priests of the.

REILLY, THOMAS à K., O.P., S.T.L., S.S.L., Professor of Sacred Scripture, Dominican House of Studies, Washington: Medices (de Medicis), Hieronymus; Mosaic Legislation; Moses.

REMY, ARTHUR F. J., M.A., Ph.D., Adjunct-Professor of Germanic Philology, Columbia University, New York: Miracle Plays and Mysteries; Münch-Bellinghausen, Baron Eligius Franz Joseph von.

REZEK, ANTOINE IVAN, Houghton, Michigan: Mrak, Ignatius.

ROMPEL, JOSEF HEINRICH, S.J., Ph.D., Stella Matutina College, Feldkirch, Austria: Molina, Juan Ignacio; Mutis, José Celestino.

RYAN, JOHN A., S.T.D., Professor of Moral Theology, St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota: Monopoly, Moral Aspects of.

SAINT BEATRICE, SISTER, Sisters of the Misericorde, Montreal: Misericorde, Congregation of the Sisters of.

SALAVILLE, SÉVÉRIEN, A.A., Professor of Liturgy, Greek Catholic Seminary of Kadi-Keui, Constantinople: Memphis; Methymna; Miletus; Mitylene; Mylasa; Myra.

SAUVAGE, G.M., C.S.C., S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology, Holy Cross College, Washington: Mysticism; Necessity.

SCANNELL, THOMAS B. CANON, S.T.D., Editor, "Catholic Dictionary", Weybridge, England: Maury, Jean-Siffrein.

SCHEID, N., S.J., Stella Matutina College, Feldkirch, Austria: Morel, Gall; Morell, Juliana; Murner, Thomas.

SCHLAGER, HEINRICH PATRICIUS, O.F.M., St. Ludwig's College, Dalheim, Germany: Matthias of Neuburg; Mechtel, Johann; Ménard, Léon; Mermillod, Gaspard; Miltiz, Karl von; Möhler, Johann Adam; Moncada, Francisco de; Moy de Sons, Karl Ernst; Muchar, Albert Anton von.

SCHLITZ, CHARLES, S.J., Bonn, Germany: Melania, Saint (the Younger).

SCHROEDER, JOSEPH, O.P., Dominican House of Studies, Washington: Mensing, John; Missions, Catholic Parochial; Moneta; Monsabré, Jacques-Marie-Louis; Montesino, Antonio; Montesino, Luis de; Morales, Juan Bautista; Navarrete, Domingo Fernández; Nazarius, John Paul.

SENFELDER, LEOPOLD, M.D., Teacher of the History of Medicine, University of Vienna: Medicine, History of.

SHIPMAN, ANDREW J., M.A., LL.M., New York: Moscow.

SILLARD, PETER A., New York: Meehan, Charles Patrick.

SLATER, T., S.J., St. Beuno's College, St. Asaph, Wales: Mental Reservation.

SLOANE, CHARLES WILLIAM, New York: Mortmain.

SMITH, SYDNEY F., S.J., London: Mortification.

SMITH, WALTER GEORGE, M.A., LL.B. (U. of P.), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Masses, Devises and Bequests for (United States).

SOLLIER, JOSEPH FRANCIS, S.M., S.T.D., San Francisco, California: Mérode, Frédéric-François-Xavier Ghislain de.

SORTAIS, GASTON, S.J., Assistant Editor, "Etudes", Paris: Matteo da Siena; Messina, Antonello da; Morales, Luis de; Moroni, Giovanni Battista.

SOUVAY, CHARLES L., C.M., S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor, Sacred Scripture, Hebrew, and Liturgy, Kenrick Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri: Nabuchodonosor; Nahum; Names, Hebrew; Nephtali.

STACE, FRANCIS A., Grand Rapids, Michigan: Michigan.

SULLIVAN, WILLIAM CLEARY, LL.B., Secretary, Catholic Young Men's National Union, Washington: National Union, Catholic Young Men's.

SUTTON, JOHN P., Lincoln, Nebraska: Nebraska.

TALLON, WILLIAM THOMAS, S.J., Woodstock College, Maryland: Melia, Pius.

TARNOWSKI, COUNT STANISLAUS, President, Imperial Academy of Sciences, Professor, Polish Literature, University of Krakow: Mickiewicz, Adam.

THURSTON, HERBERT, S.J., London: Medals, Devotional; Menologium; Minister; Missal; Monk; Morone, Giovanni; Nails, Holy; Names, Christian; Natal Day; Necrologies.

TIERNEY, JOHN J., M.A., S.T.D., Professor of Sacred Scripture and Semitic Studies, Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Maryland: Melchisedech; Mesa.

TOKE, LESLIE ALEXANDER ST. LAWRENCE, B.A., Stratton-on-Fosse, Bath, England: Maurists, The; Melk, Abbey and Congregation of.

TURNER, WILLIAM, B.A., S.T.D., Professor of Logic and the History of Philosophy, Catholic University of America, Washington: Megarians; Melissus of Samos; Metaphysics; Michael Scotus; Monad; Monism; Neo-Platonism; Neo-Pythagorean Philosophy.

VAILHÉ, SIMÉON, A.A., Member of the Russian Archæological Institute of Constantinople, Professor of Sacred Scripture and History, Greek Catholic Seminary of Kadi-Keui, Constantinople: Mater; Maximianopolis; Maximopolis; Medea; Megara; Melitene; Melos; Mesopotamia, Kurdistan, and Armenia, Delegation Apostolic of; Messene; Metropolis; Milevum; Milopotamos; Mopsuestia; Mossul; Mosynoupolis; Mush; Myrina; Myriophytum; Neocæsarea; Neocæsarea (Pontus Polemoniacus); Neve.

VALLUET, LOUIS, Missionary of St. Francis de Sales of Annecy, Wilts, England: Missionaries of St. Francis de Sales of Annecy.

VAN HOONACKER, A., Professor of Critical History of the Old Testament and Oriental Languages, University of Louvain: Micheas; Nehemias, Book of.

VASCHALDE, A.A., C.S.B., Catholic University of America, Washington: Mesrob; Nerses, I–IV; Nerses of Lambron.

VERMEERSCH, ARTHUR, S.J., LL.D., Doctor of Social and Political Sciences, Professor of Moral Theology and Canon Law, Louvain: Modernism.

WAINEWRIGHT, JOHN BANNERMAN, B.A. (Oxon.), London: Maxfield, Thomas, Venerable; Mayne, Cuthbert, Blessed; Metham, Sir Thomas; Morgan, Edward, Venerable; Morse, Henry, Venerable; Morton, Robert, Venerable; Napper, George, Venerable.

WALLAU, HEINRICH WILHELM, Mainz, Germany: Mentelin, Johannes.

WALSH, JAMES J., M.D., Ph.D., LL.D., Dean of the Medical School, Fordham University, New York: Mercuriali, Geronimo; Mondino dei Lucci; Morgagni, Giovanni Battista; Müller, Johann; Nélaton, Auguste.

WALSH, REGINALD, O.P., S.T.D., Professor of Theology, S. Clemente, Rome: Master of the Sacred Palace.

WALSH, T. J., Helena, Montana: Montana.

WARD, Mgr. BERNARD CANON, President, St. Edmund's College, Ware, England: Milner, John.

WARREN, KATE MARY, Lecturer in English Literature under University of London at Westfield College, Hampstead, London: Moralities (Moral Plays).

WEBER, ANSELM, O.F.M., St. Michael's, Arizona: Navajo Indians.

WEBER, N. A., S.M., S.T.D., Professor of Fundamental Theology and Church History, Marist College, Washington: Maxentius, Joannes; Mennonites; Men of Understanding; Methodism; Michelians; Morcelli, Stefano Antonio.

WELD–BLUNDELL, EDWARD BENEDICT, O.S.B., Stanbrook, England: More, Helen (Dame Gertrude).

WESTLAKE, N. H. J., F.S.A., Hon. Member, British and American Archæol. Soc. of Rome; Member of the Archæol. Assoc. of London and of L'Union Internationale des Beaux-Arts, London: Mosaics.

WILHELM, J., S.T.D., Ph.D., Battle, England: Mediator.

WILLIAMSON, GEORGE CHARLES, Litt.D., London: Mazzolini, Ludovico; Mazzuchelli, Pietro Francesco; Melzi, Francesco; Meneses, Osorio Francisco; Mengs, Anthon Rafael; Mor (Moor), Antonis Van Dashorst; Morigi (Caravaggio), Michelangelo.

WILLIS, JOHN WILLEY, M.A., St. Paul, Minnesota: Minnesota.

WINDLE, BERTRAM C. A., M.B., Sc.D., M.D., B.Ch., LL.D., F.R.S., F.S.A., Vice-President, R.S.A.I., Senator, N. U. I., President, University College, Cork: Mendel, Mendelism.

WISSEL, JOSEPH, C.SS.R., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Neumann, John Nepomucene, Venerable.

WITTMANN, PIUS, Ph.D., Reichsarchivrat, Büdingen, Germany: Maximilian I, Duke of Bavaria.

WOLFSGRUBER, COELESTIN, O.S.B., Vienna: Metternich, Klemens Lothar Wenzel, Prince von; Migazzi, Christoph Anton; Milde, Vinzenz Eduard; Mostar and Markana-Trebinje, Diocese of; Mühlbacher, Engelbert.

ZIMMERMANN, BENEDICT, O.D.C., St. Luke's Priory, Wincanton, Somersetshire, England: Netter, Thomas.

Tables of Abbreviations

The following tables and notes are intended to guide readers of THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA in interpreting those abbreviations, signs, or technical phrases which, for economy of space, will be most frequently used in the work. For more general information see the article ABBREVIATIONS, ECCLESIASTICAL

I.—GENERAL ABBREVIATIONS.

a. . . . article.
ad an. . . . at the year (Lat. *ad annum*).
an., ann. . . . the year, the years (Lat. *annus, anni*).
ap. . . . in (Lat. *apud*).
art. . . . article.
Assyr. . . . Assyrian.
A. S. . . . Anglo-Saxon.
A. V. . . . Authorized Version (i.e. tr. of the Bible authorized for use in the Anglican Church—the so-called "King James", *or* "Protestant Bible").
b. . . . born.
Bk. . . . Book.
Bl. . . . Blessed.
C., c. . . . about (Lat. *circa*); canon; chapter; *compagnie*.
can. . . . canon.
cap. . . . chapter (Lat. *caput*—used only in Latin context).
cf. . . . compare (Lat. *confer*).
cod. . . . codex.
col. . . . column.
concl. . . . conclusion.
const., constit. . . . Lat. *constitutio*.
curâ. . . . by the industry of.
d. . . . died.
dict. . . . dictionary (Fr. *dictionnaire*).
disp. . . . Lat. *disputatio*.
diss. . . . Lat. *dissertatio*.
dist. . . . Lat. *distinctio*.
D. V. . . . Douay Version.
ed., edit. . . . edited, edition, editor.
Ep., Epp. . . . letter, letters (Lat. *epistola*).
Fr. . . . French.
gen. . . . genus.
Gr. . . . Greek.
H. E., Hist. Eccl. . . . Ecclesiastical History.
Heb., Hebr. . . . Hebrew.
ib., ibid. . . . in the same place (Lat. *ibidem*).
Id. . . . the same person, *or* author (Lat. *idem*).
inf. . . . below (Lat. *infra*).
It. . . . Italian.
l. c., loc. cit. . . . at the place quoted (Lat. *loco citato*).
Lat. . . . Latin.
lat. . . . latitude.
lib. . . . book (Lat. *liber*).
long. . . . longitude.
Mon. . . . Lat. *Monumenta*.
MS., MSS. . . . manuscript, manuscripts.
n., no. . . . number.
N. T. . . . New Testament.
Nat. . . . National.
Old Fr., O. Fr. . . . Old French.
op. cit. . . . in the work quoted (Lat. *opere citato*).
Ord. . . . Order.
O. T. . . . Old Testament.
p., pp. . . . page, pages, *or* (in Latin references) *pars* (part).
par. . . . paragraph.
passim. . . . in various places.
pt. . . . part.
Q. . . . Quarterly (a periodical), e.g. "Church Quarterly".
Q., QQ., quæst. . . . question, questions (Lat. *quæstio*).
q. v. . . . which [title] see (Lat. *quod vide*).
Rev. . . . Review (a periodical).
R. S. . . . Rolls Series.
R. V. . . . Revised Version.
S., SS. . . . Lat. *Sanctus, Sancti*, "Saint", "Saints"—used in this Encyclopedia only in Latin context.
Sept. . . . Septuagint.
Sess. . . . Session.
Skt. . . . Sanskrit.
Sp. . . . Spanish.
sq., sqq. . . . following page, *or* pages (Lat. *sequens*).
St., Sts. . . . Saint, Saints.
sup. . . . Above (Lat. *supra*).
s. v. . . . Under the corresponding title (Lat. *sub voce*).
tom. . . . volume (Lat. *tomus*).

tr. . . . . translation *or* translated. By itself it means "English translation", *or* "translated into English by". Where a translation is into any other language, the language is stated.

tr., tract. . . . . tractate.

v. . . . . see (Lat. *vide*).

Ven. . . . . Venerable.

Vol. . . . . Volume.

II.—Abbreviations of Titles.

Acta SS. . . . . *Acta Sanctorum* (Bollandists).

Ann. pont. cath. . . . . Battandier, *Annuaire pontifical catholique.*

Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath. Gillow, Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics.

Dict. Christ. Antiq. . . Smith and Cheetham (ed.), Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.

Dict. Christ. Biog. . . Smith and Wace (ed.), Dictionary of Christian Biography.

Dict. d'arch. chrét. . . Cabrol (ed.), *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie.*

Dict. de théol. cath. . Vacant and Mangenot (ed.), *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique.*

Dict. Nat. Biog. . . . . Stephen and Lee (ed.), Dictionary of National Biography.

Hast., Dict. of the Bible . . . . . Hastings (ed.), A Dictionary of the Bible.

Kirchenlex. . . . . Wetzer and Welte, *Kirchenlexicon.*

P. G. . . . . Migne (ed.), *Patres Græci.*

P. L. . . . . Migne (ed.), *Patres Latini.*

Vig., Dict. de la Bible. Vigouroux (ed.), *Dictionnaire de la Bible.*

Note I.—Large Roman numerals standing alone indicate volumes. Small Roman numerals standing alone indicate chapters. Arabic numerals standing alone indicate pages. In other cases the divisions are explicitly stated. Thus "Rashdall, Universities of Europe, I, ix" refers the reader to the ninth chapter of the first volume of that work; "I, p. ix" would indicate the ninth page of the preface of the same volume.

Note II.—Where St. Thomas (Aquinas) is cited without the name of any particular work the reference is always to "Summa Theologica" (not to "Summa Philosophiæ"). The divisions of the "Summa Theol." are indicated by a system which may best be understood by the following example: "I-II, Q. vi, a. 7, ad 2 um" refers the reader to the *seventh* article of the *sixth* question in the *first* part of the *second* part, in the response to the *second* objection.

Note III.—The abbreviations employed for the various books of the Bible are obvious. Ecclesiasticus is indicated by *Ecclus.*, to distinguish it from Ecclesiastes (*Eccles.*). It should also be noted that I and II Kings in D. V. correspond to I and II Samuel in A. V.; and I and II Par. to I and II Chronicles. Where, in the spelling of a proper name, there is a marked difference between the D. V. and the A. V., the form found in the latter is added, in parentheses.

Full Page Illustrations in Volume X

	PAGE
St. Matthew	56
Maya—Tablet with Hieroglyph Inscription, etc	84
Cardinal Mazarin—Philippe de Champagne	92
Cosimo de' Medici—Laurentian Library	120
Adoration of the Magi—Memling	174
St. David's Cathedral, St. David's, Wales	186
Messina (1907)	216
Metal Work	220
Bronze Doors, Ravello (1179)—Barifano of Trani	224
Cathedral, City of Mexico	250
Cathedral, Milan	300
The Angelus—Millet	312
Missal	356
Mitres of Bl. Nicolò Albergati, etc	404
Pietà—Montagna	510
Mont-Saint-Michel	552
Mosaic Map of Christian Palestine and Egypt	590
Moses	596
Munich	632
Murillo	644
Naples—Drying Macaroni, etc	686
Napoleon—Paul Delaroche	694
Narni	704
John Henry Cardinal Newman	796

Coloured Plates

Angel Playing a Violin—Melozzo da Forlì	168
St. Michael and the Dragon—Guido Reni	276
Scene in the Passion Play at Valenciennes, A. D. 1547	348
Battle of Issus (333 B. C.)	584

Maps

Mexico	268
Ecclesiastical Provinces of Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, Kingston	546

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA

M

Mass, Music of the.—Under this heading will be considered exclusively the texts of the Mass (and not, therefore, the Asperges, Vidi aquam, Litanies, Prophecies, etc., which in the Roman Missal are found more or less closely associated with the Mass in certain seasons of the Church Year), which receive a musical treatment. These texts comprise those which are sung (that is, recited in musical monotone with occasional cadences or inflections) by the celebrant and the sacred ministers (who will be referred to as priest, deacon, and sub-deacon) and which are styled "Accentus"; and those which are assigned to the choir and which are styled "Concentus". For the sake of convenience of reference the Concentus may be divided into the following classes: first, those which are found in the section of the Roman Missal under the heading "Ordinarium Missæ" (namely, the Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Benedictus, Agnus Dei) and which will be briefly referred to as the Ordinary; second, those texts which are found under the headings "Proprium de Tempore", "Proprium Sanctorum", "Commune Sanctorum" (namely, Introit, Gradual, Alleluia-Verse, Sequence, Tract, Offertory, Communion) and which will be referred to briefly as the Proper, a serviceable but ambiguous term frequently used to describe these texts.

The "Graduale Romanum" (together with the Missal) provides plain-song melodies for all the texts styled Accentus or Concentus. The Accentus must be plain-song, and must be that plain-song which is found in the present typical edition, styled the Vatican Edition, of the "Roman Gradual". The Concentus, if sung to plain-song melodies, must also be in the approved form found in the Vatican Edition of the "Gradual"; but these texts may employ "modern" (as opposed to "medieval") music, provided the musical treatment is in every way appropriate as indicated in the "Instruction on Sacred Music", commonly styled the "Motu Proprio", issued by Pius X on the Feast of St. Cecilia, Patron of Church Music (22 Nov., 1903). This "modern" or "figured" music is customarily styled in Church decrees simply *musica*, and the plain chant or plain-song is styled *cantus* (chant). The serviceable distinction will be employed throughout this article: chant, chanting, chanted, will refer to plain-song melodies; music, musical, to figured music.

I. Accentus.—These chants should never be accompanied by the organ or any other instrument. The priest intones the Gloria (Gloria in excelsis Deo) and the Credo (Credo in unum Deum). The choir must not repeat these words of the intonation, but must begin with Et in terra pax, etc., and Patrem omnipotentem, etc., respectively. The priest also sings the Collects and post-Communions and the Dominus vobiscum and Oremus preceding them. Amen is sung by the choir at the end of these prayers, as also after the Per omnia sæcula sæculorum preceding the Preface, the Pater noster and the Pax Domini . . . vobiscum. The choir responds with Et cum spiritu tuo to the Dominus vobiscum preceding the prayers, the Gospel, and the Preface. Both of these choir responses vary from the usual monotone when occurring before the Preface; and the Amen receives an upward inflection before the Pax Domini, etc. Indeed, the Dominus vobiscum and its response vary in melody for all the three forms of the Preface (the Tonus Solemnis, the Tonus Ferialis, the Tonus Solemnior found in the "Cantus Missalis Romani"), as do also the chants and responses of the Sursum corda, etc., preceding the Preface. It would be highly desirable that choirs be well practised in these special "tones" since exact correspondence with the form used by the priest is not only of æsthetic but of practical value; for any deviation from one of the "tones" into another may easily lead the priest astray and produce a lamentable confusion of forms which ought to be kept distinct.

At the end of the priest's chant of the Pater noster the choir responds with Sed libera nos a malo. The sub-deacon chants the Epistle, the deacon the Gospel. The respective responses (Deo Gratias and Laus tibi Christe) are merely to be said by the ministers of the Mass, and are not to be sung or recited by the choir. This is clear from the fact that the "Roman Gradual" does not assign any notation to these responses (see "Ecclesiastical Review", Nov., 1903, p. 539). To the deacon's chant of the Ite missa est (or Benedicamus Domino) the choir responds with Deo gratias. A Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites permits the organ to supply for this response wherever this is customary (see "Church Music", May, 1909, 175–6), provided the response be "recited" in a clear voice (see "Church Music", May, 1907, 229). The chant melodies for all these choir-responses are given in the Vatican "Gradual" under the heading "Toni Communes Missæ". It is customary in many churches to harmonize the chant-responses and even to depart in some details from the melodies officially assigned to the chant-responses. In summing up the legislation in this matter, the "Motu Proprio" says (No. 12): "With the exception of the melodies proper to the celebrant at the altar and to the ministers, which must be always sung only in Gregorian chant, and without the accompaniment of the organ, all the rest of the liturgical chant belongs to the choir of Levites and, therefore, singers in church, even when they are laymen, are really taking the place of the ecclesiastical choir. Hence the music rendered by them must, at least for the greater part, retain the character of choral music." But while the choir is thus permitted to respond in music or in harmonized chant, good taste might suggest the desirability of responding in unharmonized chant according to the exact melodies provided in the "Toni Communes Missæ".

Inasmuch as the Vatican "Gradual" is meant merely for the use of the choir, the complete Accentus of the celebrant and ministers will not be found there. The Missal contains these chants in full (except, of course, the chants for the prayers, prophecies, etc., which are

to be recited or sung according to certain general forms which are indicated in the "Toni Com. Mis."). However, a number of changes made in the Missal melodies by order of the Vatican Commission on Chant have been comprised in a separate publication entitled "Cantus Missalis Romani" (Rome, Vatican Press, 1907), which has been edited in various styles by competent publishers of liturgical books. Henceforth no publisher is permitted to print or publish an edition of the Missal containing the melodies in use heretofore, but must insert the new melodies according to the scheme found in the "Cantus Missalis Romani". Some of the new melodic forms are to appear in the places occupied, in the typical edition of the Missal (1900), by the forms hitherto in use, while some are to be placed in an Appendix.

The Decree of 8 June, 1907, contains the following clauses: (1) Dating from this day, the proofs containing the new typical chant of the Missal are placed by the Holy See without special conditions, at the disposal of the publishers, who can no longer print or publish the chant of the Missals in use at present. (2) The new typical chant must be inserted in the new editions exactly in the same place as the old. (3) It may, however, be published separately or it may be placed at the end of the older Missals now in print, and in both of these cases may bear the general title, "Cantus missalis Romani iuxta editionem Vaticanam". (4) The Tract Sicut cervus of Holy Saturday must hereafter be printed with the words only, without chant notation. (5) The intonations or chants *ad libitum*, Asperges me, Gloria in excelsis, and the more solemn tones of the Prefaces must not be placed in the body of the Missal, but only at the end, in the form of a supplement or appendix; to them (the *ad libitum* intonations or chants) may be added, either in the Missals or in separate publications of the chanted parts, the chants of the "Toni communes", already published in the "Gradual", which have reference to the sacred ministers. (6) No change is made in the words of the text or in the rubrics, which, therefore, must be reproduced without modification, as in the last typical edition (1900).

In the midst of the perplexities inevitably associated with such modifications of or additions to the former methods of rendering the Accentus, Dom Johner, O.S.B., of the Beuron Congregation, has come to the assistance of clerics, by collecting into one conveniently arranged manual ("Cantus Ecclesiastici iuxta editionem Vaticanam", Ratisbon, 1909: 146 pages, 12 mo.) all of the Accentus (including the responses) found in the "Toni Communes Missæ" of the "Graduale Romanum" (1908) and in the "Cantus Missalis Romani" (1908). These he has illustrated with appropriate extracts from the "Rubricæ Missalis Romani", and has added comments and explanations of his own in brackets in order to distinguish them from official matter (e. g. pp. 14, 15, when discussing the festal tone of the Oratio). While such a volume is appropriate for the study or the class-room, the intonations of the priest and deacon have been issued for use in the sanctuary, in various forms. At Tournai, Belgium, is published "Intonationes celebrantis in Missa ad exemplar editionis Vaticanæ" (containing the Asperges, Vidi aquam, Gloria, Credo, Ite Missa est, Benedicamus Domino, for all the masses contained in the "Kyriale") on seven cards of Bristol-board which are enclosed in a case and also in form of a pamphlet bound in cloth. At Düsseldorf is issued a collection of the intonations (under the title of "Tabula Intonationum") of the Gloria (15), Credo (4), Ite Missa est and Benedicamus (17), and Requiescant in pace, pasted on thin but strong cardboard (cloth-covered) of four pages. These are given here merely as illustrations of the practical means at hand for actually inaugurating the reform of the Accentus; other publishers of the official editions of the chant books may be consulted for other forms for use in the sanctuary.

Some of these forms of chant-intonations are for use *ad libitum*. The various intonations of the Gloria and Credo bear a close relation to the succeeding chant of the choir, while those of the Ite Missa est or Benedicamus are frequently identical in melody with the chant of the Kyrie eleison. Nominally, these chants and intonations are assigned to definite seasons of the Church Year or to peculiar kinds of rite (solemn, double, semi-double, ferial, etc.), but inasmuch as permission has been given to use the chants of the "Kyriale" indifferently for any rite or season, the only requirement to be met by the priest is the artistic one, of singing the intonation of the Mass which the choir will actually render in chant. Thus it will be seen that the many intonations furnished do not represent an obligatory burden but merely a large liberty of choice. The chant of the Ite missa est by the deacon would seem similarly to be a matter of artistic appropriateness rather than of liturgical law.

II. The Concentus.—These texts may be sung in chant or in music. If chant be used, it must be either that contained in the "Vatican Gradual," or some other approved form of the "traditional melodies" (see "Motu Proprio" of 25 April, 1904, d; the Decree of the S. R. C., 11 August, 1905, VI; the Decree prefixed to the "Kyriale", dated 14 August, 1905, closing paragraph); if the setting be musical, it must meet all the requirements summarily indicated in the "Motu Proprio" of 22 November, 1903 (see Music, Ecclesiastical). Under the heading of Concentus must be considered (a) the Ordinary, (b) the Proper.

(a) *The Ordinary.*—The texts are those of the Kyrie, the Gloria, the Credo, the Sanctus, the Benedictus, the Agnus Dei. A collection of these, or a portion of them, is styled simply a "Mass". When several "Masses" are written by the same composer, they are differentiated numerically (e. g. Mozart's No. 1, No. 2, No. 17) or by dedication to some particular feast (e. g. Gounod's "Messe de Paques"), or saint (e. g. Gounod's "St. Cecilia" Mass), or devotion (e. g. Gounod's "Messe du Sacré Coeur"), or musical association (e. g. Gounod's "Messe des Orphéonistes", Nos. I, II), or musical patron (e. g. Palestrina's "Missa Papæ Marcelli"), or special occasion (e. g. Cherubini's "Third Mass in A" entitled the "Coronation Mass", as it was composed for the coronation of King Charles X). The title Missa Brevis is sometimes employed for a Mass requiring only a moderate time for its rendition (e. g. Palestrina's "Missa Brevis"; Andrea Gabrieli's printed in Vol. I. of Proske's "Musica Divina") although the term scarcely applies, save in another sense, to J. S. Bach's "Missa Brevis" (in A) comprising in its forty-four closely printed pages only the music of the Kyrie and Gloria. In some Masses the place of the Benedictus is taken by an O Salutaris. A polyphonic Mass composed, not upon themes taken from chant melodies (as was the custom), was styled "sine nomine". Those founded upon chant subjects were thus styled (e. g. Palestrina's "Ecce Sacerdos Magnus", "Virtute Magna", etc.) or when founded on secular song themes unblushingly bore the appropriate title (e. g. Palestrina's "L'homme armé"). Masses were sometimes styled by the name of the chant-mode in which they were composed (e. g. "Primi Toni") or, founded on the hexachordal system, were styled "Missa super voces musicales" (Missa Ut, Re, Mi, Fa, Sol, La); or bore as title the number of voices employed (e. g. "Missa Quatuor Vocum").

This is not the place to rehearse the story of the gradual development and corruption of ecclesiastical music, of the many attempts at reform, and of the latest pronouncements of the Holy See which oblige consciences with all the force of liturgical law An excellent summary of this history is given by Dr. Rockstro in Grove's "Dictionary of Music and Musi-

cians" (s. v. Mass), which may be supplemented by the recent abundant literature of the reform-movement in Church Music. It is of more immediate and practical importance to indicate the various catalogues or lists of music compiled by those who are seeking to reform the music of the Mass. It is interesting to reflect that in his earlier legislation on this subject, Leo XIII recommended a diocesan commission to draw up a diocesan Index of Repertoires, or at least to sanction the performance of pieces therein indicated, whether published or unpublished. In the later *Regolamento* of 6 July, 1894, the S. C. of Rites does not refer to any such index but merely requires bishops to exercise appropriate supervision over the pastors so that inappropriate music may not be heard in their churches. The present pope has nowhere indicated the necessity, or even the advisability, of compiling such an index or catalogue, but has required the appointment, in every diocese, of a competent commission which shall supervise musical matters and see that the legislation of the "Motu Proprio" be properly carried out.

Nevertheless, it was the stimulus of the *Regolamento* of 1894 which led to the compilation, in the Diocese of Cincinnati, of a highly informing "First Official Catalogue" of that diocesan commission, which was made obligatory by Archbishop Elder in a letter dated 26 July, 1899, and which was to go into operation on the First Sunday of Advent (3 Dec.) of that year. The commission requested pastors to submit the music used, for inspection by the commission. The catalogue does not content itself with approving certain of these compositions, but takes the trouble both to mark "rejected" after the various titles and to give, usually, the reason for the rejection. In the following year it issued its "Second Official Catalogue". Both catalogues are important as illustrating the exact musical conditions of one great diocese, and show forth more searchingly than many arguments the need of reform. These catalogues have been rendered obsolete by the more stringent recent legislation.

But, although that legislation has not prescribed the compilation of lists of approved music, many such catalogues or lists have been compiled. They all pay great attention to the music of the Mass, and should prove of the greatest assistance to choir-masters [see "Church Music", Dec., 1905, 80–92; March, 1906, 157–168; Sept., 1906, 541–545, for an account of the two Cincinnati catalogues, and for those of Salford, Eng., Grand Rapids, Mich., Pittsburg, Pa., Waterford and Lismore, Ireland, Covington, Ky., Liverpool, Eng., and Metz. These should be supplemented by Singenberger, "Guide to Catholic Church Music" (St. Francis, Wisconsin, 1905); Terry, "Catholic Church Music" (London, 1907), 201–213; the lists of publishers who understand and respect the provisions of the "Motu Proprio", and the review-pages of the many magazines, in various lands, devoted to the reform movement in sacred music]. Correct and appropriate music for Mass, for all degrees of musical ability or choral attainment and of the greatest abundance and freshness and individuality of style, can now be easily obtained.

In selecting a Mass it is always advisable to read the text in order to see that it is both complete and liturgically correct; that there should be no alteration or inversion of the words, no undue repetition, no breaking of syllables. In addition, the "Motu Proprio" specifies [No. 11 (a)]: "The Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, etc., of the Mass must preserve the unity of composition proper to their text. It is not lawful, therefore, to compose them in separate pieces, in such a way that each of those pieces may form a complete composition in itself, and be capable of being detached from the rest, and substituted by another". It further remarks (No. 22): "It is not lawful to keep the priest at the altar waiting on account of the chant or the music for a length of time not allowed by the liturgy. According to the ecclesiastical prescriptions the Sanctus of the Mass should be over before the Elevation and therefore the priest must have regard to the singers. The Gloria and Credo ought, according to the Gregorian tradition, to be relatively short."

Something remains to be said of the chant of the Ordinary which is found in the separate small volume entitled "Kyriale". It is issued by the various competent publishers in all styles of printing, paper, binding, in large and small forms; in medieval and in modern notation; with and without certain "rhythmical signs". (See "Church Music", passim, for review-notices of the various issues; and particularly March, 1906, pp. 235–249, for an elaborate article on the earlier issues.) The eighteen "Masses" it contains are nominally assigned to various qualities of rite; but, in accordance with ancient tradition and with the unanimous agreement of the pontifical Commission on the Chant, liberty has been granted to select any "Mass" for any quality of rite (see the note "Quoslibet cantus" etc., p. 64 of the Vatican Edition of the "Kyriale": "Any chant assigned in this Ordinarium to one Mass may be used in any other; in the same way, according to the quality of the Mass or the degree of solemnity, any one of those which follow [that is, in the section styled "Cantus ad libitum"] may be taken"). The decrees relating to the publishing of editions based on this typical edition, and to its promulgation, are given in Latin and English translation in "Church Music", March, 1906, pp. 250–256.

It is noteworthy that this typical edition gives no direction about singing the Benedictus after the Elevation, but prints both chants in such juxtaposition as to suggest that the Benedictus might be sung before the Elevation. In the "Revue du Chant Grégorien" (Aug.–Oct., 1905), its editor, Canon Grospellier, who was one of the Consultors of the Gregorian Commission, said that he was inclined to think that, where time allows, the Benedictus might be sung immediately after the Sanctus. The Pontifical Commission at its meeting at Appuldurcombe, in 1904, unanimously accepted a resolution to this effect. The preface to the Vatican "Gradual", while giving minute directions for the ceremonial rendering of the chants merely says: "When the Preface is finished, the choir goes on with the Sanctus, etc." At the elevation of the Blessed Sacrament, the choir is silent like every one else. Nevertheless, inasmuch as the "Gradual" does not declare that the Benedictus is to be chanted after the Elevation, the "etc." is understood to imply that it should be sung immediately after the Sanctus. The "Cæremoniale Episcoporum", however, directs that it be sung "after the elevation of the chalice". The apparent conflict of authorities may be harmonized by supposing that the "Cæremoniale" legislated for the case of musically developed (e. g. polyphonic) settings of the Sanctus and the Benedictus, whose length would necessitate their separation from each other; while the "Gradual" contemplates, of course, the much briefer settings of the plain-song (see "Church Music", Jan., 1909, p. 87).

(b) *The Proper.*—While the texts of the Ordinary do not (with the exception of the Agnus Dei, which is altered in Requiem Mass) change, those which commonly, but somewhat ambiguously, are called the "Proper", change in accordance with the character of the feast or Sunday or ferial day. These texts are the Introit, Gradual, Alleluia-Verse, Sequence, Tract, Offertory, Communion. Not all of these will be found in any one Mass. Thus, e. g. Holy Saturday has no Introit, Gradual, Offertory, Communion; from Low Sunday to Trinity Sunday, the Gradual is replaced by an Alleluia-Verse; from Septuagesima to Easter, as well as on certain penitential days, the Alleluia-Verse, which ordinarily follows the Gradual, is replaced by a Tract; in only a few Masses is a Sequence used; there

is no Introit on Whitsun Eve, while the customary Gloria Patri after the Introit is omitted during Passiontide. In Requiem Masses the Gloria Patri is omitted after the Introit, a Tract and a Sequence follow the Gradual. Nor do the texts differ for every feast, as is illustrated by the division of the Sanctorale into the "Proprium de Sanctis" and the "Commune Sanctorum", this latter division grouping the feasts into classes, such as the feasts of confessors-bishops, confessors-not-bishops, martyrs, virgins, etc., in which the texts of the "Proper" serve for many feasts of the "Propers" in many churches. They are, however, an integral part of the duty of the choir, and must be sung, or at least "recited", in a clear and intelligible voice, the organ meanwhile sustaining appropriate chords.

In a Rescript dated 8 August, 1906, the S. R. C., answering questions proposed by the Abbot of Santa Maria Maggiore in Naples, declares that in solemn Mass, when the organ is used, the Gradual, Offertory, Communion, when not sung, must be recited in a high and intelligible voice, and that the Deo Gratias following the Ite missa est should receive the same treatment (see "Church Music", May, 1907, 229–235). Previous answers of the S. R. C. were of similar tenor. Thus (Coimbra, 14 April, 1753): in a "Community Mass" it is always necessary to sing the Gloria, Credo, all of the Gradual, the Preface, Pater noster; so, too, a question from Chioggia in 1875, as to whether the custom introduced into that diocese of omitting the chant of the Gradual, the Tract, the Sequence, the Offertory, the Benedictus, the Communion was contrary to the rubrics and decisions of the S. R. C., was answered affirmatively, and the questioner was remitted to the Coimbra decision. A specific difficulty was offered for solution by a bishop who declared that in his diocese where a single chanter was used, and where the people had to hurry to their daily work, the custom had obtained (throughout almost the whole diocese) of omitting, in stipendiary Masses, the Gloria, Gradual, Tract, Sequence, Credo. He was answered (29 Dec., 1884) that the custom was an abuse that must be absolutely eliminated. The spirit of the Church legislation is summed up in the "Motu Proprio" (22 Nov., 1903, No. 8): "As the texts that may be rendered in music, and the order in which they are to be rendered, are determined for every function, it is not lawful to confuse this order or to change the prescribed texts for others collected at will, or to omit them entirely or even in part, except when the rubrics allow that some versicles of the text be supplied with the organ while these versicles are simply recited in choir. It is permissible, however, according to the custom of the Roman Church, to sing a motet to the Blessed Sacrament after the Benedictus in a solemn Mass. It is also permitted after the Offertory prescribed for the Mass has been sung, to execute during the time that remains a brief motet to words approved by the Church."

A practical difficulty is encountered in the fact that many choirs have met the limit of their capacity in preparing the chant or music of the Ordinary, whose texts are fixed and repeated frequently. How shall such choirs prepare for a constantly changing series of Proper texts, whether in chant or in music? Several practical solutions of the difficulty have been offered. There is, first of all, the easy device of recitation. For an elaborate discussion of the times when it may be used, the character it should assume, the legal aspects and decisions concerning it, see the Rev. Ludwig Bonvin's article in "Church Music," March, 1906, pp. 146–156. Then there is the solution offered in the excellent and laborious work of Dr. Edmund Tozer, who prepared simple psalm-like settings which could be easily mastered by a fairly equipped choir. The work "The Proper of the Mass for Sundays and Holidays" (New York, 1907–1908, Vol. II, No. 2926) is reviewed in "Church Music" Jan., 1907, 127–128; Mar., 1908, 171–178; see also June, 1906, "One Outcome of the Discussion", 409–415, including a specimen-four-page of Dr. Tozer's method of treatment of the Proper text. A third volume which will comprise various local texts is in course of preparation. Another method is that undertaken by Marcello Capra, of Turin, Italy, which provides musical settings for the Proper of the principal feasts, for one or two voices, and with easy organ accompaniment. Still another method is that of Giulio Bas, who has compiled a volume, "Gradualis, Versus Alleluiatici et Tractus" (Düsseldorf, 1910), of plain-song settings from the Ambrosian, Aquileian, Greek, Mozarabic chant, for Sundays and Double Feasts, in order to facilitate the rendering of the more difficult portions of the Proper.

However rendered, these chants of the Proper must not be omitted or curtailed. But apart from this liturgical necessity, they challenge admiration because of their devotional, poetic, æsthetic perfection: "If we pass in review before our musical eye the wonderful thoughts expressed in the Introits, Graduals, Alleluia Verses, Tracts, Offertories, and Communions of the whole ecclesiastical year, from the first Sunday in Advent to the last Sunday after Pentecost, as well as those of the numerous Masses of the saints, apostles, martyrs, confessors, virgins, we must feel that in the Roman Church we have an anthology worthy of our highest admiration" (Rev. H. Bewerunge, "Address at London Eucharistic Congress"). It should be a part of a choirmaster's business to translate and explain these texts to his choir, that they may be recited or sung with the understanding as well as with the voice. To this end the "Missal for the Laity", with its Latin and parallel English version, might be used. The spirit of the liturgy might also be largely acquired from the volumes of Dom Guéranger's "Liturgical Year". As this is, however, such an extensive work, the much briefer and more direct treatments of the texts of the Proper with comment on the spirit, which ran serially through the issues of "Church Music", would prove highly serviceable.

With respect to the plain-song setting, two typical chants should be studied carefully (see Dom Eudine's articles in "Church Music", March, 1906, 222–235, on "the Gradual for Easter", "the Hæc dies", and June, 1906, 360–373, on "the Introit Gaudeamus", which give the plain-song notation with transcription into modern notation, rhythmical and dynamical analyses, etc.). Such a study will encourage the present day musician to acquire a greater familiarity with the plain-song of the Proper which present-day choirs should have: "First, there is the Gregorian Chant. The more one studies these ancient melodies the more one is impressed by their variety and rare beauty. Take the distinctiveness of their forms, the characteristic style which distinguishes an Introit from a Gradual, an Offertory from a Communion. Then within each class what variety of expression, what amazing interpretation of the words, and above all what sublime beauty and mystical spirit of prayer! Certainly, anyone who has tasted the sweetness of these chants must envy the few privileged places where there is high Mass every day and thus a chance is given of hearing all of these divine strains at least once a year" (Bewerunge).

There is a large body of settings of the classical polyphonic schools, and of modern polyphony, as also much illustration of modern homophonic music, of the proper texts. Care should be taken to see that the texts thus treated are verbally correct. For in the return to the traditional melodies of the chants, the commission found it necessary to restore, in very many instances, omitted portions of text, and in various ways to restore to use the more ancient forms of the texts. In the "Proprium de Tempore", for instance, there are about 200 textual

changes. A summary view of their general character is given in "Church Music" (July, 1908), pp. 232–235. Since these altered texts differ from those still retained in the Missal, choirs which "recite" the texts will do so from the Vatican "Gradual", and not from the Missal. When the "Gradual" was first issued, it was noticed that the Propers of some American feasts (as also, of course, the Propers of many foreign dioceses as well) were omitted (see "Church Music," March, 1908, 132–134). Some publishers have added these Propers for America, in an appendix bound in with the volume. Doubtless a similar process will be adopted in the case of many foreign dioceses.

Many questions which touch the musical part of the services at Mass belong to the general subject of the reform movement in Church Music, and will be more appropriately treated under the heading MUSIC, ECCLESIASTICAL. Such are, e. g. the long debated matter of the use of women's voices in our gallery-choirs; the capabilities of chorister boys for the proper rendition of the Ordinary and the Proper; the use of chants with rhythmical signs added; the character of the rhythm to be used ("oratorical" or "measured"); the character of accompaniment best suited to the chant; the use of musical instruments in chanted or musical Masses; the status of women as organists; the adoption of a sanctuary choir, whether in place of, or in conjunction with, the gallery choir. Historically the reform movement in the chant was signalized by the issuance, first of all, of the "Kyriale", which contains the Ordinary chants, and then of the "Graduale", which comprises all the chants for Mass; but this matter also belongs to a more general treatment.

DUCLOS, *Sa Sainteté Pie X et la musique Religieuse* (Rome, 1905), 95–105; FINN-WELLS-O'BRIEN, *Manual of Church Music* (Philadelphia, 1905); see Index for special references to Mass chants and music; JOHNER, *A New School of Gregorian Chant* (New York, 1906), 93–142; TERRY, *Catholic Church Music* (London, 1907): gives Church legislation, 9–46, and the order of the Mass service, 124–125; BENEDICTINES OF STANBROOK, *A grammar of Plain-song* (Worcester, 1905): see Index; MITTERER, *Ecclesiastical Precepts in Reference to Church Music* (London, 1901); WAGNER (BOUR tr.), *Origine et Dévelopement du Chant Liturgique, etc.* (Tournai, 1904), 64–126; TOZER, *The Proper of the Mass for Sundays and Holidays*, 3 vols. (New York, 1907–1910; WEINMANN, *Karl Proske, der Restaurator der klassischen Kirchemusik* (Ratisbon, 1909). The following in *Church Music:* BEWERUNGE, *Music at Mass and Benediction* (Nov., 1908), 15–18 and (Jan., 1909) 65–66; WAEDENSCHWILER, *Classical and Modern Polyphony in Europe* (March, 1908), 147–151; IDEM, *The Present Status of Plain-song in Europe; Theory and Practice of Appuldurcombe* (Jan., 1908), 89–93; *The Vatican Graduale and Its Alleluia* (March, 1908), 159; *The Proprium de Tempore* (March, 1908), 161; *New Ceremonial Points for the Choir* (Sept., 1908), 275; *Dates of the Kyriale Chants* (Sept., 1908), 281; *Variant Texts of the Missal and Gradual* (Sept., 1908), 305; *Repetition of the verse in the Gradual* (Jan., 1909), 88; *Vatican Gradual* (May, 1908), 199–201 (3 artt.); *De Ritibus Servandis in Cantu Missæ* (Mar., 1909), 108; *Preface to Gradual* (July, 1908), 233–238; GRATTAN-FLOOD, *Church Music in Ireland from 1878–1908* (Mar., 1909), 113–116 and (May, 1909) 161–163; WAEDENSCHWILER, *Applied Mensuralism* (May, 1909), 171; HUEGLE, *Fr. Bonvin's "Missa pro Defunctis"* (May, 1909), 154; IDEM, *Measured or Free Rhythm—Which?* (Sept., 1909), 278.

OTTEN, *Literature of Mensuralism*, ibid., 277; BONVIN, *Objections to Applied Mensuralism Examined* (July, 1909), 223. These references to Mensuralism are made here for historical reasons; practically the dispute seems to be settled by the Letter of Card. Martinelli, Prefect of the S. C. R., to Mons. Haberl, 18 Feb., 1910, declaring "absolutely false in itself and highly prejudicial to the uniform restoration of the chant throughout the Church" the opinion which has held that choir-masters may give what rhythm they please to the chant, and appealing to the evidence of the preface to the "Gradual" to prove the necessity of "free" (as it is technically styled) rhythm, or that advocated in general by the Benedictines. Mensuralism, or "measured" rhythm, is not free. For a translation of Card. Martinelli's letter into English together with comment, see *Ecclesiastical Review* (June, 1910), 734–738. SCHMIDT-WHITING, *Requiem Mass*, reviewed (May, 1909), 197, illustrates the necessity of continued caution in purchasing even recently issued editions of Masses: Much omission of text. No Graduale, no Communio, no Libera. The Introit omits *exaudi orationem meam;* the Kyrie is very defective in text, and is interposed between the Introit and its repetition. The Sequence omits forty-two lines of text. The Offertory omits *tu suscipe*, turns *fac eas* into *facias* and *faceas* (with proparoxytone rhythm), and superfluously adds Amen at the end. The Sanctus omits *Dominus*. For various editions of the Vatican chant books consult *Church Music* (passim).

H. T. HENRY.

Mass, NUPTIAL, "Missa pro sponso et sponsa", the last among the votive Masses in the Missal. It is composed of lessons and chants suitable to the Sacrament of Matrimony, contains prayers for persons just married and is interwoven with part of the marriage rite, of which in the complete form it is an element. As the Mass was looked upon as the natural accompaniment of any solemn function (ordination, consecration of churches, etc.), it was naturally celebrated as part of the marriage service. Tertullian (d. about 220; ad Uxor., II, 9) mentions the oblation that confirms marriage (matrimonium quod ecclesia conciliat et confirmat oblatio). All the Roman Sacramentaries contain the nuptial Mass (The Leonine, ed. Feltoe, 140–142; The Gelasian, ed. Wilson, 265–267; The Gregorian, P. L., LXXVIII, 261–264), with our present prayers and others (a special *Hanc Igitur* and Preface). The Gelasian Sacramentary (loc. cit.) contains, moreover, the blessing now said after the *Ite missa est*, then said after the Communion, a Gallican addition (Duchesne, "Origines du Culte", Paris, ed. 2, 1898, p. 417). Pope Nicholas I (858–867) in his instruction for the Bulgars, in 866, describes the whole rite of marriage, including the crowning of the man and wife that is still the prominent feature of the rite in the Byzantine Church; this rite contains a Mass at which the married persons make the offertory and receive communion (Resp. ad cons. Bulgarorum, iii, quoted by Duchesne, op. cit., 413–414).

The present rules for a nuptial Mass are: first, that it may not be celebrated in the closed time for marriages, that is from Advent Sunday till after the octave of the Epiphany and from Ash Wednesday till after Low Sunday. During these times no reference to a marriage may be made in Mass; if people wish to be married then they must be content with the little service in the Ritual, without music or other solemnities. This is what is meant by the rubric: "clauduntur nuptiarum solemnia"; it is spoken of usually as the closed season. During the rest of the year the nuptial Mass may be said at a wedding any day except Sundays and feasts of obligation, doubles of the first and second class and such privileged ferias and octaves as exclude a double. It may not displace the Rogation Mass at which the procession is made, nor may it displace at least one Requiem on All Souls' day. On these occasions its place is taken by the Mass of the day to which commemorations of the nuptial Mass are added in the last place and at which the blessings are inserted in their place. The nuptial blessing is considered as part of the nuptial Mass. It may never be given except during this Mass or during a Mass that replaces it (and commemorates it) when it cannot be said, as above. The nuptial Mass and blessing may be celebrated after the closed time for people married during it. So nuptial Mass and blessing always go together; either involves the other. One Mass and blessing may be held for several pairs of married people, who must all be present. The forms, however, remain in the singular as they are in the Missal. The Mass and blessing may not be held if the woman has already received this blessing in a former marriage. This rule only affects the woman, for whom the blessing is more specially intended (see the prayer *Deus qui potestate*). It must be understood exactly as stated. A former marriage without this blessing, or the fact that children had been born before the marriage, is no hindrance. Nor may the nuptial Mass and blessing be held in cases of mixed marriages (*mixta religio*) in spite of any dispensation. According to the Constitution "Etsi sanctissimus Dominus" of Pius IX (15 November, 1858), mixed marriages must be celebrated outside the church (in England and America this is understood as meaning outside the sanctuary and choir), without the blessing of the ring or of the spouses without any ecclesiastical rite or vestment, without proclamation of banns.

The rite of the nuptial Mass and blessing is this: The Mass has neither Gloria nor Creed. It counts as a votive Mass not for a grave matter; therefore it has three collects, its own, the commemoration of the day, and the third which is the one chosen for semi-doubles at that time of the year, unless there be two commemorations. At the end *Benedicamus Domino* and the Gospel of St. John are said. The colour is white. The bridegroom and bride assist near the altar (just outside the sanctuary), the man on the right. After the *Pater noster* the celebrant genuflects and goes to the epistle side. Meanwhile the bridegroom and bride come up and kneel before him. Turning to them he says the two prayers *Propitiare Domine* and *Deus qui potestate* (as in the Missal) with folded hands. He then goes back to the middle and continues the Mass. They go back to their places. He gives them Communion at the usual time. This implies that they are fasting and explains the misused name "wedding breakfast" afterwards. But the Communion is not a strict law (S. R. C., no. 5582, 21 March, 1874). Immediately after the *Benedicamus Domino* and its answer the celebrant again goes to the Epistle side and the bridegroom and bride kneel before him as before. The celebrant turning to them says the prayer *Deus Abraham* (without *Oremus*). He is then told to warn them "with grave words to be faithful to one another". The rest of the advice suggested in the rubric of the Missal is now generally left out. He sprinkles them with holy water; they retire, he goes back to the middle of the altar, says *Placeat tibi*, gives the blessing and finishes Mass as usual.

In the cases in which the "Missa pro sponso et sponsa" may not be said but may be commemorated, the special prayers and blessing are inserted in the Mass in the same way. But the colour must be that of the day. During the closed time it is, of course, quite possible for the married people to have a Mass said for their intention, at which they receive Holy Communion. The nuptial Blessing in this Mass is quite a different thing from the actual celebration of the marriage, which must always precede it. The blessing is given to people already married, as the prayers imply. It need not be given (nor the Mass said) by the priest who assisted at the marriage. But both these functions (assistance and blessing) are rights of the parish priest, which no one else may undertake without delegation from him. Generally they are so combined that the marriage takes place immediately before the Mass; in this case the priest may assist at the marriage in Mass vestments, but without the maniple. In England and other countries where a civil declaration is required by law, this is usually made in the sacristy between the marriage and the Mass. Canon Law in England orders that marriages be made only in churches that have a district with the cure of souls (Conc. prov. Westm. I, decr. XXII, 4). This implies as a general rule, but does not command absolutely, that the nuptial Mass also be celebrated in such a church.

See Rubrics of the *Missa pro sponso et sponsa* in the *Missal; Rituale Romanum. Tit. VII: de sacramento matrimonii;* Le Vavasseur, *Manuel de Liturgie*, I (Paris, 1910), 228–229; de Herdt, *Sacræ Liturgiæ Praxis*, III (Louvain, 1894), 361–377.

Adrian Fortescue.

Mass, Sacrifice of the.—A. *The Dogmatic Doctrine of the Mass.*—The word Mass (*missa*) first established itself as the general designation for the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the West after the time of Pope Gregory the Great (d. 604), the early Church having used the expression the "breaking of bread" (*fractio panis*) or "liturgy" (Acts, xiii, 2, λειτουργοῦντες); the Greek Church has employed the latter name for almost sixteen centuries. There were current in the early days of Christianity other terms: "The Lord's Supper" (*cœna dominica*), the "Sacrifice" (προσφορά, *oblatio*), "the gathering together" (σύναξις, *congregatio*), "the Mysteries", and (since Augustine) "the Sacrament of the Altar". With the name "Love-Feast" (ἀγάπη) the idea of the sacrifice of the Mass was not necessarily connected (see Agape). Etymologically, the word *missa* is neither (as Baronius states) from the Hebrew מסה nor from the Greek μόσις, but is simply derived from *missio*, just as *oblata* is derived from *oblatio*, *collecta* from *collectio*, and *ulta* from *ultio* (Du Cange, "Glossar.", s. v. "Missa"). The reference was however not to a Divine "mission", but simply to a "dismissal" (*dimissio*), as was also customary in the Greek rite (cf. "Canon. Apost.", VIII, xv: ἀπολύεσθε ἐν εἰρήνῃ), and as is still echoed in the phrase *Ite missa est.* This solemn form of leave-taking was not introduced by the Church as something new, but was adopted from the ordinary language of the day, as is shown by Bishop Avitus of Vienna as late as A. D. 500 (Ep. 1 in P. L., LIX, 199): "In churches and in the emperor's or the prefect's courts, *Missa est* is said when the people are released from attendance." In the sense of "dismissal", or rather "close of prayer", *missa* is used in the celebrated "Peregrinatio Silviæ" at least seventy times (Corpus scriptor. eccles. latinor., XXXVIII, 366 sq.), and the Rule of St. Benedict places after Hours, Vespers, and Compline, the regular formula: *Et missæ fiant* (prayers are ended). Popular speech gradually applied the ritual of dismissal, as it was expressed in both the Mass of the Catechumens and the Mass of the Faithful, by synecdoche to the entire Eucharistic Sacrifice, the whole being named after the part. The first certain trace of such an application is found in Ambrose (Ep. xx, 4, in P. L., XVI, 995). We will use the word in this sense in our consideration of the Mass in its (1) existence, (2) essence, and (3) causality.

(1) The Existence of the Mass.—Before dealing with the proofs of revelation afforded by the Bible and tradition, certain preliminary points must first be decided. Of these the most important is that the Church intends the Mass to be regarded as a "true and proper sacrifice", and will not tolerate the idea that the sacrifice is identical with Holy Communion. That is the sense of a clause from the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, can. i): "If any one saith that in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God; or, that to be offered is nothing else but that Christ is given us to eat; let him be anathema" (Denzinger, "Enchir.", 10th ed., 1908, n. 948). When Leo XIII in the dogmatic Bull "Apostolicæ Curæ" of 13 Sept., 1896, based the invalidity of the Anglican form of consecration on the fact among others, that in the consecrating formula of Edward VI (that is, since 1549) there is nowhere an unambiguous declaration regarding the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Anglican archbishops answered with some irritation: "First, we offer the Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; next, we plead and represent before the Father the Sacrifice of the Cross . . . and, lastly, we offer the Sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things, which we have already signified by the oblation of His creatures. This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take part with the priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic Sacrifice." In regard to this last contention, Bishop Hedley of Newport declared his belief that not one Anglican in a thousand is accustomed to call the communion the "Eucharistic Sacrifice". But, even if they were all so accustomed, they would have to interpret the terms in the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, which deny both the Real Presence and the sacrificial power of the priest, and thus admit a sacrifice in an unreal or figurative sense only. Leo XIII, on the other hand, in union with the whole Christian past, had in mind in the above-mentioned Bull nothing else than the Eucharistic "Sacrifice of the true Body and Blood of Christ" on the altar. This Sacrifice is certainly not identical with the Anglican form of celebration (see Anglicanism).

The simple fact that numerous heretics, such as Wyclif and Luther, repudiated the Mass as "idolatry", while retaining the Sacrament of the true Body and Blood of Christ, proves that the Sacrament of the Eucharist is something essentially different from the Sacrifice of the Mass. In truth, the Eucharist performs at once two functions: that of a sacrament and that of a sacrifice. Though the inseparableness of the two is most clearly seen in the fact that the consecrating and sacrificial powers of the priest coincide, and consequently that the sacrament is produced only in and through the Mass, the real difference between them is shown in that the sacrament is intended primarily for the sanctification of the soul, whereas the sacrifice serves primarily to glorify God by adoration, thanksgiving, prayer, and expiation. The recipient of the one is God, who receives the sacrifice of His only-begotten Son; of the other, man, who receives the sacrament for his own good. Furthermore, the unbloody Sacrifice of the Eucharistic Christ is in its nature a transient action, while the Sacrament of the Altar continues as something permanent after the sacrifice, and can even be preserved in monstrance and ciborium. Finally, this difference also deserves mention: communion under one form only is the reception of the whole sacrament, whereas, without the use of the two forms of bread and wine (the symbolic separation of the Body and Blood), the mystical slaying of the Victim, and therefore the Sacrifice of the Mass, does not take place.

The definition of the Council of Trent supposes as self-evident the proposition that, along with the "true and real Sacrifice of the Mass", there can be and are in Christendom figurative and unreal sacrifices of various kinds, such as prayers of praise and thanksgiving, alms, mortification, obedience, and works of penance. Such offerings are often referred to in Holy Scripture, e. g. in Ecclus., xxxv, 4: "And he that doth mercy, offereth sacrifice"; and in Ps. cxl, 2: "Let my prayer be directed as incense in thy sight; the lifting up of my hands as evening sacrifice." These figurative offerings, however, necessarily presuppose the real and true offering, just as a picture presupposes its subject and a portrait its original. The Biblical metaphors—a "sacrifice of jubilation" (Ps. xxvi, 6), the "calves of our lips" (Osee, xiv, 3), the "sacrifice of praise" (Heb., xiii, 15)—expressions which apply sacrificial terms to simple prayer—would be without application or meaning if there were not, or there had not been, a true and real sacrifice (hostia, *θυσία*). That there was such a sacrifice, the whole sacrificial system of the Old Law bears witness. It is true that we may and must recognize, with St. Thomas (II–II, Q. lxxxv, a. 3, ad 2um), as the *principale sacrificium* the sacrificial intent which, embodied in the spirit of prayer, inspires and animates the external offering as the body animates the soul, and without which even the most perfect offering has neither worth nor effect before God. Hence, the holy psalmist says: "For if thou hadst desired sacrifice, I would indeed have given it: with burnt-offerings thou wilt not be delighted. A sacrifice to God is an afflicted spirit" (Ps. l, 18 sq.). This indispensable requirement of an internal sacrifice, however, by no means makes the external sacrifice superfluous in Christianity; indeed, without a perpetual oblation deriving its value from the sacrifice once offered on the Cross, Christianity, the perfect religion, would be inferior not only to the Old Testament, but even to the poorest form of natural religion. Since sacrifice is thus essential to religion, it is all the more necessary for Christianity, which cannot otherwise fulfil its duty of showing outward honour to God in the most perfect way. Thus, the Church, as the mystical Christ, desires and must have her own permanent sacrifice, which surely cannot be either an independent addition to that of Golgotha or its intrinsic complement; it can only be the one self-same sacrifice of the Cross, whose fruits, by an unbloody offering, are daily made available for believers and unbelievers and sacrificially applied to them.

If the Mass is to be a true sacrifice in the literal sense, it must realize the philosophical conception of sacrifice. Thus the last preliminary question arises; What is a sacrifice in the proper sense of the term? Without attempting to state and establish a comprehensive theory of sacrifice (q. v.), it will suffice to show that, according to the comparative history of religions, four things are necessary to a sacrifice: a sacrificial gift (*res oblata*), a sacrificing minister (*minister legitimus*), a sacrificial action (*actio sacrifica*), and a sacrificial end or object (*finis sacrificii*). In contrast with sacrifices in the figurative or less proper sense, the sacrificial gift must exist in physical substance, and must be really or virtually destroyed (animals slain, libations poured out, other things rendered unfit for ordinary uses), or at least really transformed, at a fixed place of sacrifice (*ara, altare*), and offered up to God. As regards the person offering, it is not permitted that any and every individual should offer sacrifice on his own account. In the revealed religion, as in nearly all heathen religions, only a qualified person (usually called priest, *sacerdos*, *ἱερεύς*), who has been given the power by commission or vocation, may offer up sacrifice in the name of the community. After Moses, the priests authorized by law in the Old Testament belonged to the tribe of Levi, and more especially to the house of Aaron (Heb., v, 4). But, since Christ Himself received and exercised His high priesthood, not by the arrogation of authority but in virtue of a Divine call, there is still greater need that priests who represent Him should receive power and authority through the Sacrament of Holy orders to offer up the sublime Sacrifice of the New Law. Sacrifice reaches its outward culmination in the sacrificial act, in which we have to distinguish between the proximate matter and the real form. The form lies, not in the real transformation or complete destruction of the sacrificial gift, but rather in its sacrificial oblation, in whatever way it may be transformed. Even where a real destruction took place, as in the sacrificial slayings of the Old Testament, the act of destroying was performed by the servants of the Temple, whereas the proper oblation, consisting in the "spilling of blood" (*aspersio sanguinis*), was the exclusive function of the priests. Thus, the real form of the Sacrifice of the Cross consisted neither in the killing of Christ by the Roman soldiers nor in an imaginary self-destruction on the part of Jesus, but in His voluntary surrender of His blood shed by another's hand, and in His offering of His life for the sins of the world. Consequently, the destruction or transformation constitutes at most the proximate matter; the sacrificial oblation, on the other hand, is the physical form of the sacrifice. Finally, the object of the sacrifice, as significant of its meaning, lifts the external offering beyond any mere mechanical action into the sphere of the spiritual and Divine. The object is the soul of the sacrifice, and, in a certain sense, its "metaphysicial form". In all religions we find, as the essential idea of sacrifice, a complete surrender to God for the purpose of union with Him; and to this idea there is added, on the part of those who are in sin, the desire for pardon and reconciliation. Hence at once arises the distinction between sacrifices of praise and expiation (*sacrificium latreuticum et propitiatorium*), and sacrifices of thanksgiving and petition (*sacrificium eucharisticum et impetratorium*); hence also the obvious inference that, under pain of idolatry, sacrifice is to be offered to God alone as the beginning and end of all things. Rightly does St. Augustine remark (De civit. Dei, X, iv): "Who ever thought of offering sacrifice except to one whom he either knew, or thought, or imagined to be God?"

If then we combine the four constituent ideas in a definition, we may say: "Sacrifice is the external obla-

tion to God by an authorized minister of a sense-perceptible object, either through its destruction or at least through its real transformation, in acknowledgment of God's supreme dominion and for the appeasing of His wrath." We shall demonstrate the applicability of this definition to the Mass in the section devoted to the nature of the sacrifice, after settling the question of its existence.

(a) Scriptural Proof.—It is a notable fact that the Divine institution of the Mass can be established, one might almost say, with greater certainty by means of the Old Testament than by means of the New.

(i) The Old Testament prophecies are recorded partly in types, partly in words. Following the precedent of many Fathers of the Church (see Bellarmine, "De Euchar.", v, 6), the Council of Trent especially (Sess. XXII, cap. i) laid stress on the prophetical relation that undoubtedly exists between the offering of bread and wine by Melchisedech and the Last Supper of Jesus. The occurrence was briefly as follows: After Abraham (then still called "Abram") with his armed men had rescued his nephew Lot from the four hostile kings who had fallen on him and robbed him, Melchisedech, King of Salem (Jerusalem), "bringing forth [*proferens*, Heb. הוציא, Hiphil of יצא] bread and wine, for he was a priest of the Most High God, blessed him [Abraham] and said: Blessed be Abram by the Most High God . . . And he [Abraham] gave him the tithes of all" (Gen., xiv, 18–20). Catholic theologians (with very few exceptions) have from the beginning rightly emphasized the circumstance that Melchisedech brought out bread and wine, not merely to provide refreshment for Abram's followers wearied after the battle, for they were well supplied with provisions out of the booty they had taken (Gen., xiv, 11, 16), but to present bread and wine as food-offerings to Almighty God. Not as a host, but as "priest of the Most High God", he brought forth bread and wine, blessed Abraham, and received the tithes from him. In fact, the very reason for his "bringing forth bread and wine" is expressly stated to have been his priesthood: "for he was a priest". Hence, *proferre* must necessarily become *offerre*, even if it were true that יצא in Hiphil is not an hieratic sacrificial term; but even this is not quite certain (cf. Judges, vi, 18 sq.). Accordingly, Melchisedech made a real food-offering of bread and wine. Now it is the express teaching of Scripture that Christ is "a priest for ever according to the order [κατὰ τὴν τάξιν] of Melchisedech" (Ps. cix, 4; Heb., v, 5 sq.; vii, 1 sqq.). Christ, however, in no way resembled his priestly prototype in His bloody sacrifice on the Cross, but only and solely at His Last Supper. On that occasion He likewise made an unbloody food-offering, only that, as Antitype, He accomplished something more than a mere oblation of bread and wine, namely the sacrifice of His Body and Blood under the mere forms of bread and wine. Otherwise, the shadows cast before by the "good things to come" would have been more perfect than the things themselves, and the antitype at any rate no richer in reality than the type. Since the Mass is nothing else than a continual repetition, commanded by Christ Himself, of the Sacrifice accomplished at the Last Supper, it follows that the Sacrifice of the Mass partakes of the New Testament fulfilment of the prophecy of Melchisedech. (Concerning the Paschal Lamb as the second type of the Mass, see Bellarmine, "De Euchar.", V, vii; cf. also von Cichowski, "Das altestamentl. Pascha in seinem Verhältnis zum Opfer Christi", Munich, 1849.)

Passing over the more or less distinct references to the Mass in other prophets (Ps. xxi, 27 sqq.; Is., lxvi, 18 sqq.), the best and clearest prediction concerning the Mass is undoubtedly that of Malachias, who makes a threatening announcement to the Levite priests in the name of God: "I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts: and I will not receive a gift of your hand. For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles [גוים, heathens, non-Jews], and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation: for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts" (Mal., i, 10–11). According to the unanimous interpretation of the Fathers of the Church (see Petavius, "De incarn.", xii, 12), the prophet here foretells the everlasting Sacrifice of the New Dispensation. For he declares that these two things will certainly come to pass: (1) The abolition of all Levitical sacrifices, and (2) the institution of an entirely new sacrifice. As God's determination to do away with the sacrifices of the Levites is adhered to consistently throughout the denunciation, the essential thing is to specify correctly the sort of sacrifice that is promised in their stead. In regard to this, the following propositions have to be established: (1) that the new sacrifice is to come about in the days of the Messiah; (2) that it is to be a true and real sacrifice, and (3) that it does not coincide formally with the Sacrifice of the Cross.

It is easy to show that the sacrifice referred to by Malachias did not signify a sacrifice of his time, but was rather to be a future sacrifice belonging to the age of the Messiah. For though the Hebrew participles of the original can be translated by the present tense (there is sacrifice; it is offered), the mere universality of the new sacrifice—"from the rising to the setting", "in every place", even "among the Gentiles", i. e. heathen (non-Jewish) peoples—is irrefragable proof that the prophet beheld as present an event of the future. Wherever Jahwe speaks, as in this case, of His glorification by the "heathen", He can, according to Old Testament teaching (Ps. xxi, 28; lxxi, 10 sqq.; Is., xi, 9; xlix, 6; lx, 9; lxvi, 18 sqq.; Amos, ix, 12; Mich., iv, 2, etc.), have in mind only the kingdom of the Messiah or the future Church of Christ; every other explanation is shattered by the text. Least of all could a new sacrifice in the time of the prophet himself be thought of. Nor could there be any idea of a sacrifice among the genuine heathens, as Hitzig has suggested, for the sacrifices of the heathen, associated with idolatry and impurity, are unclean and displeasing to God (I Cor., x, 20). Again, it could not be a sacrifice of the dispersed Jews (*Diaspora*); for apart from the fact that the existence of such sacrifices in the Diaspora is rather problematic, they were certainly not offered the world over, nor did they possess the unusual significance attaching to special modes of honouring God. Consequently, the reference is undoubtedly to some entirely distinctive sacrifice of the future. But of what future? Was it to be a future sacrifice among genuine heathens, such as the Old Mexicans or the Congo negroes? This is as impossible as in the case of other heathen forms of idolatry. Perhaps then it was to be a new and more perfect sacrifice among the Jews? This also is out of the question, for since the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus (A. D. 70), the whole system of Jewish sacrifice is irrevocably a thing of the past; and the new sacrifice, moreover, is to be performed by a priesthood of an origin other than Jewish (Is., lxvi, 21). Everything, therefore, points to Christianity, in which, as a mattter of fact, the Messiah rules over non-Jewish peoples.

The second question now presents itself: Is the universal sacrifice thus promised "in every place" to be only a purely spiritual offering of prayer, in other words a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, such as Protestantism is content with; or is it to be a true sacrifice in the strict sense, as the Catholic Church maintains? It is forthwith clear that abolition and substitution must correspond, and accordingly that the old real sacrifice cannot be displaced by a new unreal sacrifice. Moreover, prayer, adoration, thanksgiving, etc., are far from being a new offering, for they are permanent realities common to every age, and constitute the indispensable foundation of every religion whether before or after the Messiah. The last

doubt is dispelled by the Hebrew text, which has no fewer than three classic sacerdotal declarations referring to the promised sacrifice, thus designedly doing away with the possibility of interpreting it metaphorically. Especially important is the substantive מנחה. Although in its origin the generic term for every sacrifice, the bloody included (cf. Gen., iv, 4 sq.; I Kings, ii, 17), it was not only never used to indicate an unreal sacrifice (such as a prayer offering), but even became the technical term for an unbloody sacrifice (mostly food offerings), in contradistinction to the bloody sacrifice which is given the name of זבח, *Sebach* (see Knabenbauer, "Commentar. in Prophet. minor.", II, Paris, 1886, pp. 430 sqq.).

As to the third and last proposition, no lengthy demonstration is needed to show that the sacrifice of Malachias cannot be formally identified with the Sacrifice of the Cross. This interpretation is at once contradicted by the *Minchah*, i. e. unbloody (food) offering. Then, there are other cogent considerations based on fact. Though a real sacrifice, belonging to the time of the Messiah and the most powerful means conceivable for glorifying the Divine name, the Sacrifice of the Cross, so far from being offered "in every place" and among non-Jewish peoples, was confined to Golgotha and the midst of the Jewish people. Nor can the Sacrifice of the Cross, which was accomplished by the Saviour in person without the help of a human representative priesthood, be identified with that sacrifice for the offering of which the Messiah makes use of priests after the manner of the Levites, in every place and at all times. Furthermore, he wilfully shuts his eyes against the light, who denies that the prophecy of Malachias is fulfilled to the letter in the Sacrifice of the Mass. In it are united all the characteristics of the promised sacrifice: its unbloody sacrificial rite as genuine *Minchah*, its universality in regard to place and time, its extension to non-Jewish peoples, its delegated priesthood differing from that of the Jews, its essential unity by reason of the identity of the Chief Priest and the Victim (Christ), and its intrinsic and essential purity which no Levitical or moral uncleanliness can defile. Little wonder that the Council of Trent should say (Sess. XXII, cap. i): "This is that pure oblation, which cannot be defiled by unworthiness and impiety on the part of those who offer it, and concerning which God has predicted through Malachias, that there would be offered up a clean oblation in every place to His Name, which would be great among the Gentiles" (see Denzinger, n. 939).

(ii) Passing now to the proofs contained in the New Testament, we may begin by remarking that many dogmatic writers see in the dialogue of Jesus with the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well a prophetic reference to the Mass (John, iv, 21 sqq.): "Woman, believe me, that the hour cometh, when you shall neither on this mountain [Garizim] nor in Jerusalem, adore the Father. . . . But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true adorers shall adore the Father in spirit and in truth." Since the point at issue between the Samaritans and the Jews related, not to the ordinary, private offering of prayer practised everywhere, but to the solemn, public worship embodied in a real sacrifice, Jesus really seems to refer to a future real sacrifice of praise, which would not be confined in its liturgy to the city of Jerusalem but would captivate the whole world (see Bellarmine, "De Euchar.", v, 11). Not without good reason do most commentators appeal to Heb., xiii, 10: "We have an altar [*Θυσιαστήριον, altare*], whereof they have no power to eat [*Φαγεῖν, edere*] who serve the tabernacle." Since St. Paul has just contrasted the Jewish food offering (*βρώμασιν, escis*) and the Christian altar food, the partaking of which was denied to the Jews, the inference is obvious: where there is an altar, there is a sacrifice. But the Eucharist is the food which the Christians alone are permitted to eat: therefore there is a Eucharistic sacrifice. The objection that, in Apostolic times, the term *altar* was not yet used in the sense of the "Lord's table" (cf. I Cor., x, 21) is clearly a begging of the question, since Paul might well have been the first to introduce the name, it being adopted from him by later writers (e. g. Ignatius of Antioch, died A. D. 107).

It can scarcely be denied that the entirely mystical explanation of the "spiritual food from the altar of the cross", favoured by St. Thomas Aquinas, Estius, and Stentrup, is far-fetched (cf. Thalhofer, "Das Opfer des A. und N. Bundes", Ratisbon, 1870, pp. 233 sqq.). It might on the other hand appear still more strange that in the passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where Christ and Melchisedech are compared, the two food offerings should be not only not placed in prophetical relation with each other, but not even mentioned. The reason, however, is not far to seek: such a parallel lay entirely outside the scope of the argument. All that St. Paul desired to show was that the high priesthood of Christ was superior to the Levitical priesthood of the Old Testament (cf. Heb., vii, 4 sqq.), and this he fully demonstrated by proving that Aaron and his priesthood stood far below the unattainable height of Melchisedech. So much the more, therefore, must Christ as "priest according to the order of Melchisedech" excel the Levitical priesthood. The peculiar dignity of Melchisedech, however, was manifested not through the fact that he made a food offering of bread and wine, a thing which the Levites also were able to do, but chiefly through the fact that he blessed the great "Father Abraham and received the tithes from him". (For the proofs relating to the Sacrifice of the Mass in I Cor., x, 16–21, see Al. Schäfer, "Erklärung der beiden Briefe an die Korinther", Münster, 1903, pp. 195 sqq.)

The main testimony of the New Testament lies in the account of the institution of the Eucharist, and most clearly in the words of consecration spoken over the chalice. For this reason we shall consider these words first, since thereby, owing to the analogy between the two formulæ, clearer light will be thrown on the meaning of the words of consecration pronounced over the bread. For the sake of clearness and easy comparison we subjoin the four passages in Greek and English:

(1) Matt., xxvi, 28: *Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ τῆς [καινῆς] διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.*

For this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins.

(2) Mark, xiv, 24: *Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης τὸ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.*

This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many.

(3) Luke, xxii, 20: *Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.*

This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you.

(4) I Cor., xi, 25: *Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι.*

This chalice is the new testament in my blood.

The Divine institution of the sacrifice of the altar is proved by showing (1) that the "shedding of blood" spoken of in the text took place there and then and not for the first time on the cross; (2) that it was a true and real sacrifice; (3) that it was considered a permanent institution in the Church. The present form of the participle *ἐκχυννόμενον* in conjunction with the present *ἐστίν* establishes the first point. For it is a grammatical rule of New Testament Greek, that, when the double present is used (that is, in both the participle and the finite verb, as is the case here), the time denoted is not the distant or near future, but strictly the present (see Fr. Blass, "Grammatik des N. T. Griechisch", p. 193, Göttingen, 1896). This rule does not apply to other constructions of the present tense, as when Christ says earlier (John, xiv, 12): "I go (*πορεύομαι*) to the father". Alleged exceptions to the rule

are not such in reality, as, for instance, Matt., vi, 30: "And if the grass of the field, which is to-day and to-morrow is cast into the oven (*βαλλόμενον*) God doth so clothe (*ἀμφιέννυσιν*): how much more you, O ye of little faith?" For in this passage it is a question not of something in the future but of something occurring every day. For other examples see Chr. Pesch, "Præl. dogm.", VI, 396 (3rd ed., Freiburg, 1908). When the Vulgate translates the Greek participles by the future (effundetur, fundetur), it is not at variance with facts, considering that the mystical shedding of blood in the chalice, if it were not brought into intimate relation with the physical shedding of blood on the cross, would be impossible and meaningless; for the one is the essential presupposition and foundation of the other. Still, from the standpoint of philology, effunditur (funditur) ought to be translated into the strictly present, as is really done in many ancient codices. The accuracy of this exegesis is finally attested in a striking way by the Greek wording in St. Luke: *τὸ ποτήριον . . . ἐκχυννόμενον*. Here the shedding of blood appears as taking place directly in the chalice, and therefore in the present. Overzealous critics, it is true, have assumed that there is here a grammatical mistake, in that St. Luke erroneously connects the "shedding" with the chalice (*ποτήριον*), instead of with "blood" (*τῷ αἵματι*) which is in the dative. Rather than correct this highly cultivated Greek, as though he were a school boy, we prefer to assume that he intended to use synecdoche, a figure of speech known to everybody, and therefore put the vessel to indicate its contents (Winer-Moulton, "Grammar of New Testament Greek", p. 791, Edinburgh, 1882).

As to the establishment of our second proposition, believing Protestants and Anglicans readily admit that the phrase: "to shed one's blood for others unto the remission of sins" is not only genuinely Biblical language relating to sacrifice, but also designates in particular the sacrifice of expiation (cf. Lev., vii, 14; xiv, 17; xvii, 11; Rom., iii, 25, v, 9; Heb., ix, 10, etc.). They, however, refer this sacrifice of expiation, not to what took place at the Last Supper, but to the Crucifixion the day after. From the demonstration given above that Christ, by the double consecration of bread and wine, mystically separated His Blood from His Body and thus in the chalice itself poured out this Blood in a sacramental way, it is at once clear that he wished to solemnize the Last Supper not as a sacrament merely but also as a Eucharistic sacrifice. If the "pouring out of the chalice" is to mean nothing more than the sacramental drinking of the Blood, the result is an intolerable tautology: "Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood, which is being drunk". As, however, it really reads: "Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood, which is shed for many (you) unto remission of sins," the double character of the rite, as sacrament and sacrifice, is evident. The sacrament is shown forth in the "drinking", the sacrifice in the "shedding of blood". "The blood of the new testament", moreover, of which all the four passages speak, has its exact parallel in the analogous institution of the Old Testament through Moses. For by Divine command he sprinkled the people with the true blood of an animal and added, as Christ did, the words of institution (Ex., xxiv, 8): "This is the blood of the covenant (Sept.: *ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης*) which the Lord hath made with you". St. Paul, however (Heb., ix, 18 sq.), after repeating this passage, solemnly demonstrates (ibid., ix, 11 sq.) the institution of the New Law through the blood shed by Christ at the crucifixion; and the Saviour Himself, with equal solemnity, says of the chalice: "This is My Blood of the new testament". It follows therefore that Christ had intended His true Blood in the chalice not only to be imparted as a sacrament, but to be also a sacrifice for the remission of sins. With the last remark our third statement, viz. as to the permanency of the institution in the Church, is also established. For the duration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is indissolubly bound up with the duration of the sacrament. Christ's last supper thus takes on the significance of a Divine institution whereby the Mass is established in His Church. St. Paul (I Cor., xi, 25), in fact, puts into the mouth of the Saviour the words: "This do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me."

We are now in a position to appreciate in their deeper sense Christ's words of consecration over the bread. Since only St. Luke and St. Paul have made additions to the sentence, "This is My Body", it is only on them that we can base our demonstration. (1) Luke, xxii, 19: Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis datur; *τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον*; This is my body which is given for you. (2) I Cor., xi, 24: Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur; *τοῦτό μού ἐστι τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* [*κλώμενον*]; This is my body which shall be broken for you. Once more, we maintain that the sacrificial "giving of the body" (in organic unity of course with the "pouring of blood" in the chalice) is here to be interpreted as a present sacrifice and as a permanent institution in the Church. Regarding the decisive point, i. e. indication of what is actually taking place, it is again St. Luke who speaks with greatest clearness, for to *σῶμα* he adds the present participle, *διδόμενον*, by which he describes the "giving of the body" as something happening in the present, here and now, not as something to be done in the near future.

The reading *κλώμενον* in St. Paul is disputed. According to the best critical reading (Tischendorf, Lachmann) the participle is dropped altogether, so that St. Paul probably wrote: *τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* (the body for you, i. e. for your salvation). There is good reason, however, for regarding the word *κλώμενον* (from *κλᾶν*, to break) as Pauline, since St. Paul shortly before spoke of the "breaking of bread" (I Cor., x, 16), which for him meant "to offer as food the true body of Christ". From this however we may conclude that the "breaking of the body" not only confines Christ's action to the strictly present, especially as His natural Body could not be "broken" on the cross (cf. Ex., xii, 46; John, xix, 32 sq.), but also implies the intention of offering a "body broken for you" (*ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*) i. e. the act constituted in itself a true food offering. All doubt as to its sacrificial character is removed by the expression *διδόμενον* in St. Luke, which the Vulgate this time quite correctly translates into the present: "quod pro vobis datur." But "to give one's body for others" is as truly a Biblical expression for sacrifice (cf. John, vi, 52; Rom., vii, 4; Col., i, 22; Heb., x, 10, etc.) as the parallel phrase, "the shedding of blood". Christ, therefore, at the Last Supper offered up His Body as an unbloody sacrifice. Finally, that He commanded the renewal for all time of the Eucharistic sacrifice through the Church is clear from the addition: "Do this for a commemoration of me" (Luke, xxxii, 19; I Cor., xi, 24).

(b) Proof from Tradition.—Harnack is of opinion that the early Church up to the time of Cyprian (d. 258) contented itself with the purely spiritual sacrifices of adoration and thanksgiving and that it did not possess the sacrifice of the Mass, as Catholicism now understands it. In a series of writings, Dr. Wieland, a Catholic priest, likewise maintained in the face of vigorous opposition from other theologians, that the early Christians confined the essence of the Christian sacrifice to a subjective Eucharistic prayer of thanksgiving, till Irenæus (d. 202) brought forward the idea of an objective offering of gifts, and especially of bread and wine. He, according to this view, was the first to include in his expanded conception of sacrifice, the entirely new idea of material offerings (i. e. the Eucharistic elements) which up to that time the early Church had formally repudiated. Were this assertion correct, the doctrine of the Council of Trent (Sess.

XXII, c. ii), according to which in the Mass "the priests offer up, in obedience to the command of Christ, His Body and Blood" (see Denzinger, "Enchir.", n. 949), could hardly take its stand on Apostolic tradition; the bridge between antiquity and the present would thus have been broken by the abrupt intrusion of a completely contrary view. An impartial study of the earliest texts seems indeed to make this much clear, that the early Church paid most attention to the spiritual and subjective side of sacrifice and laid chief stress on prayer and thanksgiving in the Eucharistic function.

This admission, however, is not identical with the statement that the early Church rejected out and out the objective sacrifice, and acknowledged as genuine only the spiritual sacrifice as expressed in the "Eucharistic thanksgiving". That there has been an historical dogmatic development from the indefinite to the definite, from the implicit to the explicit, from the seed to the fruit, no one familiar with the subject will deny. An assumption so reasonable, the only one in fact consistent with Christianity, is, however, fundamentally different from the hypothesis that the Christian idea of sacrifice has veered from one extreme to the other. This is *a priori* improbable and unproved in fact. In the Didache or "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles", the oldest post-Biblical literary monument (c. A. D. 96), not only is the "breaking of bread" (cf. Acts, xx, 7) referred to as a "sacrifice" (Θυσία) and mention made of reconciliation with one's enemy before the sacrifice (cf. Matt., v, 23), but the whole passage is crowned with an actual quotation of the prophecy of Malachias, which referred, as is well known, to an objective and real sacrifice (Didache, c. xiv). The early Christians gave the name of "sacrifice" not only to the Eucharistic "thanksgiving," but also to the entire ritual celebration including the liturgical "breaking of bread", without at first distinguishing clearly between the prayer and the gift (Bread and Wine; Body and Blood). When Ignatius of Antioch (d. 107), a disciple of the Apostles, says of the Eucharist: "There is only one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, only one chalice containing His one Blood, one altar (ἓν θυσιαστήριον), as also only one bishop with the priesthood and the deacons" (Ep., ad. Philad., iv), he here gives to the liturgical Eucharistic celebration, of which alone he speaks, by his reference to the "altar" an evidently sacrificial meaning, often as he may use the word "altar" in other contexts in a metaphorical sense.

A heated controversy had raged round the conception of Justin Martyr (d. 166) from the fact that in his "Dialogue with Tryphon" (c. 117) he characterizes "prayer and thanksgiving" (εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι) as the "one perfect sacrifice acceptable to God" (τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐάρεστοι θυσίαι). Did he intend by thus emphasizing the interior spiritual sacrifice to exclude the exterior real sacrifice of the Eucharist? Clearly he did not, for in the same "Dialogue" (c. xli; P. G., VI, 564) he says the "food offering" of the lepers, assuredly a real gift offering (cf. Levit., xiv), was a figure (τύπος) of the bread of the Eucharist, which Jesus commanded to be offered (ποιεῖν) in commemoration of His sufferings". He then goes on: "of the sacrifices which you (the Jews) formerly offered, God through Malachias said: 'I have no pleasure, etc.' By the sacrifices (θυσιῶν), however, which we Gentiles present to Him in every place, that is (τουτέστι) of the bread of the Eucharist and likewise of the chalice of the Eucharist, he then said that we glorify his name, while you dishonour him." Here "bread and chalice" are by the use of τουτέστι clearly included as objective gift offerings in the idea of the Christian sacrifice. If the other apologists (Aristides, Athenagoras, Minucius Felix, Arnbobius) vary the thought a great deal—God has no need of sacrifice; the best sacrifice is the knowledge of the Creator; sacrifice and altars are unknown to the Christians—it is to be presumed not only that under the restraint imposed by the *disciplina arcani* they withheld the whole truth, but also that they rightly repudiated all connexion with pagan idolatry, the sacrifice of animals, and heathen altars. Tertullian bluntly declared: "We offer no sacrifice (non sacrificamus) because we cannot eat both the Supper of God and that of demons" (De spectac., c., xiii). And yet in another passage (De orat., c., xix) he calls Holy Communion "participation in the sacrifice" (participatio sacrificii), which is accomplished "on the altar of God" (ad aram Dei); he speaks (De cult. fem., II, xi) of a real, not a mere metaphorical, "offering up of sacrifice" (sacrificium offertur); he dwells still further as a Montanist (de pudicit, c., ix) as well on the "nourishing power of the Lord's Body" (opimitate dominici corporis) as on the "renewal of the immolation of Christ" (rursus illi mactabitur Christus).

With Irenæus of Lyons there comes a turning-point, inasmuch as he, with conscious clearness, first puts forward "bread and wine" as objective gift offerings, but at the same time maintains that these elements become the "body and blood" of the Word through consecration; and thus by simply combining these two thoughts we have the Catholic Mass of to-day. According to him (Adv. hær., iv, 18, 4) it is the Church alone "that offers the pure oblation" (oblationem puram offert), whereas the Jews "did not receive the Word, which is offered (or through whom an offering is made) to God" (non receperunt Verbum quod [*aliter*, per quod] offertur Deo). Passing over the teaching of the Alexandrine Clement and Origen, whose love of allegory, together with the restrictions of the *disciplina arcani*, involved their writings in a mystic obscurity, we make particular mention of Hippolytus of Rome (d. 235) whose celebrated fragment Achelis has wrongly characterized as spurious. He writes (Fragm. in Prov., ix, i; P. G., LXXX, 593), "The Word prepared His Precious and immaculate Body (σῶμα) and His Blood (αἷμα), that daily (καθ' ἑκάστην) are set forth as a sacrifice (ἐπιτελοῦνται θυόμενα) on the mystic and Divine table (τραπέζῃ) as a memorial of that ever memorable first table of the mysterious supper of the Lord". Since according to the judgment of even Protestant historians of dogma, St. Cyril (d. 258) is to be regarded as the "herald" of Catholic doctrine on the Mass, we may likewise pass him over, as well as Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386) and Chrysostom (d. 407) who have been charged with exaggerated "realism", and whose plain discourses on the sacrifice rival those of Basil (d. 379), Gregory of Nyssa (d. c. 394) and Ambrose (d. 397). Only about Augustine (d. 430) must a word be said, since, in regard to the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, he is cited as favouring the "symbolical" theory. Now it is precisely his teaching on sacrifice that best serves to clear away the suspicion that he inclined to a merely spiritual interpretation.

For Augustine nothing is more certain than that every religion, whether true or false, must have an exterior form of celebration and worship (contra Faust., xix, 11). This applies as well to Christians (l. c., xx, 18), who "commemorate the sacrifice consummated (on the cross) by the holiest oblation and participation of the Body and Blood of Christ" (celebrant sacrosancta oblatione et participatione corporis et sanguinis Christi). The Mass is, in his eyes (de civ. Dei, X, 20), the "highest and true sacrifice" (summum verumque sacrificium), Christ being at once "priest and victim" (ipse offerens, ipse et oblatio); and he reminds the Jews (Adv. Jud., ix, 13) that the sacrifice of Malachias is now made in every place (in omni loco offerri sacrificium Christianorum). He relates of his mother Monica (Confess., ix, 13) that she had asked for prayers at the altar (ad altare) for her soul and had attended Mass daily. From Augustine onwards the current of the Church's tradition flows

smoothly along in a well-ordered channel, without check or disturbance, through the Middle Ages to our own time. Even the powerful attempt made to stem it through the Reformation had no effect.

A briefer demonstration of the existence of the Mass is the so-called proof from prescription, which is thus formulated: A sacrificial rite in the Church which is older than the oldest attack made on it by heretics cannot be decried as "idolatry", but must be referred back to the Founder of Christianity as a rightful heritage of which He was the originator. Now the Church's legitimate possession as regards the Mass can be traced back to the beginnings of Christianity; it follows that the Mass was Divinely instituted by Christ. Regarding the minor proposition, the proof of which alone concerns us here, we may begin at once with the Reformation, the only movement that utterly did away with the Mass. Psychologically, it is quite intelligible that men like Zwingli, Karlstadt and Œcolampadius should tear down the altars, for they denied Christ's real presence in the Sacrament. Calvinism also in reviling the "papistical mass" which the Heidelberg catechism characterized as "cursed idolatry" was merely self-consistent since it admitted only a "dynamic" presence. It is rather strange on the other hand that, in spite of his belief in the literal meaning of the words of consecration, Luther, after a violent "nocturnal disputation with the devil", in 1521, should have repudiated the Mass. But it is exactly these measures of violence that best show to what a depth the institution of the Mass had taken root by that time in Church and people. How long had it been taking root? The answer, to begin with, is: all through the Middle Ages back to Photius, the originator of the Eastern Schism (869). Though Wycliffe protested against the teaching of the Council of Constance (1414–18), which maintained that the Mass could be proved from Scripture; and though the Albigenses and Waldenses claimed for the laity also the power to offer sacrifice (cf. Denzinger, "Enchir.", 585 and 430), it is none the less true that even the schismatic Greeks held fast to the Eucharistic sacrifice as a precious heritage from their Catholic past. In the negotiations for reunion at Lyons (1274) and Florence (1439) they showed moreover that they had kept it intact; and they have faithfully safeguarded it to this day. From all which it is clear that the Mass existed in both Churches long before Photius, a conclusion borne out by the monuments of Christian antiquity.

Taking a long step backwards from the ninth to the fourth century, we come upon the Nestorians and Monophysites who were driven out of the Church during the fifth century at Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451). From that day to this they have celebrated in their solemn liturgy the sacrifice of the New Law, and since they could only have taken it with them from the old Christian Church, it follows that the Mass goes back in the Church beyond the time of Nestorianism and Monophysitism. Indeed, the first Nicene Council (325) in its celebrated eighteenth canon forbade priests to receive the Eucharist from the hands of deacons for the very obvious reason that "neither the canon nor custom have handed down to us, that those, who have not the power to offer sacrifice (προσφέρειν) may give Christ's body to those who offer (προσφέρουσι)". Hence it is plain that for the celebration of the Mass there was required the dignity of a special priesthood, from which the deacons as such were excluded. Since, however, the Nicene Council speaks of a "custom", that takes us at once into the third century, we are already in the age of the Catacombs (q. v.) with their Eucharistic pictures, which according to the best founded opinions represent the liturgical celebration of the Mass. According to Wilpert, the oldest representation of the Holy Sacrifice is in the "Greek Chapel" in the Catacomb of St. Priscilla (c. 150). The most convincing evidence, however, from those early days is furnished by the liturgies of the West and the East, the basic principles of which reach back to Apostolic times and in which the sacrificial idea of the Eucharistic celebration found unadulterated and decisive expression (see LITURGIES). We have therefore traced the Mass from the present to the earliest times, thus establishing its Apostolic origin, which in turn goes back again to the Last Supper.

On the idea of Sacrifice cf. BECANUS, *De triplici sacrificio naturæ, legis, gratiæ* (Lyons, 1631); STÖCKL, *Das Opfer nach seinem Wesen und seiner Geschichte* (Mainz, 1861); KÖPPLER, *Priester und Opfergabe* (Mainz, 1886); for scripture proof, cf. the exegetical commentaries of KNABENBAUER, SCHANZ, SCHÄFER, etc.; also THALHOFER, *Die Opfer des Hebräerbriefes* (Dillingen, 1855); BICKELL, *Messe und Pascha* (Mainz, 1871); PATRY, *Le caractère religieux de la Sainte Cène* in *Revue chrétienne*, LVI (1909), 518; RIGGENBACH, *Der Begriff der διαθήκη im Hebräerbrief* (Leipzig, 1908); GARDENER, *The Origin of the Lord's Supper* (London, 1893); MOZLEY, *The Meaning of τοῦτο ποιεῖτε* in *The Expositor*, XXIX (1903), 370 sq.; MACKINTOSH, *The Objective Aspect of the Lord's Supper* in *The Expositor*, XXIX, 180 sq.; EAGAR, *St. Luke's Account of the Last Supper* in *The Expositor*, XXXIV (1908), 252 sq.; 343 sq.; DENNEY, *The Cup of the Lord and the Cup of the Demons* in *The Expositor*, XXXIII (1908), 290 sq.; BARES, *Die moderne protestantische Abendmahlsforschung* (Trier, 1910). For proof from tradition see WIELAND, *Mensa und Confessio I: Der Altar der vorkonstantinischen Kirche* (Munich, 1906); IDEM, *Der vorirenäische Opferbegriff* (Munich, 1909). For a contrary view see DORSCH, *Der Opfercharakter der Eucharistie einst und jetzt* (Innsbruck, 1909); GARRETT PIERSE, *The Mass in the Infant Church* (Dublin, 1909); RENZ, *Der Opfercharakter der Eucharistie nach der Lehre der Väter und Kirchenschriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* (Paderborn, 1892); BATIFFOL, *Etudes d'histoire et de théologie positive* (Paris, 1902); RAUSCHEN, *Eucharistie und Bussakrament in den ersten 6 Jahrhunderten* (2nd ed., Fribourg, 1910); BRIDGETT, *A History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain* (London, 1908); FRANKLAND, *The Holy Eucharist* (London, 1902); DARWELL STONE, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (2 vols., London, 1909); NAEGLE, *Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Chrysostomus* (Fribourg, 1900); WILDEN, *Die Lehre des hl. Augustinus über das Opfer der Eucharistie* (Schaffhausen, 1864); BLANK, *Die Lehre des hl. Augustin vom Sakrament der Eucharistie* (Paderborn, 1907); ADAM, *Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Augustin* (Paderborn, 1908); FRANZ, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter* (Freiburg, 1902); RAIBLE, *Der Tabernakel einst und jetzt. Eine historische und liturgische Darstellung der Andacht zur aufbewahrten Eucharistie* (Freiburg, 1908); PROBST, *Die Liturgie der ersten drei christlichen Jahrhunderte* (Tübingen, 1870); IDEM, *Die Liturgie des 4. Jahrhunderts und deren Reform* (Münster, 1892); IDEM, *Die Abendländische Messe vom 5. bis zum 8. Jahrhundert* (Münster, 1896); MONE, *Lateinische und Griechische Messen aus dem 2. bis 6. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt, 1850); SWAINSON, *The Greek Liturgies* (London, 1884); MERCATI, *Antiche Reliquie liturgiche* (Rome, 1902); SEMERIA, *La Messa nella sua storia e nei suoi Simboli* (2nd ed., Rome, 1907); ERMONI, *L'Eucharistie dans l'Eglise primitive* (5th ed., Paris, 1908); CABROL, *Origines liturgiques* (Paris, 1906); BAUMSTARK, *Liturgia Romana e Liturgia dell' Esarcato* (Rome, 1904); IDEM, *Die Messe im Morgenland* (Kempten, 1906); DREWS, *Untersuchungen über die sogen. Clementinische Liturgie* (Leipzig, 1906); WILPERT, "*Fractio panis*" *oder die älteste Darstellung des euchar. Opfers in der Cappella Greca* (Freiburg, 1895); IDEM, *Die Römischen Katakomben* (Freiburg, 1903).

(2) The Nature of the Mass.—In its denial of the true Divinity of Christ and of every supernatural institution, modern unbelief endeavours, by means of the so-called historico-religious method, to explain the character of the Eucharist and the Eucharistic sacrifice as the natural result of a spontaneous process of development in the Christian religion. In this connexion it is interesting to observe how these different and conflicting hypotheses refute one another, with the rather startling result at the end of it all that a new, great, and insoluble problem looms up for investigation. While some discover the roots of the Mass in the Jewish funeral feasts (O. Holtzmann) or in Jewish Essenism (Bousset, Heitmüller, Wernle), others delve in the underground strata of pagan religions. Here, however, a rich variety of hypotheses is placed at their disposal. In this age of Pan-Babylonism it is not at all surprising that the germinal ideas of the Christian communion should be located in Babylon, where in the Adapa myth (on the tablet of Tell Amarna) mention has been found of "water of life" and "food of life" (Zimmern). Others (e. g. Brandt) fancy they have found a still more striking analogy in the "bread and water" (Pathâ and Mambûhâ) of the Mandæan religion. The view most widely held to-day among

upholders of the historico-religious theory is that the Eucharist and the Mass originated in the practices of the Persian Mithraism (Dieterich, H. T. Holtzmann, Pfleiderer, Robertson, etc.). "In the Mandæan mass", writes Cumont ("Mysterien des Mithra", Leipzig, 1903, p. 118), "the celebrant consecrated bread and water, which he mixed with perfumed Haoma-juice, and ate this food while performing the functions of divine service". Tertullian in anger ascribed this mimicking of Christian rites to the "devil" and observed in astonishment (De præscript hæret, C. xl): "Celebrat (Mithras) et panis oblationem." This is not the place to criticize in detail these wild creations of an overheated phantasy. Let it suffice to note that all these explanations necessarily lead to impenetrable night, as long as men refuse to believe in the true Divinity of Christ, who commanded that His bloody sacrifice on the Cross should be daily renewed by an unbloody sacrifice of His Body and Blood in the Mass under the simple elements of bread and wine. This alone is the origin and nature of the Mass.

(a) The Physical Character of the Mass.—In regard to the physical character there arises not only the question as to the concrete portions of the liturgy, in which the real offering lies hidden, but also the question regarding the relation of the Mass to the bloody sacrifice of the Cross. To begin with the latter question as much the more important, Catholics and believing Protestants alike acknowledge that as Christians we venerate in the bloody sacrifice of the Cross the one, universal, absolute Sacrifice for the salvation of the world. And this indeed is true in a double sense; first, because among all the sacrifices of the past and future the Sacrifice on the Cross alone stands without any relation to, and absolutely independent of, any other sacrifice, a complete totality and unity in itself; second, because every grace, means of grace and sacrifice, whether belonging to the Jewish, Christian or pagan economy, derive their whole undivided strength, value, and efficacy singly and alone from this absolute sacrifice on the Cross. The first consideration implies that all the sacrifices of the Old Testament, as well as the Sacrifice of the Mass, bear the essential mark of relativity, in so far as they are necessarily related to the Sacrifice of the Cross, as the periphery of a circle to the centre. From the second consideration it follows that all other sacrifices, the Mass included, are empty, barren and void of effect, so far and so long as they are not supplied from the mainstream of merits (due to the suffering) of the Crucified. Let us deal briefly with this double relationship.

Regarding the qualification of relativity, which adheres to every sacrifice other than the sacrifice of the Cross, there is no doubt that the sacrifices of the Old Testament by their figurative forms and prophetic significance point to the sacrifice of the Cross as their eventual fulfilment. The Epistle to the Hebrews (viii–x) in particular develops grandly the figurative character of the sacrifices of the Old Testament. Not only was the Levitic priesthood, as a "shadow of the things to come" a faint type of the high priesthood of Christ; but the complex sacrificial cult, broadly spread out in its parts, prefigured the one sacrifice of the Cross. Serving only the legal "cleansing of the flesh" the Levitical sacrifices could effect no true "forgiveness of sins"; by their very inefficacy however they point prophetically to the perfect sacrifice of propitiation on Golgotha. Just for that reason their continual repetition as well as their great diversity was essential to them, as a means of keeping alive in the Jews the yearning for the true sacrifice of expiation which the future was to bring. This longing was satiated only by the single Sacrifice of the Cross, which was never again to be repeated. Naturally the Mass, too, if it is to have the character of a legitimate sacrifice, must be in accord with this inviolable rule, no longer indeed as a type prophetic of future things, but rather as the living realization, representation and renewal of the past. Only the Last Supper, standing midway as it were between the figure and its fulfilment, still looked to the future, in so far as it was an anticipatory commemoration of the sacrifice of the Cross. In the discourse in which the Eucharist was instituted, the "giving of the body" and the "shedding of the Blood" were of necessity related to the physical separation of the blood from the body on the Cross, without which the sacramental immolation of Christ at the Last Supper would be inconceivable. The Fathers of the Church, such as Cyprian (Ep., lxiii, 9, ed. Hartel, II, 708), Ambrose (De offic., I, xlviii), Augustine (Contra Faust., XX, xviii) and Gregory the Great (Dial., IV, lviii), insist that the Mass in its essential nature must be that which Christ Himself characterized as a "commemoration" of Him (Luke, xxii, 19) and Paul as the "showing of the death of the Lord" (I Cor., xi, 26).

Regarding the other aspect of the Sacrifice on the Cross, viz. the impossibility of its renewal, its singleness and its power, Paul again proclaimed with energy that Christ on the Cross definitively redeemed the whole world, in that he "by His own Blood, entered once into the holies, having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb., ix, 12). This does not mean that mankind is suddenly and without the action of its own will brought back to the state of innocence in Paradise and set above the necessity of working to secure for itself the fruits of redemption. Otherwise children would be in no need of baptism nor adults of justifying faith to win eternal happiness. The "completion" spoken of by Paul can therefore refer only to the objective side of redemption, which does not dispense with, but on the contrary requires, the proper subjective disposition. The sacrifice once offered on the Cross filled the infinite reservoirs to overflowing with healing waters; but those who thirst after justice must come with their chalices and draw out what they need to quench their thirst. In this important distinction between objective and subjective redemption, which belongs to the essence of Christianity, lies not merely the possibility, but also the justification of the Mass. But here unfortunately Catholics and Protestants part company. The latter can see in the Mass only a "denial of the one sacrifice of Jesus Christ". This is a wrong view; for if the Mass can do and does no more than convey the merits of Christ to mankind by means of a sacrifice, exactly as the sacraments do it without the use of sacrifice, it stands to reason that the Mass is neither a second independent sacrifice alongside of the sacrifice on the Cross, nor a substitute whereby the sacrifice on the Cross is completed or its value enhanced.

The only distinction between the Mass and the sacrament lies in this: that the latter applies to the individual the fruits of the Sacrifice on the Cross by simple distribution, the other by a specific offering. In both, the Church draws upon the one Sacrifice on the Cross. This is and remains the one Sun, that gives life, light, and warmth to everything; the sacraments and the Mass are only the planets that revolve round the central body. Take the Sun away and the Mass is annihilated not one whit less than the sacraments. On the other hand, without these two the Sacrifice on the Cross would reign as independently as, conceivably, the sun without the planets. The Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, can. iv) therefore rightly protested against the reproach that "the Mass is a blasphemy against or a derogation from the Sacrifice on the Cross" (cf. Denzinger, "Enchir.", 951). Must not the same reproach be cast upon the Sacraments also? Does it not apply to baptism and communion among Protestants? And how can Christ Himself put blasphemy and darkness in the way of His Sacrifice on the Cross when He Himself is the High Priest, in whose name and by whose commission His human representative offers sacrifice with the words: "This is my Body, this is my Blood"? It is the express teaching

of the Church (cf. Trent, Sess. XXII, i) that the Mass is in its very nature a "representation" (representatio), a "commemoration" (memoria) and an "application" (applicatio) of the Sacrifice of the Cross. When indeed the Roman Catechism (II, c. iv, Q. 70), as a fourth relation, adopts the daily repetition (instauratio), it means that such a repetition is to be taken not in the sense of a multiplication, but simply of an application of the merits of the passion. Just as the Church repudiates nothing so much as the suggestion that by the Mass the sacrifice on the Cross is as it were set aside, so she goes a step farther and maintains the essential identity of both sacrifices, holding that the main difference between them is in the different manner of sacrifice—the one bloody, the other unbloody (Trent, Sess. XXII, ii): "Una enim eademque est hostia, idem nunc offerens sacerdotum ministerio, qui seipsum tunc in cruce obtulit, sola offerendi ratione diversa." Inasmuch as the sacrificing priest (offerens) and the sacrificial victim (hostia) in both sacrifices are Christ Himself, their sameness amounts even to a numerical identity. In regard to the manner of the sacrifice (offerendi ratio) on the other hand, it is naturally a question only of a specific identity or unity that includes the possibility of ten, a hundred, or a thousand masses.

(b) Turning now to the other question as to the constituent parts of the liturgy of the Mass in which the real sacrifice is to be looked for, we need only take into consideration its three chief parts; the Offertory, the Consecration and the Communion. The antiquated view of Johann Eck, according to which the act of sacrifice was comprised in the prayer "Unde et memores . . . offerimus", is thus excluded from our discussion, as is also the opinion of Melchior Canus, who held that the sacrifice is accomplished in the symbolical ceremony of the breaking of the Host and its commingling with the Chalice. The question therefore arises first: Is the sacrifice comprised in the Offertory? From the wording of the prayer this much at least is clear, that bread and wine constitute the secondary sacrificial elements of the Mass, since the priest, in the true language of sacrifice, offers to God bread as an "unspotted host" (immaculatam hostiam) and wine as the "chalice of salvation" (calicem salutaris). But the very significance of this language proves that attention is mainly directed to the prospective transubstantiation of the Eucharistic elements. Since the Mass is not a mere offering of bread and wine, like the figurative food offering of Melchisedech, it is clear that only the Body and Blood of Christ can be the primary matter of the sacrifice, as was the case at the Last Supper (cf. Trent, Sess. XXII, i, can. 2; Denzinger, n. 938, 949). Consequently, the sacrifice is not in the Offertory. Does it consist then in the priest's Communion? There were and are theologians who favour that view. They can be ranged in two classes, according as they see in the Communion the essential or the co-essential.

Those who belong to the first category (Dominicus Soto, Renz, Bellord) had to beware of the heretical doctrine proscribed by the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, can. 1), viz., that Mass and Communion were identical. In American and English circles the so-called "banquet-theory" of the late Bishop Bellord once created some stir (cf. The Ecclesiastical Review, XXXIII, 1905, 258 sq.). According to that view, the essence of the sacrifice was not to be looked for in the offering of a gift to God, but solely in the Communion. Without communion there was no sacrifice. Regarding pagan sacrifices Döllinger ("Heidentum und Judentum", Ratisbon, 1857) had already demonstrated the incompatibility of this view. With the complete shedding of blood pagan sacrifices ended, so that the supper which sometimes followed it was expressive merely of the satisfaction felt at the reconciliation with the gods. Even the horrible human sacrifices had as their object the death of the victim only and not a cannibal feast (cf. Mader, "Die Menschenopfer der alten Hebräer und der benachbarten Völker", Freiburg, 1909). As to the Jews, only a few Levitical sacrifices, such as the peace offering, had feasting connected with them; most, and especially the burnt offerings (holocausta), were accomplished without feasting (cf. Levit., vi, 9 sq.). Bishop Bellord, having cast in his lot with the "banquet-theory", could naturally find the essence of the Mass in the priests' Communion only. He was indeed logically bound to allow that the Crucifixion itself had the character of a sacrifice only in conjunction with the Last Supper, at which alone food was taken; for the Crucifixion excluded any ritual food offering. These disquieting consequences are all the more serious in that they are devoid of any scientific basis (see Pesch, "Præl. dogmat.", VI, 379 sq., Freiburg, 1908).

Harmless, even though improbable, is that other view (Bellarmine, De Lugo, Tournely, etc.) which includes the Communion as at least a co-essential factor in the constitution of the Mass; for the consumption of the Host and of the contents of the Chalice, being a kind of destruction, would appear to accord with the conception of the sacrifice developed above. But only in appearance; for the sacrificial transformation of the victim must take place on the altar, and not in the body of the celebrant, while the partaking of the two elements can at most represent the burial and not the sacrificial death of Christ. The Last Supper also would have been a true sacrifice only on condition that Christ had given the Communion not only to His apostles but also to Himself. There is however no evidence that such a Communion ever took place, probable as it may appear. For the rest, the Communion of the priest is not the sacrifice, but only the completion of, and participation in, the sacrifice; it belongs therefore not to the essence, but to the integrity of the sacrifice. And this integrity is also preserved absolutely even in the so-called "private Mass" at which the priest alone communicates; private Masses are allowed for that reason (cf. Trent, Sess. XXII, can. 8). When the Jansenist Synod of Pistoia (1786), proclaiming the false principle that "participation in the sacrifice is essential to the sacrifice", demanded at least the making of a "spiritual communion" on the part of the faithful as a condition of allowing private Masses, it was denied by Pius VI in his Bull "Auctorem fidei" (1796) (see Denzinger, n. 1528).

After the elimination of the Offertory and Communion, there remains only the Consecration as the part in which the true sacrifice is to be sought. In reality, that part alone is to be regarded as the proper sacrificial act which is such by Christ's own institution. Now the Lord's words are: "This is my Body; this is my Blood." The Oriental Epiklesis (q. v.) cannot be considered as the moment of consecration for the reason that it is absent in the Mass in the West and is known to have first come into practice after Apostolic times (see EUCHARIST). The sacrifice must also be at the point where Christ personally appears as High Priest and the human celebrant acts only as his representative. The priest does not however assume the personal part of Christ either at the Offertory or Communion. He only does so when he speaks the words: "This is My Body; this is My Blood", in which there is no possible reference to the body and blood of the celebrant. While the Consecration as such can be shown with certainty to be the act of Sacrifice, the necessity of the *twofold* consecration can be demonstrated only as highly probable. Not only older theologians such as Frassen, Gotti, and Bonacina, but also later theologians such as Schouppen, Stentrup and Fr. Schmid, have supported the untenable theory that when one of the consecrated elements is invalid, such as barley bread or cider, the consecration of the valid element not only produces the Sacrament, but also the (mutilated) sacrifice. Their chief argument is that the

sacrament in the Eucharist is inseparable in idea from the sacrifice. But they entirely overlooked the fact that Christ positively prescribed the twofold consecration for the sacrifice of the Mass (not for the sacrament), and especially the fact that in the consecration of one element only the intrinsically essential relation of the Mass to the sacrifice of the Cross is not symbolically represented. Since it was no mere death from suffocation that Christ suffered, but a bloody death, in which His veins were emptied of their Blood, this condition of separation must receive visible representation on the altar, as in a sublime drama. This condition is fulfilled only by the double consecration, which brings before our eyes the Body and the Blood in the state of separation, and thus represents the mystical shedding of blood. Consequently, the double consecration is an absolutely essential element of the Mass as a relative sacrifice.

(b) The Metaphysical Character of the Sacrifice of the Mass.—The physical essence of the Mass having been established in the consecration of the two species, the metaphysical question arises as to whether and in what degree the scientific concept of sacrifice is realized in this double consecration. Since the three ideas, sacrificing priest, sacrificial gift, and sacrificial object, present no difficulty to the understanding, the problem is finally seen to lie entirely in the determination of the real sacrificial act (*actio sacrifica*), and indeed not so much in the form of this act as in the matter, since the glorified Victim, in consequence of Its impassibility, cannot be really transformed, much less destroyed. In their investigation of the idea of destruction, the post-Tridentine theologians have brought into play all their acuteness, often with brilliant results, and have elaborated a series of theories concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass, of which, however, we can discuss only the most notable and important. But first, that we may have at hand a reliable, critical standard wherewith to test the validity or invalidity of the various theories, we maintain that a sound and satisfactory theory must satisfy the following four conditions: (1) the twofold consecration must show not only the relative, but also the absolute moment of sacrifice, so that the Mass will not consist in a mere relation, but will be revealed as in itself a real sacrifice; (2) the act of sacrifice (*actio sacrifica*), veiled in the double consecration, must refer directly to the sacrificial matter—i. e. the Eucharistic Christ Himself—not to the elements of bread and wine or their unsubstantial species; (3) the sacrifice of Christ must somehow result in a kenosis, not in a glorification, since this latter is at most the object of the sacrifice, not the sacrifice itself; (4) since this postulated kenosis, however, can be no real, but only a mystical or sacramental one, we must appraise intelligently those moments which approximate in any degree the "mystical slaying" to a real exinanition, instead of rejecting them. With the aid of these four criteria it is comparatively easy to arrive at a decision concerning the probability or otherwise of the different theories concerning the sacrifice of the Mass.

(i) The Jesuit Gabriel Vasquez, whose theory was supported by Perrone in the last century, requires for the essence of an absolute sacrifice only—and thus, in the present case, for the Sacrifice of the Cross—a true destruction or the real slaying of Christ, whereas for the idea of the relative sacrifice of the Mass it suffices that the former slaying on the Cross be visibly represented in the separation of Body and Blood on the altar. This view soon found a keen critic in Cardinal de Lugo, who, appealing to the Tridentine definition of the Mass as a true and proper sacrifice, upbraided Vasquez for reducing the Mass to a purely relative sacrifice. Were Jephta to arise again to-day with his daughter from the grave, he argues (De Euchar., disp. xix, sect. 4, n. 58), and present before our eyes a living dramatic reproduction of the slaying of his daughter after the fashion of a tragedy, we would undoubtedly see before us not a true sacrifice, but a historic or dramatic representation of the former bloody sacrifice. Such may indeed satisfy the notion of a relative sacrifice, but certainly not the notion of the Sacrifice of the Mass, which includes in itself both the relative and the absolute (in opposition to the merely relative) sacrificial moment. If the Mass is to be something more than an Ober-Ammergau Passion Play, then not only must Christ appear in His real personality on the altar, but He must also be in some manner really sacrificed on that very altar. The theory of Vasquez thus fails to fulfil the first condition which we have named above.

To a certain extent the opposite of Vasquez's theory is that of Cardinal Cienfuegos, who, while exaggerating the absolute moment of the Mass, undervalues the equally essential relative moment of the sacrifice. The sacrificial destruction of the Eucharistic Christ he would find in the voluntary suspension of the powers of sense (especially of sight and hearing), which the sacramental mode of existence implies, and which lasts from the consecration to the mingling of the two Species. But, apart from the fact that one may not constitute a hypothetical theologumenon the basis of a theory, one can no longer from such a standpoint successfully defend the indispensability of the double consecration. Equally difficult is it to find in the Eucharistic Christ's voluntary surrender of his sensitive functions the relative moment of sacrifice, i. e. the representation of the bloody sacrifice of the Cross. The standpoint of Suarez, adopted by Scheeben, is both exalting and imposing; the real transformation of the sacrificial gifts he refers to the destruction of the Eucharistic elements (in virtue of the transubstantiation) at their conversion into the Precious Body and Blood of Christ (*immutatio perfectiva*), just as, in the sacrifice of incense in the Old Testament, the grains of incense were transformed by fire into the higher and more precious form of the sweetest odour and fragrance. But, since the antecedent destruction of the substance of bread and wine can by no means be regarded as the sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, Suarez is finally compelled to identify the substantial production of the Eucharistic Victim with the sacrificing of the same. Herein is straightway revealed a serious weakness, already clearly perceived by De Lugo. For the production of a thing can never be identical with its sacrifice; otherwise one might declare the gardener's production of plants or the farmer's raising of cattle a sacrifice. Thus, the idea of kenosis, which in the minds of all men is intimately linked with the notion of sacrifice, and which we have given above as our third condition, is wanting in the theory of Suarez. To offer something as a sacrifice always means to divest oneself of it, even though this self-divestment may finally lead to exaltation.

In Germany the profound, but poorly developed theory of Valentin Thalhofer found great favour. We need not, however, develop it here, especially since it rests on the false basis of a supposed "heavenly sacrifice" of Christ, which, as the virtual continuation of the Sacrifice of the Cross, becomes a temporal and spatial phenomenon in the Sacrifice of the Mass. But, as practically all other theologians teach, the existence of this heavenly sacrifice (in the strict sense) is only a beautiful theological dream, and at any rate cannot be demonstrated from the Epistle to the Hebrews.

(ii) Disavowing the above-mentioned theories concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass, theologians of to-day are again seeking a closer approximation to the pre-Tridentine conception, having realized that post-Tridentine theology had perhaps for polemical reasons needlessly exaggerated the idea of destruction in the sacrifice. The old conception, which our catechisms even to-day proclaim to the people as the most natural and intelligible, may be fearlessly declared the

patristic and traditional view; its restoration to a position of general esteem is the service of Father Billot (De sacram., I, 4th ed., Rome, 1907, pp. 567 sqq.). Since this theory refers the absolute moment of sacrifice to the (active) "sacramental mystical slaying", and the relative to the (passive) "separation of Body and Blood", it has indeed made the "two-edged sword" of the double consecration the cause from which the double character of the Mass as an absolute (real in itself) and relative sacrifice proceeds. We have an absolute sacrifice, for the Victim is—not indeed *in specie propria*, but *in specie aliena*—sacramentally slain; we have also a relative sacrifice, since the sacramental separation of Body and Blood represents perceptibly the former shedding of Blood on the Cross.

While this view meets every requirement of the metaphysical nature of the Sacrifice of the Mass, we do not think it right to reject offhand the somewhat more elaborate theory of Lessius instead of utilizing it in the spirit of the traditional view for the extension of the idea of a "mystical slaying". Lessius (De perfect. moribusque div., XII, xiii) goes beyond the old explanation by adding the not untrue observation that the intrinsic force of the double consecration would have as result an actual and true shedding of blood on the altar, if this were not *per accidens* impossible in consequence of the impassibility of the transfigured Body of Christ. Since *ex vi verborum* the consecration of the bread makes really present only the Body, and the consecration of the Chalice only the Blood, the tendency of the double consecration is towards a formal exclusion of the Blood from the Body. The mystical slaying thus approaches nearer to a real destruction and the absolute sacrificial moment of the Mass receives an important confirmation. In the light of this view, the celebrated statement of St. Gregory of Nazianzus becomes of special importance ("Ep. clxxi, ad Amphil." in P. G., XXXVII, 282): "Hesitate not to pray for me . . . when with bloodless stroke [ἀναιμάκτῳ τομῇ] thou separatest [τέμνῃς] the Body and Blood of the Lord, having speech as a sword [φωνὴν ἔχων τὸ ξίφος]." As an old pupil of Cardinal Franzelin (De Euchar., p. II, thes. xvi, Rome, 1887), the present writer may perhaps speak a good word for the once popular, but recently combatted theory of Cardinal De Lugo, which Franzelin revived after a long period of neglect; not however that he intends to proclaim the theory in its present form as entirely satisfactory, since, with much to recommend it, it has also serious defects. We believe, however, that this theory, like that of Lessius, might be most profitably utilized to develop, supplement, and deepen the traditional view. Starting from the principle that the Eucharistic destruction can be, not a physical, but only a moral one, De Lugo finds this exinanition in the voluntary reduction of Christ to the condition of food (*reductio ad statum cibi et potus*), in virtue of which the Saviour, after the fashion of lifeless food, leaves himself at the mercy of mankind. That this is really equivalent to a true kenosis no one can deny. Herein the Christian pulpit has at its disposal a truly inexhaustible source of lofty thoughts wherewith to illustrate in glowing language the humility and love, the destitution and defencelessness of Our Saviour under the sacramental veil, His magnanimous submission to irreverence, dishonour, and sacrilege, and wherewith to emphasize that even to-day that fire of self-sacrifice, which once burned on the Cross, still sends forth its tongues of flame in a mysterious manner from the Heart of Jesus to our altars. While, in this incomprehensible condescension, the absolute moment of sacrifice is disclosed in an especially striking manner, one is reluctantly compelled to recognize the absence of two of the other requisites: in the first place, the necessity of the double consecration is not made properly apparent, since a single consecration would suffice to produce the condition of food, and would therefore achieve the sacrifice; secondly, the reduction to the state of articles of food reveals not the faintest analogy to the blood-shedding on the Cross, and thus the relative moment of the Sacrifice of the Mass is not properly dealt with. De Lugo's theory seems, therefore, of no service in this connexion. It renders, however, the most useful service in extending the traditional idea of a "mystical slaying", since indeed the reduction of Christ to food is and purports to be nothing else than the preparation of the mystically slain Victim for the sacrificial feast in the Communion of the priest and the faithful.

Concerning research in history of religions see ANRICH, *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum* (Göttingen, 1894); HEITMÜLLER, *Taufe u. Abendmahl bei Paulus* (Göttingen, 1904); ANDERSEN, *Das Abendmahl in den zwei ersten Jahrh. n. Chr.* (2nd ed., Giessen, 1906); BASSERMANN, *Ueber Reform des Abendmahles* (Tübingen, 1904); O. HOLTZMANN, *Das Abendmahl im Urchristentum* in *Zeitschr. für neutestamentl. Wissenschaft* (1904), 204 sqq.; DEISSMANN, *Licht vom Osten* (Tübingen, 1908); GEFFCKEN, *Aus der Werdezeit des Christentums* (Leipzig, 1904); CLEMEN, *Die religionsgesch. Methode in der Theol.* (Bonn, 1904); IDEM, *Religionsgesch. Erklärung des N. T.* (Giessen, 1909); RÉVILLE, *Les origines de l'Eucharistie* (Paris, 1908). For an answer to Radicalism see RAHLENBECK, *Die Einsetzung der Taufe u. des Abendmahls u. die moderne Kritik* (Gütersloh, 1907); BARES, *Die moderne prot. Abendmahlsforschung* (Trier, 1910); GÖTZ, *Die heutige Abendmahlsfrage in ihrer geschichtl. Entwicklung* (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1908). Concerning the Anglican view see GORE, *The Body of Christ* (5th ed., London, 1907); NEWBOLT, *The Sacrament of the Altar* (London, 1908). Concerning the nature of the Sacrifice of the Mass, cf. VON LASAULX, *Das Sühnopfer der Griechen u. Römer u. ihr Verhältnis zu dem einen auf Golgatha* (Würzburg, 1841); BREITENREICHER, *Die Sakramente u. das hl. Messopfer* (Schaffhausen, 1869); TANNER, *Cruentum Christi sacrificium, incruentum Missæ sacrificium explicatum* (Prague, 1669); CIENFUÉGOS, *Vita abscondita sub speciebus velata* (Rome, 1728); WESTERMAYR, *Die Messe in ihrem Wesen oder das verklärte Kreuzesopfer* (Ratisbon, 1868); THALHOFER, *Das Opfer des A. u. N. Bundes* (Ratisbon, 1870); DIEPOLDER, *Das Wesen des eucharist. Opfers u. die vorzüglichen kath. Theologen der drei letzten Jahrh.* (Ratisbon, 1877); SCHWANE, *Die eucharist. Opferhandlung* (Freiburg, 1889); HUMPHREY, *The One Mediator or Sacrifice and Sacrament* (London, 1890); VACANT, *Hist. de la Conception du Sacrifice de la Messe dans l'Eglise latine* (Paris, 1894); VAN WERSCH, *Das hl. Messopfer in seiner Wesenheit u. in seiner Feier* (Strasburg, 1895); CHARRE, *Le Sacrifice de l'Homme-Dieu* (Paris, 1899); SCHEEBEN, *Die Mysterien des Christentums*, § 72 (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1898); GÖTZMANN, *Das eucharist. Opfer nach der Lehre der älteren Scholastik* (Freiburg, 1901); HEINRICH-GUTBERLET, *Dogmat. Theol.*, IX (Mainz, 1901); RENZ, *Die Gesch. des Messopferbegriffes oder der alte Glaube u. die neuen Theorien über das Wesen des unblutigen Opfers* (2 vols., Freising, 1901–3); MORTIMER, *The Eucharistic Sacrifice. An historical and theological Investigation of the Sacrificial Conception of the Holy Eucharist in the Catholic Church* (London, 1901).

(3) The Causality of the Mass.—In this section we shall treat: (a) the effects (*effectus*) of the Sacrifice of the Mass, which practically coincide with the various ends for which the Sacrifice is offered, namely adoration, thanksgiving, impetration, and expiation; (b) the manner of its efficacy (*modus efficiendi*), which lies in part objectively in the Sacrifice of the Mass itself (*ex opere operato*), and partly depends subjectively on the personal devotion and piety of man (*ex opere operantis*).

(a) The Effects of the Sacrifice of the Mass.—The Reformers found themselves compelled to reject entirely the Sacrifice of the Mass, since they recognized the Eucharist merely as a sacrament. Both their views were founded on the reflection, properly appraised above, that the Bloody Sacrifice of the Cross was the sole Sacrifice of Christ and of Christendom, and thus does not admit of the Sacrifice of the Mass. As a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving in the symbolical or figurative sense, they had earlier approved of the Mass, and Melanchthon resented the charge that Protestants had entirely abolished it. What they most bitterly opposed was the Catholic doctrine that the Mass is a sacrifice not only of praise and thanksgiving, but also of impetration and atonement, whose fruits may benefit others, while it is evident that a sacrament as such can profit merely the recipient. Here the Council of Trent interposed with a definition of faith (Sess. XXII, can. iii): "If any one saith, that

the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving . . . , but not a propitiatory sacrifice; or, that it profits only the recipient, and that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities; let him be anathema" (Denzinger, n. 950). In this canon, which gives a summary of all the sacrificial effects in order, the synod emphasizes the propitiatory and impetratory nature of the sacrifice. Propitiation (*propitiatio*) and petition (*impetratio*) are distinguishable from each other, inasmuch as the latter appeals to the goodness and the former to the mercy of God. Naturally, therefore, they differ also as regards their objects, since, while petition is directed towards our spiritual and temporal concerns and needs of every kind, propitiation refers to our sins (*peccata*) and to the temporal punishments (*poenæ*), which must be expiated by works of penance or satisfaction (*satisfactiones*) in this life, or otherwise by a corresponding suffering in Purgatory. In all these respects the impetratory and expiatory Sacrifice of the Mass is of the greatest utility, both for the living and the dead.

Should a Biblical foundation for the Tridentine doctrine be asked for, we might first of all argue in general as follows: Just as there were in the Old Testament, in addition to sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving, propitiatory and impetratory sacrifices (cf. Lev., iv sqq.; II Kings, xxiv, 21 sqq., etc.), the New Testament, as its antitype, must also have a sacrifice which serves and suffices for all these objects. But, according to the prophecy of Malachias, this is the Mass, which is to be celebrated by the Church in all places and at all times. Consequently, the Mass is the impetratory and propitiatory sacrifice. As for special reference to the propitiatory character, the record of institution states expressly that the Blood of Christ is shed in the chalice "unto remission of sins" (Matt., xxvi, 28).

The chief source of our doctrine, however, is tradition, which from the earliest times declares the impetratory value of the Sacrifice of the Mass. According to Tertullian (Ad scapul., ii), the Christians sacrificed "for the welfare of the emperor" (*pro salute imperatoris*); according to Chrysostom (Hom. xxi in Act. Apost., n. 4), "for the fruits of the earth and other needs". St. Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386) describes the liturgy of the Mass of his day as follows ("Catech. myst.", v, n. 8, in P. G., XXXIII, 1115): "After the spiritual sacrifice [*πνευματικὴ θυσιά*], the unbloody service [*ἀναίμακτος λατρεία*] is completed; we pray to God over this sacrifice of propitiation [*ἐπὶ τῆς θυσίας ἐκείνης τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ*] for the universal peace of the churches, for the proper guidance of the world, for the emperor, soldiers and companions, for the infirm and the sick, for those stricken with trouble, and in general for all in need of help we pray and offer up this sacrifice [*ταύτην προσφέρομεν τὴν θυσιάν*]. We then commemorate the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, that God may, at their prayers and intercession, graciously accept our supplication. We afterwards pray for the dead . . . since we believe that it will be of the greatest advantage [*μεγίστην ὄνησιν ἔσεσθαι*], if we in the sight of the holy and most awesome Victim [*τῆς ἁγίας καὶ φρικωδεστάτης θυσίας*] discharge our prayers for them. The Christ, who was slain for our sins, we sacrifice [*Χριστὸν ἐσφαγμένον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἁμαρτημάτων προσφέρομεν*], to propitiate the merciful God for those who are gone before and for ourselves." This beautiful passage, which reads like a modern prayer-book, is of interest in more than one connexion. It proves in the first place that Christian antiquity recognized the offering up of the Mass for the deceased, exactly as the Church to-day recognizes requiem Masses—a fact which is confirmed by other independent witnesses, e. g. Tertullian (De monog., x), Cyprian (Ep. lxvi, n. 2), and Augustine (Confess., ix, 12). In the second place, it informs us that our so-called Masses of the Saints also had their prototype among the primitive Christians, and for this view we likewise find other testimonies—e. g. Tertullian (De Cor., iii) and Cyprian (Ep. xxxix, n. 3). By a Saint's Mass is meant, not the offering up of the Sacrifice of the Mass to a saint, which would be impossible without most shameful idolatry, but a sacrifice, which, while offered to God alone, on the one hand thanks Him for the triumphal coronation of the saints, and on the other aims at procuring for us the saint's efficacious intercession with God. Such is the authentic explanation of the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, cap. iii, in Denzinger, n. 941). With this threefold limitation, Masses "in honour of the saints" are certainly no base "deception", but are morally allowable, as the Council of Trent specifically declares (loc. cit., can. v); "If any one saith, that it is an imposture to celebrate masses in honour of the saints, and for obtaining their intercession with God, as the Church intends, let him be anathema". The general moral permissibility of invoking the intercession of the saints, concerning which this is not the place to speak, is of course assumed in the present instance.

While adoration and thanksgiving are effects of the Mass which relate to God alone, the success of impetration and expiation on the other hand reverts to man. These last two effects are thus also called by theologians the "fruits of the Mass" (*fructus missæ*), and this distinction leads us to the discussion of the difficult and frequently asked question as to whether we are to impute infinite or finite value to the Sacrifice of the Mass. This question is not of the kind which may be answered with a simple yes or no. For, apart from the already indicated distinction between adoration and thanksgiving on the one hand and impetration and expiation on the other, we must also sharply distinguish between the intrinsic and the extrinsic value of the Mass (*valor intrinsecus, extrinsecus*). As for its intrinsic value, it seems beyond doubt that, in view of the infinite worth of Christ as the Victim and High Priest in one Person, the sacrifice must be regarded as of infinite value, just as the sacrifice of the Last Supper and that of the Cross. Here, however, we must once more strongly emphasize the fact that the ever-continued sacrificial activity of Christ in Heaven does not and cannot serve to accumulate fresh redemptory merits and to assume new objective value; it simply stamps into current coin, so to speak, the redemptory merits definitively and perfectly obtained in the Sacrifice of the Cross, and sets them into circulation among mankind. This also is the teaching of the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, cap. ii): "Of which bloody oblation the fruits are most abundantly obtained through this unbloody one [the Mass]." For, even in its character of a sacrifice of adoration and thanksgiving, the Mass draws its whole value and all its power only from the Sacrifice of the Cross, which Christ makes of unceasing avail in Heaven (cf. Rom., viii, 34; Heb., vii, 25). There is, however, no reason why this intrinsic value of the Mass derived from the Sacrifice of the Cross, in so far as it represents a sacrifice of adoration and thanksgiving, should not also operate outwardly to the full extent of its infinity, for it seems inconceivable that the Heavenly Father could accept with other than infinite satisfaction the sacrifice of His only begotten Son. Consequently God, as Malachias had already prophesied, is in a truly infinite degree honoured, glorified, and praised in the Mass; through Our Lord Jesus Christ he is thanked by men for all His benefits in an infinite manner, in a manner worthy of God.

But when we turn to the Mass as a sacrifice of impetration and expiation, the case is different. While we must always regard its intrinsic value as infinite, since it is the sacrifice of the God-Man Himself, its extrinsic value must necessarily be finite in consequence of the limitations of man. The scope of the so-called "fruits of the Mass" is limited. Just as a tiny chip of

wood cannot collect within it the whole energy of the sun, so also, and in a still greater degree, is man incapable of converting the boundless value of the impetratory and expiatory sacrifice into an infinite effect for his soul. Wherefore, in practice, the impetratory value of the sacrifice is always as limited as is its propitiatory and satisfactory value. The greater or less measure of the fruits derived will naturally depend very much on the personal efforts and worthiness, the devotion and fervour of those who celebrate or are present at Mass. This limitation of the fruits of the Mass must, however, not be misconstrued to mean that the presence of a large congregation causes a diminution of the benefits derived from the Sacrifice by the individual, as if such benefits were after some fashion divided into so many aliquot parts. Neither the Church nor the Christian people has any tolerance for the false principle: "The less the number of the faithful in the church, the richer the fruits". On the contrary, the Bride of Christ desires for every Mass a crowded church, being rightly convinced that from the unlimited treasures of the Mass much more grace will result to the individual from a service participated in by a full congregation, than from one attended merely by a few of the faithful. This relative infinite value refers indeed only to the general fruit of the Mass (*fructus generalis*), and not to the special (*fructus specialis*)—two terms whose distinction will be more clearly characterized below. Here, however, we may remark that by the special fruit of the Mass is meant that for the application of which according to a special intention a priest may accept a stipend.

The question now arises whether in this connexion the applicable value of the Mass is to be regarded as finite or infinite (or, more accurately, unlimited). This question is of importance in view of the practical consequences it involves. For, if we decide in favour of the unlimited value, a single Mass celebrated for a hundred persons or intentions is as efficacious as a hundred Masses celebrated for a single person or intention. On the other hand, it is clear that, if we incline towards a finite value, the special fruit is divided *pro rata* among the hundred persons. In their quest for a solution of this question, two classes of theologians are distinguished according to their tendencies: the minority (Gotti, Billuart, Antonio Bellarini, etc.) are inclined to uphold the certainty or at least the probability of the former view, arguing that the infinite dignity of the High Priest Christ cannot be limited by the finite sacrificial activity of his human representative. But, since the Church has entirely forbidden as a breach of strict justice that a priest should seek to fulfil, by reading a single Mass, the obligations imposed by several stipends (see Denzinger, n. 1110), these theologians hasten to admit that their theory is not to be translated into practice, unless the priest applies as many individual Masses for all the intentions of the stipend-givers as he has received stipends. But inasmuch as the Church has spoken of strict justice (*justitia commutativa*), the overwhelming majority of theologians incline even theoretically to the conviction that the satisfactory—and, according to many, also the propitiatory and impetratory—value of a Mass for which a stipend has been taken, is so strictly circumscribed and limited from the outset, that it accrues *pro rata* (according to the greater or less number of the living or the dead for whom the Mass is offered) to each of the individuals. Only on such a hypothesis is the custom prevailing among the faithful of having several Masses celebrated for the deceased or for their intentions intelligible. Only on such a hypothesis can one explain the widely established "Mass Association", a pious union whose members voluntarily bind themselves to read or get read at least one Mass annually for the poor souls in purgatory. As early as the eighth century we find in Germany a so-called "Totenbund" (see Pertz, "Monum. Germaniæ hist.: Leg.", II, i, 221). But probably the greatest of such societies is the *Messbund* of Ingolstadt, founded in 1724; it was raised to a confraternity (Confraternity of the Immaculate Conception) on 3 Feb., 1874, and at present counts 680,000 members (cf. Beringer, "Die Ablässe, ihr Wesen u. ihr Gebrauch", 13th ed., Paderborn, 1906, pp. 610 sqq.). Tournely (De Euch. q. viii, a. 6) has also sought in favour of this view important internal grounds of probability, for example by adverting to the visible course of Divine Providence: all natural and supernatural effects in general are seen to be slow and gradual, not sudden or desultory, wherefore it is also the most holy intention of God that man should, by his personal exertions, strive through the medium of the greatest possible number of Masses to participate in the fruits of the Sacrifice of the Cross.

(b) The Manner of Efficacy of the Mass.—In theological phrase an effect "from the work of the action" (*ex opere operato*) signifies a grace conditioned exclusively by the objective bringing into activity of a cause of the supernatural order, in connexion with which the proper disposition of the subject comes subsequently into account only as an indispensable antecedent condition (*conditio sine qua non*), but not as a real joint cause (*concausa*). Thus, for example, baptism by its mere ministration produces *ex opere operato* interior grace in each recipient of the sacrament who in his heart opposes no obstacle (*obex*) to the reception of the graces of baptism. On the other hand, all supernatural effects, which, presupposing the state of grace, are accomplished by the personal actions and exertions of the subject (e. g. everything obtained by simple prayer), are called effects "from the work of the agent" (*ex opere operantis*). We are now confronted with the difficult question: In what manner does the Eucharistic Sacrifice accomplish its effects and fruits? As the early scholastics gave scarcely any attention to this problem, we are indebted for almost all the light thrown upon it to the later scholastics.

(i) It is first of all necessary to make clear that in every sacrifice of the Mass four distinct categories of persons really participate. At the head of all stands of course the High Priest, Christ Himself; to make the Sacrifice of the Cross fruitful for us and to secure its application, He offers Himself as a sacrifice, which is quite independent of the merits or demerits of the Church, the celebrant or the faithful present at the sacrifice, and is for these an *opus operatum*. Next after Christ and in the second place comes the Church as a juridical person, who, according to the express teaching of the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, cap. i), has received from the hands of her Divine Founder the institution of the Mass and also the commission to ordain constantly priests and to have celebrated by these the most venerable Sacrifice. This intermediate stage between Christ and the celebrant may be neither passed over nor eliminated, since a bad and immoral priest, as an ecclesiastical official, does not offer up his own sacrifice—which indeed could only be impure—but the immaculate Sacrifice of Christ and his spotless Bride, which can be soiled by no wickedness of the celebrant. But to this special sacrificial activity of the Church, offering up the sacrifice together with Christ, must also correspond a special ecclesiastico-human merit as a fruit, which, although in itself an *opus operantis* of the Church, is yet entirely independent of the worthiness of the celebrant and the faithful, and therefore constitutes for these an *opus operatum*. When, however, as De Lugo rightly points out, an excommunicated or suspended priest celebrates in defiance of the prohibition of the Church, this ecclesiastical merit is always lost, since such a priest no longer acts in the name and with the commission of the Church. His sacrifice is nevertheless valid, since, by virtue of his priestly ordination, he celebrates in the name of Christ, even though in opposition to His wishes, and, as the self-sacrifice of Christ, even such a

Mass remains essentially a spotless and untarnished sacrifice before God.

We are thus compelled to concur in another view of De Lugo, namely that the greatness and extent of this ecclesiastical service is dependent on the greater or less holiness of the reigning pope, the bishops, and the clergy throughout the world, and that for this reason in times of ecclesiastical decay and laxity of morals (especially at the papal court and among the episcopate) the fruits of the Mass, resulting from the sacrificial activity of the Church, might under certain circumstances easily be very small. With Christ and His Church is associated in the third place the celebrating priest, since he is the representative through whom the real and the mystical Christ offer up the sacrifice. If, therefore, the celebrant be a man of great personal devotion, holiness, and purity, there will accrue an additional fruit which will benefit not himself alone, but also those in whose favour he applies the Mass. The faithful are thus guided by sound instinct when they prefer to have Mass celebrated for their intentions by an upright and holy priest rather than by an unworthy one, since, in addition to the chief fruit of the Mass, they secure this special fruit which springs *ex opere operantis*, from the piety of the celebrant.

Finally, in the fourth place, must be mentioned those who participate actively in the Sacrifice of the Mass, e. g. the servers, sacristan, organist, singers, and the whole congregation joining in the sacrifice. The priest, therefore, prays also in their name: *Offerimus* (i. e. We offer). That the effect resulting from this (metaphorical) sacrificial activity is entirely dependent on the worthiness and piety of those taking part therein and thus results exclusively *ex opere operantis*, is evident without further demonstration. The more fervent the prayer, the richer the fruit. Most intimate is the active participation in the Sacrifice of those who receive Holy Communion during the Mass, since in their case the special fruits of the Communion are added to those of the Mass. Should sacramental Communion be impossible, the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, cap. vi) advises the faithful to make at least a "spiritual communion" (*spirituali effectu communicare*), which consists in the ardent desire to receive the Eucharist. However, as we have already emphasized, the omission of real or spiritual Communion on the part of the faithful present does not render the Sacrifice of the Mass either invalid or unlawful, wherefore the Church even permits "private Masses", which may on reasonable grounds be celebrated in a chapel with closed doors.

(ii) In addition to the active, there are also passive participators in the Sacrifice of the Mass. These are the persons in whose favour—it may be even without their knowledge and in opposition to their wishes—the Holy Sacrifice is offered. They fall into three categories: the community, the celebrant, and the person (or persons) for whom the Mass is specially applied. To each of these three classes corresponds *ex opere operato* a special fruit of the Mass, whether the same be an impetratory effect of the Sacrifice of Petition or a propitiatory and satisfactory effect of the Sacrifice of Expiation. Although the development of the teaching concerning the threefold fruit of the Mass begins only with Scotus (Quæst. quodlibet, xx), it is nevertheless based on the very essence of the Sacrifice itself. Since, according to the wording of the Canon of the Mass (q. v.), prayer and sacrifice is offered for all those present, the whole Church, the pope, the diocesan bishop, the faithful living and dead, and even "for the salvation of the whole world", there must first of all result a "general fruit" (*fructus generalis*) for all mankind, the bestowal of which lies immediately in the will of Christ and His Church, and can thus be frustrated by no contrary intention of the celebrant. In this fruit even the excommunicated, heretics, and infidels participate, mainly that their conversion may thus be effected. The second kind of fruit (*fructus personalis, specialissimus*) falls to the personal share of the celebrant, since it were unjust that he—apart from his worthiness and piety (*opus operantis*)—should come empty-handed from the sacrifice. Between these two fruits lies the third, the so-called "special fruit of the Mass" (*fructus specialis, medius*, or *ministerialis*), which is usually applied to particular living or deceased persons according to the intention of the celebrant or the donor of a stipend. This "application" rests so exclusively in the hands of the priest that even the prohibition of the Church cannot render it inefficacious, although the celebrant would in such a case sin through disobedience. For the existence of the special fruit of the Mass, rightly defended by Pius VI against the Jansenistic Synod of Pistoia (1786), we have the testimony also of Christian antiquity, which offered the Sacrifice for special persons and intentions. To secure in all cases the certain effect of this *fructus specialis*, Suarez (De Euch., disp. lxxix, sect. 10) gives priests the wise advice that they should always add to the first a "second intention" (*intentio secunda*), which, should the first be inefficacious, will take its place.

(iii) A last and an entirely separate problem is afforded by the special mode of efficacy of the Sacrifice of Expiation. As an expiatory sacrifice, the Mass has the double function of obliterating actual sins, especially mortal sins (*effectus stricte propitiatorius*), and also of taking away, in the case of those already in the state of grace, such temporal punishments as may still remain to be endured (*effectus satisfactorius*). The main question is: Is this double effect *ex opere operato* produced mediately or immediately? As regards the actual forgiveness of sin, it must, in opposition to earlier theologians (Aragon, Casalis, Gregory of Valentia), be maintained as undoubtedly a certain principle, that the expiatory sacrifice of the Mass can never accomplish the forgiveness of mortal sins otherwise than by way of contrition and penance, and therefore only mediately through procuring the grace of conversion (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XXII, cap. ii: "donum pœnitentiæ concedens"). With this limitation, however, the Mass is able to remit even the most grievous sins (Council of Trent, l. c., "Crimina et peccata etiam ingentia dimittit"). Since, according to the present economy of salvation, no sin whatsoever, grievous or trifling, can be forgiven without an act of sorrow, we must confine the efficacy of the Mass, even in the case of venial sins, to obtaining for Christians the grace of contrition for less serious sins (Sess. XXII, cap. i). It is indeed this purely mediate activity which constitutes the essential distinction between the sacrifice and the sacrament. Could the Mass remit sins immediately *ex opere operato*, like Baptism or Penance, it would be a sacrament of the dead and cease to be a sacrifice (see SACRAMENT). Concerning the remission of the temporal punishment due to sin, however, which appears to be effected in an immediate manner, our judgment must be different. The reason lies in the intrinsic distinction between sin and its punishment. Without the personal co-operation and sorrow of the sinner, all forgiveness of sin by God is impossible; this cannot however be said of a mere remission of punishment. One person may validly discharge the debts or fines of another, even without apprising the debtor of his intention. The same rule may be applied to a just person, who, after his justification, is still burdened with temporal punishment consequent on his sins. It is certain that, only in this immediate way, can assistance be given to the poor souls in purgatory through the Sacrifice of the Mass, since they are henceforth powerless to perform personal works of satisfaction (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XXV, de purgat.). From this consideration we derive by analogy the legitimate conclusion that the case is exactly the same as regards the living.

See BELLARMINE, *De Euchar.*, vi, 2 sqq.; SUAREZ, *De Euchar.*, disp. lxxix; DE LUGO, *De Euchar.*, disp. xix; BILLUART, *De Euchar.*, dissert. viii; especially SANCHEZ, *Spiritualis Thesaurus Missæ* (Ingoldstadt, 1620); GÖTZMANN, *Das euchar. Opfer nach der Lehre der älteren Scholastik* (Freiburg, 1901). Also KÖSSING, *Liturgische Erklärung der hl. Messe* (3rd ed., Ratisbon, 1869); OLIVIER, *Solutions théol. et liturg. touchant le saint Sacrifice de la Messe* (Paris, 1873); SPECHT, *Die Wirkungen des euchar. Opfers* (Augsburg, 1876); MÜLLER, *The Holy Mass, the Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead* (New York, 1879); BACUEZ, *Du divin Sacrifice et du prêtre qui le célèbre* (Paris, 1888); LÜDTKE, *Erklärung des hl. Messopfers* (Danzig, 1892); ROHAULT DE FLEURY, *Les Saints de la Messe* (10 vols., Paris, 1893–9); WALTER, *Die hl. Messe, der grösste Schatz der Welt* (6th ed., Brixen, 1901); GIHR, *Das hl. Messopfer dogmatisch, liturgisch u. aszetisch erklärt* (10th ed., Freiburg, 1907); 6th ed. tr. (St. Louis, 1908).

B. *Practical Questions Concerning the Mass.*—From the exceedingly high valuation, which the Church places on the Mass as the unbloody Sacrifice of the God-Man, issue, as it were spontaneously, all those practical precepts of a positive or a negative nature, which are given in the Rubrics of the Mass, in Canon Law, and in Moral Theology. They may be conveniently divided into two categories, according as they are intended to secure in the highest degree possible the objective dignity of the Sacrifice or the subjective worthiness of the celebrant.

(1) Precepts for the Promotion of the Dignity of the Sacrifice.—(a) One of the most important requisites for the worthy celebration of the Mass is that the place in which the all-holy Mystery is to be celebrated, should be a suitable one Since, in the days of the Apostolic Church, there were no churches or chapels, private houses with suitable accommodation were appointed for the solemnization of "the breaking of bread" (cf. Acts, ii, 46; xx, 7 sq.; Col., iv, 15; Philem., 2). During the era of the persecutions the Eucharistic services in Rome were transferred to the catacombs, where the Christians believed themselves secure from government agents. The first "houses of God" reach back certainly to the end of the second century, as we learn from Tertullian (Adv. Valent., iii) and Clement of Alexandria (Strom., I, i). In the second half of the fourth century (A. D. 370), Optatus of Mileve (De Schism. Donat., II, iv) could already reckon more than forty basilicas which adorned the city of Rome. From this period dates the prohibition of the Synod of Laodicea (can. lviii) to celebrate Mass in private houses. Thenceforth the public churches were to be the sole places of worship. In the Middle Ages the synods granted to bishops the right of allowing house-chapels within their dioceses. According to the law of to-day (Council of Trent, Sess. XXII, de reform.), the Mass may be celebrated only in chapels and public (or semi-public) oratories, which must be consecrated or at least blessed. At present, private chapels may be erected only in virtue of a special papal indult (S. C. C., 23 Jan., 1847; 6 Sept., 1870). In the latter case, the real place of sacrifice is the consecrated altar (or altar-stone), which must be placed in a suitable room (cf. Missale Romanum, Rubr. gen., tit. xx). In times of great need (e. g. war, persecution of Catholics), the priest may celebrate outside the church, but naturally only in a becoming place, provided with the most necessary utensils. On reasonable grounds the bishop may, in virtue of the so-called "quinquennial faculties", allow the celebration of Mass in the open air, but the celebration of Mass at sea is allowed only by papal indult. In such an indult it is usually provided that the sea be calm during the celebration, and that a second priest (or deacon) be at hand to prevent the spilling of the chalice in case of the rocking of the ship.

(b) For the worthy celebration of Mass the circumstance of time is also of great importance. In the Apostolic age the first Christians assembled regularly on Sundays for "the breaking of bread" (Acts, xx, 7: "on the first day of the week"), which day the "Didache" (c. xiv), and later Justin Martyr (I Apol., lxvi), already name "the Lord's day". Justin himself seems to be aware only of the Sunday celebration, but Tertullian adds the fast-days on Wednesday and Friday and the anniversaries of the martyrs ("De cor. mil.", iii; "De orat.", xix). As Tertullian calls the whole paschal season (until Pentecost) "one long feast", we may conclude with some justice that during this period the faithful not only communicated daily, but were also present at the Eucharistic Liturgy. As regards the time of the day, there existed in the Apostolic age no fixed precepts regarding the hour at which the Eucharistic celebration should take place. The Apostle Paul appears to have on occasion "broken bread" about midnight (Acts, xx, 7). But Pliny the Younger, Governor of Bithynia (died A. D. 114), already states in his official report to Emperor Trajan that the Christians assembled in the early hours of the morning and bound themselves by a *sacramentum* (oath), by which we can understand to-day only the celebration of the mysteries. Tertullian gives as the hour of the assembly the time before dawn (De cor. mil., iii: *antelucanis cœtibus*). When the fact was adverted to that the Saviour's Resurrection occurred in the morning before sunrise, a change of the hour set in, the celebration of Mass being postponed until this time. Thus Cyprian writes of the Sunday celebration (Ep., lxiii): "We celebrate the Resurrection of the Lord in the morning." Since the fifth century the "third hour" (i. e. 9 a. m.) was regarded as "canonical" for the Solemn Mass on Sundays and festivals. When the Little Hours (Prime, Terce, Sext, None) began in the Middle Ages to lose their significance as "canonical hours", the precepts governing the hour for the conventual Mass received a new meaning. Thus, for example, the precept that the conventual Mass should be held after None on fast days does not signify that it be held between midday and evening, but only that "the recitation of None in choir is followed by the Mass". It is in general left to the discretion of the priest to celebrate at any hour between dawn and midday (*ab aurora usque ad meridiem*). It is proper that he should read beforehand Matins and Lauds from his breviary.

The sublimity of the Sacrifice of the Mass demands that the priest should approach the altar wearing the sacred vestments (amice, stole, cincture, maniple, and chasuble). Whether the priestly vestments are historical developments from Judaism or paganism, is a question still discussed by archæologists. In any case the "Canones Hippolyti" require that at Pontifical Mass the deacons and priests appear in "white vestments", and that the lectors also wear festive garments. No priest may celebrate Mass without light (usually two candles), except in case of urgent necessity (e. g. to consecrate a Host as the Vaticum for a person seriously ill). The altar-cross is also necessary as an indication that the Sacrifice of the Mass is nothing else than the unbloody reproduction of the Sacrifice of the Cross. Usually, also, the priest must be attended at the altar by a server of the male sex. The celebration of Mass without a server is allowed only in case of need (e. g. to procure the Viaticum for a sick person, or to enable the faithful to satisfy their obligation of hearing Mass). A person of the female sex may not serve at the altar itself, e. g. transfer the missal, present the cruets, etc. (S. R. C., 27 August, 1836). Women (especially nuns) may, however, answer the celebrant from their places, if no male server be at hand. During the celebration of Mass a simple priest may not wear any head-covering—whether biretta, pileolus, or full wig (*comæ fictitiæ*)—but the bishop may allow him to wear a plain perruque as a protection for his hairless scalp.

(c) To preserve untarnished the honour of the most venerable sacrifice, the Church has surrounded with a strong rampart of special defensive regulations the institution of "mass-stipends"; her intention is on the one hand to keep remote from the altar all base ava-

rice, and on the other to ensure and safeguard the right of the faithful to the conscientious celebration of the Masses bespoken. By a mass-stipend is meant a certain monetary offering which anyone makes to the priest with the accompanying obligation of celebrating a Mass in accordance with the intentions of the donor (*ad intentionem dantis*). The obligation incurred consists, concretely speaking, in the application of the "special fruit of the Mass" (*fructus specialis*), the nature of which we have already described in detail (A, 3). The idea of the stipend emanates from the earliest ages, and its justification lies incontestably in the axiom of St. Paul (I Cor., ix, 13): "They that serve the altar, partake with the altar". Originally consisting of the necessaries of life, the stipend was at first considered as "alms for a Mass" (*eleemosyna missarum*), the object being to contribute to the proper support of the clergy. The character of a pure alms has been since lost by the stipend, since such may be accepted by even a wealthy priest. But the Pauline principle applies to the wealthy priest just as it does to the poor. The now customary money-offering, which was introduced about the eighth century and was tacitly approved by the Church, is to be regarded merely as the substitute or commutation of the earlier presentation of the necessaries of life. In this very point, also, a change from the ancient practice has been introduced, since at present the individual priest receives the stipend personally, whereas formerly all the clergy of the particular church shared among them the total oblations and gifts. In their present form, the whole matter of stipends has been officially taken by the Church entirely under her protection, both by the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, de ref.) and by the dogmatic Bull "Auctorem fidei" (1796) of Pius VI (Denzinger, n. 1554). Since the stipend, in its origin and nature, claims to be and can be nothing else than a lawful contribution towards the proper support of the clergy, the false and foolish views of the ignorant are shown to be without foundation, when they suppose that a Mass may be simoniacally purchased with money (cf. St. Thomas, II-II, Q. c, art. 2). To obviate all abuses concerning the amount of the stipend, there exists in each diocese a fixed "mass-tax" (settled either by ancient custom or by an episcopal regulation), which no priest may exceed, unless extraordinary inconvenience (e. g. long fasting or a long journey on foot) justifies a somewhat larger sum. To eradicate all unworthy greed from among both laity and clergy in connexion with a thing so sacred, Pius IX in his Constitution "Apostolicæ Sedis" of 12 Oct., 1869, forbade under penalty of excommunication the commercial traffic in stipends (*mercimonium missæ stipendiorum*). The trafficking consists in reducing the larger stipend collected to the level of the "tax", and appropriating the surplus for oneself. Into the category of shameful traffic in stipends also falls the reprehensible practice of book-sellers and tradesmen, who organize public collections of stipends and retain the money contributions as payment for books, merchandise, wines, etc., to be delivered to the clergy (S. C. C., 31 Aug., 1874; 25 May, 1893). As special punishment for this offence, *suspensio a divinis* reserved to the pope is proclaimed against priests, irregularity against other clerics, and excommunication reserved to the bishop, against the laity.

Another bulwark against avarice is the strict regulation of the Church, binding under pain of mortal sin, that priests shall not accept more intentions than they can satisfy within a reasonable period (S. C. C., 1904). This regulation was emphasized by the additional one which forbade stipends to be transferred to priests of another diocese without the knowledge of their ordinaries (S. C. C., 22 May, 1907). The acceptance of a stipend imposes under pain of mortal sin the obligation not only of reading the stipulated Mass, but also of fulfilling conscientiously all other appointed conditions of an important character (e. g. the appointed day, altar, etc.). Should some obstacle arise, the money must either be returned to the donor, or a substitute procured. In the latter case, the substitute must be given, not the usual stipend, but the whole offering received (cf. Prop. ix damn. 1666 ab Alex. VIII in Denzinger, n. 1109), unless it be indisputably clear from the circumstances that the excess over the usual stipend was meant by the donor for the first priest alone. There is a tacit condition which requires the reading of the stipulated Mass as soon as possible. According to the common opinion of moral theologians, a postponement of two months is in less urgent cases admissible, even though no lawful impediment can be brought forward. Should, however, a priest postpone a Mass for a happy delivery until after the event, he is bound to return the stipend. However, since all these precepts have been imposed solely in the interests of the stipend-giver, it is evident that he enjoys the right of sanctioning all unusual delays.

(d) To the kindred question of "mass-foundations" the Church has, in the interests of the founder and in her high regard for the Holy Sacrifice, devoted the same anxious care as in the case of stipends. Mass-foundations (*fundationes missarum*) are fixed bequests of funds or real property, the interest or income from which is to procure for ever the celebration of Mass for the founder or according to his intentions. Apart from anniversaries, foundations of Masses are divided, according to the testamentary arrangement of the testator, into monthly, weekly, and daily foundations. As ecclesiastical property, mass-foundations are subject to the administration of the ecclesiastical authorities, especially of the diocesan bishop, who must grant his permission for the acceptance of such and must appoint for them the lowest rate. Only when episcopal approval has been secured can the foundation be regarded as completed; thenceforth it is unalterable for ever. In places where the acquirement of ecclesiastical property is subject to the approval of the State (e. g. in Austria), the establishment of a mass-foundation must also be submitted to the secular authorities. The declared wishes of the founder are sacred and decisive as to the manner of fulfilment. Should no special intention be mentioned in the deed of foundation, the Mass must be applied for the founder himself (S. C. C., 18 March, 1668). To secure punctuality in the execution of the foundation, Innocent XII ordered in 1697 that a list of the mass-foundations, arranged according to the months, be kept in each church possessing such endowments. The administrators of pious foundations are bound under pain of mortal sin to forward to the bishop at the end of each year a list of all founded Masses left uncelebrated together with the money therefor (S. C. C., 25 May, 1893).

The celebrant of a founded Mass is entitled to the full amount of the foundation, unless it is evident from the circumstances of the foundation or from the wording of the deed that an exception is justifiable. Such is the case when the foundation serves also as the endowment of a benefice, and consequently in such a case the beneficiary is bound to pay his substitute only the regular tax (S. C. C., 25 July, 1874). Without urgent reason, founded Masses may not be celebrated in churches (or on altars) other than those stipulated by the foundation. Permanent transference of such Masses is reserved to the pope, but in isolated instances the dispensation of the bishop suffices (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XXI de ref.; Sess. XXV de ref.). The unavoidable loss of the income of a foundation puts an end to all obligations connected with it. A serious diminution of the foundation capital, owing to the depreciation of money or property in value, also the necessary increase of the mass-tax, scarcity of priests, poverty of a church or of the clergy may con-

stitute just grounds for the reduction of the number of Masses, since it may be reasonably presumed that the deceased founder would not under such difficult circumstance insist upon the obligation. On 21 June, 1625, the right of reduction, which the Council of Trent had conferred on bishops, abbots, and the generals of religious orders, was again reserved by Urban VIII to the Holy See.

Consult PASQUALIGO, *De sacrificio Novæ Legis quæst. theologicæ, morales, iuridicæ* (2 vols., Lyons, 1662); BONA, *De sacrificio missæ tract. asceticus* (new ed., Freiburg, 1906; Ratisbon, 1909); BENEDICT XIV, *De ss. Missæ sacrificio* in MIGNE, *Theol. Curs. Complet.*, XXIII; KÖSSING, *Liturg. Erklärung der hl. Messe* (3rd ed., Münster, 1869); THALHOFER, *Handbuch der kathol. Liturgik* (2 vols., Freiburg, 1870); BUATHIER, *Le sacrifice dans le dogme cathol. et dans la vie chrét.* (Paris, 1889); HILARIUS A SEXTEN, *Tract. pastoralis de sacramentis* (Mainz, 1895); GASPARRI, *Tract. canonicus de ss. Eucharistia* (Paris, 1897); GIORDANO, *Das euch. Leben u. das ewige Königtum Christi*, tr. from Italian (Freiburg, 1900); PRUNER, *Lehrbuch der Pastoraltheol.*, I (2d ed., Freiburg, 1904); BALTHASAR, *Das Geheimnis aller Geheimnisse in hl. Sakrament des Altars* (Freiburg, 1905); TYRRELL-GREEN, *The Eucharist, Devotional Addresses on its chief Aspects* (London, 1908); KINANE, *Dove of the Tabernacle; or, The Love of Jesus in the Most Holy Eucharist* (Dublin), German tr. (Freiburg, 1910). On particular points consult KRAUS, *Realencykl. der christl. Alterthümer* (2 vols., Freiburg, 1879–86); WIELAND, *Mensa u. Confessio*, I (Munich, 1906); RAIBLE, *Der Tabernakel einst u. jetzt* (Freiburg, 1908); BRAUN, *Die priesterl. Gewänder des Abendlandes nach ihrer geschichtl. Entwicklung* (Freiburg, 1897); IDEM, *Die liturg. Gewandung im Occident u. Orient nach Ursprung u. Entwicklung* (Freiburg, 1907) Concerning mass-stipends, see BERLENDIS, *De oblationibus et stipendiis* (Venice, 1743); SCHMID, *Messopfer, Messapplikation u. Messtipendien* (Passau, 1834); LEINZ, *Die Simonie, eine kanonistische Studie* (Freiburg, 1902). Consult further PHILLIPS, *Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts* (2d ed., Ratisbon, 1871), 549 sqq.; LEHMKUHL, *Theol. moralis*, II (10th ed., Freiburg, 1902); GÖPFERT, *Moraltheologie*, III (5th ed., Paderborn, 1906). On mass-foundations see BENEDICT XIV, *De synod. dioces.*, V, x; XII, xxv; EUZET, *Nature juridique de la fondation de Messes* (Paris, 1906); DEJUST, *Des fondations de Messes* (Paris, 1908); THURSTON in *The Month* (1908), 13–27.

(2) Precepts to secure the Worthiness of the Celebrant.—Although, as declared by the Council of Trent (Sess. XXII, cap. i), the venerable, pure, and sublime Sacrifice of the God-man "cannot be stained by any unworthiness or impiety of the celebrant", still ecclesiastical legislation has long regarded it as a matter of special concern that priests should fit themselves for the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice by the cultivation of integrity, purity of heart, and other qualities of a personal nature.

(a) In the first place it may be asked: Who may celebrate Mass? Since for the validity of the sacrifice the office of a special priesthood is essential, it is clear, to begin with, that only bishops and priests (not deacons) are qualified to offer up the Holy Sacrifice (see EUCHARIST). The fact that even at the beginning of the second century the regular officiator at the Eucharistic celebration seems to have been the bishop will be more readily understood when we remember that at this early period there was no strict distinction between the offices of bishop and priest. Like the "Didache" (xv), Clement of Rome (Ad Cor., xl–xlii) speaks only of the bishop and his deacon in connexion with the sacrifice. Ignatius of Antioch, indeed, who bears irrefutable testimony to the existence of the three divisions of the hierarchy—bishop (ἐπίσκοπος), priests (πρεσβύτεροι) and deacons (διάκονοι)—confines to the bishop the privilege of celebrating the Divine Service, when he says: "It is unlawful to baptize or to hold the agape [ἀγάπην] without the bishop." The "Canones Hippolyti", composed probably about the end of the second century, first contain the regulation (can. xxxii): "If, in the absence of the bishop, a priest be at hand, all shall devolve upon him, and he shall be honoured as the bishop is honoured." Subsequent tradition recognizes no other celebrant of the Mystery of the Eucharist than the bishops and priests, who are validly ordained "according to the keys of the Church" (*secundum claves Ecclesiæ*). (Cf. Lateran IV, cap. "Firmiter" in Denzinger, n. 430.)

But the Church demands still more by insisting also on the personal moral worthiness of the celebrant. This connotes not alone freedom from all ecclesiastical censures (excommunication, suspension, interdict), but also a becoming preparation of the soul and body of the priest before he approaches the altar. To celebrate in the state of mortal sin has always been regarded by the Church as an infamous sacrilege (cf. I Cor., xi, 27 sqq.). For the worthy (not for the valid) celebration of the Mass it is, therefore, especially required that the celebrant be in the state of grace. To place him in this condition, the awakening of perfect sorrow is no longer sufficient since the Council of Trent (Sess. XIII, cap. vii in Denzinger, n. 880), for there is a strict ecclesiastical precept that the reception of the Sacrament of Penance must precede the celebration of Mass. This rule applies to all priests, even when they are bound by their office (*ex officio*) to read Mass, e. g. on Sundays for their parishioners. Only in instances, when no confessor can be procured, may they content themselves with reciting an act of perfect sorrow (*contritio*), and they then incur the obligation of going to confession "as early as possible" (*quam primum*), which, in canon law, signifies within three days at furthest. In addition to the pious preparation for Mass (*accessus*), there is prescribed a correspondingly long thanksgiving after Mass (*recessus*), whose length is fixed by moral theologians between fifteen minutes and half an hour, although in this connexion the particular official engagements of the priest must be considered. As regards the length of the Mass itself, the duration is naturally variable, according as a Solemn High Mass is sung or a Low Mass celebrated. To perform worthily all the ceremonies and pronounce clearly all the prayers in Low Mass requires on an average about half an hour. Moral theologians justly declare that the scandalous haste necessary to finish Mass in less than a quarter of an hour is impossible without grievous sin.

With regard to the more immediate preparation of the body, custom has declared from time immemorial, and positive canon law since the Council of Constance (1415), that the faithful, when receiving the Sacrament of the Altar, and priests, when celebrating the Holy Sacrifice, must be fasting (*jejunium naturale*), which means that they must have partaken of no food or drink whatsoever from midnight. Midnight begins with the first stroke of the hour. In calculating the hour, the so-called "mean time" (or local time) must be used: according to a recent decision (S. C. C., 12 July, 1893), Central-European time may be also employed, and, in North America, "zone time". The movement recently begun among the German clergy, favouring a mitigation of the strict regulation for weak or overworked priests with the obligation of duplicating, has serious objections, since a general relaxation of the ancient strictness might easily result in lessening respect for the Blessed Sacrament and in a harmful reaction among thoughtless members of the laity. The granting of mitigations in general or in exceptional cases belongs to the Holy See alone. To keep away from the altar irreverent adventurers and unworthy priests, the Council of Trent (Sess. XXIII, de ref.) issued the decree, made much more stringent in later times, that an unknown priest without the Celebret (q. v.) may not be allowed to say Mass in any church.

(b) A second question may be asked: "Who must say Mass?" In the first place, if this question be considered identical with the enquiry as to whether a general obligation of Divine Law binds every priest by reason of his ordination, the old Scholastics are divided in opinion. St. Thomas, Durandus, Paludanus, and Anthony of Bologna certainly maintained the existence of such an obligation; on the other hand, Richard of St. Victor, Alexander of Hales, Bonaventure, Gabriel Biel, and Cardinal Cajetan declared for the opposite view. Canon law teaches nothing on the subject. In the absence of a decision, Suarez (De Euchar., disp. lxxx, sect. 1, n. 4) believes that one who conforms to

the negative view, may be declared free from grievous sin. Of the ancient hermits we know that they did not celebrate the Holy Sacrifice in the desert, and St. Ignatius Loyola, guided by high motives, abstained for a whole year from celebrating. Cardinal De Lugo (De Euchar., disp. xx, sect. 1, n. 13) takes a middle course, by adopting theoretically the milder opinion, while declaring that, in practice, omission through lukewarmness and neglect may, on account of the scandal caused, easily amount to mortal sin. This consideration explains the teaching of the moral theologians that every priest is bound under pain of mortal sin to celebrate at least a few times each year (e. g. at Easter, Pentecost, Christmas, the Epiphany). The obligation of hearing Mass on all Sundays and holy days of obligation is of course not abrogated for such priests. The spirit of the Church demands—and it is to-day the practically universal custom—that a priest should celebrate daily, unless he prefers to omit his Mass occasionally through motives of reverence.

Until far into the Middle Ages it was left to the discretion of the priest, to his personal devotion and his zeal for souls, whether he should read more than one Mass on the same day. But since the twelfth century canon law declares that he must in general content himself with one daily Mass, and the synods of the thirteenth century allow, even in case of necessity, at most a duplication (see BINATION). In the course of time this privilege of celebrating the Holy Sacrifice twice on the same day was more and more curtailed. According to the existing law, duplication is allowed, under special conditions, only on Sundays and holy days, and then only in the interests of the faithful, that they may be enabled to fulfil their obligation of hearing Mass. For the feast of Christmas alone have priests universally been allowed to retain the privilege of three Masses; in Spain and Portugal this privilege was extended to All Souls' Day (2 Nov.) by special Indult of Benedict XIV (1746). Such customs are unknown in the East.

This general obligation of a priest to celebrate Mass must not be confounded with the special obligation which results from the acceptance of a Mass-stipend (*obligatio ex stipendio*) or from the cure of souls (*obligatio ex cura animarum*). Concerning the former sufficient has been already said. As regards the claims of the cure of souls, the obligation of Divine Law that parish priests and administrators of a parish should from time to time celebrate Mass for their parishioners, arises from the relations of pastor and flock. The Council of Trent (Sess. XXIII, de ref.) has specified this duty of application more closely, by directing that the parish priest should especially apply the Mass, for which no stipend may be taken, for his flock on all Sundays and holy days (cf. Benedict XIV, "Cum semper oblatas", 19 Aug., 1744). The obligation to apply the Mass *pro populo* extends also to the holy days abrogated by the Bull of Urban VIII, "Universa per orbem", of 13 Sept., 1642; for even to-day these remain "canonically fixed feast days", although the faithful are dispensed from the obligation of hearing Mass and may engage in servile works. The same obligation of applying the Mass falls likewise on bishops, as pastors of their dioceses, and on those abbots who exercise over clergy and people a quasi-episcopal jurisdiction. Titular bishops alone are excepted, although even in their case the application is to be desired (cf. Leo XIII, "In suprema", 10 June, 1882). As the obligation itself is not only personal, but also real, the application must, in case of an impediment arising, either be made soon afterwards, or be effected through a substitute, who has a right to a mass stipend as regulated by the tax. Concerning this whole question, see Heuser, "Die Verpflichtung der Pfarrer, die hl. Messe für die Gemeinde zu applicieren" (Düsseldorf, 1850).

(c) For the sake of completeness a third and last question must be touched on in this section: For whom may Mass be celebrated? In general the answer may be given: For all those and for those only, who are fitted to participate in the fruits of the Mass as an impetratory, propitiatory, and satisfactory sacrifice. From this is immediately derived the rule that Mass may not be said for the damned in Hell or the blessed in Heaven, since they are incapable of receiving the fruits of the Mass; for the same reason children who die unbaptized are excluded from the benefits of the Mass. Thus, there remain as the possible participants only the living on earth and the poor souls in purgatory (cf. Trent, Sess. XXII, can. iii; Sess. XXV, decret. de purgat.). Partly out of her great veneration of the Sacrifice, however, and partly to avoid scandal, the Church has surrounded with certain conditions, which priests are bound in obedience to observe, the application of Mass for certain classes of the living and dead. The first class are non-tolerated excommunicated persons, who are to be avoided by the faithful (*excommunicati vitandi*). Although, according to various authors, the priest is not forbidden to offer up Mass for such unhappy persons in private and with a merely mental intention, still to announce publicly such a Mass or to insert the name of the excommunicated person in the prayers, even though he may be in the state of grace owing to perfect sorrow or may have died truly repentant, would be a "communicatio in divinis", and is strictly forbidden under penalty of excommunication (cf. C. 28, de sent. excomm., V, t. 39). It is likewise forbidden to offer the Mass publicly and solemnly for deceased non-Catholics, even though they were princes (Innoc. III, C. 12, X, l. 3, tit. 28). On the other hand it is allowed, in consideration of the welfare of the state, to celebrate for a non-Catholic living ruler even a public Solemn Mass. For living heretics and schismatics, also for the Jews, Turks, and heathens, Mass may be privately applied (and even a stipend taken) with the object of procuring for them the grace of conversion to the true Faith. For a deceased heretic the private and hypothetical application of the Mass is allowed only when the priest has good grounds for believing that the deceased held his error in good faith (*bona fide*. Cf. S. C. Officii, 7 April, 1875). To celebrate Mass privately for deceased catechumens is permissible, since we may assume that they are already justified by their desire of Baptism and are in purgatory. In like manner Mass may be celebrated privately for the souls of deceased Jews and heathens, who have led an upright life, since the sacrifice is intended to benefit all who are in purgatory. For further details see Göpfert, "Moraltheologie", III (5th ed., Paderborn, 1906).

In addition to the special bibliography given under each section, see for the word Mass: MÜLLER, *Missa. Ursprung u. Bedeutung der Benennung* (Aschaffenburg, 1873); LOEWY, *Die mystischen Bezeichnungen Jesu Christi als Siloe, Schiloch u. Piscis, insbesondere die Bezeichnung der christl. Opferfeier als Missa* (Paderborn, 1888); KELLNER, *Heortologie* (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1906), pp. 58 sqq.; tr. (London and St. Louis, 1908), pp. 430 sqq.; VON FUNK, *Abhandlungen u. Untersuchungen*, III (Paderborn, 1907); *Katholik*, II (1907), 239; I (1908), 114 sqq. Concerning the Agape (q. v.), see E. BAUMGARTNER, *Eucharistie u. Agape im Urchristentum* (Solothurn, 1909). On the whole subject: *Summa Theol.*, III, Q. lxxxiii; INNOCENT III, *De sacro altaris mysterio* in *P. L.*, CCXXVII, 773 sqq.; BILLUART, *De Eucharistia*, VI, ed. LEQUETTE; BELLARMINE, *De Eucharistia*, VI, ed. FÈVRE; DE VALENTIA, *De ss. Missæ sacrificio* (Ingolstadt, 1580); SUAREZ, *De Euchar. et de Missæ sacrificio* (new ed., Paris, 1861); DE LUGO, *De ss. Eucharistia*, IV, ed. FOURNIALS; TANNER, *De ss. Missæ sacrificio* (Ingolstadt, 1620); LAMBRECHT, *De ss. Missæ sacrificio* (Louvain, 1874); ROSSET, *De Eucharistiæ mysterio* (Cambrai, 1876); FRANZELIN, *De ss. Eucharistiæ sacramento et sacrificio* (4th ed., Rome, 1884); KATSCHTHALER, *De ss. Eucharistia* (2nd ed., Ratisbon, 1886); EINIG, *De ss. Eucharistiæ mysterio* (Trier, 1888); STENTRUP, *De sacrificio Eucharistiæ* (Innsbruck, 1889); MANY, *Prælectiones de Missa* (Paris, 1903); GAVIN, *The Sacrifice of the Mass* (London, 1903); HEDLEY, *The Holy Eucharist* (London, 1907), pp. 147–252; ROHAULT DE FLEURY, *La Messe* (8 vols., Paris, 1883–89); DE SÉGUR, *Die hl. Messe* (Mainz, 1874); CAPPELLAZZI, *L'Eucharistia come sacramento e come sacrificio* (Turin, 1898); HERGENRÖTHER, *Die Eucharistie als Opfer* (Ratisbon, 1868); HOLTZWARTH, *Briefe über das hl. Messopfer* (Mainz, 1873); MENNE, *Das hl. Sakrament des Altars als Opfer* (Paderborn, 1876); EIS-

ENRING, *Das hl. Messopfer* (Einsiedeln, 1880); BUSINGER, *Das unblutige Opfer des Neuen Bundes* (Solothurn, 1890); SAUTER, *Das hl. Messopfer* (3rd ed., Paderborn, 1910); LOHMANN, *Das Opfer des Neuen Bundes* (2nd ed., Paderborn, 1909); also the various text-books of dogmatic theology, e. g. PESCH, *Prælectiones dogmat.*, VI (3rd ed., Freiburg, 1908); POHLE, *Dogmatik*, III (4th ed., Paderborn, 1910). See also bibliography under EUCHARIST.

J. POHLE.

Massa Candida.—Under the date 24 August, the "Martyrologium Romanum" records this commemoration: "At Carthage, of three hundred holy martyrs in the time of Valerian and Gallienus. Among other torments, the governor, ordering a limekiln to be lighted and live coals with incense to be set near by, said to these confessors of the Faith: 'Choose whether you will offer incense to Jupiter or be thrown down into the lime.' And they, armed with faith, confessing Christ, the Son of God, with one swift impulse hurled themselves into the fire, where, in the fumes of the burning lime, they were reduced to a powder. Hence this band of blessed ones in white raiment have been held worthy of the name, *White Mass.*" The date of this event may be placed between A. D. 253, when Gallienus was associated with his father in the imperial office, and A. D. 260, when Valerian was entrapped and made prisoner by Sapor, King of Persia. As to the exact place, St. Augustine [Ser. cccvi (al. cxii), 2] calls these martyrs the "White Mass of Utica", indicating that there they were specially commemorated. Utica was only 25 miles from the city of Carthage, which was the capital of a thickly populated district, and the three hundred may have been brought from Utica to be judged by the procurator (Galerius Maximus).

The fame of the Massa Candida has been perpetuated chiefly through two early references to them: that of St. Augustine, and that of the poet Prudentius (q. v.). The latter, in the thirteenth hymn of his *περὶ στεφάνων* collection, has a dozen lines describing "the pit dug in the midst of the plain, filled nearly to the brim with lime that emitted choking vapours", how the "stones vomit fire, and the snowy dust burns." After telling how they faced this ordeal, he concludes: "Whiteness [*candor*] possesses their bodies; purity [*candor*] bears their minds [or, souls] to heaven. Hence it [the "headlong swarm" to which the poet has referred in a preceding line] has merited to be forever called the *Massa Candida.*" Both St. Augustine and Prudentius were at the height of their activity before the end of the fourth century. Moreover, St. Augustine was a native and a resident of this same Province of Africa, while Prudentius was a Spaniard. It is natural to suppose that the glorious tale of the three hundred of Carthage had become familiar to both writers through a fresh and vivid tradition—no older than the traditions of the Revolutionary War now are in, say, New England. It is not even probable that either of them originated the metaphor under which the martyrs of the limekiln have been known to later generations: the name *Massa Candida* had, most likely, been long in use among the faithful of Africa and Spain. As Christians, they would have been reminded of Apoc., vii, 13 and 14, by every commemoration of a martyrdom; as Romans—at least in language and habit of thought—they were aware that candidates (*candidati*) for office were said to have been so called in Republican Rome from the custom of whitening the toga with chalk or lime (*calx*) when canvassing for votes. Given the Apocalyptic image and the Latin etymology (*candor—candidus—candidatus;* cf. in the "Te Deum", "Candidatus martyrum exercitus"), it was almost inevitable that this united body of witnesses for Christ, together winning their heavenly white raiment in the incandescent lime, which reduced their bodies to a homogeneous mass, should, by the peculiar form of their agony, have suggested this name to the African and Spanish Christians.

(For the casuistry of the self-destruction of the Massa Candida, see SUICIDE.)

HERGENRÖTHER, *Kirchengesch.*, French tr. BELET, I (Paris, 1901); MORONI, *Dizionario di Erudizione Storico-Eccles.*, XLII (Venice, 1847), 190.

E. MACPHERSON.

Massa Carrara, DIOCESE OF (MASSENSIS), in Central Italy (Lunigiana and Garfagnana). The city is located on the Frigido, in a district rich in various mines but especially famous for its pure white marble, which the Romans preferred to those of Paros and Pentelicus. Massa Carrara is the "Mansio ad Taberna Frigida" of the "Tabula Peutingeriana". In the ninth century it belonged to the bishops of Luni, and was confirmed to them by Otto I and by Frederick Barbarossa, though really at that time subject to the Malaspina, counts of Lunigiana. It passed from Lucca to Pisa, was held by the Visconti and the Fieschi, again by Lucca, and was later a free commune under the protectorate of Florence. In 1434, it took the marquis Antonio Alberico Malaspina for its lord; in 1548 the marquisate passed to the House of Cybò, through the marriage of Lorenzo of that name with Riccarda Malaspina. In 1568, Carrara became a principality, and in 1664 a duchy. The most famous prince of the house of Cybò was Alberico I, who endowed his little state with a model code of laws. The daughter of Alderamo, the last of the Cybòs, married Rinaldo Ercole d'Este, and by this marriage the duchy became united with that of Modena; in 1806 it was given to Elisa Bacciochi, and in 1814 to Maria Beatrice, daughter of Rinaldo Ercole, at whose death the duchy returned to Modena. The name of Carrara comes from Carraria, a stone quarry. An academy of sculpture founded by Duchess Maria Teresa (1741) has its seat at Carrara in the old but magnificent ducal palace. The fine cathedral dates from 1300. Carrara is the birthplace of the sculptors Tacca, Baratta, Finelli, and Tenerani, and of the statesman Pellegrino Rossi. The see was created in 1822 at the instance of Duchess Maria Beatrice, and its first bishop was Francesco Maria Zappi; it was then suffragan of Pisa, but since 1855 has been suffragan of Modena. The sanctuary of Santa Maria dei Quercioli, founded in 1832, is in the Diocese of Carrara. The latter has 213 parishes, 155,400 inhabitants, one religious house of men, seven of women, and four educational institutes for male students, and as many for girls.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XV (Venice, 1857); FARSETTI, *Ragionamento storico intorno alla città di Modena;* VIANI, *Memorie della famiglia Cybò.*

U. BENIGNI.

Massachusetts, one of the thirteen original United States of America. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts covers part of the territory originally granted to the Plymouth Company of England. It grew out of the consolidation (in 1692) of the two original colonies, Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay. The settlement at Plymouth began with the landing of the Pilgrims, 22 December, 1620; the Colony of Massachusetts Bay was established under John Endicott at Salem in 1628. The royal province created by this consolidation included also the District of Maine and so remained until the present State of Maine was set off from Massachusetts by Congress, 3 March, 1820. No authentic and complete survey of the State of Massachusetts exists, but it is generally believed to include an area of about 8040 square miles, with a population of rather more than three millions. Of this number 1,373,752 are Catholics, distributed among the three Dioceses of Boston (the Archdiocese), Fall River, and Springfield, which are the actual ecclesiastical divisions of the state. Classified by nationalities, this Catholic population comprises more than 7000 Germans, 50,000 Portuguese, 100,000 Italians, 150,000 French Canadians, 10,000 Lithuanians, 3000 Syrians, 25,000 Poles, 1000 Negroes, 81 Chinese, 3000 Bravas, the remainder—more than 1,000,000—being principally Irish or of Irish parentage.

I. Colonial History.—A. *Settlement.*—The explorations and settlements of the Northmen upon the shores of Massachusetts, the voyages of the Cabots, the temporary settlement (1602) of the Gosnold party on one of the Elizabeth Islands of Buzzard's Bay, and the explorations and the mapping of the New England coast by Captain John Smith are usually passed over as more or less conjectural. The undisputed history of Massachusetts begins with the arrival of the "Mayflower" in December, 1620. Nevertheless the due appreciation of these previous events gives a ready and logical explanation of many acts, customs, and laws of the founders of this commonwealth which, in general, are imperfectly understood. The early maps (1582) mark the present territory of New England under the name "Norumbega", and show that the coast had been visited by Christian mariners—whether by fishermen in search of the fisheries set forth by Cabot, or by the daring Drakes, Frobishers, and Hawkinses of Elizabeth's reign, does not seem clear. It is an accepted fact that, when Gosnold set out in 1602, there was not a single English settlement on the Continent. France did not acknowledge the claim of England over the whole of the territory. A French colony had been established where now is northern Virginia, under the name of "New France". This was after Verazzano's expedition made by order of Francis I. A French explorer, too, the Huguenot Sieur de Monts, had been to Canada, and knew much about the resources of that country, especially the fur trade of the Indian tribes. Henry IV had given De Monts a patent to all the country now included in New England, also a monopoly of the fur trade. All this is important, because it entered into the conditions of the early permanent settlement here.

Coat-of-Arms forming part of the Seal of Massachusetts

For a quarter of a century prior to the coming of the Pilgrims, the French and the Dutch resented the encroachments of the English. "The Great Patent for New England", of 1620, granted to Gorges and his forty associates, has been called a "despotic as well as a gigantic commercial monopoly". This grant included the New Netherlands of the Dutch, the French Acadia and, indeed, nearly all the present inhabited British possessions in North America, besides all New England, the State of New York, half of New Jersey, nearly all of Pennsylvania, and the country to the west—in short, all the territory from the fortieth degree of north latitude to the forty-eighth, and from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean. The English had increased the enmity of the French by destroying the Catholic settlements at Ste-Croix and at Port-Royal, and had aroused the suspicion and hostility of the Indians by the treachery of Hunt, an act described by Mather as "one which constrained the English to suspend their trade and abandon their prospects of a settlement in New England".

The religious conditions were no less ominous for the Pilgrims. At the opening of the sixteenth century, all Christian Europe, with slight exceptions, was Catholic and loyal to the papacy; at the close of that century England herself was the mother of three anti-papacy sects: the State Church and its two divisions; the Nonconformists, or Puritans; and the Separatists, or Pilgrims. At the time of the sailing of the "Mayflower", the Puritans had become as fully disenfranchised by the Anglican Church as the Pilgrims had estranged themselves from both; each distrusted the others; all three hated the Church of Rome. Gorges and his associates had found the French and their Jesuit missionaries a stumbling-block in the way of securing fur-trading privileges from the Indians. The alleged gold and copper mines of Smith and of Gosnold were now regarded as myths; unless something could be done at once, the opportunities offered by their charter monopoly would be worthless. A permanent English settlement in America was the only sure way of preventing the French and the Dutch from acquiring the Virginia territory. The Gorges company knew of the cherished hopes of the Pilgrims to find a home away from their English persecutors, and, after much chicanery on the part of the promoters, the company agreed to found a home for the Pilgrims in the new world. The articles of agreement were wholly commercial, and the "Mayflower" sailed for Virginia. History differs in its interpretation of the end of that voyage, but all agree that the Pilgrims, in landing at Plymouth, 22 December, 1620, were outside any jurisdiction of their patrons, the Virginia Company. The Pilgrims themselves recognized their difficulty, and the famous "Compact" was adopted, before landing, as a basis of government by mutual agreement. Gorges protected his company's investment by obtaining from James I the new charter of 1620 which controlled, on a commercial basis, all religious colonization in America. The struggle of race against race, tribe against tribe, neighbour against neighbour were all encouraged so long as the warfare brought gain to the mercenary adventurers at home. The Pilgrims, finding themselves deserted by the instigators of this ill-feeling, were forced by the law of self-preservation to continue religious intolerance and the extermination of the Indians. Thus it is that we find the laws, the customs, and the manners of these first English settlers so interwoven with the religio-commercial principle. The coming of the Puritans, in 1629–30, added the factor of politics, which resulted in establishing in America the very thing against which these "Purists" had fought at home, namely, the union of Church and State. Here, again, at Puritan Salem, Gorges and Mason cloaked their commercialism under religion, as the accounts of La Tour and Winslow attest, and so effective were their machinations that, as early as 1635, Endicott's zeal had not left a set of the king's colours intact with the red cross thereon—that "relic of popery insufferable in a Puritan community".

B. *Colonial Legislation.*—The legality of the early acts of the colonists depends, to a great degree, on whether the charters granted to the two colonies were for the purpose of instituting a corporation for trading purposes, or whether they are regarded as constitutions and foundations of a government. This much-controverted point has never been settled satisfactorily. The repeated demands from the king, often with threat of prosecution, for the return of the charters were ignored, so that, until 1684, the colony was practically a free state, independent of England, and professing little, if any, loyalty. Judging from the correspondence, it is more than probable that the intention of the Crown in granting the charter was that the corporation should have a local habitation in England, and it is equally evident that the colony did not possess the right to make its own laws. It is plainly stated, in the patent granted to the Puritans, who the governor and other officials of the colony should be, showing thereby that the Crown retained the right of governing. A new charter was granted in 1692, covering Massachusetts, Plymouth, Maine, Nova Scotia, and the intervening territory, entitled "The Province of Massachusetts Bay in New England"; nevertheless it was not until the Treaty of Utrecht, in 1713, that the proceedings on the part of the home Government, to assert the Crown's rights, abated notably. During the half-century in which the Puritans ignored the terms of their charter, and made laws in accordance

with their own selfish interests, many of those acts occurred which history has since condemned. At the first meeting of the General Court held 30 August, 1630, it was voted to build a house for the minister and maintain it at the state's expense—an act described by Benedict, in his "History of the Baptists", as "the first dangerous act performed by the rulers of this incipient government which led to innumerable evils, hardships, and privations to all who had the misfortune to dissent from the ruling power in after times.—The Viper in Embryo; here was an importation and establishment, in the outset of the settlement, of the odious doctrine of Church and State which had thrown empires into convulsions, had caused rivers of blood to be shed, had crowded prisons with innocent victims, and had driven the Pilgrims [he means Puritans] themselves, who were now engaged in the mistaken legislation, from all that was dear in their native homes." This union of Church and State controlled the electorate and citizenship of the colony, made the school a synonym of both, excluded Catholic priests and prohibited the entrance of Jesuits, condemned witches to death, banished Roger Williams and the Quakers, established the pillory, and in other ways left to posterity many chapters of uncharitableness, intolerance, and cruelty. After the War of Independence, the old colonial government took a definite constitutional form under the Union, in 1780, and the first General Court of the sovereign State of Massachusetts convened in October of that year. This constitution was revised in 1820.

C. *Catholic Colonization.*—The Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay Colonies were composed principally of English. Near the close of the reign of Charles I, however, the forced emigration of the Irish brought many of that race to these shores; their number is hard to estimate, first, because the law made it obligatory that all sailings must take place from English ports, so that there are no records of those who came from Ireland with English sailing registry; secondly, because the law, under heavy penalties, obliged all Irishmen in certain towns of Ireland to take English surnames—the name of some small town, of a colour, of a particular trade or office, or of a certain art or craft. Children in Ireland were separated forcibly from their parents and under new names sent into the colonies. Men and women, from Cork and its vicinity, were openly sold into slavery for America. Connaught, which was nine-tenths Catholic, was depopulated. The frequently published statement in justification of Cromwell's persecution, that the victims of this white slave-traffic were criminals, finds no corroboration in the existence of a single penal colony in this country. In 1634 the General Court of Massachusetts Bay also granted land for an Irish settlement on the banks of the Merrimac River. (See BOSTON, ARCHDIOCESE OF; IRISH IN COUNTRIES OTHER THAN IRELAND, I.)

II. MODERN MASSACHUSETTS.—A. *Statistics of Population.* In 1630 the population of Plymouth and Massachusetts Colonies was estimated at 8000 white people; in 1650, at 16,000; in 1700, at 70,000; while in 1750 it was placed at 220,000. In 1790 the population of the State of Massachusetts was 378,787; in 1905 it was 3,003,680. The density of population increased from 47 to the square mile, in 1790, to 373, in 1905. In 1790 over nine-tenths of the population lived in rural communities, while in 1905 less than one-fourth (22.26 per cent) of the total population lived in communities of 8000 or less. The great tide of Irish immigration began in 1847. This has since conspicuously modified the population of Massachusetts. In 1905 the ratio of increase in the native and in the foreign-born of the population was 6.46 per cent and 8.47 per cent respectively; the number of native-born in the total population being 2,085,636, and that of the foreign-born being 918,044, an increase of the latter of 459.7 per cent since 1850. This foreign-born population is mostly (83.91 per cent) in cities and towns with populations of more than 8000. Ireland has furnished 25.75 per cent of the total foreign-born. Canada (exclusive of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island) is second, with a population of 12.88 per cent of the total foreign-born population. At present Russia supplies the largest increase in foreign-born, having risen from one-half of one per cent, in 1885, to 6.43 per cent, in 1905. Italy's contribution in the same period rose from .76 per cent to 5.51 per cent. Almost sixty per cent of the entire population of Massachusetts is now of foreign parentage. In the cities of Fall River and Lawrence it runs as high as four-fifths of the entire population, while in Holyoke, Lowell, and Chicopee it is more than three-fourths. In Boston the population of foreign parentage forms 69.03 per cent, while at New Bedford it rises to 72.34 per cent, at Worcester to 65.64 per cent, at Cambridge to 65.16 per cent, at Woburn to 63.63 per cent, and at Salem to 61.10 per cent. The Greeks have increased in Massachusetts 1242.7 per cent since 1895, a greater rapidity of increase than all peoples of foreign parentage in the population. Austria comes next, and Italy is third. In the city of Boston, Irish parentage gives 174,770 out of a total census of 410,960 persons of foreign parentage, and this nationality predominates in every ward except the eighth, where Russian parentage stands first. The transformation in the racial and national population in Massachusetts has likewise changed the religious prominence of the various denominations. The present order of denominations in this state is: Catholic, 69.2 per cent; Congregationalists, 7.6 per cent; Baptists, 5.2 per cent; Methodists, 4.2 per cent; Protestant Episcopalians, 3.3 per cent.

B. *Economic Conditions.*—Massachusetts was not favoured by nature for an agricultural centre. The soil is sandy in the level areas and clayey in the hilly sections. The valleys of the streams are rich in soil favourable to vegetable- and fruit-production. The early industries were cod and mackerel fisheries. At the outbreak of the Revolution, commerce was the most profitable occupation, and after the declaration of peace, Massachusetts sent its ships to all parts of the world. The European wars helped this commerce greatly until the War of 1812, with its embargo and non-intercourse laws, which forced the American vessels to stay at home. It had its recompenses, however, in the birth of manufactures, an industry attempted as early as 1631 and 1644, but subsequently suppressed by the mother country. The first cotton mill was established at Beverly in 1787. It was not until 1840, however, that the cotton and leather industries attained permanent leadership. According to the published statistics of 1908, Massachusetts had 6044 manufacturing establishments, with a yearly product valued at $1,172,808,782. The boot and shoe industry was the leading industry of the State, with a yearly production of $213,506,562. This industry produced 18.2 per cent of the product value of the State, and one-half of all the product in this line in the United States. The cotton manufactures were 13.51 per cent of the State's total product. The total capital devoted to production in the State was $717,787,955. More than 480,000 wage-earners were employed (323,308 males; 156,826 females) in the various manufacturing industries of the State, the two leading industries employing 35.22 per cent of the aggregate average number of all employees. The average yearly earning for each operative is $501.71. The Massachusetts laws prohibit more than fifty-eight hours' weekly employment in mercantile establishments, and limit the day's labour to ten hours. No woman or minor can be employed for purposes of manufacturing between the hours of ten o'clock p. m. and six o'clock a. m.; no minor under

eighteen years and no woman can be employed in any textile factory between six o'clock p. m. and six o'clock a. m.; no child under fourteen years of age can be employed during the hours when the public schools are in session, nor between seven o'clock p. m. and six o'clock a. m. Children under fourteen years, and children over fourteen years and under sixteen years, who cannot read at sight and write legibly simple sentences in the English language, shall be permitted to work on Saturdays between six o'clock a. m. and seven o'clock p. m. only. Transportation facilities have kept pace with the growth of the industries. Two main railroad systems connect with the West, and, by means of the interstate branches, these connect with all the leading industrial cities. One general railroad system with its sub-divisions connects with the South, via New York. The means of transportation by water are no less complete than those by rail, and offer every facility to bring coal and other supplies of the world into connection with the various railroad terminals for distribution.

C. *Education.*—All education in Massachusetts was at first religious. We read of the establishment in 1636 of Harvard College, "lest an illiterate ministry might be left to the churches", and "to provide for the instruction of the people in piety, morality, and learning." The union of Church and State was accepted, and the General Court agreed to give 400 pounds towards the establishment of the college. Six years later it was resolved, "taking into consideration the great neglect of many parents and guardians in training up their children in learning and labor and other employment which may be profitable to the Commonwealth . . . that chosen men in every town are to redress this evil, are to have power to take account of parents, masters, and of their children, especially of their ability to read and understand the principles of religion and the capital laws of the country". This was the origin of compulsory education in Massachusetts. In 1647 every town was ordered, under penalty of a fine, to build and support a school for the double purpose of religious instruction and of citizenship; every large town of one hundred families to build a grammar school to fit the youths for the university. Thus was established the common free school. The union of Church and State was as pronounced in education as in civic affairs. When the grants from the legislature—colonial, provincial, and state—failed to meet the expenses of salaries and maintenance, lotteries were employed. The last grant to Harvard College from the public treasury was in 1814. Congregationalism had controlled education and legislation, and the corporation of Harvard College was limited to state officials and a specified number of Congregational clergymen. It was not until 1843 that other than Congregationalists were eligible for election as overseers of the college.

The original system of state education, as outlined above, was uninterrupted until the close of the Revolution. The burdens of the war, with its poverty and taxation, reduced the "grammar school" to a very low standard. Men of ability found a more lucrative occupation than teaching. Private schools sprang into existence about this time, and the legacies of Dummer, Phillips, Williston, and others made their foundations the preparatory schools for Harvard. In 1789 the legislature passed an act substituting six months for the constant instruction provided for towns of fifty families; and the law required a grammar-teacher of determined qualifications for towns of 200 families, instead of the similar requirements for all towns of half that population. In 1797 the Legislature formally adopted all the incorporated academies as public state schools, and thus denominational education almost entirely replaced the grammar schools founded in 1647. The act of 1789 was repealed in 1824. This aided greatly the private denominational schools and gave to them a false and fictitious social, intellectual, and moral standing. The American Institute of Instruction was formed in 1830 at Boston as a protest against the low standard of teaching in the public schools. Three years prior to this (1827) the Legislature had established the State Board of Education, which remained unchanged in form until 1909. That same year was made historic by the Legislature voting to make it unlawful to use the common schools, or to teach anything in the schools, in order to turn the children to a belief in any particular sect. This was the first show of strength Unitarianism had manifested in Massachusetts, and it has retained its control of the educational policy of the state since that date. In 1835 the civil authorities at Lowell authorized the establishment of separate Catholic schools with Catholic teachers and with all text-books subject to the pastor's approval. The municipality paid all the expenses except the rent of rooms. This experiment was a great success. The general wave of religious fanaticism, which swept the country a few years later, was responsible for the acceptance of the referendum vote of 21 May, 1855, which adopted the constitutional amendment that "all moneys thus raised by taxation in towns, or appropriated by the state, shall never be appropriated to any religious sect for the maintenance exclusively of its own schools". The Civil War resulted in a saner view of many questions which had been blurred by passion and prejudice, and in 1862 (and again in 1880) the statute law was modified so that "Bible reading is required, but without written note or oral comment; a pupil is exempt from taking part in any such exercise if his parent or guardian so wishes; any version is allowed, and no committee may purchase or order to be used in any public school books calculated to favor the tenets of any particular sect of Christians."—This, in brief, is the process by which the secularization of the public schools came about, a complete repudiation of the law of 1642.

Massachusetts has ten state normal schools with over 2000 pupils and a corps of 130 teachers. In the 17,566 public schools there are 524,319 pupils with an average attendance of 92 per cent. The proportion of teachers is 1281 male and 13,497 female. The total support of the public schools amounts annually to $14,697,774. There are forty-two academies with an enrolment of over 6000 pupils, and 344 private schools with a registration of 91,772. The local annual tax for school support per child between the ages of five to fifteen years is $26. The total valuation of all schools in Massachusetts is $3,512,557,604. There are within the state eighteen colleges or universities, six of them devoted to the education of women only. Massachusetts has also eight schools of theology, three law schools, four medical schools, two dental schools, one school of pharmacy, and three textile schools. The only colleges in Massachusetts (except textile schools) receiving state or federal subsidies are the State Agricultural Colleges and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the latter receiving both. The number of public libraries in Massachusetts exceeds that of any other state. The list includes 2586 libraries with 10,810,974 volumes valued at $12,657,757. There are 623 reading rooms, of which 301 are free. There are thirty schools for the dependent and the afflicted.

The growth of the Catholic schools has been notable. Besides Holy Cross College at Worcester, and Boston College at Boston, there are in the diocese of Boston seventy-nine grammar schools and twenty-six high schools with a teaching staff of 1075 persons and an enrolment of 52,142. This represents an investment of more than $2,700,000, a yearly interest of $135,000. More than a third of the parishes in this diocese now maintain parochial schools. In the Diocese of Fall River there are over 12,000 pupils in 28 parochial schools, besides a commercial school with

363 pupils. In the Diocese of Springfield there are 24,542 pupils in 56 parochial schools.

D. *Laws affecting Religion and Morals.*—Elsewhere in this article we have traced colonial laws and legislation. The Constitution of the United States gave religious liberty. The State Constitution of 1780 imposed a religious test as a qualification for office and it authorized the legislature to tax the towns, if necessary, "for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion, and morality". The former law was repealed in 1821, and the latter in 1833. Complete religious equality has existed since the latter date. The observance of the Lord's Day is amply safeguarded, but entertainments for charitable purposes given by charitable or religious societies are permitted. The keeping of open shop or engaging in work or business not for charitable purposes is forbidden. Many of the rigid laws of colonial days are yet unrepealed. There is no law authorizing the use of prayer in the Legislature; custom, however, has made it a rule to open each session with prayer. This same custom has become the rule in opening the several sittings of the higher courts. Catholic priests have officiated at times at the former. The present Archbishop of Boston offered prayer at the opening of at least one term of the Superior Court, being the first Catholic to perform this office. The courts and the judiciary have full power to administer oaths.

The legal holidays in Massachusetts are 22 February, 19 April (Patriots' Day), 30 May, 4 July, the first Monday in September (Labor Day), 12 Oct. (Columbus Day), Thanksgiving Day, and Christmas Day. The list does not include Good Friday. The seal of confession is not recognized by law, although in practice sacramental confession is generally treated as a privileged conversation. Incorporation of churches and of charitable institutions is authorized by statute. Such organizations may make their own laws and elect their own officers. Every religious society so organized shall constitute a body corporate with the powers given to corporations. Section 44, chapter 36, of the Public Statutes provide that the Roman Catholic archbishop or bishop, the vicar-general of the diocese, and the pastor of the church for the time being, or a majority of these, may associate with themselves two laymen, communicants of the church, may form a body corporate, the signers of the certificate of incorporation becoming the trustees. Such corporations may receive, hold, and manage all real and personal property belonging to the church, sell, transfer, hold trusts, bequests, etc., but all property belonging to any church or parish, or held by such a corporation, shall never exceed one hundred thousand dollars, exclusive of church buildings. All church property and houses of religious worship (except that part of such houses appropriated for purposes other than religious worship or instruction) are exempt from taxation. This exemption extends to the property of literary, benevolent, charitable, and scientific institutions, and temperance societies; also to legacies, cemeteries, and tombs. Clergymen are exempt from service as constables, from jury service, and service in the militia. Clergymen are permitted by law to have access to prisoners after death sentence, and are among those designated as "officials" who may be present at executions. The statutes prohibit marriage between relatives, and recognize marriage by civil authorities and by rabbis. The statutory grounds for divorce recognized are adultery, impotency, desertion continued for three consecutive years, confirmed habits of intoxication by liquor, opium, or drugs, cruel and abusive treatment; also if either party is sentenced for life to hard labour, or five or more years in state prison, jail, or house of correction. The Superior Court hears all divorce libels. After a decree of divorce has become absolute, either party may marry again as if the other were dead; except that the party from whom the decree was granted shall not marry within two years. The sale of intoxicating liquors is regulated by law. Each community, city, or town votes annually upon the question, whether or not licence to sell liquor shall be issued in that municipality. Special boards are appointed to regulate the conditions of such licences. The number of licences that may be granted in each town or city is limited to one to each thousand persons, though Boston has a limitation of one licence to each five hundred of the population. The hours of opening and closing bars are regulated by law. Any person owning property can object to the granting of a licence to sell intoxicating liquors within twenty-five feet of his property. A licence cannot be granted to sell intoxicating liquors on the same street as, or within four hundred feet of, a public school.

E. *Religious Liberty.*—In the beginning Massachusetts was Puritan against the Catholic first, against all non-conformists to their version of established religion next. The Puritan was narrow in mind and for the most part limited in education, a type of man swayed easily to extremes. England was at that period intensely anti-papal. In Massachusetts, however, the antipathy early became racial: first against the French Catholic, later against the Irish Catholic. This racial religious bigotry has not disappeared wholly in Massachusetts. Within the pale of the Church racial schisms have been instigated from time to time in order that the defeat of Catholicism might be accomplished when open antagonism from without failed to accomplish the end sought. In politics it is often the effective shibboleth. Congregationalism soon took form in the colony and as early as 1631 all except Puritans were excluded by law from the freedom of the body politic. In 1647 the law became more specific and excluded priests from the colony. This act was reaffirmed in 1770. Bowdoin College preserves the cross and Harvard College the "Indian Dictionary" of Sebastian Rasle, the priest executed under the provision of the law. In 1746 a resolution and meeting at Faneuil Hall bear testimony that Catholics must prove, as well as affirm, their loyalty to the colony. Washington himself was called upon to suppress the insult of Pope Day at the siege of Boston. Each of these events was preceded by a wave of either French or Irish immigration, a circumstance which was repeated in the religious fanaticism of the middle of the nineteenth century. Cause and effect seem well established and too constant to be incidental. In all the various anti-Catholic uprisings, from colonial times to the present, there is not one instance where the Catholics were the aggressors by word or deed: their patience and forbearance have always been in marked contrast to the conduct of their non-Catholic contemporaries. In every one of the North Atlantic group of states, the Catholics now constitute the most numerous religious denomination. In Massachusetts the number of the leading denominations is as follows: Catholics 1,373,752; Congregationalists 119,196; Baptists 80,894; Methodists 65,498; Protestant Episcopalians 51,636; Presbyterians 8559.

F. *Catholic Progress.*—Throughout the account of the doings among the colonists, there are references to the coming, short stay, and departure of some Irish priest or French Jesuit. In the newspaper account of the departure of the French from Boston, in 1782, it is related that the clergy and the selectmen paraded through the streets preceded by a cross-bearer. It was some fifty years later that the prosperity and activity of the Church aroused political demagoguery and religious bigotry. Massachusetts, as well as New York and Philadelphia, experienced the storm: a convent was burned, churches were threatened, monuments to revered heroes of the Church were razed, and cemeteries desecrated. The consoling memory, however, of this period, is that Massachusetts furnished

the Otises, the Lees, the Perkinses, Everetts, and Lorings—all non-Catholics—whose voices and pens were enlisted heartily in the cause of justice, toleration, and unity.

In 1843, Rhode Island and Connecticut were set off from the original Diocese of Boston. Maine and New Hampshire, also under the jurisdiction of Boston, were made a new diocese ten years later, with the episcopal see at Portland. This was the period of the great Irish immigration, and Boston received a large quota. This new influx was, as in the previous century, looked upon as an "intrusion" and the usual result followed. New England had now become what Lowell was pleased to call "New Ireland". This religious and racial transformation, made the necessity for churches, academies, schools, asylums, priests, and teachers an imperative one. The work of expansion, both material and spiritual, went forward apace. The great influx of Canadian Catholics added much to the Catholic population, which had now reached more than a million souls—over sixty-nine per cent of the total religious population of the state. The era was not without its religious strife, this time within public and charitable institutions, state and municipal. This chapter reads like those efforts of proselytizing in the colonial days when names of Catholic children were changed, paternity denied, maternity falsified—all in the hope of destroying the true religious inheritance of the state's wards. The influence of Catholics in the governing of institutions, libraries, and schools has since then increased somewhat. The spiritual necessities of the vast Catholic communities are provided for abundantly; orphans are well housed; unfortunates securely protected; the poor greatly succoured; and the sick have the sacraments at their very door. Schools, academies, colleges, and convents, wherein Catholic education is given, are now within the reach of all. The whole period of Archbishop Williams's administration (1866–1907) has been appropriately called "the brick and mortar age of the Catholic Church in New England". (See BOSTON, ARCHDIOCESE OF.)

Upon the death of Archbishop Williams, in the summer of 1907, his coadjutor, the Most Reverend William H. O'Connell, D.D. (the present archbishop), was promoted to the metropolitan see. This archbishop invited the National Convention of the Federation of Catholic Societies to meet in Boston with resulting interest, activity, and strength to that society, in which, indeed, he has shown a special interest. To develop the solidarity of priests and people, of races and nations, of the cultured and the unlettered—a unity of all the interests of the Church, the archbishop needed a free press: he purchased "The Pilot", secured able and fearless writers and placed it at a nominal cost within the reach of all. The dangers to the immigrant in a new and fascinating environment are all anticipated, and safeguards are being strengthened daily. At the same time, the inherited misunderstandings of Puritan Massachusetts, and the evil machinations of those who would use religion and charity for selfish motives or aggrandizement are still active. The Catholic mind is aroused, however, and the battle for truth is being waged; Catholic Massachusetts moves forward, all under one banner—French Canadian, Italian, Pole, German, Portuguese, Greek, Scandinavian, and Irish—each vying with the other for an opportunity to prove his loyalty to the Church, to its priests, and to their spiritual leader. In every diocese and in each county well-organized branches of the Federation exist, temperance and church societies flourish, educational and charitable associations are alive and active. The Church's ablest laymen are enlisted, and all are helping mightily to accomplish the avowed intention of the Archbishop of Boston, to make Massachusetts the leading Catholic state in the country. (See also CHEVERUS, JEAN LOUIS DE; BOSTON, ARCHDIOCESE OF; FALL RIVER, DIOCESE OF; SPRINGFIELD, DIOCESE OF.)

AUSTIN, *History of Massachusetts* (Boston, 1876); BANCROFT, *History of the United States*, I (London, 1883–84); BARRY, *History of New England*, I (Boston, 1855); *Boston Town Records* (Boston, 1772); BRADFORD, *History of Plymouth Plantation;* DAVIS, *The New England States*, III (Boston, 1897); DRAKE, *The Making of New England, 1584–1643* (New York, 1886); DWIGHT, *Travels in New England*, I (New Haven, 1821), 22; EMERSON, *Education in Massachusetts, Massachusetts Historical Collection* (Boston, 1869); HALE, *Review of the Proceedings of the Nunnery Committee* (Boston, 1855); HARRINGTON, *History of Harvard Medical School*, III (New York, 1905); *Irish Historical Proceedings*, II (Boston, 1899); LEAHY, *History of the Catholic Church in New England States*, I (Boston, 1899); *Massachusetts Historical Society, Collection*, 1st ser., V (Boston, 1788); *Proceedings*, 2d ser., III (Boston, 1810); MCGEE, *The Irish Settlers in America* (Boston, 1851); PARKER, *The First Charter and the Early Religious Legislation of Massachusetts, Massachusetts Historical Collection* (1869); WALSH, *The Early Irish Catholic Schools of Lowell, Mass., 1835–1855* (Boston, 1901); IDEM, *Am. Cath. Q. Rev.* (January, 1904).

THOMAS F. HARRINGTON.

Massaia, GUGLIELMO, Cardinal, b. 9 June, 1809, at Piova in Piedmont, Italy; d. at Cremona, 6 August, 1889. His baptismal name was Lorenzo; that of Guglielmo was given him when he became a religious. He was first educated at the Collegio Reale at Asti under the care of his elder brother Guglielmo, a canon and precentor of the cathedral of that city. On the death of his brother he passed as a student to the diocesan seminary; but at the age of sixteen entered the Capuchin Franciscan Order, receiving the habit on 25 September, 1825. Immediately after his ordination to the priesthood, he was appointed lector of theology; but even whilst teaching he acquired some fame as a preacher and was chosen confessor to Prince Victor Emmanuel, afterwards King of Italy, and Ferdinand, Duke of Genoa. The royal family of Piedmont would have nominated him on several occasions to an episcopal see, but he strenuously opposed their project, being desirous of joining the foreign missions of his order. He obtained his wish in 1846. That year the Congregation of Propaganda, at the instance of the traveller Antoine d'Abbadie, determined to establish a Vicariate-Apostolic for the Gallas in Abyssinia. The mission was confided to the Capuchins, and Massaia was appointed first vicar-apostolic, and was consecrated in Rome on 24 May of that year. On his arrival in Abyssinia he found the country in a state of religious agitation. The heretical Coptic bishop, Cyril, was dead and there was a movement amongst the Copts towards union with Rome. Massaia, who had received plenary faculties from the pope, ordained a number of native priests for the Coptic Rite; he also obtained the appointment by the Holy See of a vicar-apostolic for the Copts, and himself consecrated the missionary Giustino de Jacobis to this office. But this act aroused the enmity of the Coptic Patriarch of Egypt, who sent a bishop of his own, Abba Salama, to Abyssinia. As a result of the ensuing political agitation, Massaia was banished from the country and had to flee under an assumed name. In 1850 he visited Europe to gain a fresh band of missionaries and means to develop his work: he had interviews with the French Minister of Foreign Affairs in Paris, and with Lord Palmerston in London. On his return to the Gallas he founded a large number of missions; he also established a school at Marseilles for the education of Galla boys whom he had freed from slavery; besides this he composed a grammar of the Galla language which was published at Marseilles in 1867. During his thirty-five years as a missionary he was exiled seven times, but he always returned to his labours with renewed vigour. However, in 1880 he was compelled by ill-health to resign his mission. In recognition of his merit, Leo XIII raised him to the titular Archbishopric of Stauropolis, and on 10 November, 1884, to the dignity of cardinal of the title of S. Vitalis. At the command of the pope he wrote an account of his missionary labours, under the title, "I miei trentacinque anni di missione nell'

alta Etiopia", the first volume of which was published simultaneously at Rome and Milan in 1883, and the last in 1895. In this work he deals not only with the progress of the mission, but with the political and economic conditions of Abyssinia as he knew them.

MASSAIA, *I miei trentacinque anni* etc.; *Analecta Ordinis FF. Min. Capp.*, V, 291 seq.

FATHER CUTHBERT.

Massa Marittima, DIOCESE OF (MASSANA), in the Province of Grosseto, in Tuscany, first mentioned in the eighth century. It grew at the expense of Populonia, an ancient city of the Etruscans, the principal port of that people, and important on account of its iron, tin, and copper works. Populonia was besieged by Sulla, and in Strabo's time was already decadent; later it suffered at the hands of Totila, of the Lombards, and in 817 of a Byzantine fleet. After this, the bishops of Populonia abandoned the town, and in the eleventh century, established their residence at Massa. In 1226 Massa became a commune under the protection of Pisa. In 1307 it made an alliance with Siena, which was the cause of many wars between the two republics that brought about the decadence of Massa. The town has a fine cathedral. The first known Bishop of Populonia was Atellus (about 495); another was Saint Cerbonius (546), protector of the city, to whom Saint Gregory refers in his Dialogues. Among the bishops of Massa were the friar Antonio (1430), a former general of the Franciscans, and legate of Boniface IX; Leonardo Dati (1467), author of poetic satires; Alessandro Petrucci (1601), who embellished the cathedral and the episcopal palace; the Camaldolese Eusebio da Ciani (1719), who governed the diocese for fifty-one years. This see was at first suffragan of Pisa, but since 1458 of Siena. It has 29 parishes, 68,200 inhabitants, one religious house of men and four of women.

CATHEDRAL, MASSA MARITTIMA
XIII–XIV Century

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XVII (Venice, 1862).

U. BENIGNI.

Mass Book. See MISSAL.

Massé, ENEMOND, one of the first Jesuits sent to New France; b. at Lyons, 1574; d. at Sillery, 12 May, 1646. He went to Acadia with Father Biard, and when it was found impossible to effect any good there, they established a new mission at the present Bar Harbor, Maine, which was soon after destroyed by the English—Massé being set adrift on the sea in an open boat. He succeeded in reaching a French ship and returned to France. In 1625 he again set sail for Canada, and remained there until the fall of Quebec. He returned a third time in 1632, but, as he was then advanced in age, he no longer laboured among the savages, but lived mostly at Sillery, which he built as a reservation for the converted Indians. A monument has recently been erected to his honour at this place on the site of the old Jesuit church which stood on the bank of the St. Lawrence a short distance above Quebec.

DE ROCHEMONTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle France* (3 vols., Paris, 1896); CAMPBELL, *Pioneer Priests of North America* (New York, 1909).

T. J. CAMPBELL.

Masses, BEQUESTS FOR (CANADA.)—The law governing bequests, being concerned with "property and civil rights", falls within the legislative competency of the provincial legislatures, not of the Dominion Parliament. The basic law in all the provinces is, however, not the same. Any question concerning bequests is, therefore, one of provincial, not Dominion law. There is no statute enacted by any of the legislatures specially affecting bequests for Masses.

Quebec.—In this province there is no question of the validity of such bequests. The basic law is the French law as in force in the province at the time of the cession (1759–63). Whether such bequests were or are valid under English statutory or Common Law, is immaterial. Under article 869 of the Civil Code a testator may make bequests for charitable or other *lawful* purposes. The freedom of the practice of the Catholic religion being not only recognized but guaranteed, as well under the Treaty of Cession (1763) as under the terms of the Quebec Act (1774), and subsequent Provincial Legislation (14 & 15 Vic., Can., c. 175) having confirmed that freedom, a bequest for the saying of Masses is clearly for a *lawful* purpose.

Ontario.—In this province the law of England, as in force on 15 October, 1792, introduced "so far as it was not from local circumstances inapplicable", under powers conferred by the statute of 1791, which divided the old Province of Quebec into Lower and Upper Canada, is the basic law. That Act preserved to Roman Catholics in Upper Canada the rights as regards their religion secured to them under the Act of 1774. The provincial legislation cited as regards Quebec being enacted after the reunion of Upper and Lower Canada, was also law in this province. The validity of bequests for the saying of Masses was upheld in the case of Elmsley and Madden (18 Grant Chan. R. 386). The court held that the English law, as far as under it such dispositions may have been invalid, was inapplicable under the circumstances of the province, wherein the Catholic religion was tolerated. This case has been accepted as settling the law.

British Columbia, Manitoba, Alberta, and Saskatchewan.—In British Columbia the civil law of England, as it existed on 19 November, 1858, and in the three other of these provinces, that law as it existed on 15 July, 1870, "so far as not from local circumstances inapplicable", is the basic law. The Ontario judgment above cited is in practice accepted as settling the question under consideration.

In *Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island,* though there is no statutory enactment making the English law applicable, it has, since the acquisition of Acadia by Great Britain, been recognized as being in force. In these provinces, however, that law in so far as it may treat as void dispositions for the

purpose in question as being for superstitious uses, has always been treated as inapplicable. The validity of such bequests was maintained in an elaborate judgment of Hodgins, Master of the Rolls, in an unreported case of Gillis and Gillis in Prince Edward Island in 1894. CHAS. J. DOHERTY.

Masses, BEQUESTS FOR (ENGLAND).—Before the Reformation dispositions of property, whether real or personal, for the purposes of Masses, were valid, unless where, in the case of real property, they might happen to conflict with the Mortmain laws by being made to religious congregations. There was a tenure of land known as tenure by divine service, an incident of which was the saying of Masses and of prayers for the dead. The Statute of Westminster, 31 Edward III, c. 11, contained a provision that the administrators of an intestate should be able to recover by action debts due to the intestate and that they should administer and dispense for the soul of the dead. The wills of various great people who lived in those ages contain bequests for Masses. Henry VII left £250 for 10,000 Masses to be said for his and other souls. The will of Henry VIII, made on 30 December, 1546, contains a provision for an altar over his tomb in St. George's Chapel in Windsor, where daily Mass shall be said "as long as the world shall indure", and it sets out a grant to the dean and canons of the chapel of lands to the value of £600 a year for ever to find two priests to say Mass and to keep four obits yearly and to give alms for the King's soul: and it contains other provisions for requiem masses and prayers for his soul. But in A. D. 1531, by the statute 23, Henry VIII, c. 10, all subsequent assurances or dispositions of land to the use of a perpetual obit (i. e. a service for the dead to be celebrated at certain fixed periods) or the continual service of a priest were to be void if the use was to extend over more than twenty years, but if the use was limited to that or a less period the dispositions were to be valid. That even private Masses were at that time approved by the state is shown by the six articles passed in A. D. 1539 (32 Henry VIII, c. 14), which constituted the denial of their expediency a felony. Henry VIII died 28 January A. D. 1547. The change of religion became much more marked in the following reign, and the government fostered the establishment in England of the Protestant doctrines which had begun to spread on the continent. In the same year the Six Articles were repealed and the Statute of Chauntries (1 Edward VI, c. 14) was passed from which the invalidity of bequests for requiem Masses has been deduced. The preamble to the statute recites that " a great part of the superstition and errors in the Christian religion hath been brought into the minds and estimation of men by reason of the ignorance of their very true and perfect salvation through the death of Jesus Christ and by devising and phantasying vain opinions of purgatory and masses satisfactory to be done for them which be departed, the which doctrine and vain opinion by nothing more is maintained and upholden than by the abuse of trentals, chauntries and other provisions made for the continuance of the said blindness and ignorance." The statute, after further reciting that the property given to such uses ought to be devoted to the founding of schools and other good purposes, enacted that property given to such uses, which had been so used within the preceding five years, should be given to the king. The statute only applied to past dispositions of property and it did not declare the general illegality of bequests for requiem Masses, nor has any other statute ever so declared (Cary v. Abbot, 1802, 7 Ves. 495). Nevertheless, the establishment of that principle has been deduced from it (West v. Shuttleworth, 1835, 2 M. & K. 679; Heath v. Chapman, 1854, 2 Drew 423).

The statute was not repealed under Mary, and by 1 Eliz., c. 24, all property devoted to such uses in Mary's reign was given to the crown. There is a series of cases on the question decided under Elizabeth, notably that of Adams v. Lambert, decided in 1602, in the report of which the other cases are cited. Some of these decisions are slightly conflicting, but the main points to be drawn from the series are, first, that uses for Masses or prayers for the dead were held to be superstitions and unlawful, but, second, that the question of their unlawfulness was considered according as they came within the provisions of the Statute 1 Edward VI, c. 14. In that and the following century the Catholic religion was proscribed and any devise or bequest for the promotion of it was illegal and, as regarded the purpose thereof, void (Re Lady Portington 1692, 1 Salk 162). In the report of that case, as also in other later cases, the terms "superstitious" and "unlawful" appear to be applied indifferently to purposes for the maintenance of the Catholic religion. But dispositions for Catholic poor or Catholic schools or other Catholic purposes which might come under the general construction of "charity", passed to the crown to be devoted to other *lawful* charitable purposes (Cary v. Abbot above). In 1829 the Roman Catholic Relief Act was passed, which contained, however, in some of its sections still unrepealed, certain penal provisions against members of religious orders of men by reason of which the status of these orders in the United Kingdom is illegal. In 1832 the Roman Catholic Charities Act (2 and 3 William IV, c. 115) was passed. By it Catholics were, as regards their charitable purposes, put in the same position as that of Protestant dissenters. Therefore now, seemingly, a bequest for the celebration of Masses with no intention for souls departed would be valid, and, moreover, it would constitute a good charitable bequest, and so, it would be valid though made in perpetuity (Re Michel's Trusts, 1860, 28 Beav. 42). But it has been held that the act has not validated bequests for requiem Masses, that the law still regards them as "superstitious" (West v. Shuttleworth above), that they do not constitute charitable bequests and that, accordingly, the property given under them passes to the person otherwise entitled (Heath v. Chapman above).

This is the position of the law to-day with the exception made by the Roman Catholic Charities Act, 1860, which provides that no lawful devise or bequest to any Catholic or Catholic Charity is to be invalidated because the estate devised or bequeathed is, also, subject to any trust deemed to be superstitious or prohibited through being to religious orders of men, but such latter trust may be apportioned by the Court or the Charity Commissioners to some other lawful Catholic charitable trust. Thus, a trust for requiem Masses is as such invalid, and where no question of apportionment can arise, for instance, where there is a specific legacy of money for the purpose only of such Masses, the estate which is subject to the trust does not pass to any charity but to the person otherwise entitled to it (Re Fleetwood, Sidgreaves v. Brewer, 1880, 15 Ch. D. 609). Also, a legacy for requiem Masses is invalid even though the legacy be payable in a country where it would be legally valid (Re Elliot, 1891, 39 W. R. 297). The grounds on which this position of the law is based appear rather unsatisfactory. Admittedly, there is no direct statutory illegality. In the case of Heath v. Chapman (above) Kindersley V. C. stated that the Statute I Edward VI, c. 14, assumed that trusts for Masses were already illegal—that they were in fact so—and that the statute has stamped on all such trusts, whether made before or since it, the character of illegality on the ground of being superstitious. Seeing that the statute was passed in the year of the death of Henry VIII, within eight years of the passing of the Six Articles, and that during that time there had been no statutory abolition of the Mass or condemnation of the doctrine of purgatory, it is not easy to discern how the legal invalidity of such bequests had al-

ready become established. In West v. Shuttleworth (above), which is the leading case on the subject, Pepys M. R. stated that it was by analogy to the statute that the illegality of these bequests had become established. This would seem to mean that their illegality was based upon the general policy of the law and upon principles resulting from such a change in the national system as must have arisen in that age from the complete change in the national church. In that case, since the policy applied to the whole realm including Ireland, where Protestantism became the established church and an even more vigorous anti-Catholic policy was pursued by the legislature, one would expect to find the illegality of bequests for Masses established in Ireland also, though the statute itself did not apply to Ireland. Thus, in the case of the Attorney-General v. Power, 1809 (1 B. & Ben. 150) Lord Manners, Irish Lord Chancellor, in giving judgment with regard to a bequest to a school by a Catholic testator, stated that he would not act upon the presumption that it was for the endowment of a Catholic school, and that such a bequest would by the law of England be deemed void either as being contrary to the provisions of the statute of Edward VI or as being against public policy. Yet the same Lord Chancellor, in the case of the Commissioners of Charitable Donations v. Walsh, 1823, 7 Ir. Eq. 32, after a prolonged argument before him, held a bequest for requiem Masses to be good.

The ground of public policy in respect of this question seems no longer to hold good. There is no longer any public policy against Catholicism as such. As mentioned above, seemingly, a bequest for the mere celebration of Masses with no intention for souls departed would be valid. Moreover, seemingly, a bequest for the propagation of the doctrine of purgatory would be a good charitable bequest (Thornton v. Howe, 1862, 31 Beav. 19). Thus, since the Roman Catholic Charities Act 1832, putting Catholics as regards "their . . . charitable purposes" in the same position as other persons, the holding a bequest for Masses for the dead to be invalid appears necessarily to imply that the bequest is not to a charitable purpose and thereby to involve the inconsistency that it is not a "charity" to practise by the exercise of a "charity" the doctrine which it is a "charity" to propagate. Yet this is so even though, by the bequest being for Masses to be said for the departed generally, there is evidence of an intention on the part of the testator of promoting more than his own individual welfare. Thus, apparently, the real basis of the legal view of these bequests is that the law may not recognize the purpose of a spiritual benefit to one's fellow-creatures in an after existence intended by a person believing in the possibility of such a benefit. But such an attitude, apart from the inconsistency mentioned, seems to be opposed to the present policy of the law with regard to religious opinions, especially when the act of worship directed by the bequest, when viewed apart from the particular believed effect, is approved by the law as a charity. Doubt as to the soundness of the present law on the subject was expressed by Romilly M. R. in the case Re Michels Trusts (above), where he upheld a bequest for a Jewish prayer to be recited on the testator's anniversary in perpetuity, there being no evidence that the prayer was to be recited for the benefit of the testator's soul, and in the case re Blundell's Trusts, 1861 (30 Beav. 362), where he considered himself compelled, in compliance with the judgment in West v. Shuttleworth (above), to disallow a bequest by a Catholic testator for requiem Masses, stating that the law declaring such bequests to be invalid had now become so established that only a judgment of the House of Lords could alter it. It would be desirable that the decision of that tribunal should be obtained on this question.

In Ireland bequests for requiem Masses have long been regarded as valid, and, by a recent decision given upon exhaustive consideration of the question by the Irish Court of Appeal, the law is settled that such bequests, even when the Masses are to be said in private, constitute good charitable gifts and so may be made in perpetuity (O'Hanlon v. Logue, 1906, 1 Ir. 247). But in Ireland, also, religious orders of men are illegal and any bequest for Masses to such an order which is to go to the benefit of the order is illegal and void (Burke v. Power, 1905, 1 Ir. 123). But such a bequest was allowed in one recent case, and in cases where the bequest for Masses contains no indication that the money is to go to the order itself the Court will allow the bequest (Bradshaw v. Jackman, 1887, 21 L. R. Ir. 15). The decisions show a strong general tendency to seek any means of escaping those penal provisions of the Catholic Relief Act, 1829, which, though never actively enforced, still remain on the statute book. This statutory illegality of any bequest to a religious order of men to go to the benefit of the order applies, of course, equally to England and to Scotland, where these provisions against religious orders are also law, but there does not appear to be any report of any decision on the point in either of these countries.

In Scotland the position seems, otherwise, to be as follows: though, in the centuries succeeding the Reformation the public policy was distinctly anti-Catholic and there was legislation (like the anti-Popery Act passed in 1700, which, amongst other provisions, penalized the hearing of Mass) directed against the Catholic religion, yet there seems to have been no Statute which has given rise to the question of "superstition" on the special point of gifts for prayers for the dead. By an Act passed in 1793 Catholics in Scotland, who had made a declaration now no longer required, were put upon the same footing as other persons. The Catholic Charities Act, 1832, applied also to Scotland. The term "charity" is even rather more widely interpreted in Scottish law than in English law. Thus, in Scotland through the repeal of the legislation against Catholics and the legalization of bequests to their charitable purposes, legacies for requiem Masses seem to pass unquestioned. There is little doubt that, if they were to be challenged, the Courts would uphold them. In a recent case where there was a bequest for the celebration of Mass in perpetuity (there was no mention of any intention for the dead) the validity of the bequest was not in any way called in question (Marquess of Bute's Trustees v. Marquess of Bute, 1904, 7 F. 42). The law as to superstitious uses prevailing in England is not taken to be imported into the laws of British colonies or possessions (Yeap v. Ong, 1875, L. R. 6 C. P. 396). In Australia, though by an Act of the British Parliament passed in 1828, all the laws and statutes in force in England at that date were, as far as possible, to be applied to the administration of justice in the Courts of the new Australasian Colonies, the law as to superstitious uses has been held by the Supreme Court of Victoria not to apply there (In the Will of Purcell, 1895, 21, V. L. R. 249). This decision was followed in the Supreme Court of New South Wales in 1907 (Re Hartnett, 7 S. R. 463). There is little doubt that the law which these cases declare would be followed in all other Australian Colonies and in New Zealand. In India bequests for requiem Masses are valid (Das Merces v. Cones, 1864, 2 Hyde 65; Judah v. Judah, 1870, 2 B. L. R. 433).

COKE on *Littleton* 96 (b); NICHOL, *Wills of the Kings and Queens of England and of members of the Blood Royal from William the Conqueror to Henry VII* (London, 1780); *Will of King Henry the Eighth from an authentic copy in the Hands of an Attorney* (London, 1793); DUKE on the *Law of Charitable Uses*, edited by BRIDGMAN (London, 1805).

R. S. NOLAN.

Masses, DEVISES AND BEQUESTS FOR (UNITED STATES).—Prior to the period of the Reformation in England in 1532, Masses for the repose of the souls of

the donors of property given for that purpose were upheld in England, but during that year a statute was passed providing that thereafter all uses declared of land, except leaseholds of twenty years, to the intent to have perpetual or the continued service of a priest, or other like uses, should be void. In the reign of Edward VI (1547), another statute was passed declaring the king entitled to all real and certain specified personal property theretofore disposed of for the perpetual finding of a priest or maintenance of any anniversary or obit, or other like thing, or any light or lamp at any church or chapel. These statutes did not make disposition of personal property to such uses void, and the statute of Henry VIII was prospective and applied only to assurances of land to churches and chapels, and that of Edward VI was limited to dispositions of property, real and personal, theretofore made. But the English chancellors and the English judges, in the absence of any express statute, determined all dispositions of property, whether real or personal, given or devised for uses specified in the two statutes, to be absolutely void as contrary to public policy, being for superstitious uses. The decision covered legacies such as to priests to pray for the soul of the donor or for the bringing up of poor children in the Roman Catholic faith.

It has been expressly decided that these statutes and the doctrine of superstitious uses as enunciated by the English judges do not apply in the United States, although the first colonies from which the States grew were established subsequently to the dates of the adoption of the statutes referred to, and this, notwithstanding the fact that in some of the states statutes were passed adopting the common law and statutes of England so far as the same might be applicable to the altered condition of the settlers in the colonies. It has been pointed out that it is a maxim of law in the United States that a man may do what he will with his own, so long as he does not violate the law by so doing or devote his property to an immoral purpose; consequently, since there is a legal equality of sects and all are thus in the eyes of the law equally orthodox, to discriminate between what is a pious and what a superstitious use would be to infringe upon the constitutional guarantee of perfect freedom and equality of all religions (see opinion of Tuley, J., in the case of Kehoe v. Kehoe, reported as a note to Gilman v. McArdle, 12 Abb. N. C., 427 New York). In none of the states of the Union, therefore, are bequests or devises of property for Masses for the dead invalid on the ground of being superstitious, but there is a diversity among the decisions as to the circumstances under which such bequests or devises will be sustained.

In New York the law of England on the subject of charitable and religious trusts has been completely abrogated by statute, it being intended that there should be no system of public charities in that state except through the medium of corporate bodies. The policy has been to enact from time to time general and special laws specifying and sanctioning the particular object to be promoted, restricting the amount of property to be enjoyed, carefully keeping the subject under legislative control, and always providing a competent and ascertained donee to take and use the charitable gifts (Levy v. Levy, 33 N. Y., 97; Holland v. Alcock, 108 N. Y., 312). In accordance with this policy a general act was passed regulating the incorporation of religious bodies, and empowering the trustees to take into their possession property, whether the same has been given, granted or devised directly to a church, congregation or society, or to any other person for their use (Laws of 1813, c. 60, s. 4, III; Cummings and Gilbert, "Gen. Laws and other Statutes of N. Y.", p. 3401). By the provisions of other statutes Roman Catholic churches come under this act (Laws of 1862, c. 45; Cummings and Gilbert, loc. cit., p. 3425). Therefore a bequest of real property for Masses will be upheld if it comply with the statutory requirements, which are (1) that the gift be to a corporation duly authorized by its charter or by statute to take gifts for such purpose and not to a private person; (2) that the will by which the gift is made shall have been properly executed at least two months before the testator's death (Cummings and Gilbert, loc. cit., p. 4470; Laws of 1848, c. 319; Laws of 1860, c. 360: Lefevre v. Lefevre, 59 N. Y., 434), and (3) that if the testator have a wife, child, or parent, the bequest shall not exceed one-half of his property after his debts are paid (ibid., see Hagenmeyer's Will, 12 Abb. N. C., 432). Every trust of personal property, which is not contrary to public policy and is not in conflict with the statute regulating the accumulation of interest and protecting the suspension of absolute ownership in property of that character, is valid when the trustee is competent to take and a trust is for a lawful purpose well defined so as to be capable of being specifically executed by the court (Holmes v. Mead, 52 N. Y., 332). "If then a Catholic desire to make provision by will for saying of Masses for his soul, there is not the shadow of a doubt but that every court in the State [New York], if not in the Union, would uphold the bequest if the mode of making it were agreeable to the law" (see careful article written in 1886 by F. A. McCloskey in "Albany Law Journal", XXXII, 367).

For similar reasons in Wisconsin, where all trusts are abolished by statute except certain specified trusts with a definite beneficiary, a gift for Masses, to be good, must not be so worded as to constitute a trust. Thus a bequest in the following language: "I do give and bequeath unto the Roman Catholic Bishop of the Diocese of Green Bay, Wisconsin, the sum of $4150, the said sum to be used and applied as follows: For Masses for the repose of my soul, two thousand dollars, for Masses for the repose of the soul of my deceased wife, etc., etc." The court held that a trust was created by this language, and says: "It is evident that such a trust is not capable of execution, and no court would take cognizance of any question in respect to it for want of a competent party to raise and litigate any question of abuse or perversion of the trust." But it adds: "We know of no legal reason why any person of the Catholic faith, believing in the efficacy of Masses, may not make a direct gift or bequest to any bishop or priest of any sum out of his property or estate for Masses for the repose of his soul or the souls of others, as he may choose. Such gifts or bequests, when made in clear, direct, and legal form, should be upheld; and they are not to be considered as impeachable or invalid under the rule that prevailed in England by which they were held void as gifts to superstitious uses" (72 N. W. Rep., 631).

The same view was taken by the Supreme Court of Alabama, where a bequest to a church to be used in solemn Masses for the repose of the soul of the testator was held invalid inasmuch as it did not respond to any one of the following tests: (1) that it was a direct bequest to the church for its general uses; (2) that it created a charitable use; or (3) that it created a valid private trust. It was not a charity inasmuch as it was "for the benefit alone of his own soul, and cannot be upheld as a public charity without offending every principle of law by which such charities are supported", and it was not valid as a private trust for want of a living beneficiary to support it (Festorazzi v. St. Joseph's R. C. Church of Mobile, 25 Law. Rep. Ann., 360).

In Illinois an opposite conclusion is reached, it being held distinctly that a devise for Masses for the repose of the soul of the testator, or for the repose of the souls of other named persons, is valid as a charitable use, and the devise for such purpose will not be allowed to fail for want of a competent trustee, but the court will appoint a trustee to take the gift and apply it to the purposes of the trust. Such a bequest is distinctly

held to be within the definition of charities which are to be sustained irrespective of the indefiniteness of the beneficiaries, or of the lack of trustees, or the fact that the trustees appointed are not competent to take; and it is not derived from the Statute of Charitable Uses (43 Elizabeth, c. 4), but existed prior to and independent of that statute. The court quotes with approval the definition of a charity as given by Mr. Justice Gray of Massachusetts: "A charity in a legal sense may be more fully defined as a gift, to be applied consistently with existing laws, for the benefit of an indefinite number of persons, either by bringing their hearts under the influence of education or religion, by relieving their bodies from disease, suffering, or constraint, by assisting them to establish themselves for life, or by erecting and maintaining public buildings or works, or otherwise lessening the burthen of government. It is immaterial whether the purpose is called charitable in the gift itself, if it be so described as to show that it is charitable in its nature" (Jackson v. Phillips, 14 Allen, 539). The court proceeds to show that the Mass is intended to be a repetition of the sacrifice of the Cross, and is the chief and central act of worship in the Catholic Church; that it is public. It points out the Catholic belief on the subject of Purgatory, and holds that the adding of a particular remembrance in the Mass does not change the character of the religious service and render it a mere private benefit; and further, that the bequest is an aid to the support of the clergy (Hoeffer v. Clogan, 49 N. E. Rep., 527).

In Pennsylvania bequests and devises for Masses are distinctly held to be gifts for religious uses, the Supreme Court of that state having expressed the same view of the law subsequently adopted in Illinois. The court uses the following language: "According to the Roman Catholic system of faith there exists an intermediate state of the soul, after death and before final judgment, during which guilt incurred during life and unatoned for must be expiated; and the temporary punishments to which the souls of the penitent are thus subjected may be mitigated or arrested through the efficacy of the Mass as a propitiatory sacrifice. Hence the practice of offering Masses for the departed. It cannot be doubted that, in obeying the injunction of the testator, intercession would be specially invoked in behalf of the testator alone. The service is just the same in kind whether it be designed to promote the spiritual welfare of one or many. Prayer for the conversion of a single impenitent is as purely a religious act as a petition for the salvation of thousands. The services intended to be performed in carrying out the trust created by the testator's will, as well as the objects designed to be attained, are all essentially religious in their character" (Rhymer's Appeal, 93 Pa., 142). In Pennsylvania care must be taken to observe the provisions of the Act of 26 April, 1855, P. L., 332, which prohibits devises or legacies for charitable or religious uses, unless by will executed at least one month before the death of the testator. A gift to be expended for Masses, being a religious use, would come within this statute. The provisions of the law relating to attesting witnesses, requiring two credible and disinterested witnesses when any gift is made by will for religious or charitable uses, should also be noted.

In Massachusetts the courts take the same view as those of Pennsylvania, that gifts for Masses are to be sustained as for religious uses (Re Schouler, 134 Mass., 126).

In Iowa the Supreme Court has sustained a bequest "to the Catholic priest who may be pastor of the R. Catholic Church when this will shall be executed, three hundred dollars that Masses may be said for me", as being valid, though it contains no element of a charitable use. The court says: "We have said that this bequest, if the priest should accept the money, is a private trust: and we think it possesses the essential elements of such a trust, as much as it would if the object were the erection of a monument or the doing of any other act intended alone to perpetuate the memory or name of the testator. But even if there is a technical departure because of no living beneficiary, still the bequest is valid. We have also said that it is not a charity, and we can discover no element of a charity in it. It seems to be a matter entirely personal to the testator. In one or more cases the courts have felt the necessity in order to sustain such a bequest, to denominate it a charity because charitable bequests have had the sanction of the law. We know of no such limitation on testamentary acts as that bequests or devises must be in the line of other such acts, if otherwise lawful" (Moran v. Moran, 73 N. W. Rep., 617).

It follows then that there is no legal inhibition on bequests for Masses in any of the United States either on the ground of public policy or because they offend against any inherent principle of right. But care must be taken in drafting the will to observe the statutes, where any exist, in relation to devises or bequests in trust for any purpose as well as the current of decisions where cases have arisen. The language should be clear and drawn in accordance with legal rules. It should not be left to the chances of interpretation.

See the authorities quoted above.

WALTER GEORGE SMITH.

Massilians. See SEMIPELAGIANS.

Massillon, JEAN-BAPTISTE, celebrated French preacher and bishop; b. 24 June, 1663; d. 28 September, 1742. The son of François Massillon, a notary of Hyères in Provence, he began his studies in the college of that town and completed them in the college of Marseilles, both under the Oratorians. He entered the Congregation of the Oratory at the age of eighteen. After his novitiate and theological studies, he was sent as professor to the colleges of the congregation at Pèzenas, Marseilles, Montbrison, and, lastly, Vienne, where he taught philosophy and theology for six years (1689–95).

Ordained priest in 1691, he commenced preaching in the chapel of the Oratory at Vienne and in the vicinity of that city. Upon the death of Villeroy, Archbishop of Lyons (1693), he was called upon to deliver the funeral oration, and six months later that of M. de Villars, Archbishop of Vienne. Joining the Lyons Oratory in 1695, and summoned to Paris in the following year, to be director of the Seminary of Saint-Magloire, he was thenceforward able to devote himself exclusively to preaching. As director of this seminary he delivered those lectures (*conférences*) to young clerics which are still highly esteemed. But a year later he was removed from his position at Saint-Magloire for having occupied himself too exclusively with preaching. Having preached the Lent at Montpellier in 1698, he preached it the next year at the Oratory of Paris. His eloquence in this series of discourses was very much approved, and, although he aimed at preaching in a style unlike that of his predecessors, public opinion already hailed him as the successor of Bossuet and Bourdaloue who were at that time reduced to silence by age. At the end of this year he preached the Advent at the court of Louis XIV—an honour which was in those days highly coveted as the consecration of a preacher's fame. He justified every hope, and the king wittily declared that, where he had formerly been well pleased with the preachers, he was now very ill pleased with himself. Massillon, by command, once more appeared in the chapel of Versailles for the Lent of 1701. Bossuet, who, according to his secretary, had thought Massillon very far from the sublime in 1699, this time declared himself very well satisfied, as was the king. Massillon was summoned again for the Lent of 1704. This was the apogee of his eloquence and his success. The king assiduously attended his sermons, and in the royal presence Mas-

sillon delivered that discourse "On the Fewness of the Elect", which is considered his masterpiece. Nevertheless, whether because the compromising relations of the orator with certain great families had produced a bad impression on the king, or because Louis ended by believing him inclined—as some of his brethren of the Oratory were thought to be—to Jansenism, Massillon was never again summoned to preach at the Court during the life of Louis XIV, nor was he even put forward for a bishopric. Nevertheless he continued, from 1704 to 1718, to preach Lent and Advent discourses with great success in various churches of Paris. Only in the Advent of 1715 did he leave those churches to preach before the Court of Stanislas, King of Lorraine.

In the interval he preached, with only moderate success, sermons at ceremonies of taking the habit, panegyrics, and funeral orations. Of his funeral orations that on Louis XIV is still famous, above all for its opening: "God alone is great"—uttered at the grave of a prince to whom his contemporaries had yielded the title of "The Great".



JEAN-BAPTISTE MASSILLON

After the death of this king Massillon returned to favour at Court. In 1717 the regent nominated him to the Bishopric of Clermont (Auvergne) and caused him to preach before the young king, Louis XV, the lenten course of 1718, which was to comprise only ten sermons. These have been published under the title of "Le Petit Carême"—Massillon's most popular work. Finally, he was received, a few months later, into the French Academy, where Fleury, the young king's preceptor, pronounced his eulogy.

But Massillon, consecrated on 21 December, 1719, was in haste to take possession of his see. With its 29 abbeys, 224 priories, and 758 parishes, the Diocese of Clermont was one of the largest in France. The new bishop took up his residence there, and left it only to assist, by order of the regent, in the negotiations which were to decide the case of Cardinal de Noailles (q. v.) and certain bishops suspected of Jansenism, in accepting the Bull "Unigenitus", to assist at the coronation of Louis XV, and to preach the funeral sermon of the Duchess of Orleans, the regent's mother.

He made it his business to visit one part of his diocese each year, and at his death he had been through the whole diocese nearly three times, even to the poorest and remotest parishes. He set himself to re-establish or maintain ecclesiastical discipline and good morals among his clergy. From the year 1723 on, he annually assembled a synod of the priests; he did this once more in 1742, a few days before his death. In these synods and in the retreats which followed them he delivered the synodal discourses and *conférences* which have been so much, and so justly, admired. If he at times displayed energy in reforming abuses, he was generally tender and fatherly towards his clergy; he was willing to listen to them; he promoted their education, by attaching benefices to his seminaries, and assured them a peaceful old age by building a house of retirement for them. He defended his clergy against the king's ministers, who wished to increase their fiscal burdens, and he never ceased to guard them against the errors and subterfuges of the Jansenists, who, indeed, assailed him sharply in their journal "Les Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques".

Thoroughly devoted to all his diocesan flock, he busied himself in improving their condition. This is apparent in his correspondence with the king's intendants and ministers, in which he does his utmost to alleviate the lot of the Auvergne peasantry whenever there is a disposition to increase their taxation, or the scourge of a bad season afflicts their crops. The poor were always dear to him: not only did he plead for them in his sermons, but he assisted them out of his bounty, and at his death he instituted the hospital of Clermont for his universal heirs, the poor. His death was lamented, as his life had been blessed and admired by his contemporaries. Posterity has numbered him with Bossuet, Fénelon, Fléchier, and Mascaron, among the greatest French bishops of the eighteenth century. As an orator, no one was more appreciated by the eighteenth century, which placed him easily—at least as to preaching properly so called—above Bossuet and Bourdaloue. Our age places him rather lower. Massillon has neither the sublimity of Bossuet nor the logic of Bourdaloue: with him the sermon neglects dogma for morality, and morality loses its authority, and sometimes its security, in the eyes of Christians. For at times he is so severe as to render himself suspect of Jansenism, and again he is so lax as to be accused of complaisancy for the sensibilities and the philosophism of his time. His chief merit was to have excelled in depicting the passions, to have spoken to the heart in a language it always understood, to have made the great, and princes, understand the loftiest teachings of the Gospel, and to have made his own life and his work as a bishop conform to those teachings. During Massillon's lifetime only the funeral oration on the Prince de Conti was published (1709); he even disavowed a collection of sermons which appeared under his name at Trévoux (1705, 1706, 1714). The first authentic edition of his works appeared in 1745, published by his nephew, Father Joseph Massillon, of the Oratory; it has been frequently reprinted. But the best edition was that of Blampignon, Bar-le-Duc, 1865–68, and Paris, 1886, in four vols. It comprises ten sermons for Advent, forty-one for Lent, eight on the mysteries, four on virtues, ten panegyrics, six funeral orations, sixteen ecclesiastical conferences, twenty synodal discourses, twenty-six charges, paraphrases on thirty psalms, some *pensées choisies*, and some fifty miscellaneous letters or notes.

D'ALEMBERT, *Eloge de Massillon* in *Histoire des membres de l'Académie française* (Paris, 1787), I; V; BAYLE, *Massillon* (Paris, 1867); BLAMPIGNON, *Massillon d'après des documents inédits* (Paris, 1879); *L'épiscopat de Massillon* (Paris, 1884); ATTAIS, *Etude sur Massillon* (Toulouse, 1882); COHENDY, *Correspondance Mandements de Massillon* (Clermont, 1883); PAUTHE, *Massillon* (Paris, 1908). ANTOINE DÉGERT.

Massorah, the textual tradition of the Hebrew Bible, an official registration of its words, consonants, vowels and accents. It is doubtful whether the word should be pointed מָסֹרֶת (from אסר, "to bind") or מְסֹרֶת (from the New Hebrew verb, מסר "to hand down"). The former pointing is seen in Ezech. xx, 37; the latter is due to the fact that, in the Mishna, the word's primary meaning is "tradition". Our chief witness to Massorah is the actual text of MSS. of the Hebrew Bible. Other witnesses are several collections of Massorah and the numerous marginal notes scattered over Hebrew MSS. The upper and lower margins and the end of the MS. contain the Greater Massorah, such as lists of words; the side margins contain the Lesser Massorah, such as variants. The best collection of Massorah is that of Ginsburg, "The Massorah compiled from MSS. alphabetically and lexically arranged" (3 vols., London, 1880–85). This article will treat (I) the history and (II) the critical value of Massorah. For the number and worth of Massoretic MSS., see MSS. OF THE BIBLE.

I. History of Massorah.—Their sacred books were to the Jews an inspired code and record, a God-intended means to conserve the political and religious unity and fidelity of the nation. It was imperative upon them to keep those books intact. So far back as the first century B. C., copyists and revisers were trained and employed to fix the Hebrew text. All had one purpose,—to copy על פי המסרת, i. e. according to the face-value of the Massorah. To reproduce their exemplar perfectly, to hand down the Massorah,—only this and nothing more was purposed by the official copyist of the Hebrew Bible. Everything new was shunned. There is evidence that false pronunciations were fixed by Massorah centuries before the invention of points such as are seen in our present Massoretic text. At times such early translations as those of Aquila, Theodotion, the LXX and the Peshitto give evidence of precisely the same erroneous pronunciation as is found in the pointed Hebrew text of to-day.

(1) *The Consonantal Text.*—Hebrew had no vowels in its alphabet. Vowel sounds were for the most part handed down by tradition. Certain consonants, א, ו, י and sometimes ה, were used to express some long vowels; these consonants were called *Matres lectionis*, because they determined the pronunciation. The efforts of copyists would seem to have become more and more minute and detailed in the perpetuation of the consonantal text. These copyists (*γραμματεῖς*) were at first called *Sopherim* (from ספר, "to count"), because, as the Talmud says, "they counted all the letters in the Torah" (Kiddushin, 30a). It was not till later on that the name Massoretes was given to the preservers of Massorah. In the Talmudic period (c. A. D. 300–500), the rules for perpetuating Massorah were extremely detailed. Only skins of clean animals must be used for parchment rolls and fastenings thereof. Each column must be of equal length, not more than sixty nor less than forty-eight lines. Each line must contain thirty letters, written with black ink of a prescribed make-up and in the square letters which were the ancestors of our present Hebrew text-letters. The copyist must have before him an authentic copy of the text; and must not write from memory a single letter, not even a *yod*,—every letter must be copied from the exemplar, letter for letter. The interval between consonants should be the breadth of a hair; between words, the breadth of a narrow consonant; between sections, the breadth of nine consonants; between books, the breadth of three lines.

Such numerous and minute rules, though scrupulously observed, were not enough to satisfy the zeal to perpetuate the consonantal text fixed and unchanged. Letters were omitted which had surreptitiously crept in; variants and conjectural readings were indicated in side-margins,—words, "read but not written" (*Qerē*), "written but not read" (*Kethibh*), "read one way but written another". These marginal critical notes went on increasing with time. Still more was done to fix the consonantal text. The words and letters of each book and of every section of the twenty-four books of the Hebrew Bible were counted. The middle words and middle letters of books and sections were noted. In the Talmud, we see how one rabbi was wont to pester the other with such trivial textual questions as the juxtaposition of certain letters in this or that section, the half-section in which this consonant or that was, etc. The rabbis counted the number of times certain words and phrases occurred in the several books and in the whole Bible; and searched for mystic meanings in that number of times. On the top and bottom margins of MSS., they grouped various peculiarities of the text and drew up alphabetical lists of words which occurred equally often,—for instance, of those which appeared once with and once without *waw*. In Cod. Babylon. Petropolitanus (A. D. 916), we have many critical marginal notes of such and of other peculiarities, v. g. a list of fourteen words written with final *He* which are to be read with *Waw*, and of eight words written with final *Waw*, which are to be read with *He*. Such were some of the painstaking means employed to preserve the consonantal text of the Massorah.

(2) *The Points.*—Rolls that were destined for use in the synagogue were always unpointed. Rolls that were for other use came in time to receive vowel-points, and accents; these latter indicated the interrelation of words and modulation of the voice in public cantillation. One scribe wrote the consonantal text; another put in the vowel-points and accents of Massorah. The history of the vocalization of the text is utterly unknown to us. It has been suggested that dogmatic interpretation clearly led to certain punctuations; but it is likelier that the pronunciation was part of Massorah long before the invention of punctuation. The very origin of this invention is doubtful. Bleek assigns it to the eighth century (cf. "Introd. to O. T." I, 109, London, 1894). Points were certainly unused in St. Jerome's time; he had no knowledge whatsoever of them. The punctuation of the traditional text was just as certainly complete in the ninth century; for R. Saadia Gaon († 942), of Fayum in Egypt, wrote treatises thereon. The work of punctuating must have gone on for years and been done by a large number of scholars who laboured conjointly and authoritatively. Strack (see "Text of O. T.", in Hastings, "Dict. of Bib.") says it is practically certain that the points came into Massorah by Syriac influence. Syrians strove, by such signs, to perpetuate the correct vocalization and intonation of their Sacred text. Their efforts gave an impulse to Jewish zeal for the traditional vocalization of the Hebrew Bible. Bleek ("Introd. to O. T.", I, 110, London, 1894) and others are equally certain that Hebrew scholars received their impulse to punctuation from the Moslem method of preserving the Arabic vocalization of the Koran. That Hebrew scholars were influenced by either Syriac or Arabic punctuation is undoubted. Both forms and names of the Massoretic points indicate either Syriac or Arabic origin. What surprises us is the absence of any vestige of opposition to this introduction into Massorah of points that were most decidedly not Jewish. The Karaite Jews surprise us still more, since, during a very brief period, they transliterated the Hebrew text in Arabic characters.

At least two systems of punctuation are Massoretic: the Western and the Eastern. The Western is called Tiberian, after the far famed school of Massorah at Tiberias. It prevailed over the Eastern system and is followed in most MSS. as well as in all printed editions of the Massoretic text. By rather complicated and ingenious combinations of dots and dashes, placed either above or below the consonants, the Massoretes accurately represented ten vowel sounds (long and short *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*) together with four half-vowels or *Shewas*. These latter corresponded to the very much obscured English sounds of *e*, *a*, and *o*. The Tiberian Massoretes also introduced a great many accents to indicate the tone-syllable of a word, the logical correlation of words and the voice modulation in public reading. The Eastern or Babylonian system of punctuation shows dependence on the Western and is found in a few MSS.—chiefest of which is Cod. Babylon. Petropolitanus (A. D. 916). It was the punctuation of Yemen till the eighteenth century. The vowel signs are all above the consonants and are formed from the *Matres lectionis* א,ו,י. Disjunctive accents of this supralinear punctuation have signs like the first letter of their name; ֑, *zaqeph*; ט, *ṭarḥa*. A third system of punctuation has been found in two fragments of the Bible lately brought to light in Egypt and now in the Bodleian Library (cf. Kahle in "Zeitschrift für die Alttestam. Wissenschaft", 1901; Friedländer, "A third system of symbols for the Hebrew vowels and

accents" in "Jewish Quarterly Review", 1895). The invention of points greatly increased the work of scribes; they now set themselves to list words with a view to perpetuating not only the consonants but the vowels. Cod. Babyl. Petropolitanus (A. D. 916), for instance, lists eighteen words beginning with *Lamed* and either *Shewa* or *Ḥireq* followed by *Shewa;* eighteen words beginning with *Lamed* and *Pathaḥ;* together with an alphabetical list of words ending with הָ, which occur only once.

II. Critical Value of Massorah.—During the seventeenth century, many Protestant theologians, such as the Buxtorfs, defended the Massoretic text as infallible; and considered that Esdras together with the men of the Great Synagogue had, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, not only determined the Hebrew canon but fixed forever the text of the Hebrew Bible, its vowel points and accents, its division into verses and paragraphs and books. Modern textcritics value Massorah, just as the Itala and Peshitto, only as one witness to a text of the second century. The pointed Massoretic text is witness to a text which is not certainly earlier than the eighth century. The consonantal text is a far better witness; unfortunately the tradition of this text was almost absolutely uniform. There were different schools of Massoretes, but their differences have left us very few variants of the consonantal text (see Manuscripts of the Bible). The Massoretes were slaves to Massorah and handed down one and one only text. Even textual peculiarities, clearly due to error or accident, were perpetuated by rabbis who puzzled their brains to ferret out mystical interpretations of these peculiarities. Broken and inverted letters, consonants that were too small or too large, dots that were out of place—all such vagaries were slavishly handed down as if God-intended and full of Divine meaning.

Morinus, *Exercitationum biblicarum de Hebræi Græcique textus sinceritate libri duo* (Paris, 1669); Kuenen, *Les Origines du texte Masorétique* (Paris, 1875); Abbott, *Essays chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Testaments* (London, 1891); Buhl, *Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments* (Leipzig, 1891); Loisy, *Histoire critique du texte et des versions de la Bible* (2 vols., Paris, 1892–95); Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient MSS.* (London, 1896); Kahle, *Der Masoretische Text des Alten Testaments nach der Ueberlieferung der Babylonischen Juden* (Leipzig, 1902); Ginsburg, *Introduction to the Massoretico-critical edition of the Hebrew Bible* (1897).

Walter Drum.

Massoulié, Antoine, theologian, b. at Toulouse, 28 Oct., 1632; d. at Rome, 23 Jan., 1706. At an early age he entered the Order of St. Dominic, in which he held many important offices; but above all these he prized study, teaching, and writing, for the love of which he refused a bishopric and asked to be relieved of distracting duties. It was said that he knew by heart the Summa of St. Thomas. He devoted himself with such earnestness to the study of Greek and Hebrew that he could converse fluently in both of these languages. His knowledge of Hebrew enabled him to overcome in public debate two Jewish Rabbis, one at Avignon in 1659, the other at Florence in 1695. The latter became an exemplary Christian, his conversion being modestly ascribed by Massoulié to prayer more than to successful disputation. His published works and some unpublished manuscripts (preserved in the Casanatense Library at Rome) may be divided into two classes: those written in defence of the Thomistic doctrine of physical premotion, relating to God's action on free agents, and those written against the Quietists, whom he strenuously opposed, both by attacking their false teachings and also by explaining the true doctrine according to the principles of St. Thomas. His principal works are: "Divus Thomas sui interpres de divina motione et libertate creata" (Rome, 1692); "Oratio ad explicandam Summan theologicam D. Thomae" (Rome, 1701); "Méditations de s. Thomas sur les trois vies, purgative, illuminative et unitive" (Toulouse, 1678); "Traité de la véritable oraison, où les erreurs des Quiétistes sont réfutées" (Paris, 1699); "Traité de l'amour de Dieu" (Paris, 1703).

Quétif-Echard, *Script. Ord. Præd.*, II, 769; Touron, *Hist. des hommes illus.*, V, 751–73; Hurter, *Nomenclator.*

D. J. Kennedy.

Massuet, René, Benedictine patrologist, of the Congregation of St. Maur; b. 13 Aug., 1666, at St. Ouen de Mancelles in the diocese of Evreux; d. 11 Jan., 1716, at St. Germain des Prés in Paris. He made his solemn profession in religion in 1682 at Notre Dame de Lire, and studied at Bonnenouvelle in Orleans, where he showed more than ordinary ability. After teaching philosophy in the Abbey of Bec, and theology at St. Stephen's, in Caen, he attended the lectures of the University and obtained the degrees of bachelor and licentiate in law. After this he taught a year at Jumièges and three years at Fécamp. He spent the year 1702 in Rome in the study of Greek. The following year he was called to St. Germain des Prés and taught theology there to the end of his life. His principal work, which he undertook rather reluctantly, is the edition of the writings of St. Irenæus, Paris, 1710. An elegant edition of these writings had appeared at Oxford, 1702, but the editor, John Ernest Grabe, was less intent on an accurate rendering of the text than on making Irenæus favour Anglican views. Massuet enriched his edition with valuable dissertations on the heresies impugned by St. Irenæus and on the life, writings, and teaching of the saint. He also edited the fifth volume of the "Annales Ord. S. Ben." of Mabillon, with some additions and a preface inclusive of the biographies of Mabillon and Ruinart. We owe him, moreover, a letter to John B. Langlois, S.J., in defence of the Benedictine edition of St. Augustine, and five letters addressed to Bernard Pez found in Schelhorn's "Amoenitates Literariæ". He left in manuscript a work entitled "Augustinus Graecus", in which he quotes all the passages of St. John Chrysostom on grace.

Theol. Quartalschrift, 1833, 452; Tassin, *Congr. von St. Maur* (Frankfurt, 1773), 575; Hurter, *Nomencl.*, IV (Innsbruck, 1910), 527; *Kirchenlexikon*, s. v.; Buchberger, *Kirchl. Handlex.*, s. v.

Francis Mershmann.

Massys (Messys, Metzys), Quentin, painter, b. at Louvain in 1466; d. at Antwerp in 1530 (bet. 13 July and 16 September), and not in 1529, as his epitaph states (it dates from the seventeenth century). The life of this great artist is all adorned, or obscured, with legends. It is a fact that he was the son of a smith. There is nothing to prove, but it is not impossible that he first followed his father's trade. In any case he was a "bronzier" and medallist. On 29 March, 1528, Erasmus wrote to Boltens that Massys had engraved a medallion of him (Effigiem meam fudit aere). This was perhaps the medal dated 1519, a copy of which is at the Museum of Basle. In 1575 Molanas in his history of Louvain states that Quentin is the author of the standard of the baptismal fonts at St-Pierre, but his account is full of errors. As for the wrought iron dome over the well in the Marché-aux-Gants at Antwerp, which popular tradition attributes to him, the attribution is purely fanciful. Tradition also states that the young smith, in love with a young woman of Antwerp, became a painter for her sake. Indeed this pretty fable explains the poetical character of Massys. All his works are like love songs. Facts tell us only that the young man, an orphan since he was fifteen, was emancipated by his mother 4 April, 1491, and that in the same year he was entered as a painter on the registers of the Guild of Antwerp. He kept a studio which four different pupils entered from 1495 to 1510.

He had six children by a first marriage with Alyt van Tuylt. She died in 1507. Shortly afterwards, in 1508 or 1509, he married Catherine Heyns, who bore him, according to some, ten children, according to

others, seven. He seems to have been a respected personage. As has been seen, he had relations with Erasmus, whose portrait he painted in 1517 (the original, or an ancient copy, is at Hampton Court), and with the latter's friend, Petrus Egidius (Peter Gillis), magistrate of Antwerp, whose portrait by Massys is preserved by Lord Radnor at Longford. Dürer went to visit him immediately on his return from his famous journey to the Low Countries in 1519. On 29 July of that year Quentin had purchased a house, for which he had perhaps carved a wooden statue of his patron saint. In 1520 he worked together with 250 other artists on the triumphal arches for the entry of Emperor Charles V. In 1524 on the death of Joachim Patenier he was named guardian of the daughters of the deceased. This is all we learn from documents concerning him. He led a quiet, well-ordered, middle-class, happy life, which scarcely tallies with the legendary figure of the little smith becoming a painter through love.



Quentin Massys
By himself, Uffizi Gallery, Florence

Nevertheless, in this instance also, the legend is right. For nothing explains better the appearance in the dull prosaic Flemish School of the charming genius of this lover-poet. It cannot be believed, as Molanus asserts, that he was the pupil of Rogier van der Weyden, since Rogier died in 1484, two years before Quentin's birth. But the masters whom he might have encountered at Louvain such as Gonts, or even Dirck, the best among them, distress by a lack of taste and imagination a dryness of ideas and style which is the very opposite of Massys's manner. Add to this that his two earliest known works, in fact the only two which count, the "Life of St. Anne" at Brussels and the Antwerp triptych, the "Deposition from the Cross", date respectively from 1509 and 1511, that is from a period when the master was nearly fifty years old. Up to that age we know nothing concerning him. The "Banker and His Wife" (Louvre) and the "Portrait of a Young Man" (Collection of Mme. André), his only dated works besides his masterpieces, belong to 1513 and 1514 (or 1519). We lack all the elements which would afford us an idea of his formation. He seems like an inexplicable, miraculous flower.

When it is remembered that his great paintings have been almost ruined by restorations, it will be understood that the question of Massys contains insoluble problems. In fact the triptych of St. Anne at Brussels is perhaps the most gracious, tender, and sweet of all the painting of the North. And it will always be mysterious, unless the principal theme, which represents the family or the parents of Christ, affords some light. It is the theme, dear to Memling, of "spiritual conversations", of those sweet meetings of heavenly persons, in earthly costumes, in the serenity of a Paradisal court. This subject, whose unity is wholly interior and mystic, Memling, as is known, had brought from Germany, where it had been tirelessly repeated by painters, especially by him who was called because of this, the Master *der Heiligen Sippe*. Here the musical, immaterial harmony, resulting from a composition which might be called symphonic, was enhanced by a new harmony, which was the feeling of the circulation of the same blood in all the assembled persons. It was the poem arising from the quite Germanic intimacy of the love of family. One is reminded of Suso or of Tauler. The loving, tender genius of Massys would be stirred to grave joy in such a subject. The exquisite history of St. Anne, that poem of maternity, of the holiness of the desire to survive in posterity, has never been expressed in a more penetrating, chaste, disquieting art.

Besides, it was the beginning of the sixteenth century and Italian influences were making themselves felt everywhere. Massys translated them into his brilliant architecture, into the splendour of the turquoise which he imparted to the blue summits of the mountains, to the horizons of his landscapes. A charming luxury mingles with his ideas and disfigures them. It was a unique work, a unique period; that of an ephemeral agreement between the genius of the North and that of the Renaissance, between the world of sentiment and that of beauty. This harmony which was at the foundation of all the desires of the South, from Dürer to Rembrandt and Goethe, was realized in the simple thought of the ancient smith. By force of candour, simplicity, and love he found the secret which others sought in vain. With still greater passion the same qualities are found in the Antwerp "Deposition". The subject is treated, not in the Italian manner, as in the Florentine or Umbrian "Pietas", but with the familiar and tragic sentiment which touches the Northern races. It is one of the "Tombs" compositions, of which the most famous are those of Saint Mihiel and Solesmes. The body of Christ is one of the most exhausted, the most "dead", the most moving that painting has ever created. All is full of tenderness and desolation.

Massys has the genius of tears. He loves to paint tears in large pearls on the eyes, on the red cheeks of his holy women, as in his wonderful "Magdalen" of Berlin or his "Pietà" of Munich. But he had at the same time the keenest sense of grace. His Herodiades, his Salomes (Antwerp triptych) are the most bewitching figures of all the art of his time. And this excitable nervousness made him particularly sensitive to the ridiculous side of things. He had a sense of the grotesque, of caricature, of the droll and the hideous, which is displayed in his figures of old men, of executioners. And this made him a wonderful genre painter. His "Banker" and his "Money Changers" inaugurated in the Flemish School the rich tradition of the painting of manners. He had a pupil in this style, Marinus, many of whose pictures still pass under his name.

Briefly, Massys was the last of the great Flemish artists prior to the Italian invasion. He was the most sensitive, the most nervous, the most poetical, the most comprehensive of all, and in him is discerned the

tumultuous strain which was to appear 100 years later in the innumerable works of Rubens.

VAN MANDER, *Le Livre des Peintres*, ed. HYMANS (Paris, 1884); WAAGEN, *Treasures of Art in England* (London, 1854); HYMANS, *Quentin Metzys* in *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* (1888); COHEN, *Studien zu Quentin Metzys* (Bonn, 1894); DE BOSSCHERE, *Quentin Metzys* (Brussels, 1907); WURZBACH, *Niederländisches Künstlerlexicon* (Leipzig, 1906–10).

LOUIS GILLET.

Master of Arts. See ARTS, MASTER OF.

Master of the Sacred Palace.—This office (which has always been entrusted to a Friar Preacher) may briefly be described as being that of the pope's theologian. St. Dominic, appointed in 1218, was the first Master of the Sacred Palace (*Magister Sacri Palatii*). Among the eighty-four Dominicans who have succeeded him, eighteen were subsequently created cardinals, twenty-four were made archbishops or bishops (including some of the cardinals), and six were elected generals of the order. Several are famous for their works on theology, etc., but only Durandus, Torquemada, Prierias, Mamachi, and Orsi can be mentioned here. As regards nationality: the majority have been Italians; of the remainder ten have been Spaniards and ten Frenchmen, one has been a German and one an Englishman (i. e. William de Boderisham, or Bonderish, 1263–1270?). It has sometimes been asserted that St. Thomas of Aquin was a Master of the Sacred Palace. This is due to a misconception. He was Lector of the Sacred Palace. The offices were not identical. (See Bullarium O. P., III, 18.) Though he and two other contemporary Dominicans, namely his teacher Bl. Albert the Great and his fellow pupil Bl. Ambrose Sansedonico (about both of whom the same assertion has been made) held successively the office of Lecturer on Scripture or on Theology in the papal palace school, not one of them was Master of the Sacred Palace. Their names do not occur in the official lists. While all Masters of the Sacred Palace were Dominicans, several members of other orders were Lectors of the Sacred Palace (e. g. Peckham O. S. F., who became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1279).

St. Dominic's work as Master of the Sacred Palace consisted partly at least in expounding the Epistles of St. Paul (Colonna, O. P., c. 1255, who says that the commentary was then extant; Flaminius; S. Antonius; Malvenda, in whose time the MS. of the Epistles used by the Saint as Master of the Sacred Palace was preserved in Toulouse; Echard; Renazzi; Mortier, etc.). These exegetical lectures were delivered to prelates and to the clerical attendants of cardinals who, as the saint observed, had been accustomed to gather in the antechamber and to spend the time in gossip while their masters were having audiences with the pope. According to Renazzi (I, 25), St. Dominic may be regarded as the founder of the papal palace school, since his Biblical lectures were the occasion of its being established. Catalanus, who, however, is not guilty of the confusion alluded to above, says he was the first Lector of the Sacred Palace as well as the first Master of the Sacred Palace. In the thirteenth century the chief duty of the Master of the Sacred Palace was to lecture on Scripture and to preside over the theological school in the Vatican: "in scholæ Romanæ et Pontificiæ regimine et in publica sacræ scripturæ expositione" (Echard). The *Lectores* or *Magistri scholarum S. Palatii* taught under him. It became customary for the Master of the Sacred Palace, according to Cardinal de Luca, to preach before the pope and his court in Advent and Lent. This had probably been sometimes done by St. Dominic. Up to the sixteenth century the Master of the Sacred Palace preached, but after it this work was permanently entrusted to his companion (a Dominican). A further division of labour was made by Benedict XIV (Decree, "Inclyta Fratrum", 1743); at present the companion preaches to the papal household, and a Capuchin preaches to the pope and to the cardinals.

But the work of the Master of the Sacred Palace as papal theologian continues to the present day. As it has assumed its actual form by centuries of development, we may give a summary of the legislation respecting it and the various functions it comprises and also of the honours attaching to it. The "Acta" (or "Calenda") of the Palatine officials in 1409 (under Alexander V) show that on certain days the Master of the Sacred Palace was bound to deliver lectures and on other days was expected, if called upon, either to propose or to answer questions at the theological conference which was held in the pope's presence. On 30 October, 1439, Eugene IV decreed that the Master of the Sacred Palace should rank next to the dean of the Rota, that no one should preach before the pope whose sermon had not been previously approved of by him, and that in accordance with ancient usage no one could be made a doctor of theology in Rome but by him (Bullarium O. P., III, 81). Callistus III (13 November, 1455) confirmed and amplified the second part of this decree, but at the same time exempted cardinals from its operation (ibid., p. 356). At present it has fallen into disuse. In the Fifth Lateran Council (sess. x, 4 May, 1513) Leo X ordained that no book should be printed either in Rome or in its district without leave from the cardinal vicar and the Master of the Sacred Palace (ibid., IV, 318). Paul V (11 June, 1620) and Urban VIII added to the obligations imposed by this decree. So did Alexander VII in 1663 (Bullarium, *passim*). All these later enactments regard the inhabitants of the Roman Province or of the Papal States. They were renewed by Benedict XIV (1 Sept., 1744). And the permission of the Master of the Sacred Palace must be got not only to print, but to publish, and before the second permission is granted, three printed copies must be deposited with him, one for himself, another for his companion, a third for the cardinal vicar. The Roman Vicariate never examines work intended for publication. For centuries the imprimatur of the Master of the Sacred Palace who always examines them followed the *Si videbitur Reverendissimo Magistro Sacri Palatii* of the cardinal vicar; now in virtue of custom but not of any ascertained law, since about the year 1825 the cardinal vicar gives an imprimatur, and it follows that of the Master of the Sacred Palace. At present the obligation once incumbent on cardinals of presenting their work to the Master of the Sacred Palace for his imprimatur has fallen into disuse, but through courtesy many cardinals do present their works. In the Constitution "Officiorum ac munerum" (25 Jan., 1897), Leo XIII declared that all persons residing in Rome may get leave from the Master of the Sacred Palace to read forbidden books, and that if authors who live in Rome intend to get their works published elsewhere, the joint imprimatur of the cardinal vicar and the Master of the Sacred Palace renders it unnecessary to ask any other approbation. As is well known, if an author not resident in Rome desires to have his work published there, provided that an agreement with the author's Ordinary has been made and that the Master of the Sacred Palace judges favourably of the work, the imprimatur will be given. In this case the book is known by its having two title-pages: the one bearing the name of the domiciliary, the other of the Roman publisher.

Before the establishment of the Congregations of the Inquisition (in 1542) and Index (1587), the Master of the Sacred Palace condemned books and forbade reading them under censure. Instances of his so doing occur regularly till about the middle of the sixteenth century; one occurred as late as 1604, but by degrees this task has been appropriated to the above-mentioned congregations of which he is an ex-officio member. The Master of the Sacred Palace was

made by Pius V (29 July, 1570; see "Bullarium", V, 245) canon theologian of St. Peter's, but this Bull was revoked by his successor Gregory XIII (11 March, 1575). From the time when Leo X recognized the Roman University or "Sapienza" (5 November, 1513; by the Decree "Dum suavissimos") he transferred to it the old theological school of the papal palace. The Master of the Sacred Palace became the president of the new theological faculty. The other members were the pope's grand sacristan (an Augustinian), the commissary of the Holy Office (a Dominican), the procurators general of the five Mendicant Orders, i. e. Dominican, Franciscan (Conventual), Augustinian, Carmelite, and Servite, and the professors who succeeded to the ancient Lectors of the Sacred Palace. Sixtus V is by some regarded as the founder of this college or faculty, but he may have only given its definite form. He is said to have confirmed the prerogative enjoyed by the Master of the Sacred Palace of conferring all degrees of philosophy and theology. Instances of papal diplomas implying this power of the Master of the Sacred Palace occur in the "Bullarium" *passim* (e. g. of Innocent IV, 6 June, 1406). The presidential authority of the Master of the Sacred Palace over this, the greatest theological faculty in Rome, was confirmed by Leo XII in 1824.

Since the occupation of Rome in 1870 the Sapienza has been laicized and turned into a state university, so that on the special occasions when the Master of the Sacred Palace holds an examination, e. g. for the purpose of examining all that are to be appointed to sees in Italy, or again of conferring the title of S.T.D., he does so, with the assistance of the high dignitaries just mentioned, in his apartment in the Vatican. He is also examiner in the concursus for parishes in Rome which are held in the Roman Vicariate. Before Eugene IV issued the Bull referred to above, the Master of the Sacred Palace was in processions, etc., the dignitary immediately under the Apostolic subdeacons, but when this pope raised the auditors of the Rota to the rank of Apostolic subdeacons, he gave the Master of the Sacred Palace the place immediately next to the dean who was in charge of the papal mitre. In 1655, Alexander VII put the other auditors of the Rota above the Master of the Sacred Palace. This was done, according to Cardinal de Luca, solely because one white and black habit looked badly among several violet soutanes. One of the occasional duties of the Master of the Sacred Palace is performed in conjunction with the auditors of the Rota; namely to watch over the three apertures or "drums" through which during a conclave the cardinals receive all communications. In papal processions the Master of the Sacred Palace walks next to the auditors, immediately behind the bearer of the tiara.

Though he has, as we have seen, gradually lost some of his ancient authority and rank, nevertheless at the present day the Master of the Sacred Palace is a very high official. He is one of the three Palatine prelates (the others being the Maggiordomo and the Grand Almoner) to whom as to bishops, the papal guards present arms. He is always addressed, even by cardinals, as "Most Reverend". In the Dominican Order he ranks next to the general, ex-general, and vicar-general. He is ex-officio consultor of the Holy Office, prelate-consultor of Rites, and perpetual assistant of the Index. He is consultor of the Biblical Commission, and is frequently consulted on various matters by the pope as his theologian. His official audience occurs once a fortnight. The official apartment of the Master of the Sacred Palace was in the Quirinal, and until recently it contained the unbroken series of portraits of the Masters of the Sacred Palace, from St. Dominic down. These frescoes have been effaced by the present occupants of the Quirinal, but copies of them are to be seen in the temporary apartment of the Master of the Sacred Palace in the Vatican.

Bullarium O.P., VIII (Rome, 1730–1740); *MSS. in Vatican, Dominican Order, and Minerva Archives;* ANTONIUS, *Chronicon*, III (Lyons, 1586); MALVENDA, *Annales Ordinis Prædicatorum* (Naples, 1627); FONTANA, *Syllabus Magistrorum Sacri Palatii Apostolici* (Rome, 1663); DE LUCA, *Romanæ Curiæ Relatio* (Cologne, 1683); CATALANUS, *De Magistro Sacri Palatii Apostolici libri duo* (Rome, 1761); QUÉTIF-ECHARD, *Scriptor. Ordinis Prædicatorum* (Paris, 1719); CARAFFA, *De Gymnasio* (Rome, 1751), 135–145; RENAZZI, *Storia dell' Università Romana, etc.* (Rome, 1803–1806), *passim;* MORTIER, *Histoire des Maîtres Généraux de l'Ordre des Frères Prêcheurs* (Paris, 1903, in progress); BATTANDIER, *Annuaire Pont. Cath.* (1901), 473–482.

REGINALD WALSH.

Master of the Sentences. See PETER LOMBARD.

Mastrius, BARTHOLOMEW, Franciscan, philosopher and theologian, b. near Forli, at Meldola, Italy, in 1602; d. 3 Jan., 1673. He was one of the most prominent writers of his time on philosophy and theology. He received his early education at Cesena, and took degrees at the University of Bologna. He also frequented the Universities of Padua and Rome before assuming the duties of lecturer. He acquired a profound knowledge of scholastic philosophy and theology, being deeply versed in the writings of Scotus. He was an open-minded and independent scholar. As a controversialist he was harsh and arrogant towards his opponents, mingling invective with his arguments. His opinions on some philosophical questions were fiercely combatted by many of his contemporaries and especially by Matthew Ferchi and the Irish Franciscan, John Ponce. When presenting the second volume of his work on the "Sentences" to Alexander VII, to whom he had dedicated it, the pope asked him where he had learned to treat his opponent Ferchi in such a rough manner: Mastrius answered, "From St. Augustine and St. Jerome, who in defence of their respective opinions on the interpretation of Holy Scripture fought hard and not without reason": the pope smilingly remarked, "From such masters other things could be learned". Ponce in his treatise on Logic holds that with qualifying explanations God may be included in the Categories. Mastrius in combatting this opinion characteristically says, "Hic Pontius male tractat Deum sicut et alter". Mastrius had a well-ordered intellect which is seen in the clearness and precision with which he sets forth the subject-matter of discussion. His arguments for and against a proposition show real critical power and are expressed in accurate and clear language. His numerous quotations from ancient and contemporary authors and various schools of thought are a proof of his extensive reading. His works shed light on some of the difficult questions in Scotistic philosophy and theology. His "Philosophy" in five volumes folio, his "Commentaries" on the "Sentences" in four volumes, and his Moral Theology "ad mentem S. Bonaventuræ" in one volume were all published at Venice.

WADDING-SBARALEA, *Scriptores ord. min.* (Rome, 1806); IOANNES A S. ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca univ. franc.* (Madrid, 1732); THEULUS, *Triumphus Seraphicus* (Velletri, 1656); FRANCHINI, *Bibliosofia di scrittori francescani* (Modena, 1693); HURTER, *Nomenclator.*

GREGORY CLEARY.

Mataco Indians (or MATAGUAYO).—A group of wild tribes of very low culture, ranging over a great part of the western Chaco region, about the head waters of the Vermejo and the Pilcomayo, in the Argentine province of Salta and the Bolivian province of Tarija, and noted for the efforts made by Jesuit and Franciscan missionaries in their behalf in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The group consists, or formerly consisted, of about a dozen tribes speaking the same language with slight dialectic differences, and together constituting a distinct linguistic stock, the Matacoan or Mataguayan, which, however, Quevedo suspects to be connected with the Guaycuran stock, to which belong the Toba, Mocobí and the famous Abipon tribes. Of the Matacoan group the principal tribes were the Mataco, Mataguayo, and Vejoz. At present the names in most general use

are Mataco in Argentina and Nocten (corrupted from their Chiriguano name) in Bolivia. From 60,000 (estimated) in the mission period they are now reduced to about 20,000 souls. In 1690 Father Arcé, from the Jesuit college of Tarija, attempted the first mission among the Mataguayo and Chiriguano, but with little result, owing to their wandering habit. "Houses and churches were built, but the natives poured in and out, like the water through a bottomless barrel", and, at last, weary of the remonstrances of the missionaries, burned the missions, murdered several of the priests, and drove the others out of the country. At a later period, 1756, the Jesuit mission of San Ignacio de Ledesma on the Rio Grande, a southern head stream of the Vermejo, was founded for Toba and Mataguayo, of whom 600 were enrolled there at the time of the expulsion of the order in 1767.

About the end of the eighteenth century the Franciscans of Tarija undertook to restore the mission work in the Chaco, founding a number of establishments, among which were Salinas, occupied by Mataguayo and Chiriguano, and Centa (now Oran, Salta province), occupied by Mataguayo and Vejoz, the two missions in 1799 containing nearly 900 Indians, with 7300 cattle. With the decline of the Spanish power these missions also fell into decay and the Indians scattered to their forests and rivers. In 1895 Father Gionnecchini, passing by the place of the old Centa mission, found a cattle corral where the church had been. An interesting account of the present condition of the wild Mataco is quoted by Quevedo from a letter by Father Alejandro Corrado, Franciscan, Tarija. Their houses are light brush structures scattered through the forests, hardly high enough to allow of standing upright, and are abandoned for others set up in another place as often as insects or accumulation of filth make necessary. The only furniture is a wooden mortar with a few earthen pots, and some skins for sleeping. Men and women shave their heads and wear a single garment about the lower part of the body. The men also pluck out the beard and paint the face and body. They live chiefly upon fish and the fruit of the algarroba, a species of mesquit or honey-locust, but will eat anything that is not poisonous, even rats and grasshoppers. From the algarroba they prepare an intoxicating liquor which rouses them to a fighting frenzy. Their principal ceremony is in connexion with the ripening of the algarroba, when the priests in fantastic dress go about the trees, dancing and singing at the top of their voices to the sound of a wooden drum, keeping up the din day and night. A somewhat similar ceremony takes place when a young girl arrives at puberty. Everything is in common, and a woman divides her load of fruits or roots with her neighbours without even a word of thanks. They recognize no authority, even of parents over their children. The men occupy themselves with fishing or occasional hunting, their arms being the bow and club. The women do practically all the other work.

Marriage is simple and at the will of the young people, the wife usually going to live with her husband's relatives. Polygamy and adultery are infrequent, but divorce is easy. The woman receives little attention in pregnancy or childbirth, but on the other hand the father conforms to the *couvade*. Children are named when two or three years old. Abortion is very frequent; infanticide more rare, but the infant is often buried alive on the breast of the dead mother.

Disease is driven off by the medicine men with singing and shaking of rattles. They believe in a good spirit to whom they seem to pay no worship; and in a malevolent night spirit, whom they strive to propitiate. They believe that the soul, after death, enters into the body of some animal. The best work upon the language of the Mataco tribes is the grammar and dictionary of the Jesuit missionary, Father Joseph Araoz, with Quevedo's studies of the Nocten and Vejoz dialects, from various sources.

ARAOZ, *Grammar and Dictionary;* BRINTON, *American Race* (NewYork, 1891); CHARLEVOIX, *Hist. du Paraguay*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1756), Eng. tr., 2 vols. (London, 1769); HERVAS, *Catálogo de las Lenguas*, I (Madrid, 1800); LOZANO, *Descripcion Chorographica del Gran Chaco* (Cordoba, 1733); PAGE, *La Plata, the Argentine Confederation and Paraguay* (New York, 1859); PELLESCHI, *Otto Mesi nel Gran Ciacco* (Florence, 1881), tr., *Eight Months on the Gran Chaco* (London, 1886); QUEVEDO, *Lenguas Argentinas* (Dialecto Nocten, Dialecto Vejoz) in *Bol. del Instituto Geográfico Argentino*, XVI–XVII (Buenos Aires, 1896).

JAMES MOONEY.

Matelica. See FABRIANÒ AND MATELICA, DIOCESE OF.

Mater, a titular bishopric in the province of Byzantium, mentioned as a free city by Pliny under the name of Matera (Hist. natur., V, iv, 5). Mgr. Toulotte ("Géographie de l'Afrique chrétienne", proconsulaire, 197) cites only two occupants of this see: Rusticianus, who died shortly before 411, and Quintasius, who succeeded him. Gams (Series episcoporum, 467) mentions four: Rusticianus, Cultasius for Quintasius, Adelfius in 484, and Victor about the year 556. Mater is now known as Mateur, a small town of 4000 inhabitants, in great part Christian, and is situated in Tunis. The modern town is encircled with a wall, with three gates; it is situated on the railway from Tunis to Bizerta, not far from the lake to which it has given its name.

S. VAILHÉ.

Matera. See ACERENZA, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

Materialism.—As the word itself signifies, Materialism is a philosophical system which regards matter as the only reality in the world, which undertakes to explain every event in the universe as resulting from the conditions and activity of matter, and which thus denies the existence of God and the soul. It is diametrically opposed to Spiritualism and Idealism, which, in so far as they are one-sided and exclusive, declare that everything in the world is spiritual, and that the world and even matter itself are mere conceptions or ideas in the thinking subject. Materialism is older than Spiritualism, if we regard the development of philosophy as beginning in Greece. The ancient Indian philosophy, however, is idealistic; according to it there is only one real being, *Brahma;* everything else is appearance, *Maja*. In Greece the first attempts at philosophy were more or less materialistic; they assumed the existence of a single primordial matter—water, earth, fire, air—or of the four elements from which the world was held to have developed. Materialism was methodically developed by the Atomists. The first and also the most important systematic Materialist was Democritus, the "laughing philosopher". He taught that out of nothing comes nothing; that everything is the result of combination and division of parts (atoms); that these atoms, separated by empty spaces, are infinitely numerous and varied. Even to man he extended his cosmological Materialism, and was thus the founder of Materialism in the narrow sense, that is the denial of the soul. The soul is a complex of very fine, smooth, round, and fiery atoms: these are highly mobile and penetrate the whole body, to which they impart life. Empedocles was not a thorough-going Materialist, although he regarded the four elements with love and hatred as the formative principles of the universe, and refused to recognize a spiritual Creator of the world. Aristotle reproaches the Ionian philosophers in general with attempting to explain the evolution of the world without the *Nous* (intelligence); he regarded Protagoras, who first introduced a spiritual principle, as a sober man among the inebriated.

The Socratic School introduced a reaction against Materialism. A little later, however, Materialism found a second Democritus in Epicurus, who treated the system in greater detail and gave it a deeper foun-

dation. The statement that nothing comes from nothing, he supported by declaring that otherwise everything might come from everything. This argument is very pertinent, since if there were nothing, nothing could come into existence, i. e. if there were no cause. An almighty cause can of itself through its power supply a substitute for matter, which we cannot create but can only transform. Epicurus further asserted that bodies alone exist; only the void is incorporeal. He distinguished, however, between compound bodies and simple bodies or atoms, which are absolutely unchangeable. Since space is infinite, the atoms must likewise be infinitely numerous. This last deduction is not warranted, since, even in infinite space, the bodies might be limited in number—in fact, they must be, as otherwise they would entirely fill space and therefore render movement impossible. And yet Epicurus ascribes motion to the atoms, i. e. constant motion downwards. Since many of them deviate from their original direction, collisions result and various combinations are formed. The difference between one body and another is due solely to different modes of atomic combination; the atoms themselves have no quality, and differ only in size, shape, and weight. These materialistic speculations contradict directly the universally recognized laws of nature. Inertia is an essential quality of matter, which cannot set itself in motion, cannot of itself fix the direction of its motion, least of all change the direction of the motion once imparted to it. The existence of all these capabilities in matter is assumed by Epicurus: the atoms fall downwards, before there is either "up" or "down"; they have weight, although there is as yet no earth to lend them heaviness by its attraction. From the random clash of the atoms could result only confusion and not order, least of all that far-reaching design which is manifested in the arrangement of the world, especially in organic structures and mental activities. However, the soul and its origin present no difficulty to the Materialist. According to him the soul is a kind of vapour scattered throughout the whole body and mixed with a little heat. The bodies surrounding us give off continually certain minute particles which penetrate to our souls through our sense-organs and excite mental images. With the dissolution of the body, the corporeal soul is also dissolved. This view betrays a complete misapprehension of the immaterial nature of psychical states as opposed to those of the body—to say nothing of the childish notion of sense-perception, which modern physiology can regard only with an indulgent smile.

Epicurean Materialism received poetic expression and further development in the didactic poem of the Roman Lucretius. This bitter opponent of the gods, like the modern representatives of Materialism, places it in outspoken opposition to religion. His cosmology is that of Epicurus; but Lucretius goes much further, inasmuch as he really seeks to give an explanation of the order in the world, which Epicurus referred unhesitatingly to mere chance. Lucretius asserts that it is just one of the infinitely numerous possibilities in the arrangement of the atoms; the present order was as possible as any other. He takes particular pains to disprove the immortality of the soul, seeking thus to dispel the fear of death, which is the cause of so much care and crime. The soul (*anima*) and the mind (*animus*) consist of the smallest, roundest, and most mobile atoms. That "feeling is an excitement of the atoms", he lays down as a firmly established principle. He says: "When the flavour of the wine vanishes, or the odour of the ointment passes away in the air, we notice no diminution of weight. Even so with the body when the soul has disappeared." He overlooks the fact that the flavour and odour are not necessarily lost, even though we cannot measure them. That they do not perish is now certain, and, we must therefore conclude, still less does the spiritual soul cease to exist. However, the soul is no mere odour of a body, but a being with real activity; consequently, it must itself be real, and likewise distinct from the body, since thought and volition are incorporeal activities, and not movement which, according to Lucretius at least, is the only function of the atoms.

Christianity reared a mighty dam against Materialism, and it was only with the return to antiquity in the so-called restoration of the sciences that the Humanists again made it a powerful factor. Giordano Bruno, the Pantheist, was also a Materialist: "Matter is not without its forms, but contains them all; and since it carries what is wrapped up in itself, it is in truth all nature and the mother of all the living." But the classical age of Materialism began with the eighteenth century, when de la Mettrie (1709–51) wrote his "Histoire naturelle de l'âme" and "L'homme machine". He holds that all that feels must be material: "The soul is formed, it grows and decreases with the organs of the body, wherefore it must also share in the latter's death"—a palpable fallacy, since even if the body is only the soul's instrument, the soul must be affected by the varying conditions of the body. In the case of this Materialist we find the moral consequences of the system revealed without disguise. In his two works, "La Volupté" and "L'art de jouer", he glorifies licentiousness. The most famous work of this period is the "Système de la nature" of Baron Holbach (1723–89). According to this work there exists nothing but nature, and all beings, which are supposed to be beyond nature, are creatures of the imagination. Man is a constituent part of nature; his moral endowment is simply a modification of his physical constitution, derived from his peculiar organization. Even Voltaire found himself compelled to offer a determined opposition to these extravagant attacks on everything spiritual.

In Germany Materialism was vigorously assailed, especially by Leibniz (q. v.). As, however, this philosopher sought to replace it with his doctrine of monads, an out-and-out spiritualistic system, he did not give a real refutation. On the other hand, Kant was supposed to have broken definitively the power of Materialism by the so-called idealistic argument, which runs: Matter is revealed to us only in consciousness; it cannot therefore be the cause or the principle of consciousness. This argument proves absolutely nothing against Materialism, unless we admit that our consciousness creates matter, i. e. that matter has no existence independent of consciousness. If consciousness or the soul creates matter, the latter cannot impart existence to the soul or to any psychical activity. Materialism would indeed be thus utterly annihilated: there would be no matter. But, if matter is real, it may possess all kinds of activities, even psychical, as the Materialists aver. As long as the impossibility of this is not demonstrated, Materialism is not refuted. Idealism or Phenomenalism, which entirely denies the existence of matter, is more absurd than Materialism. There is, however, some truth in the Kantian reasoning. Consciousness or the psychical is far better known to us than the material; what matter really is, no science has yet made clear. The intellectual or the psychical, on the other hand, is presented immediately to our consciousness; we experience our thoughts, volitions, and feelings; in their full clearness they stand before the eye of the mind. From the Kantian standpoint a refutation of Materialism is out of the question. To overcome it we must show that the soul is an entity, independent of and essentially distinct from the body, an immaterial substance; only as such can it be immortal and survive the dissolution of the body. For Kant, however, substance is a purely subjective form of the understanding, by means of which we arrange our experiences. The independence of the soul would thus not be objective; it would be simply an idea conceived by us. Immortality would also be

merely a thought-product; this the Materialists gladly admit, but they call it, in plainer terms, a pure fabrication.

The German Idealists, Fichte, Hegel, and Schelling, seriously espoused the Phenomenalism of Kant, declaring that matter, and, in fact, the whole universe, is a subjective product. Thereby indeed Materialism is entirely overcome, but the Kantian method of refutation is reduced to absurdity. The reaction against this extravagant Spiritualism was inevitable, and it resulted by a sort of necessary consequence in the opposite extreme of outspoken Materialism. Repelled by these fantastic views, so contrary to all reality, men turned their whole energy to the investigation of nature. The extraordinary success achieved in this domain led many investigators to overestimate the importance of matter, its forces, and its laws, with which they believed they could explain even the spiritual. The chief representatives of Materialism as a system during this period are Büchner (1824–99), the author of "Kraft und Stoff"; K. Vogt (1817–95), who held that thought is "secreted" by the brain, as gall by the liver and urine by the kidneys; Czolbe (1817–73); Moleschott, to whom his Materialism brought political fame. Born on 9 August, 1822, at Herzogenbusch, North Brabant, he studied medicine, natural science, and the philosophy of Hegel at Heidelberg from 1842. After some years of medical practice in Utrecht, he qualified as instructor in physiology and anthropology at the University of Heidelberg. His writings, especially his "Kreislauf des Lebens" (1852), created a great sensation. On account of the gross materialism, which he displayed both in his works and his lectures, he received a warning from the academic senate by command of the Government, whereupon he accepted in 1854 a call to the newly founded University of Zürich. In 1861 Cavour, the Italian premier, granted him a chair at Turin, whence fifteen years later he was called to the *Sapienza* in Rome, which owed its foundation to the popes. Here death suddenly overtook him in 1893, and, just as he had had burnt the bodies of his wife and daughter who had committed suicide, he also appointed in his will that his own body should be reduced to ashes. The most radical rejection of everything ideal is contained in the revised work "Der Einzige und sein Eigentum" (1845; 3rd ed., 1893) of Max Stirner, which rejects everything transcending the particular Ego and its self-will.

The brilliant success of the natural sciences gave Materialism a powerful support. The scientist, indeed, is exposed to the danger of overlooking the soul, and consequently of denying it. Absorption in the study of material nature is apt to blind one to the spiritual; but it is an evident fallacy to deny the soul, on the ground that one cannot experimentally prove its existence by physical means. Natural science oversteps its limits when it encroaches on the spiritual domain and claims to pronounce there an expert decision, and it is a palpable error to declare that science demonstrates the non-existence of the soul. Various proofs from natural science are of course brought forward by the Materialists. The "closed system of natural causation" is appealed to: experience everywhere finds each natural phenomenon based upon another as its cause, and the chain of natural causes would be broken were the same brought in. On the other hand, Sigwart (1830–1904) justly observes that the soul has its share in natural causation, and is therefore included in the system. At most it could be deduced from this system that a pure spirit, that God could not interfere in the course of nature; but this cannot be proved by either experience or reason. On the contrary it is clear that the Author of nature can interfere in its course, and history informs us of His many miraculous interventions. In any case it is beyond doubt that our bodily conditions are influenced by our ideas and volitions, and this influence is more clearly perceived by us than the causality of fire in the production of heat. We must therefore reject as false the theory of a closed system of natural causation, if this means the exclusion of spiritual causes.

But modern science claims to have given positive proof that in the human body there is no place for the soul. The great discovery by R. Mayer (1814–78), Joule (1818–89), and Helmholtz (1821–94) of the conservation of energy proves that energy cannot disappear in nature and cannot originate there. But the soul could of itself create energy, and there would also be energy lost, whenever an external stimulus influenced the soul and gave rise to sensation, which is not a form of energy. Now recent experiment has shown that the energy in the human body is exactly equivalent to the nutriment consumed. In these facts, however, there is absolutely nothing against the existence of the soul. The law of the conservation of energy is an empirical law, not a fundamental principle of thought; it is deduced from the material world and is based on the activity of matter. A body cannot set itself in motion, can produce no force; it must be impelled by another, which in the impact loses its own power of movement. This is not lost, but is changed into the new movement. Thus, in the material world, motion, which is really kinetic energy, can neither originate nor altogether cease. This law does not hold good for the immaterial world, which is not subject to the law of inertia. That our higher intellectual activities are not bound by the law is most plainly seen in our freedom of will, by which we determine ourselves either to move or to remain at rest. But the intellectual activities take place with the cooperation of the sensory processes; and, since these latter are functions of the bodily organs, they are like them subject to the law of inertia. They do not enter into activity without some stimulus; they cannot stop their activity without some external influence. They are, therefore, subject to the law of the conservation of energy, whose applicability to the human body, as shown by biological experiment, proves nothing against the soul. Consequently, while even without experiment, one must admit the law in the case of sentient beings, it can in no wise affect a pure spirit or an angel. The "Achilles" of materialistic philosophers, therefore, proves nothing against the soul. It was accordingly highly opportune when the eminent physiologist, Dubois Reymond (1818–96), called a vigorous halt to his colleague by his "Ignoramus et Ignorabimus". In his lectures, "Ueber die Grenzen der Naturerkenntniss" (Leipzig, 1872), he shows that feeling, consciousness, etc., cannot be explained from the atoms. He errs indeed in declaring permanently inexplicable everything for which natural science cannot account; the explanation must be furnished by philosophy.

Even theologians have defended Materialism. Thus, for example, F. D. Strauss in his work "Der alte und neue Glaube" (1872) declares openly for Materialism, and even adopts it as the basis of his religion; the material universe with its laws, although they occasionally crush us, must be the object of our veneration. The cultivation of music compensates him for the loss of all ideal goods. Among the materialistic philosophers of this time, Ueberweg (1826–71), author of the well-known "History of Philosophy", deserves mention; it is noteworthy that he at first supported the Aristotelean teleology, but later fell away into materialistic mechanism. There is indeed considerable difficulty in demonstrating mathematically the final object of nature; with those to whom the consideration of the marvellous wisdom displayed in its ordering does not bring the conviction that it cannot owe its origin to blind physical forces, proofs will avail but little. To us, indeed, it is inconceivable how any one can overlook or deny the evidences of design and of the adaptation of means for the attainment of manifold ends.

The teleological question, so awkward for Materialism, was thought to be finally settled by Darwinism, in which, as K. Vogt cynically expressed it, God was shown the door. The blind operation of natural forces and laws, without spiritual agencies, was held to explain the origin of species and their purposiveness as well. Although Darwin himself was not a Materialist, his mechanical explanation of teleology brought water to the mill of Materialism, which recognizes only the mechanism of the atoms. This evolution of matter from the protozoon to man, announced from university chairs as the result of science, was eagerly taken up by the social democrats, and became the fundamental tenet of their conception of the world and of life. Although officially socialists disown their hatred of religion, the rejection of the higher destiny of man and the consequent falling back on the material order serve them most efficiently in stirring up the deluded and discontented masses. Against this domination of Materialism among high and low there set in towards the end of the nineteenth century a reaction, which was due in no small measure to the alarming translation of the materialistic theory into practice by the socialists and anarchists. At bottom, however, it is but another instance of what the oldest experience shows: the line of progress is not vertical but spiral. Overstraining in one direction starts a rebound in the other, which usually reaches the opposite extreme. The spiritual will not be reduced to the material, but it frequently commits the error of refusing to tolerate the co-existence of matter.

Thus at present the reaction against Materialism leads in many instances to an extreme Spiritualism or Phenomenalism, which regards matter merely as a projection of the soul. Hence also the widely-echoed cry: "Back to Kant". Kant regarded matter as entirely the product of consciousness, and this view is outspokenly adopted by L. Busse, who, in his work "Geist und Körper, Seele und Leib" (Leipzig, 1903), earnestly labours to discredit Materialism. He treats exhaustively the relations of the psychical to the physical, refutes the so-called psycho-physical parallelism, and decides in favour of the interaction of soul and body. His conclusion is the complete denial of matter. "Metaphysically the world-picture changes . . . . The corporeal world as such disappears—it is a mere appearance for the apprehending mind—and is succeeded by something spiritual. The idealistic-spiritualistic metaphysics, whose validity we here tacitly assume without further justification, recognizes no corporeal but only spiritual being. 'All reality is spiritual', is its verdict" (p. 479).

How little Materialism has to fear from Kantian rivalry is plainly shown, among others, by the natural philosopher Uexküll. In the "Neue Rundschau" of 1907 (Umrisse einer neuen Weltanschauung), he most vigorously opposes Darwinism and Haeckelism, but finally rejects with Kant the substantiality of the soul, and even falls back into the Materialism which he so severely condemns. He says: "The disintegrating influence of Haeckelism on the spiritual life of the masses comes, not from the consequences which his conception of eternal things calls forth, but from the Darwinian thesis that there is no purpose in nature. Really, one might suppose that on the day, when the great discovery of the descent of man from the ape was made, the call went forth: 'Back to the Ape'." "The walls, which confine Materialism, still stand in all their firmness: it is impossible to explain the purposive character of life from material forces." "We are so constituted that we are capable of recognizing certain purposes with our intellect, while others we long for and enjoy through our sense of beauty. One general plan binds all our spiritual and emotional forces into a unity." "This view of life Haeckel seeks to replace by his senseless talk about cell-souls and soul-cells, and thinks by his boyish trick to annihilate the giant Kant. Chamberlain's words on Haeckelism will find an echo in the soul of every educated person: 'It is not poetry, science, or philosophy, but a still-born bastard of all three'." But what does the "Giant Kant" teach? That we ourselves place the purpose in the things, but that it is not in the things! This view is also held by Materialists. Uexküll finds the refutation of Materialism in the "empirical scheme of the objects", which is formed from our sense-perceptions. This is for him, indeed, identical with the *Bewegungsmelodie* (melody of motion), to which he reduces objects. Thus again there is no substance but only motion, which Materialism likewise teaches. We shall later find the Kantian Uexküll among the outspoken Materialists.

Philosophers of another tendency endeavour to refute Materialism by supposing everything endowed with life and soul. To this class belong Fechner, Wundt, Paulsen, Haeckel, and the botanist Francé, who ascribe intelligence even to plants. One might well believe that this is a radical remedy for all materialistic cravings. The pity is that Materialists should be afforded an opportunity for ridicule by such a fiction. That brute matter, atoms, electrons should possess life is contrary to all experience. It is a boast of modern science that it admits only what is revealed by exact observation; but the universal and unvarying verdict of observation is that, in the inorganic world, everything shows characteristics opposite to those which life exhibits. It is also a serious delusion to believe that one can explain the human soul and its unitary consciousness on the supposition of cell-souls. A number of souls could never have one and the same consciousness. Consciousness and every psychic activity are immanent, they abide in the subject and do not operate outwardly; hence each individual soul has its own consciousness, and of any other knows absolutely nothing. A combination of several souls into one consciousness is thus impossible. But, even if it were possible, this composite consciousness would have a completely different content from the cell-souls, since it would be a marvel if all these felt, thought, and willed exactly the same. In this view immortality would be as completely done away with as it is in Materialism.

We have described this theory as an untenable fiction. R. Semon, however, undertakes to defend the existence of memory in all living beings in his work "Die Mneme als erhaltendes Prinzip im Wechsel des organischen Geschehens" (Leipzig, 1905). He says: "The effect of a stimulus on living substance continues after the stimulation, it has an engraphic effect. This latter is called the engram of the corresponding stimulus, and the sum of the engrams, which the organism inherits or acquires during its life, is the *mneme*, or memory in the widest sense." Now, if by this word the persistence of psychic and corporeal states were alone signified, there would be little to urge against this theory. But by memory is understood a psychic function, for whose presence in plants and minerals not the slightest plea can be offered. The persistence is even more easily explained in the case of inorganic nature. This Hylozoism, which, as Kant rightly declares, is the death of all science, is also called the "double aspect theory" (*Zweiseitentheorie*). Fechner indeed regards the material as only the outer side of the spiritual. The relation between them is that of the convex side of a curve to the concave; they are essentially one, regarded now from without and again from within—the same idea expressed in different words. By this explanation Materialism is not overcome but proclaimed. For as to the reality of matter no sensible man can doubt; consequently, if the spiritual is merely a special aspect of matter, it also must be material. The convex side of a ring is really one thing with the concave; there is but the same ring regarded from two different sides. Thus Fechner, in spite of all his disclaimers of Materialism,

must deny the immortality of the soul, since in the dissolution of the body the soul must also perish, and he labours to no effect when he tries to bolster up the doctrine of survival with all kinds of fantastic ideas.

Closely connected with this theory is the so-called "pyscho-physical parallelism", which most modern psychologists since Fechner, especially Wundt and Paulsen, energetically advocate. This emphasizes so strongly the spirituality of the soul that it rejects as impossible any influence of the soul on the body, and thus makes spiritual and bodily activities run side by side (parallel) without affecting each other. Wundt, indeed, goes so far as to make the whole world consist of will-units, and regards matter as mechanized spiritual activity. Paulsen, on the other hand, endeavours to explain the concurrence of the two series of activities by declaring that the material processes of the body are the reflection of the spiritual. One might well think that there could not be a more emphatic denial of Materialism. Yet this exaggerated Spiritualism and Idealism agrees with the fundamental dogma of the Materialists in denying the substantiality and immortality of the soul. It asserts that the soul is nothing else than the aggregate of the successive internal activities without any psychical essence. This declaration leads inevitably to Materialism, because activity without an active subject is inconceivable; and, since the substantiality of the soul is denied, the body must be the subject of the spiritual activities, as otherwise it would be quite impossible that to certain physical impressions there should correspond perceptions, volitions, and movements. In any case this exaggerated Spiritualism, which no intelligent person can accept, cannot be regarded as a refutation of Materialism. Apart from Christian philosophy no philosophical system has yet succeeded in successfully combatting Materialism. One needs but a somewhat accurate knowledge of the recent literature of natural science and philosophy to be convinced that the "refutation" of Materialism by means of the latest Idealism is idle talk. Thus, Ostwald proclaims his doctrine of energy the refutation of Materialism, and, in his "Vorlesungen über Naturphilosophie", endeavours "to fill the yawning chasm, which since Descartes gapes between spirit and matter", by subordinating the ideas of matter and spirit under the concept of energy. Thus, consciousness also is energy, the nerve-energy of the brain. He is inclined "to recognize consciousness as an essential characteristic of the energy of the central organ, just as space is an essential characteristic of mechanical energy and time of kinetic energy." Is not this Materialism pure and simple?

Entirely materialistic also is the widely accepted physiological explanation of psychical activities, especially of the feelings, such as fear, anger etc. This is defended (e. g.) by Uexküll, whom we have already referred to as a vigorous opponent of Materialism. He endeavours to found, or at least to illustrate this by the most modern experiments. In his work "Der Kampf um die Tierseele" (1903), he says: "Suppose that with the help of refined röntgen rays we could project magnified on a screen in the form of movable shadow-waves the processes in the nervous system of man. According to our present knowledge, we might thus expect the following. We observe the subject of the experiment, when a bell rings near by, and we see the shadow on the screen (representing the wave of excitation) hurry along the auditory nerve to the brain. We follow the shadow into the cerebrum, and, if the person makes a movement in response to the sound, centrifugal shadows are also presented to our observation. This experiment would be in no way different from any physical experiment of a similar nature, except that in the case of the brain with its intricate system of pathways the course of the stimulus and the transformation of the accumulated energy would necessarily form a very complicated and confused picture." But what will be thereby proved or even illustrated? Even without röntgen rays we know that, in the case of hearing, nerve waves proceed to the brain, and that from the brain motor effects pass out to the peripheral organs. But these effects are mere movements, not psychical perception; for consciousness attests that sensory perception, not to speak of thought and volition, is altogether different from movement, in fact the very opposite. We can think simultaneously of opposites (e. g. existence and non-existence, round and angular), and these opposites must be simultaneously present in our consciousness, for otherwise we could not compare them, nor perceive and declare their oppositeness. Now, it is absolutely impossible that a nerve or an atom of the brain should simultaneously execute opposite movements. And, not merely in the case of true opposites, but also in the judgment of every distinction, the nerve elements must simultaneously have different movements, of different rapidity and in different directions.

An undisguised Materialism is espoused by A. Kann in his "Naturgeschichte der Moral und die Physik des Denkens", with the sub-title "Der Idealismus eines Materialisten" (Vienna and Leipzig, 1907). He says: "To explain physically the complicated processes of thought, it is above all necessary that the necessity of admitting anything 'psychical' be eliminated. Our ideas as to what is good and bad are for the average man so intimately connected with the psychical that it is a prime necessity to eliminate the psychical from our ideas of morality, etc. Only when pure, material science has built up on its own foundations the whole structure of our morals and ethics can one think of elaborating for unbiased readers what I call the 'Physics of Thinking'. To prepare the ground for the new building, one must first 'clear away the debris of ancient notions', that is 'God, prayer, immortality (the soul)'." The reduction of psychical life to physics is actually attempted by J. Pikler in his treatise "Physik des Seelenlebens" (Leipzig, 1901). He converses with a pupil of the highest form, at first in a very childish way, but finally heavy guns are called into action. "That all the various facts, all the various phenomena of psychical life, all the various states of consciousness are the self-preservation of motion, has not yet, I think, been explained by any psychologist." Such is indeed the case, for, generally speaking, gross Materialism has been rejected. Materialism refers psychical phenomena to movements of the nerve substance; but self-preservation of motion is motion, and consequently this new psycho-physics is pure Materialism. In any case, matter cannot "self-preserve" its motion; motion persists on its own account in virtue of the law of the conservation of energy. Therefore, according to this theory, all matter ought to exhibit psychical phenomena.

Still more necessary and simple was the evolution of the world according to J. Lichtneckert (Neue wissenschaftl. Lebenslehre der Weltalls, Leipzig, 1903). His "Ideal oder Selbstzweckmaterialismus als die absolute Philosophie" (Ideal or End-in-itself Materialism as the Absolute Philosophy) offers "the scientific solution of all great physical, chemical, astronomical, theological, philosophical, evolutionary, and physiological world-riddles." Let us select a few ideas from this new absolutist philosophy. "That God and matter are absolutely identical notions, was until to-day unknown." "Hitherto Materialism investigated the external life of matter, and Idealism its internal life. From the fusion of these two conceptions of life and the world, which since the earliest times have walked their separate ways and fought each other, issues the present 'Absolute Philosophy.' Heretofore Materialism has denied, as a fundamental error, teleology or the striving for an end, and hence also the spiritual or

psychical qualities of matter, while Idealism has denied the materiality of the soul or of God. Consequently, a complete and harmonious world-theory could not be reached. The Ideal or End-in-itself Materialism, or Monism, is the crown or acme of all philosophies, since in it is contained the absolute truth, to which the leading intellects of all times have gradually and laboriously contributed. Into it flow all philosophical and religious systems, as streams into the sea." "Spirit or God is matter, and, vice versa, matter is spirit or God. Matter is no raw, lifeless mass, as was hitherto generally assumed, since all chemico-physical processes are self-purposive. Matter, which is the eternal, unending, visible, audible, weighable, measurable etc. deity, is gifted with the highest evolutionary and transforming spiritual or vital qualities, and indeed possesses power to feel, will, think, and remember. All that exists is matter or God. A non-material being does not exist. Even space is matter . . . "

One needs only to indicate such fruits of materialistic science to illustrate in their absurdity the consequences of the pernicious conception of man and the universe known as Materialism. But we cite these instances also as a positive proof that the much-lauded victory of modern Idealism over Materialism has no foundation in fact. To our own time may be applied what the well-known historian of Materialism, Friedrich Albert Lange (Geschichte des Materialismus u. Kritik seiner Bedeutung in der Gegenwart), wrote in 1875: "The materialistic strife of our day thus stands before us as a serious sign of the times. To-day, as in the period before Kant and the French Revolution, a general relaxation of philosophical effort, a retrogression of ideas, is the basic explanation of the spread of Materialism." What he says indeed of the relaxation of philosophical effort is no longer true to-day; on the contrary, seldom has there been so much philosophizing by the qualified and the unqualified as at the beginning of the present and the end of the last century. Much labour has been devoted to philosophy and much has been accomplished, but, in the words of St. Augustine, it is a case of *magni gressus præter viam* (i.e. long strides on the wrong road). We find simply philosophy without ideas, for Positivism, Empiricism, Pragmatism, Psychologism, and the numerous other modern systems are all enemies of ideas. Even Kant himself, whom Lange invokes as the bulwark against Materialism, is very appropriately called by the historian of Idealism, O. Willman, "the lad who throws stones at ideas".

The idea, whose revival and development, as Lange expects, "will raise mankind to a new level", is, as we have shown, not to be sought in non-Christian philosophy. Only a return to the Christian view of the world, which is founded on Christian philosophy and the teachings of the Socratic School, can prevent the catastrophes prophesied by Lange, and perhaps raise mankind to a higher cultural level. This philosophy offers a thorough refutation of cosmological and anthropological Materialism, and raises up the true Idealism. It shows that matter cannot of itself be uncreated or eternal, which indeed may be deduced from the fact that of itself it is inert, indifferent to rest and to motion. But it must be either at rest or in motion if it exists; if it existed of itself, in virtue of its own nature, it would be also of itself in either of those conditions. If it were of itself originally in motion, it could have never come to rest, and it would not be true that its nature is indifferent to rest and to motion and could be equally well in either of the two conditions. With this simple argument the fundamental error is confuted. An exhaustive refutation will be found in the present author's writings: "Der Kosmos" (Paderborn, 1908); "Gott u. die Schöpfung" (Ratisbon, 1910); "Die Theodizee" (4th ed., 1910); "Lehrbuch der Apologetik", I (3rd ed., Münster, 1903). Anthropological Materialism is completely disproved by demonstrating for psychical activities a simple, spiritual substance distinct from the body—i. e. the soul. Reason assumes the existence of a simple being, since a multiplicity of atoms can possess no unitary, indivisible thought, and cannot compare two ideas or two psychical states. That which makes the comparison must have simultaneously in itself both the states. But a material atom cannot have two different conditions simultaneously, cannot for example simultaneously execute two different motions. Thus, it must be an immaterial being which makes the comparison. The comparison itself, the perception of the identity or difference, likewise the idea of necessity and the idea of a pure spirit, are so abstract and metaphysical that a material being cannot be their subject.

For a full refutation of anthropological Materialism see GUTBERLET, *Lehrbuch der Psychologie* (4th ed., Münster, 1904); IDEM, *Der Kampf um die Seele* (2 vols., 2nd ed., Mainz, 1903). Consult also FABRI, *Briefe gegen den M.* (Stuttgart, 1864); PRAT, *L'impuissance du M.* (Paris, 1868); MOIGNO, *Le M. et la force* (2nd ed., Paris, 1873); HERTLING, *Ueber d. Grenzen d. mechanischen Naturerklärung* (Bonn, 1875); FLINT, *Antitheistic Theories* (London, 1879); BOWNE, *Some Difficulties of M.* in *Princeton Rev.* (1881), pp. 344–372; DRESSLER, *Der belebte u. der unbelebte Stoff* (Freiburg, 1883); LILLY, *Materialism and Morality* in *Fortnightly Review* (1886), 573–94; (1887), 276–93; BOSSU, *Réfutation du matérialisme* (Louvain, 1890); DREHER, *Der M. eine Verirrung d. menschlichen Geistes* (Berlin, 1892); CORRANCE, *Will M. be the Religion of the Future?* in *Dublin Review* (1899), 86–96; COURBET, *Faillite du M.* (Paris, 1899); FULLERTON, *The Insufficiency of M.* in *Psychol. Review*, IX (1902), 156–73; PESCH, *Die grossen Welträthsel* (Freiburg, 1883; 3rd ed., 1907); STÖCKL, *Der M. geprüft in seinen Lehrsätzen u. deren Consequenzen* (Mainz, 1878). See also bibliography under GOD, SOUL, SPIRITUALISM, WORLD.

CONSTANTIN GUTBERLET.

Maternity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, FEAST OF THE, second Sunday in October.—The object of this feast is to commemorate the dignity of Mary as Mother of God. Mary is truly the Mother of God, because she is the Mother of Christ, who in one person unites the human and the divine nature. This title was solemnly ratified by the Council of Ephesus, 22 June, 431. The hymns used in the office of the feast also allude to Mary's dignity as the spiritual Mother of men. The love of Mary for all mankind was that of a mother, for she shared all the feelings of her Son whose love for men led Him to die for our redemption (Hunter, Dogm. Theol. 2, 578). The feast was first granted, on the petition of King Joseph Manuel, to the dioceses of Portugal and to Brazil and Algeria, 22 Jan., 1751, together with the feast of the Purity of Mary, and was assigned to the first Sunday in May, dupl. maj. In the following year both feasts were extended to the province of Venice, 1778 to the kingdom of Naples, and 1807 to Tuscany. At present the feast is not found in the universal calendar of the church, but nearly all diocesan calendars have adopted it. In the Roman Breviary the feast of the Maternity is commemorated on the second, and the feast of the Purity on the third, Sunday in October. In Rome, in the Church of S. Augustine, it is celebrated as a dupl. 2. classis with an octave, in honour of the miraculous statue of the Madonna del Parto by Sansovino. This feast is also the titular feast of the Trinitarians under the invocation of N. S. de los Remedios. At Mesagna in Apulia it is kept 20 Feb. in commemoration of the earthquake, 20 Feb. 1743.

HOLWECK, *Fasti Mariani* (Freiburg, 1892); ALBERS, *Blüthen-Kränze* (Paderborn, 1894), v 484 ss.

F. G. HOLWECK.

Maternus, SAINT. See EUCHARIUS, SAINT, BISHOP OF TRIER.

Maternus, FIRMICUS. See FIRMICUS MATERNUS.

Mathathias, the name of ten persons of the Bible, variant in both Hebrew and Greek of Old Testament and in Greek of New Testament; uniform in Vulgate. The meaning of the name is "gift of Jah", or "of Jahweh" (cf. Θεόδωρος). In the Hebrew, the first four of these persons are called *Mattith Jah* (מתתיה).

(1) MATHATHIAS (B. Θαμαθία, A. Μαθθαθίας), one of the sons of Nebo who married an alien wife (I Esd., x, 41) and later repudiated her; he is called Mazitias in III Esd., ix, 35.

(2) MATHATHIAS (Sept. Ματθαθίας), one of the six who stood at the right of Esdras while he read the law to the people (II Esd., viii, 4).

(3) MATHATHIAS (Sept. Ματθαθίας), a Levite of Corite stock and eldest son of Sellum; he had charge of the frying of cakes for the temple-worship (I Par., ix, 31).

(4) MATHATHIAS (Sept. Ματταθίας), a Levite, one of Asaph's musicians before the ark (I Par., xvi, 5).

(5) MATHATHIAS (I Par., xv, 18, 21; xxv, 3, 21; Heb. מתתיהו; A. Ματταθίας in first three, Ματθίας in last; B. Ιμματαθία in first, Μεττα θίας in second, Ματταθίας in last two), a Levite of the sons of Idithun, one of the musicians who played and sung before the ark on its entrance into Jerusalem, later the leader of the fourteenth group of musicians of King David.

(6) MATHATHIAS (I Mach., ii passim; xiv, 29; Sept. Ματταθίας), the father of the five Machabees (see art. s. v.) who fought with the Seleucids for Jewish liberty.

(7) MATHATHIAS (I Mach., xi, 70), the son of Absalom and a captain in the army of Jonathan the Machabee; together with Judas the son of Calphi, he alone stood firm by Jonathan's side till the tide of battle turned in the plain of Asor.

(8) MATHATHIAS (I Mach., xvi, 14), a son of Simon the high priest; he and his father and brother Judas were murdered by Ptolemee, the son of Abobus, at Doch.

(9 and 10) MATHATHIAS (Ματθαθίας), two ancestors of Jesus (Luke, iii, 25, 26). WALTER DRUM.

Mathew, THEOBALD, Apostle of Temperance, b. at Thomastown Castle, near Cashel, Tipperary, Ireland, 10 Oct., 1790; d. at Queenstown, Cork, 8 Dec., 1856. His father was James Mathew, a gentleman of good family; his mother was Anne, daughter of George Whyte of Cappaghwhyte. At twelve he was sent to St. Canice's Academy, Kilkenny. There he spent nearly seven years, during which time he became acquainted with two Capuchin Fathers, who seem to have influenced him deeply. In September, 1807, he went to Maynooth College, and in the following year joined the Capuchin Order in Dublin. Having made his profession and completed his studies, he was ordained priest by Archbishop Murray of Dublin on Easter Sunday, 1814. His first mission was in Kilkenny, where he spent twelve months. He was then transferred to Cork, where he spent twenty-four years before beginning his great crusade against intemperance. During these years he ministered in the "Little Friary", and organized schools, industrial classes, and benefit societies at a time when there was no recognized system of Catholic education in Ireland. He also founded a good library, and was foremost in every good work for the welfare of the people. In 1830 he took a long lease of the Botanic Gardens as a cemetery for the poor. Thousands, who died in the terrible cholera of 1832, owed their last resting-place as well as relief and consolation in their dying hours to Father Mathew. In 1828 he was appointed Provincial of the Capuchin Order in Ireland—a position which he held for twenty-three years.

In 1838 came the crisis of his life. Drunkenness had become widespread, and was the curse of all classes in Ireland. Temperance efforts had failed to cope with the evil, and after much anxious thought and prayer, and in response to repeated appeals from William Martin, a Quaker, Father Mathew decided to inaugurate a total abstinence movement. On 10 April, 1838, the first meeting of the Cork Total Abstinence Society was held in his own schoolhouse. He presided, delivered a modest address, and took the pledge himself. Then with the historic words, "Here goes in the Name of God", he entered his signature in a large book lying on the table. About sixty followed his example that night and signed the book. Meetings were held twice a week, in the evenings and after Mass on Sundays. The crowds soon became so great that the schoolhouse had to be abandoned, and the Horse Bazaar, a building capable of holding 4000, became the future meeting-place. Here, night after night, Father Mathew addressed crowded assemblies. In three months he had enrolled 25,000 in Cork alone; in five months the number had increased to 130,000. The movement now assumed a new phase. Father Mathew decided to go forth and preach his crusade throughout the land. In Dec., 1839, he went to Limerick and met with an extraordinary triumph. Thousands came in from the adjoining counties and from Connaught. In four days he gave the pledge to 150,000. In the same month he went to Waterford, where in three days he enrolled 80,000. In March, 1840, he enrolled 70,000 in Dublin. In Maynooth College he reaped a great harvest, winning over 8 professors and 250 students, whilst in Maynooth itself, and the neighbourhood, he gained 36,000 adherents. In January, 1841, he went to Kells, and in two days and a half enrolled 100,000. Thus in a few years he travelled through the whole of Ireland, and in February, 1843, was able to write to a friend in America: "I have now, with the Divine Assistance, hoisted the banner of Temperance in almost every parish in Ireland."

FATHER MATHEW

He did not confine himself to the preaching of temperance alone. He spoke of the other virtues also, denounced crime of every kind, and secret societies of every description. Crime diminished as his movement spread, and neither crime nor secret societies ever flourished where total abstinence had taken root. He was of an eminently practical, as well as of a spiritual turn of mind. Thackeray, who met him in Cork in 1842, wrote of him thus: "Avoiding all political questions, no man seems more eager than he for the practical improvement of this country. Leases and rents, farming improvements, reading societies, music societies—he was full of these, and of his schemes of temperance above all." Such glorious success having attended his efforts at home, he now felt himself free to answer the earnest invitations of his fellow-countrymen in Great Britain. On 13 August, 1842, he reached Glasgow, where many thousands joined the movement. In July, 1843, he arrived in England and opened his memorable campaign in Liverpool. From Liverpool he went to Manchester and Salford, and, having visited the chief towns of Lancashire, he went on to Yorkshire, where he increased his recruits by 200,000. His next visit was to London where he enrolled 74,000. During three months in England he gave the pledge to 600,000.

He then returned to Cork where trials awaited him. In July, 1845, the first blight destroyed the potato crop, and in the following winter there was bitter distress. Father Mathew was one of the first to warn the Government of the calamity which was impending. Famine with all its horrors reigned throughout the

country during the years 1846–47. During those years, the Apostle of Temperance showed himself more than ever the Apostle of Charity. In Cork he organized societies for collecting and distributing food supplies. He stopped the building of his own church, and gave the funds in charity. He spent £600 ($3000) a month in relief, and used his influence in England and America to obtain food and money. Ireland lost 2,000,000 inhabitants during those two years. All organization was broken up, and the total abstinence movement received a severe blow. In 1847 Father Mathew was placed first on the list for the vacant Bishopric of Cork, but Rome did not confirm the choice of the clergy. In the early part of 1849, in response to earnest invitations, he set sail for America. He visited New York, Boston, New Orleans, Washington, Charlestown, Mobile, and many other cities, and secured more than 500,000 disciples. After a stay of two and a half years he returned to Ireland in Dec., 1851. Men of all creeds and politics have borne important testimony to the wonderful progress and the beneficial effects of the movement he inaugurated. It is estimated that he gave the total abstinence pledge to 7,000,000 people, and everyone admits that in a short time he accomplished a great moral revolution. O'Connell characterized it as "a mighty miracle", and often declared that he would never have ventured to hold his Repeal "monster meetings" were it not that he had the teetotalers "for his policemen".

His remains rest beneath the cross in "Father Mathew's Cemetery" at Queenstown. On 10 Oct., 1864, a fine bronze statue by Foley was erected to his memory in Cork, and during his centenary year a marble statue was erected in O'Connell Street, Dublin. The influence of Father Mathew's movement is still felt in many a country and especially in his own. In 1905 the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland assembled at Maynooth unanimously decided to request the Capuchin Fathers to preach a Temperance Crusade throughout the country. In carrying out this work their efforts have been crowned with singular success. The Father Mathew Memorial Hall, Dublin, is a centre of social, educative, and temperance work, and is modelled on the Temperance Institute, founded and maintained by the Apostle of Temperance himself. The Father Mathew Hall, Cork, is doing similar work. The Dublin Hall publishes a monthly magazine called "The Father Mathew Record", which has a wide circulation. A special organization called "The Young Irish Crusaders" was founded in Jan., 1909, and its membership is already over 100,000.

Freeman's Journal (Dublin); *The Nation* (Dublin), contemporary files; MAGUIRE, *Life of Fr. Mathew: A Biography* (London, 1863); HALL, *Retrospect of a Long Life*, I (London, 1883), 482–520; MATHEW, *Father Mathew: His Life and Times* (London, Paris, and Melbourne, 1890); THOMAS, *Fr. Theobald Mathew—summarised Life* (Cork, 1902); MCCARTHY, *The Story of an Irishman* (London, 1904), 31–43; O'KELLY, *Beatha an Athar Tioboid Maitiu* (Dublin, 1907), with English introduction by AUGUSTINE; TYNAN, *Father Mathew* (London, 1908).

FATHER AUGUSTINE.

Mathieu, FRANÇOIS-DÉSIRÉ, bishop and cardinal, b. 27 May, 1839; d. 26 October, 1908. Born of humble family at Einville, Department of Meurthe and Moselle, France, he made his studies in the diocesan school and the seminary of the Diocese of Nancy, and was ordained priest in 1863. He was engaged successively as professor in the school (*petit séminaire*) of Pont-à-Mousson, chaplain to the Dominicanesses at Nancy (1879), and parish priest of Saint-Martin at Pont-à-Mousson (1890). Meanwhile, he had won the Degree of Doctor of Letters with a Latin and a French thesis, the latter being honoured with a prize from the French Academy for two years. On 3 January, 1893, he was nominated to the Bishopric of Angers, was preconized on 19 January, and consecrated on 20 March. He succeeded Mgr Freppel, one of the most remarkable bishops of his time, and set himself to maintain all his predecessor's good works. To these he added the work of facilitating the education of poor children destined for the priesthood. He inaugurated the same pious enterprise in the Diocese of Toulouse, to which he was transferred three years later (30 May, 1896) by a formal order of Leo XIII. In his new see he laboured, in accordance with the views of this pontiff, to rally Catholics to the French Government. With this aim he wrote the "Devoir des catholiques", an episcopal charge which attracted wide attention and earned for him the pope's congratulations. In addition he was summoned to Rome to be a cardinal at the curia (19 June, 1899). Having resigned the See of Toulouse (14 December, 1899), his activities were thenceforward absorbed in the work of the Roman congregations and some diplomatic negotiations which have remained secret. Nevertheless, he found leisure to write on the Concordat of 1801 and the Conclave of 1903. In 1907 he was admitted to the French Academy with a discourse which attracted much notice. Death came to him unexpectedly next year in London, whither he had gone to assist at the Eucharistic Congress. Under a somewhat commonplace exterior he had a rich and active nature, an inquiring and open mind, a fine and well-cultivated intelligence which did credit to the Sacred College and the French clergy. His works include: "De Joannis abbatis Gorziensis vita" (Nancy, 1878); "L'Ancien Régime dans la Province de Lorraine et Barrois" (Paris, 1871; 3rd ed., 1907); "Le Concordat de 1801" (Paris, 1903); "Les derniers jours de Léon XIII et le conclave de 1903" (Paris, 1904); a new edition of his works began to appear in Paris, July, 1910.

FRANÇOIS-DÉSIRÉ CARDINAL MATHIEU

La Semaine catholique de Toulouse (1896, 1908); MAISONNEUVE, *Eloge de Son Eminence le cardinal Mathieu* in *Recueil de l'Académie des Jeux floraux* (Toulouse, 1910).

ANTOINE DÉGERT.

Mathusala, one of the Hebrew patriarchs, mentioned in the book of Genesis (v). The word is given as Mathusale in I Par., i, 3, and Luke, iii, 37; and in the Revised Version as Methuselah. Etymologists differ with regard to the signification of the name. Holzinger gives "man of the javelin" as the more likely meaning; Hommel and many with him think that it means "man of Selah", Selah being derived from a Babylonian word, given as a title to the god, Sin; while Professor Sayce attributes the name to a Babylonian word which is not understood. The author of Genesis traces the patriarch's descent through his father Henoch to Seth, a son of Adam and Eve. At the time of his son's birth Henoch was sixty-five years of age. When Mathusala had reached the great age of one hundred and eighty-seven years, he became the father of Lamech. Following this he lived the remarkable term of seven hundred and eighty-two years, which makes his age at his death nine hundred and sixty-nine years. It follows thus that his death occurred in the year of the Deluge. There is no record of any other human being having lived as long as this, for which reason the name, Mathusala, has become a synonym for longevity.

The tendency of rationalists and advanced critics of different creeds leads them to deny outright the extraordinary details of the ages of the patriarchs. Catholic commentators, however, find no difficulty in accepting the words of Genesis. Certain exegetes solve the difficulty to their own satisfaction by declaring that the year meant by the sacred writer is not the equivalent of our year. In the Samaritan text Mathusala was sixty-seven at Lamech's birth, and 720 at his death.

JOSEPH V. MOLLOY.

Matilda, SAINT, Queen of Germany, wife of King Henry I (The Fowler), b. at the Villa of Engern in Westphalia, about 895; d. at Quedlinburg, 14 March, 968. She was brought up at the monastery of Erfurt. Henry, whose marriage to a young widow, named Hathburg, had been declared invalid, asked for Matilda's hand, and married her in 909 at Walhausen, which he presented to her as a dowry. Matilda became the mother of: Otto I, Emperor of Germany; Henry, Duke of Bavaria; St. Bruno, Archbishop of Cologne; Gerberga, who married Louis IV of France; Hedwig, the mother of Hugh Capet. In 912 Matilda's husband succeeded his father as Duke of Saxony, and in 918 he was chosen to succeed King Conrad of Germany. As queen, Matilda was humble, pious, and generous, and was always ready to help the oppressed and unfortunate. She wielded a wholesome influence over the king. After a reign of seventeen years, he died in 936. He bequeathed to her all his possessions in Quedlinburg, Poehlden, Nordhausen, Grona, and Duderstadt.

It was the king's wish that his eldest son, Otto, should succeed him. Matilda wanted her favourite son Henry on the royal throne. On the plea that he was the first-born son after his father became king, she induced a few nobles to cast their vote for him, but Otto was elected and crowned king on 8 August, 936. Three years later Henry revolted against his brother Otto, but, being unable to wrest the royal crown from him, submitted, and upon the intercession of Matilda was made Duke of Bavaria. Soon, however, the two brothers joined in persecuting their mother, whom they accused of having impoverished the crown by her lavish almsgiving. To satisfy them, she renounced the possessions the deceased king had bequeathed to her, and retired to her villa at Engern in Westphalia. But afterwards, when misfortune overtook her sons, Matilda was called back to the palace, and both Otto and Henry implored her pardon.

Matilda built many churches, and founded or supported numerous monasteries. Her chief foundations were the monasteries at Quedlinburg, Nordhausen, Engern, and Poehlden. She spent many days at these monasteries and was especially fond of Nordhausen. She died at the convent of Sts. Servatius and Dionysius at Quedlinburg, and was buried there by the side of her husband. She was venerated as a saint immediately after her death. Her feast is celebrated on 14 March.

Two old Lives of Matilda are extant; one, *Vita antiquior*, written in the monastery of Nordhausen and dedicated to the Emperor Otto II; edited by KOEPKE in *Mon. Germ. Script.*, X, 575–582, and reprinted in MIGNE, *P. L.*, CLI, 1313–26. The other, *Vita Mahtildis reginæ*, written by order of the Emperor Henry II, is printed in *Mon. Germ. Script.*, IV, 283–302, and in MIGNE, *P. L.*, CXXXV, 889–920. CLARUS, *Die heilige Mathilde, ihr Gemahl Heinrich I, und ihre Söhne Otto I, Heinrich und Bruno* (Münster, 1867); SCHWARZ, *Die heilige Mathilde, Gemahlin Heinrichs I. Königs von Deutschland* (Ratisbon, 1846); *Acta SS.*, March, II, 351-65.

MICHAEL OTT.

Matilda of Canossa, Countess of Tuscany, daughter and heiress of the Marquess Boniface of Tuscany, and Beatrice, daughter of Frederick of Lorraine, b. 1046; d. 24 July, 1114. In 1053 her father was murdered. Duke Gottfried of Lorraine, an opponent of the Emperor Henry III, went to Italy and married the widowed Beatrice. But, in 1055, when Henry III entered Italy he took Beatrice and her daughter Matilda prisoners and had them brought to Germany. Thus the young countess was early dragged into the bustle of these troublous times. That, however, did not prevent her receiving an excellent training; she was finely educated, knew Latin, and was very fond of serious books. She was also deeply religious, and even in her youth followed with interest the great ecclesiastical questions which were then prominent. Before his death in 1056 Henry III gave back to Gottfried of Lorraine his wife and stepdaughter. When Matilda grew to womanhood she was married to her stepbrother Gottfried of Lower Lorraine, from whom, however, she separated in 1071. He was murdered in 1076; the marriage was childless, but it cannot be proved that it was never consummated, as many historians asserted. From 1071 Matilda entered upon the government and administration of her extensive possessions in Middle and Upper Italy. These domains were of the greatest importance in the political and ecclesiastical disputes of that time, as the road from Germany by way of Upper Italy to Rome passed through them. On 22 April, 1073, Gregory VII (q. v.) became pope, and before long the great battle for the independence of the Church and the reform of ecclesiastical life began. In this contest Matilda was the fearless, courageous, and unswerving ally of Gregory and his successors.

Immediately on his elevation to the papacy Gregory entered into close relations with Matilda and her mother. The letters to Matilda (Beatrice d. 1076) give distinct expression to the pope's high esteem and sympathy for the princess. He called her and her mother "his sisters and daughters of St. Peter" (Regest., II, ix), and wished to undertake a Crusade with them to free the Christians in the Holy Land (Reg., I, xi). Matilda and her mother were present at the Roman Lenten synods of 1074 and 1075, at which the pope published the important decrees on the reform of ecclesiastical life. Both mother and daughter reported to the pope favourably on the disposition of the German king, Henry IV, and on 7 December, 1074, Gregory wrote to him, thanking him for the friendly reception of the papal legate, and for his intention to co-operate in the uprooting of simony and concubinage from among the clergy. However, the quarrel between Gregory and Henry IV soon began. In a letter to Beatrice and Matilda (11 Sept., 1075) the pope complained of the inconstancy and changeableness of the king, who apparently had no desire to be at peace with him. In the next year (1076) Matilda's first husband, Gottfried of Lorraine, was murdered at Antwerp. Gregory wrote to Bishop Hermann of Metz, 25 August, 1076, that he did not yet know in which state Matilda "the faithful handmaid of St. Peter" would, under God's guidance, remain.

On account of the action of the Synod of Worms against Gregory (1076), the latter was compelled to lay Henry IV under excommunication. As the majority of the princes of the empire now took sides against the king, Henry wished to be reconciled with the pope, and consequently travelled to Italy in the middle of a severe winter, in order to meet the pope there before the latter should leave Italian soil on his journey to Germany. Gregory, who had already arrived in Lombardy when he heard of the king's journey, betook himself at Matilda's advice to her mountain stronghold of Canossa for security. The excommunicated king had asked the Countess Matilda, his mother-in-law Adelaide, and Abbot Hugh of Cluny, to intercede with the pope for him. These fulfilled the king's request, and after long opposition Gregory permitted Henry to appear before him personally at Canossa and atone for his guilt by public penance. After the king's departure the pope set out for Mantua. For safety Matilda accompanied him with armed men, but hearing a rumour that Archbishop Wibert of Ravenna, who

was unfriendly to Gregory, was preparing an ambush for him, she brought the pope back to Canossa. Here she drew up a first deed of gift, in which she bequeathed her domains and estates from Ceperano to Radicofani to the Roman Church. But as long as she lived she continued to govern and administer them freely and independently. When, soon after, Henry again renewed the contest with Gregory, Matilda constantly supported the pope with soldiers and money. On her security the monastery of Canossa had its treasure



Monument of Countess Matilda
Bernini, St. Peter's, Rome

melted down, and sent Gregory seven hundred pounds of silver and nine pounds of gold as a contribution to the war against Henry. The latter withdrew from the Romagna to Lombardy in 1082, and laid waste Matilda's lands in his march through Tuscany. Nevertheless the countess did not desist from her adherence to Gregory. She was confirmed in this by her confessor, Anselm, Bishop of Lucca.

In similar ways she supported the successors of the great pope in the contest for the freedom of the Church. When in 1087, shortly after his coronation, Pope Victor III was driven from Rome by the Antipope Wibert, Matilda advanced to Rome with an army, occupied the Castle of Sant' Angelo and part of the city, and called Victor back. However, at the threats of the emperor the Romans again deserted Victor, so that he was obliged to flee once more. At the wish of Pope Urban II Matilda married in 1089 the young Duke Welf of Bavaria, in order that the most faithful defender of the papal chair might thus obtain a powerful ally. In 1090 Henry IV returned to Italy to attack Matilda, whom he had already deprived of her estates in Lorraine. He laid waste many of her possessions, conquered Mantua, her principal stronghold, by treachery in 1091, as well as several castles. Although the vassals of the countess hastened to make their peace with the emperor, Matilda again promised fidelity to the cause of the pope, and continued the war, which now took a turn in her favour. Henry's army was defeated before Canossa. Welf, Duke of Bavaria, and his son of the same name, Matilda's husband, went over to Henry in 1095, but the countess remained steadfast. When the new German king, Henry V, entered Italy in the autumn of 1110, Matilda did homage to him for the imperial fiefs. On his return he stopped three days with Matilda in Tuscany, showed her every mark of respect, and made her imperial vice-regent of Liguria. In 1112 she reconfirmed the donation of her property to the Roman Church that she had made in 1077 (Mon. Germ. Hist.: Legum, IV, i, 653 sqq.). After her death Henry went to Italy in 1116, and took her lands —not merely the imperial fiefs, but also the freeholds. The Roman Church, though, put forward its legitimate claim to the inheritance. A lengthy dispute now ensued over the possession of the dominions of Matilda, which was settled by a compromise between Innocent II and Lothair III in 1133. The emperor and Duke Henry of Saxony took Matilda's freeholds as fiefs from the pope at a yearly rent of 100 pounds of silver. The duke took the feudal oath to the pope; after his death Matilda's possessions were to be restored wholly to the Roman Church. Afterwards there were again disputes about these lands, and in agreements between the popes and emperors of the twelfth century this matter is often mentioned. In 1213 the Emperor Frederick II recognized the right of the Roman Church to the possessions of Matilda.

Donizo, *Vita Mathildis*, ed. Bethmann in *Mon. Germ. Hist.: Script.*, XII, 348–409; *Vita alia* in Muratori, *Scriptores rer. Italicarum*, V, 389–397; *Libelli de lite* in *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, I–III; Huddy, *Matilda, Countess of Tuscany* (London, 1905); Fiorentini, *Memorie di Matilda, la gran contessa di Toscana* (Lucca, 1642; new ed., 1756); Tosti, *La contessa Matilde e i Romani Pontefici* (Florence, 1859; new ed., Rome, 1886); Renée, *La grande Italienne, Mathilde de Toscane* (Paris, 1859); Overmann, *Die Besitzungen der Grossgräfin Mathilde von Tuscien* (Berlin, 1892); Hefele, *Konziliengeschichte*, v (2nd ed., Freiburg im Br., 1886); Meyer von Knonau, *Jahrbücher des deutschen Reiches unter Heinrich IV. und Heinrich V.* (6 vols., Leipzig, 1890–1907); Potthast, *Bibl. hist. med. ævi*, 2nd., II, 1486.

J. P. Kirsch.

Matins.—I. Name.—The word "Matins" (Lat. *Matutinum* or *Matutinæ*), comes from *Matuta*, the Latin name for the Greek goddess *Leucothœ* or *Leucothea*, white goddess, or goddess of the morning (*Aurora*): *Leucothee graius, Matuta vocabere nostris*, Ovid, V, 545. Hence *Matutine, Matutinus, Matutinum tempus*, or simply *Matutinum*. The word actually used in the Roman Breviary is *Matutinum* (i. e. *tempus*); some of the old authors prefer *Matutini Matutinorum*, or *Matutinæ*. In any case the primitive signification of the word under these different forms was *Aurora*, sunrise. It was at first applied to the office of Lauds, which, as a matter of fact, was said at dawn (see Lauds), its liturgical synonym being the word *Gallicinium* (cock-crow), which also designated this office. The night-office retained its name of Vigils, since, as a rule, Vigils and Matins (Lauds) were combined, the latter serving, to a certain extent, as the closing part of Vigils. The name Matins was then extended to the office of Vigils, Matins taking the name of Lauds, a term which, strictly speaking, only designates the last three psalms of that office, i. e. the "Laudate" psalms. At the time when this change of name took place, the custom of saying Vigils at night was observed scarcely anywhere but in monasteries, whilst elsewhere they were said in the morning, so that finally it did not seem a misapplication to give to a night Office a name which, strictly speaking, applied only to the office of day-break. The change, however, was only gradual. St. Benedict (sixth century) in his description of the Divine Office, always refers to Vigils as the Night Office, whilst that of day-break he calls Matins, Lauds being the last three psalms of that office (Regula, cap. XIII–XIV; see Lauds). The Council of Tours in 567 had already applied the title "Matins" to the Night Office: *ad Matutinum sex antiphonæ; Laudes Matutinæ; Matutini hymni* are also found in various ancient authors as synonymous with Lauds. (Hefele-Leclercq, "Hist. des Conciles", V, III, 188, 189.)

II. Origin (Matins and Vigils).—The word Vigils, at first applied to the Night Office, also comes from a Latin source, both as to the term and its use, namely, the *Vigiliæ* or nocturnal watches or guards of the soldiers. The night from six o'clock in the evening to six o'clock in the morning was divided into four watches or vigils of three hours each, the first, the second, the third, and the fourth vigil. From the liturgical point of view and in its origin, the use of the term was very vague and elastic. Generally it designated the nightly meetings, *synaxes*, of the Christians. Under this form, the watch (Vigil) might be said to date back as early as the beginning of Christianity. It was either on account of the secrecy of their meetings, or because of some mystical idea which made the middle of the night the hour *par excellence* for prayer, in the words of the psalm: *media nocte surgebam ad confitendum tibi*, that the Christians chose the night time for their synaxes, and of all other nights, preferably the Sabbath. There is an allusion to it in the Acts of the Apostles (xx, 4), as also in the letter of Pliny the Younger. The liturgical services of these synaxes was composed of almost the same elements as that of the Jewish Synagogue: readings from the Books of the Law, singing of psalms, divers prayers. What gave them a Christian character was the fact that they were followed by the Eucharistic service, and that to the reading from the Law, the Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles was very soon added, as well as the Gospels and sometimes other books which were non-canonical, as, for example, the Epistles of Saint Clement, that of Saint Barnabas, the Apocalypse of Saint Peter, etc.

The more solemn watches, which were held on the anniversaries of martyrs or on certain feasts, were also known by this title, especially during the third and fourth centuries. The Vigil in this case was also called *παννυχίς*, because the greater part of the night was devoted to it. Commenced in the evening, they only terminated the following morning, and comprised, in addition to the Eucharistic Supper, homilies, chants, and divers offices. These last Vigils it was that gave rise to certain abuses, and they were finally abolished in the Church (see Vigils). Notwithstanding this, however, the Vigils, in their strictest sense of Divine Office of the Night, were maintained and developed. Among writers from the fourth to the sixth century we find several descriptions of them. The "De Virginitate", a fourth-century treatise, gives them as immediately following Lauds. The author, however, does not determine the number of psalms which had to be recited. Methodius in his "Banquet of Virgins" (*Symposion sive Convivium decem Virginum*) subdivided the Night Office or *παννυχίς* into watches, but it is difficult to determine what he meant by these nocturnes. St. Basil also gives a very vague description of the Night Office or Vigils, but in terms which permit us to conclude that the psalms were sung, sometimes by two choirs, and sometimes as responses. Cassian gives us a more detailed account of the Night Office of the fifth century monks. The number of psalms, which at first varied, was subsequently fixed at twelve, with the addition of a lesson from the Old and another from the New Testament. St. Jerome defended the Vigils against the attacks of Vigilantius, but it is principally concerning the watches at the Tombs of the Martyrs that he speaks in his treatise, "Contra Vigilantium". Of all the descriptions the most complete is that in the "Peregrinatio Ætheriæ", the author of which assisted at Matins in the Churches of Jerusalem, where great solemnity was displayed. (For all these texts, see Bäumer-Biron, loc. cit., pp. 79, 122, 139, 186, 208, 246, etc.) Other allusions are to be found in Cæsarius of Arles, Nicetius or Nicetæ of Treves, and Gregory of Tours (see Bäumer-Biron, loc. cit., I, 216, 227, 232).

III. The Elements of Matins from the Fourth to the Sixth Century.—In all the authors we have quoted, the form of Night Prayers would appear to have varied a great deal. Nevertheless in these descriptions, and in spite of certain differences, we find the same elements repeated: the psalms generally chanted in the form of responses, that is to say by one or more cantors, the choir repeating one verse, which served as a response, alternately with the verses of psalms which were sung by the cantors; readings taken from the Old and the New Testament, and later on, from the works of the Fathers and Doctors; litanies or supplications; prayer for the divers members of the Church, clergy, faithful, neophytes, and catechumens; for emperors; travellers; the sick; and generally for all the necessities of the Church, and even prayers for Jews and for heretics. [Bäumer, Litanie u. Missal, in "Studien des Benediktinerordens", II (Raigern, 1886), 287, 289.] It is quite easy to find these essential elements in our modern Matins.

IV. Matins in the Roman and other Liturgies.—In the modern Roman Liturgy, Matins, on account of its length, the position it occupies, and the matter of which it is composed, may be considered as the most important office of the day, and for the variety and richness of its elements the most remarkable. It commences more solemnly than the other offices, with a psalm (Ps. xciv) called the Invitatory, which is chanted or recited in the form of a response, in accordance with the most ancient custom. The hymns, which have been but tardily admitted into the Roman Liturgy, as well as the hymns of the other hours, form part of a very ancient collection which, so far at least as some of them are concerned, may be said to pertain to the seventh or even to the sixth century. As a rule they suggest the symbolic signification of this Hour (see No. V), the prayer of the middle of the night. This principal form of the Office should be distinguished from the Office of Sunday, of Feasts, and the ferial or week day Office. The Sunday Office is made up of the invitatory, hymn, three nocturns, the first of which comprises twelve psalms, and the second and third three psalms each; nine lessons, three to each nocturn, each lesson except the ninth being followed by a response; and finally, the canticle Te Deum, which is recited or sung after the ninth lesson instead of a response. The Office of Feasts is similar to that of Sunday, except that there are only three psalms to the first nocturn instead of twelve. The week-day or ferial office and that of simple feasts are composed of one nocturn only, with twelve psalms and three lessons. The Office of the Dead and that of the three last days of Holy Week are simpler, the absolutions, benedictions, and invitatory being omitted, at least for the three last days of Holy Week, since the invitatory is said in the Offices of the Dead.

The principal characteristics of this office which distinguish it from all the other offices are as follows:

(a) The Psalms used at Matins are made up of a series commencing with Psalm i and running without intermission to Psalm cviii inclusive. The order of the Psalter is followed almost without interruption, except in the case of feasts, when the Psalms are chosen according to their signification, but always from the series i–cviii, the remaining Psalms being reserved for Vespers and the other Offices.

(b) The Lessons form a unique element, and in the other Offices give place to a Capitulum or short lesson. This latter has possibly been introduced only for the sake of symmetry, and in its present form, at any rate, gives but a very incomplete idea of what the true reading or lesson is. The Lessons of Matins on the contrary are readings in the proper sense of the term; they comprise the most important parts of the Old and the New Testament, extracts from the works of the principal doctors of the Church, and legends of the martyrs or of the other saints. The lessons from Holy Scripture are distributed in accordance with certain fixed rules (rubrics) which assign such or such books of the Bible to certain seasons of the year. In

this manner extracts from all the Books of the Bible are read at the Office during the year. The idea, however, of having the whole Bible read in the Office, as proposed by several reformers of the Breviary, more especially during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, has never been regarded favourably by the Church, which views the Divine Office as a prayer and not as an object of study for the clergy.

(c) The Invitatory and, on certain days, the Finale or Te Deum also form one of the principal characteristics of this Office.

(d) The Responses, more numerous in this Office, recall the most ancient form of psalmody; that of the psalm chanted by one alone and answered by the whole choir, as opposed to the antiphonic form, which consists in two choirs alternately reciting the psalms.

(e) The division into three or two Nocturns is also a special feature of Matins, but it is impossible to say why it has been thought by some to be a souvenir of the military watches (there were not three, but four, watches) or even of the ancient Vigils, since ordinarily there was but one meeting in the middle of the night. The custom of rising three times for prayer could only have been in vogue, as exceptional, in certain monasteries, or for some of the more solemn feasts (see NOCTURNS).

(f) In the Office of the Church of Jerusalem, of which the pilgrim Ætheria gives us a description, the Vigils on Sundays terminate with the solemn reading of the Gospel, in the Grotto of the Holy Sepulchre. This practice of reading the Gospel has been preserved in the Benedictine Liturgy. It is a matter for regret that in the Roman Liturgy this custom, so ancient and so solemn, is no longer represented but by the Homily.

The Ambrosian Liturgy, better perhaps than any other, has preserved traces of the great Vigils or παννυχίδες, with their complex and varied display of processions, psalmodies, etc. (cf. Dom Cagin; "Paléographie Musicale", vol. VI, p. 8, sq.; Paul Lejay; Ambrosien (rit.) in "Dictionnaire d'Archéol. Chrét. et de Liturgie", vol. I, p. 1423 sq.). The same Liturgy has also preserved Vigils of long psalmody. This Nocturnal Office adapted itself at a later period to a more modern form, approaching more and more closely to the Roman Liturgy. Here too are found the three Nocturns, with Antiphon, Psalms, Lessons, and Responses, the ordinary elements of the Roman Matins, and with a few special features quite Ambrosian. In the Benedictine Office, Matins, like the text of the Office, follows the Roman Liturgy quite closely. The number of psalms, viz. twelve, is always the same, there being three or two Nocturns according to the degree of solemnity of the particular Office celebrated. Ordinarily there are four Lessons, followed by their responses, to each Nocturn. The two most characteristic features of the Benedictine Matins are: the Canticles of the third Nocturn, which are not found in the Roman Liturgy, and the Gospel, which is sung solemnly at the end, the latter trait, as already pointed out, being very ancient. In the Mozarabic Liturgy (q. v.), on the contrary, Matins are made up of a system of Antiphons, Collects, and Versicles which make them quite a departure from the Roman system.

V. SIGNIFICATION AND SYMBOLISM.—From the foregoing it is clear that Matins remains the principal Office of the Church, and the one which, in its origin, dates back the farthest, as far as the Apostolic ages, as far even as the very inception of the Church. It is doubtless, after having passed through a great many transformations, the ancient Night Office, the Office of the Vigil. In a certain sense it is, perhaps, the Office which was primitively the preparation for the Mass, that is to say, the Mass of the Catechumens, which presents at any rate the same construction as that Office:—the reading from the Old Testament, then the Epistles and the Acts, and finally the Gospel—the whole being intermingled with psalmody, and terminated by the Homily (cf. Cabrol: "Les Origines Liturgiques", Paris, 1906, 334 seq.). If for a time this Office appeared to be secondary to that of Lauds or Morning Office, it is because the latter, originally but a part of Matins, drew to itself the solemnity, probably on account of the hour at which it was celebrated, permitting all the faithful to be present. According to another theory suggested by the testimony of Lactantius, St. Jerome, and St. Isidore, the Christians, being ignorant of the date of Christ's coming, thought He would return during the middle of the night, and most probably the night of Holy Saturday or Easter Sunday, at or about the hour when He arose from the sepulchre. Hence the importance of the Easter Vigil, which would thus have become the model or prototype of the other Saturday Vigils, and incidentally of all the nightly Vigils. The idea of the Second Advent would have given rise to the Easter Vigil, and the latter to the office of the Saturday Vigil (Batiffol, "Hist. du Bréviaire", 3). The institution of the Saturday Vigil would consequently be as ancient as that of Sunday.

BONA, *De Divina Psalmodia* in *Opera Omnia* (Antwerp, 1677), 693 sq.; GRANCOLAS, *Commentarius historicus in Rom. Breviar.*, 100; PROBST, *Brevier und Breviergebet* (Tübingen, 1854), 143 sq.; BÄUMER, *Histoire du Bréviaire*, tr. BIRON, I (Paris, 1905), 60 sq.; DUCHESNE, *Christian Worship* (1904), 448, 449; BATIFFOL, *Histoire du Bréviaire*, 3 sq.; THALHOFER, *Handbuch der Katholischen Liturgik*, II, 434, 450; GASTOUÉ, *Les Vigiles Nocturnes* (Paris, 1908) (Collection Bloud); see HOURS (CANONICAL); LAUDS; VIGILS; BREVIARY.

F. CABROL.

Matricula, a term applied in Christian antiquity (1) to the catalogue or roll of the clergy of a particular church; thus *Clerici immatriculati* denoted the clergy entitled to maintenance from the resources of the church to which they were attached. Allusions to *matricula* in this sense are found in the second and third canons of the Council of Agde and in canon xiii of the Council of Orleans (both of the sixth century). This term was also applied (2) to the ecclesiastical list of poor pensioners who were assisted from the church revenues; hence the names *matricularii*, *matriculariæ*, by which persons thus assisted, together with those who performed menial services about the church, were known. The house in which such pensioners were lodged was also known (3) as *matricula*, which thus becomes synonymous with *xenodochium*.

MAURICE M. HASSETT.

Matrimony. See MARRIAGE.

Matteo da Siena (MATTEO DI GIOVANNI DI BARTOLO), painter, b. at Borgo San Sepolcro, c. 1435; d. 1495. His common appellation was derived from his having worked chiefly in the city of Siena. In the fourteenth century the masters of the Sienese school rivalled the Florentine painters; in the fifteenth, the former school, resisting the progress achieved at Florence, allowed itself to be outstripped by its rival. Although in this period it gives the impression of a superannuated art, Sienese painting still charms with its surviving fine traditional qualities—its sincerity of feeling, the refined grace of its figures, its attention to minutiæ of dress and of architectural background, and its fascinating frankness of execution. Of these qualities Matteo has his share, but he is furthermore distinguished by the dignity of his female figures, the gracious presence of his angels, and the harmony of a colour scheme at once rich and brilliant. For this reason critics pronounce him the best of the fifteenth-century Sienese painters. The earliest authentic work of Matteo is dated 1470, a Virgin enthroned, with angels, painted for the Servites, and now in the Academy of Siena. In 1487 he executed for the high altar of Santa Maria de' Servi del Borgo—the Servite church of his native village—an "Assumption", with the Apostles and other saints looking on; on the predella he has painted the history of the Blessed Virgin. Ac-

cording to G. Milanesi (in his edition of Vasari, II, Florence, 1878, p. 493, note 3), the main portion of this painting is still to be seen in the church, while the lateral portions have been removed to the sacristy. Some other Madonnas of his deserve particular mention: one in the Palazzo Tolomei at Siena; the Virgin and Infant Jesus painted, in 1484, for the city palace of Siena, on a pilaster in the hall decorated by Spinello Aretino; in the duomo of Pienza, a Virgin and Child enthroned between St. Matthew and St. Catherine, St. Bartholomew and St. Luke. On the lunette Matteo painted the Flagellation, and on the predella three medallions—"Ecce Homo", the Virgin, and an Evangelist. The signature reads: "Opus Mathei Johannis de Senis". As decoration for the pavement of the cathedral of Siena, he designed three subjects: "The Sibyl of Samos", "The Deliverance of Bethulia", and "The Massacre of the Innocents".

In 1477 he painted his "Madonna della Neve" (Our Lady of the Snow), for the church under that invocation at Siena. On comparing this with the Servite Madonna of 1470, it is seen to surpass the earlier work in beauty of types, symmetry of proportions, and colour-tone. The St. Barbara, a composition made for the church of San Domenico at Siena, is also a remarkable work: two angels are gracefully laying a crown on the saint's head, while others, accompanied by St. Mary Magdalen and St. Catherine of Alexandria and playing musical instruments, surround her. When Matteo treats subjects involving lively action, he loses a great deal of his power. The incidental scenes are combined in a confused way, the expression of feeling is forced, and degenerates into grimace, and the general result is affected and caricature-like.

CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE, *A New History of Painting in Italy*, III (London, 1866), iii, 81–86; LÜBKE, *Geschichte der italienischen Malerei*, I, 387; BURCKHARDT AND BODE, *Le Cicerone*, Fr. tr. GÉRARD, II (Paris, 1892), 569.

GASTON SORTAIS.

Matteo of Aquasparta, a celebrated Italian Franciscan, b. at Aquasparta in the Diocese of Todi, Umbria, about 1235; d. at Rome, 29 October, 1302. He was a member of the Bentivenghi family, to which Cardinal Bentivenga (d. 1290), also a Franciscan, belonged. Matteo entered the Franciscan Order at Todi, took the degree of Master of Theology at Paris, and taught also for a time at Bologna. The Franciscan, John Peckham, having become Archbishop of Canterbury in 1279, Matteo was in 1280 made Peckham's successor as *Lector sacri Palatii apostolici*, i. e. he was appointed reader (teacher) of theology to the papal Curia. In 1287 the chapter held at Montpellier elected him general in succession to Arlotto of Prato. When Girolamo Masci (of Ascoli), who had previously been general of the Franciscan Order, became pope as Nicholas IV, 15 Feb., 1288, he created Matteo cardinal of the title of San Lorenzo in Damaso in May of that year. After this Matteo was made Cardinal Bishop of Porto, and *pœnitentiarius maior* (Grand Penitentiary). He still, however, retained the direction of the order until the chapter of 1289. Matteo had summoned this chapter to meet at Assisi, but Nicholas IV caused it to be held in his presence at Rieti; here Raymond Gaufredi, a native of Provence, was elected general. As general of the order Matteo maintained a moderate, middle course ; among other things he reorganized the studies pursued in the order. In the quarrel between Boniface VIII and the Colonna, from 1297 onwards, he strongly supported the pope, both in official memorials and in public sermons. Boniface VIII appointed him, both in 1297 and 1300, to an important embassy to Lombardy, the Romagna, and to Florence, where the Blacks (*Neri*) and the Whites (*Bianchi*), that is, the Guelphs and Ghibellines, were violently at issue with each other. In 1301 Matteo returned to Florence, following Charles of Valois, but neither peace nor reconciliation was brought about. The Blacks finally obtained the upper hand, and the chiefs of the Ghibelline party were obliged to go into exile; among these was the poet Dante. In a famous passage of the "Divina Commedia" (Paradiso, XII, 124–26), Dante certainly speaks as an extreme Ghibelline against Matteo of Aquasparta. Matteo, however, had died before this. He was buried in the Franciscan church of Ara Cœli, where his monument is still to be seen.

Matteo was a very learned philosopher and theologian; he was further a personal pupil of St. Bonaventure, whose teaching, in general, he followed, or rather developed. In this respect he was one of what is known as the older Franciscan school, who preferred Augustinianism to the more pronounced Aristoteleanism of St. Thomas Aquinas. His principal work is the acute "Quæstiones disputatæ", which treats of various subjects. Of this one book appeared at Quaracchi in 1903 (the editing and issue are discontinued for the present), namely: "Quæstiones disputatæ selectæ", in "Bibliotheca Franciscana scholastica medii ævi", I; the "Quæstiones" are preceded by a "Tractatus de excellentia S. Scripturæ" (pp. 1–22), also by a "Sermo de studio S. Scripturæ" (pp. 22–36); it is followed by "De processione Spiritus Sancti" (pp. 429–53). Five "Quæstiones de Cognitione" had already been edited in the collection called "De humanæ cognitionis ratione anecdota quædam" (Quaracchi, 1883), 87–182. The rest of his works, still unedited, are to be found at Assisi and Todi. Among them are: "Commentarius in 4 libros Sententiarum" (autograph); "Concordantiæ super 4 ll. Sententiarum"; "Postilla super librum Job"; "Postilla super Psalterium" (autograph); "In 12 Prophetas Minores"; "In Danielem"; "In Ev. Matthæi"; "In Apocalypsim" (autograph); "In Epist. ad Romanos"; "Sermones dominicales et feriales" (autograph).

Cf. the editions referred to of the *Quæst. disput.* (1903), pp. v-xvi, and *De Hum. Cognit.*, pp. xiv-xv; *Chronica XXIV Ministr. General O. Min.* in *Analecta Franciscana*, III (Quaracchi, 1897), 406–19, 699, 703; WADDING, *Scriptores Ord. Min.* (Rome, 1650), 252, (1806), 172, (1906), 269–70; SBARALEA, *Suppl. ad Script. O. M.* (Rome, 1806), 525; DENIFLE-CHATELAIN, *Chartular. Univ. Paris.*, II (Paris, 1891), 59; EHRLE in *Zeitschrift für kathol. Theologie*, VII (Innsbruck, 1883), 46; GRABMANN, *Die philosophische und theologische Erkenntnislehre des Kardinals Matthæus von Aquasparta* (Vienna, 1906); *Theologische Studien der Leo Gesellschaft*, Pt. XIV.

MICHAEL BIHL.

Matter (Gr. ὕλη; Lat. *materia;* Fr. *matière;* Ger. *materie* and *stoff*), the correlative of Form. See HYLOMORPHISM; FORM.

Taking the term in its widest sense, matter signifies that out of which anything is made or composed. Thus the original meaning of ὕλη (Homer) is "wood", in the sense of "grove" or "forest"; and hence, derivatively, "wood cut down" or timber. The Latin *materia*, as opposed to *lignum* (wood used for fuel), has also the meaning of timber for building purposes. In modern languages this word (as signifying raw material) is used in a similar way. Matter is thus one of the elements of the becoming and continued being of an artificial product. The architect employs timber in the building of his house; the shoemaker fashions his shoes from leather. It will be observed that, as an intrinsic element, matter connotes composition, and is most easily studied in a consideration of the nature of change. This is treated *ex professo* in the article on CAUSE (q. v.). It will, however, be necessary to touch upon it briefly again here, since matter can only be rationally treated in so far as it is a correlate. The present article will therefore be divided into paragraphs giving the scholastic doctrine under the following heads:—(1) Secondary Matter (in accidental change); (2) Primordial Matter (in substantial change); (3) The Nature of Primordial Matter; (4) Privation; (5) Permanent Matter; (6) The Unity of Matter; (7) Matter as the Principle of Individuation; (8) The Causality of Matter; (9) Variant Theories.

(1) *Secondary Matter.*—Accepting matter in the ori-

ginal sense given above, Aristotle defines the "material cause" οἷον ὁ χαλκὸς τοῦ ἀνδριάντος καὶ ὁ ἄργυρος τῆς φιαλῆς. That the form of the statue is realized in the bronze, that the bronze is the subject of the form, is sensibly evident. These two elements of the statue or bowl are the intrinsic "causes" of its being what it is. With the addition of the efficient and final cause (and of privation) they constitute the whole doctrine of its ætiology, and are invoked as a sufficient explanation of "accidental" change. There is no difficulty in understanding such a doctrine. The determinable "matter" (here, in scholastic terminology, more properly substance) is the concrete reality—brass or white metal—susceptible of determination to a particular mode of being. The determinant is the artificial shape or form actually visible. The "matter" remains substantially the same before, throughout, and after its fashioning.

(2) *Primordial Matter.*—The explanation is not so obvious when it is extended to cover substantial change. It is indeed true that already, in speaking of the "matter" of accidental change (substance), we go beyond the experience given in sense perception. But, when we attempt to deal with the elements of corporeal substance, we proceed still farther in the process of abstraction. It is impossible to represent to ourselves either primordial matter or substantial form. Any attempt to do so inevitably results in a play of imagination that tends to falsify their nature, for they are not imaginable. The proper objects of our understanding are the essences of those bodies with which we are surrounded (cf. S. Thomas, "De Principio Individuationis"). We have, however, no intuitive knowledge of these, nor of their principles. We may reason about them, indeed, and must so reason if we wish to explain the possibility of change; but to imagine is to court the danger of arriving at entirely false conclusions. Hence whatever may be asserted with regard to primordial matter must necessarily be the result of pure and abstract reasoning upon the concrete data furnished by sense. It is an inexisting principle invoked to account for substantial alteration. But, as St. Thomas Aquinas remarks, whatever knowledge of it we may acquire is reached only by its analogy to "form" (ibid.). The two are the inseparable constituents of corporeal beings. The teaching of Aquinas may be briefly set out here as embodying that also of Aristotle, with which it is in the main identical. It is the teaching commonly received in the School; though various other opinions, to which allusion will be made later, are to be found advanced both before and after its formulation by Aquinas.

(3) *The Nature of Primordial Matter.*—For St. Thomas primordial matter is the common ground of substantial change, the element of indetermination in corporeal beings. It is a pure potentiality, or determinability, void of substantiality, of quality, of quantity, and of all the other accidents that determine sensible being. It is not created, neither is it creatable, but rather concreatable and concreated with Form, (q. v.), to which it is opposed as a correlate, as one of the essential "intrinsic constituents" (De Principiis Naturæ) of those corporeal beings in whose existence the act of creation terminates. Similarly it is not generated, neither does it corrupt in substantial change, since all generation and corruption is a transition in which one substance becomes another, and consequently can only take place in changes of composite subjects. It is produced out of nothing and can only cease to be by falling back into nothingness (De Natura Materiæ, i). Its potentiality is not a property superadded to its essence, for it is a potentiality towards substantial being (In I Phys., Lect. 14). A stronger statement is to be found in "QQ. Disp.", III, Q. iv., a. 2 ad 4: "The relation of primordial matter . . . to passive potentiality is as that of God . . . to active (*potentiam activam*). Therefore matter is its passivity as God is His activity". It is clear throughout that St. Thomas has here in view primordial matter in the uttermost degree of abstraction. Indeed, he is explicit upon the point. "That is commonly called primordial matter which is in the category of substance as a potentiality *cognized apart* from all species and form, and even from privation; yet susceptive of forms and privations" (De spiritual. creat., Q. i, a. 1).

If we were "obliged to define its essence, it would have for specific difference its relation to form, and for genus its substantiality" (Quod., IX, a. 6. 3). And again: "It has its being by reason of that which comes to it, since in itself it has incomplete, or rather no being at all" (De Princip. Naturæ). Such information is mainly negative in character, and the phrases employed by St. Thomas show that there is a certain difficulty in expressing exactly the nature of the principle under consideration. This difficulty evidently arises from the imagination, and with imagination the philosophy of matter has nothing to do. We must begin with the real, the concrete being. To explain this, and the changes it is capable of undergoing, we must infer the coexistence of matter and form determinable and determinant. We may then strip matter, by abstraction, of this or that determination; we may consider it apart from all its determinations. But once attempt to consider it apart from that analogy by which alone we can know it, once strip it mentally of its determinability by form, and nothing—absolute nothing—remains. For matter is neither realizable nor thinkable without its correlative. The proper object of intelligence, and likewise the subject of being, is *Ens, Verum.* Hence St. Thomas teaches further that primordial matter is "a substantial reality" (i. e., a reality reductively belonging to the category of substance), "potential towards all forms, and, under the action of a fit and proportioned efficient cause, determinable to any species of corporeal substance" (In VII Met., sect. 2); and, again: "It is never stripped of form and privation; now it is under one form now under another. Of itself it can never exist" (De Princip. Natur.). What has been said may appear to deny to matter the reality that is predicated of it. This is not the case. As the determinable element in corporeal substance it must have a reality that is not that of the determining form. The mind by abstraction may consider it as potential to any form, but can never overstep the limit of its potentiality as inexistent (cf. Aristotle's τι ἐννπάρχοντος (Phys., iii, 194b, 16) and realized in bodies without finding itself contemplating absolute nothingness. Of itself matter can never exist, and consequently of itself it can never be thought.

(4) *Privation.*—The use of the term "privation" by Aquinas brings us to an exceedingly interesting consideration. While primordial matter, as "understood" without any form or privation, is an indifferent potentiality towards information by any corporeal form, the same matter, considered as realized by a given form, and actually existing, does not connote this indefinite capacity of information. There is, in fact, a certain rhythmic evolution of forms observable in nature. By electrolysis only oxygen and hydrogen can be obtained from water; from oxygen and hydrogen in definite proportions only water is generated. This fact St. Thomas expresses in the physical terms of his time: "If any particular matter, e. g. fire or air, were despoiled of its form, it is manifest that the potentiality towards other educible forms remaining in it would not be so ample, as is the case in regard to matter (considered) universally" (De Nat. Mat., v). The consideration gives us the signification of "privation", as used in the theory of substantial change. Matter is "deprived" of the form or forms towards which alone it is potential when actually existing in some one or other state of determination. Hence the distinction that is found in the Opuscule "De Principiis Naturæ".

(5) *Permanent Matter.*—"Matter that does not con-

note a privation is permanent, whereas that which does is transient". The connotation of a privation limits primordial matter to that which is realized by a form disposing it towards realization by certain other definite forms. "Privation" is the absence of those forms. Permanent matter is matter considered in the highest degree of abstraction, and connoting thereby no more than its correlation to form in general.

(6) *The Unity of Matter.*—Further, this (permanent) matter is said to be one; not however, in the sense of a numerical unity. Every corporeal being is held to result from the union of matter and form. There are in consequence as many distinct individual realized portions of matter as there are distinct bodies (atoms, for example) in the universe. Nevertheless, when the severally determining principles and privations are abstracted from, when matter is cognized in its greatest abstraction, it is cognized as possessing a logical unity. It is understood without any of those dispositions that make it differ numerically with the multiplication of bodies (De Principiis Naturæ).

(7) *Matter as the Principle of Individuation.*—More important is the doctrine that grounds in matter the numerical distinction of specifically identical corporeal beings. In the general doctrine of St. Thomas, the individual—"this thing" (*hoc aliquid*)—is a primordial substance, individualized by the fact that it is what it is ("Substantia individuatur per seipsam": Summa, Pars I, Q. xxix, a. 1). It is intrinsically complete, capable of subsisting in itself as the subject of accidents in the ontological order, and of predicates in the logical. It is undivided in itself, distinct from all other, incommunicable (cf. De Principio Individuationis). These characteristic notes are realized in the case of two substances that differ by essence. Thus, for St. Thomas, no two angels (q. v.) are specifically identical (Summa, Pars I, Q. l, a. 4). More than this, even a corporeal form, however material and low in the hierarchy of forms, would not be other than unique in its species, if it could exist (or be thought), apart from its relation to matter (cf. De Spiritual. Creaturis, Q. i, a. 8). Whiteness, if it could subsist without any subject, would be unique. If a plurality of such accidental forms could subsist they also would differ specifically—as whiteness, redness, etc. But this distinction evidently does not obtain in the case of a number of individuals belonging to one species. They are essentially identical. How is it, then, that they can constitute a plurality? The answer given by St. Thomas to this question is his doctrine of the Principle of Individuation. Whereas the plurality of simple substances, or "forms", is due to a real difference of their essences (as a triangle differs from a circle), the plurality of identical essences, or "forms", supposes an intrinsic principle of individuation for each (as two triangles realized in two pieces of wood). Thus, simple substances differ by reason of their nature, formally; while composite ones differ by reason of an inherent principle, materially. They are multiplied within a given species by reason of matter.

At this point a peculiarly delicate question arises. The abstract essence of man connotes matter. If, then, primordial matter be the principle of individuation, it would seem that the abstract essence is already individualized. Wherein would lie the admitted difference between the species and the individual? On the other hand, if that be not the case, it would appear equally evident that, in adding to the individual a principle not contained in the abstract essence, it would no longer be an object of classification in the species. It would not be merely the concrete realization of the essence, but something more. In either case the doctrine would seem to be incompatible with modern Realism. St. Thomas avoids the difficulty by teaching that matter is the principle of individuation, but only as correlated to quantity. The expressions that he uses are "materia signata", "materia subjecta dimensioni" (In Boeth. de Trin., Q. iv, a. 2), "materia sub certis dimensionibus" (De Nat. Mat., iii). This needs some explanation. Quantity, as such, is an accident; and it is evident that no accident can account for the individuality of its own subject. But quantity results in corporeal substance by reason of matter. Primordial matter, then, considered as such, has a relation to quantity consequent upon its necessary relation to form (De Nat. Mat., iv). When actuated by form it has dimensions—the "inseparable concomitants that determine it in time and place" (De Princip. Individ.). The abstract essence, then, embracing matter as it does form, will connote an aptitude or potentiality towards a quantitative determination, necessarily resultant in each concrete subject realized.

Here, as formerly, the fact must not be lost sight of that the reasoning begins with the concrete bodies actually existing in nature. It is by an abstraction that we consider matter without the actual quantity that it always exhibits when realized in corporeal substance. Peter, as a matter of fact, differs from Paul, yet they are specifically identical as rational animals. Peter is "this" man, and Paul is "that", but "this" and "that", because "here" and "there". "Form is not individuated in that it is received in matter, but only in that it is received in *this* or *that* distinct matter, and determined to here and now" (In Boeth. de Trin. Q. iv, a. 1). It is evident that "here" and "now" are the immediate and inseparable signs for us of the individual. They indicate "*hæc* caro et ossa". And they are only possible by reason of (informed) matter, the ground of divisibility and location in space. Still, it must be noted that "materia signata quantitate" is not to be understood as primordial matter having an aptitude towards fixed and invariable dimensions. The determined dimensions that are found in the existing subject are to be attributed, St. Thomas teaches, to matter as "individuated by indeterminate dimensions preunderstood in it" ("In Boeth. de Trin.", Q. iv, a. 2; "De Nat. Mat.", vii). This remark explains how an individual (as Peter) can vary in dimension without varying in identity; and at the same time gives the reply of Aquinas to the difficulty raised above. Primordial matter, as connoted in the essence, has an aptitude towards indeterminate dimensions. These dimensions when realized are the ground of the determined dimensions (*ibid.*) that make the individual *hic et nunc* an object of sense-perception (De Nat. Materiæ, iii).

(8) The Causality of Matter.—Since Primordial Matter is numbered among the causes of corporeal being, the nature of its causality remains to be considered. (See CAUSE.) All scholastics admit its concurrence with form, as an intrinsic cause; but they are not unanimous as to the precise part it plays. For Suarez it is unitive; for John of St. Thomas receptive. The Conimbricences place its causality in both notes. It would, perhaps, seem more consonant with the doctrine of St. Thomas to adopt Cardinal Mercier's opinion that the causality of matter is first receptive and second unitive; provided always that its essential potentiality be never lost sight of.

(9) Variant Theories of Matter.—The teaching of Aquinas has been given as substantially identical with that of Aristotle. The main point of divergence lies in the opinion of Aristotle that the world—and consequently matter—is eternal. St. Thomas, in accepting the doctrine of Creation, denies the eternity of primordial matter. It is interesting to note how this doctrine of matter, as the potential, or determinable, element in change, unites and corrects the views of Heraclitus, Parmenides, and Plato. The perpetual flux of the first is found in the continual transformations that take place in material nature. The changeless "one" of the second is recognized in the abstract essences eternally identical with themselves. And the world of "ideas" of Plato is assigned its place as a world of intellectual

abstractions practised upon the bodies that fall under the observation of the senses. The universal is immanent in the individual and multiplied by reason of its matter. In the system of Plato, matter (*μὴ ὄν, ἄπειρον*: the "formless and invisible") is also the condition under which being becomes the object of the senses. It gives to being all its imperfections. It is by a mixture of being and nothingness, rather than by the realization of a potentiality, that sensible things exist. While for Aristotle matter is a real element of being, for Plato it is not. Of Neoplatonists, Philo (following Plato and the Stoics) also considered matter the principle of imperfection, of limitation and of evil; Plotinus made it empty space, or a pure possibility of Being.

These systems are mentioned here because through them St. Augustine drew his knowledge of Greek philosophy. And in the doctrine of St. Augustine we find the source of an important current of thought that ran through the Middle Ages. He puts forward at different times two views as to the nature of matter. It is first, corporeal substance in a chaotic state; second, an element of complete indetermination, approaching to the *μὴ ὄν* of Plato. St. Augustine was not directly acquainted with the works of Aristotle, yet he seems to have approached very closely to this thought (probably through the Latin writings of the Neoplatonists) in certain passages of the "Confessions" (cf. Lib. XIII, v, and xxxiii): "For the changeableness of changeable things is capable of all those forms to which the changeable are changed. And what is this? Is it soul? Or body? If it could be said: 'Nothing: something that is and is not', that would I say.". . . "For from nothing they were made by Thee, yet not of Thee: nor of anything not Thine, or which was before, but of concreated matter, because Thou didst create its informity without any interposition of time." St. Augustine does not teach the dependence of quantity upon matter; and he admits a quasi-matter in the angels. Moreover, his doctrine of the *rationes seminales* (of Stoical origin), which found many adherents among later scholastics, clearly assigns to matter something more than the character of pure potentiality attributed to it by St. Thomas. It may be noted that Albert the Great, the predecessor of St. Thomas, also taught this doctrine and, further, was of the opinion that the angelic "forms" must be held to have a *fundamentum*, or ground of differentiation, analogous to matter in corporeal beings.

Following St. Augustine, Alexander of Hales and St. Bonaventure, with the Franciscan School as a whole, teach that matter is one of the intrinsic elements of all creatures. Matter and form together are the principles of individuation for St. Bonaventure. Duns Scotus is more characteristically subtle on the point, which is a capital one in his synthesis. Matter is to be distinguished as: (a) *Materia primo prima*, the universalized indeterminate element of contingent beings. This has real and numerical unity. (b) *Materia secundo prima*, united with "form" and quantified. (c) *Materia tertio prima*, subject of accidental change in existing bodies. For Scotus, who acknowledges his indebtedness to Avicebron for the doctrine (De rerum princip., Q. viii, a. 4), *Materia primo prima* is homogeneous in *all* creatures without exception. His system is dualistic. Among later notable scholastics Suarez may be cited as attributing an existence to primordial matter. This is a logical consequence of his doctrine that no real distinction is to be admitted between essence and existence (q. v.). God could, he teaches, "preserve matter without a form as He can a form without matter" (Disput. Metaph., xv, sec. 9). In his opinion, also, quantified matter no longer appears as the principle of individuation. A considerable number of theologians and philosophers have professed his doctrine upon both these points.

ALBERTUS MAGNUS, *Opera* (Lyons, 1651); ALEXANDER OF HALES, *In duodecim Aristotelis Metaphysicæ libros* (1572); IDEM, *Universæ Theologiæ Summa* (Cologne, 1622); ST. THOMAS AQUINAS, *Opera* (Parma, 1852–72), especially the *Opuscula De Natura Materiæ, De Principio Individuationis, De Spiritualibus Creaturis, In Boethium de Trinitate, De Principiis Naturæ, Quodlibet*, IX, Q. iv, *De Mixtione Elementorum;* ARISTOTLE, *Opera* (Paris, 1619); ST. AUGUSTINE, *Opera* (Antwerp, 1679–1703); ST. BONAVENTURE, *Opera* (Paris, 1864–71); CAIETAN, *Summa . . . Thomæ a Vio . . . Commentariis illustrata* (Lyons, 1562); DE WULF, *Histoire de la Philosophie Médiévale* (Louvain); FARGES, *Matière et Forme en présence des Sciences modernes* (Paris, 1892); GROTE, *Aristotle* (London, 1873); IDEM, *Plato and the other companions of Socrates* (London, 1865); HARPER, *The Metaphysics of the School* (London, 1879); LORENZELLI, *Philosophiæ Theoreticæ Institutiones* (Rome, 1896); MERCIER, *Ontologie* (Louvain, 1902); NYS, *Cosmologie* (Louvain, 1904); SCOTUS, *Opera* (Lyons, 1639); SAINT-HILAIRE, *Œuvres d'Aristote* (Paris, 1837–92); SUAREZ: *Metaphysicarum disputationum* (Mainz, 1605); UEBERWEG: *History of Philosophy*, tr. MORRIS (1872); WINDELBAND, *A History of Philosophy*, tr. TUFTS (New York, 1893).

FRANCIS AVELING.

Matteucci, CARLO, physicist, b. at Forlì, in the Romagna, 21 June, 1811; d. at Ardenza, near Leghorn, 25 July, 1868. He studied mathematics at the University of Bologna, receiving his doctorate in 1829. Then he went to the Paris Ecole Polytechnique for two years as a foreign student. In 1831 he returned to Forlì and began to experiment in physics. In taking up the Voltaic pile he took sides against Volta's contact theory of electricity. He remained at Florence until his father's death in 1834, when he went to Ravenna and later to Pisa. His study of the Voltaic battery led him to announce the law that the decomposition in the electrolytic cell corresponds to the work developed in the elements of the pile. From the external effect it became possible to calculate the material used up in the pile. In 1837 he was invited by his friend Buoninsegni, president of the Ravenna Hospital, to take charge of its chemical laboratory and at the same time assume the title and rank of professor of physics at the college. There he did most excellent work and soon became famous. Arago, hearing of the vacancy in the chair of physics at the University of Pisa, wrote to Humboldt asking him to recommend Matteucci to the Grand-Duke of Tuscany. This application was successful and there at Pisa he continued his researches. Beginning with Arago's and Faraday's discoveries he developed by ingenious experiments our knowledge of electro-statics, electro-dynamics, induced currents, and the like, but his greatest achievements however were in the field of electro-physiology, with frogs, torpedoes, and the like.

He was also successful as a politician. In 1848 Commissioner of Tuscany to Charles Albert; sent to Frankfort to plead the cause of his country before the German Assembly; 1849 in Pisa, director of the telegraphs of Tuscany; 1859 provisional representative of Tuscany at Turin, and then sent to Paris with Peruzzi and Neri Corsini to plead the annexation of Piedmont; 1860 Inspector-General of the telegraph lines of the Italian Kingdom. Senator at the Tuscan Assembly in 1848, and again in the Italian Senate in 1860; Minister of Public Instruction, 1862, in the cabinet of Rattazzi. He won the Copley medal of the Royal Society of London, and was made corresponding member of the Paris Academy of Sciences in 1844. He published a great deal in English, French, and Italian journals of science. His larger works were: "Lezioni di fisica" (4th ed., Pisa, 1858); "Lezioni sui fenomeni fisico-chimici dei corpi viventi" (2nd ed., Pisa, 1846); "Manuale di telegrafia elettrica" (2nd ed., Pisa, 1851); "Cours spécial sur l'induction, le magnétisme de rotation", etc. (Paris, 1854); "Lettres sur l'instruction publique" (Paris, 1864); "Traité des phénomènes electro-physiologiques des animaux" (Paris, 1844).

BIANCHI, *Carlo Matteucci e l'Italia del suo tempo* (Rome, 1874); *Nuova Enciclopedia Italiana* (Turin, 1882).

WILLIAM FOX.

Matthew, SAINT, APOSTLE and EVANGELIST.—The name Matthew is derived from the Hebrew *Mattija*,

ST. MATTHEW

GIOVANNI FRANCESCO BARBIERI (IL GUERCINO), THE GALLERY, DRESDEN

being shortened to *Mattai* in post-Biblical Hebrew. In Greek it is sometimes spelled Μαθθαῖος, B D, and sometimes Ματθαῖος, CEKL, but grammarians do not agree as to which of the two spellings is the original. Matthew is spoken of five times in the New Testament; first in Matt., ix, 9, when called by Jesus to follow Him, and then four times in the list of the Apostles, where he is mentioned in the seventh (Luke, vi, 15, and Mark, iii, 18), and again in the eighth place (Matt., x, 3, and Acts, i, 13). The man designated in Matt., ix, 9, as "sitting in the custom house", and "named Matthew" is the same as Levi, recorded in Mark, ii, 14, and Luke, v, 27, as "sitting at the receipt of custom". The account in the three Synoptics is identical, the vocation of Matthew-Levi being alluded to in the same terms. Hence Levi was the original name of the man who was subsequently called Matthew; the Μαθθαῖος λεγόμενος of Matt., ix, 9, would indicate this. The fact of one man having two names is of frequent occurrence among the Jews. It is true that the same person usually bears a Hebrew name such as "Shaoul" and a Greek name, Παῦλος. However, we have also examples of individuals with two Hebrew names as, for instance, Joseph-Caiphas, Simon-Cephas, etc. It is probable that Mattija, "gift of Iaveh", was the name conferred upon the tax-gatherer by Jesus Christ when He called him to the Apostolate, and by it he was thenceforth known among his Christian brethren, Levi being his original name. Matthew, the son of Alpheus (Mark, ii, 14) was a Galilean, although Eusebius informs us that he was a Syrian. As tax-gatherer at Capharnaum, he collected custom-duties for Herod Antipas and, although a Jew, was despised by the Pharisees, who hated all publicans. When summoned by Jesus, Matthew arose and followed Him and tendered Him a feast in his house, where tax-gatherers and sinners sat at table with Christ and His disciples. This drew forth a protest from the Pharisees whom Jesus rebuked in these consoling words: "I came not to call the just, but sinners." No further allusion is made to Matthew in the Gospels, except in the list of the Apostles. As a disciple and an Apostle he thenceforth followed Christ, accompanying Him up to the time of His Passion and, in Galilee, was one of the witnesses of His Resurrection. He was also amongst the Apostles who were present at the Ascension, and afterwards withdrew to an upper chamber, in Jerusalem, praying in union with Mary, the Mother of Jesus, and with his brethren (Acts, i, 10 and 14).

Of Matthew's subsequent career we have only inaccurate or legendary data. St. Irenæus tells us that Matthew preached the Gospel among the Hebrews, St. Clement of Alexandria claiming that he did this for fifteen years, and Eusebius maintains that, before going into other countries, he gave them his Gospel in the mother tongue. Ancient writers are not as one as to the countries evangelized by Matthew, but almost all mention Ethiopia to the south of the Caspian Sea (not Ethiopia in Africa), and some Persia and the kingdom of the Parthians, Macedonia, and Syria. According to Heracleon, who is quoted by Clement of Alexandria, Matthew did not die a martyr, but this opinion conflicts with all other ancient testimony. Let us add, however, that the account of his martyrdom in the apocryphal Greek writings entitled "Martyrium S. Matthæi in Ponto" and published by Bonnet, "Acta apostolorum apocrypha" (Leipzig, 1898), is absolutely devoid of historic value. Lipsius holds that this "Martyrium S. Matthæi", which contains traces of Gnosticism, must have been published in the third century. There is a disagreement as to the place of St. Matthew's martyrdom and the kind of torture inflicted on him, therefore it is not known whether he was burned, stoned, or beheaded. The Roman Martyrology simply says: "S. Matthæi, qui in Æthiopia prædicans martyrium passus est". Various writings that are now considered apocryphal, have been attributed to St. Matthew. In the "Evangelia apocrypha" (Leipzig, 1876), Tischendorf reproduced a Latin document entitled: "De Ortu beatæ Mariæ et infantia Salvatoris", supposedly written in Hebrew by St. Matthew the Evangelist, and translated into Latin by Jerome, the priest. It is an abridged adaptation of the "Protoevangelium" of St. James, which was a Greek apocryphal of the second century. This pseudo-Matthew dates from the middle or the end of the sixth century, and M. Aman has just given us a new edition of it: "Le Protévangile de Jacques et ses remaniements latins" (Paris, 1910). The Latin Church celebrates the feast of St. Matthew on 21 September, and the Greek Church on 16 November. St. Matthew is represented under the symbol of a winged man, carrying in his hand a lance as a characteristic emblem.

E. Jacquier.

Matthew, Saint, Gospel of.—I. Canonicity.—The earliest Christian communities looked upon the Books of the Old Testament as Sacred Scripture, and read them at their religious assemblies. That the Gospels, which contained the words of Christ and the narrative of His life, soon enjoyed the same authority as the Old Testament, is made clear by Hegesippus (Eusebius, "Hist. eccl.", IV, xxii, 3), who tells us that in every city the Christians were faithful to the teachings of the law, the prophets, and the Lord. A book was acknowledged as canonical when the Church regarded it as Apostolic, and had it read at her assemblies. Hence, to establish the canonicity of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, we must investigate primitive Christian tradition for the use that was made of this document, and for indications proving that it was regarded as Scripture in the same manner as the Books of the Old Testament.

The first traces that we find of it are not indubitable, because post-Apostolic writers quoted the texts with a certain freedom, and principally because it is difficult to say whether the passages thus quoted were taken from oral tradition or from a written Gospel. The first Christian document whose date can be fixed with comparative certainty (95–98), is the Epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians. It contains sayings of the Lord which closely resemble those recorded in the First Gospel (Clement, xvi, 17=Matt., xi, 29; Clem., xxiv, 5=Matt., xiii, 3), but it is possible that they are derived from Apostolic preaching, as, in chapter xiii, 2, we find a mixture of sentences from Matthew, Luke, and an unknown source. Again, we note a similar commingling of Evangelical texts elsewhere in the same Epistle of Clement, in the Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles, in the Epistle of Polycarp, and in Clement of Alexandria. Whether these texts were thus combined in oral tradition or emanated from a collection of Christ's utterances, we are unable to say.—The Epistles of St. Ignatius (martyred 110–17) contain no literal quotation from the Holy Books; nevertheless, St. Ignatius borrowed expressions and some sentences from Matthew ("Ad Polyc.", ii, 2=Matt., x, 16; "Eph.", xiv, 2=Matt., xii, 33, etc.). In his "Epistle to the Philadelphians" (v, 12), he speaks of the Gospel in which he takes refuge as in the Flesh of Jesus; consequently, he had an Evangelical collection which he regarded as Sacred Writ, and we cannot doubt that the Gospel of St. Matthew formed part of it.—In the Epistle of St. Polycarp (110–17), we find various passages from St. Matthew quoted literally (xii, 3=Matt., v, 44; vii, 2=Matt., xxvi, 41, etc.).—The Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles contains sixty-six passages that recall the Gospel of Matthew; some of them are literal quotations (viii, 2=Matt., vi, 7–13; vii, 1=Matt., xxviii, 19; xi, 7=Matt., xii, 31, etc.).—In the so-called Epistle of Barnabas (117–30), we find a passage from St. Matthew (xxii, 14), introduced by the scriptural formula, ὡς γέγραπται, which proves that the author considered

the Gospel of Matthew equal in point of authority to the writings of the Old Testament.—The "Shepherd of Hermas" has several passages which bear close resemblance to passages of Matthew, but not a single literal quotation from it.—In his "Dialogue" (xcix, 8), St. Justin quotes, almost literally, the prayer of Christ in the Garden of Olives, in Matthew, xxvi, 39, 40.

A great number of passages in the writings of St. Justin recall the Gospel of Matthew, and prove that he ranked it among the Memoirs of the Apostles which, he said, were called Gospels (I Apol., lxvi), were read in the services of the Church (ibid., lxvii), and were consequently regarded as Scripture.—In his "Legatio pro christianis", xii, 11, Athenagoras (117) quotes almost literally sentences taken from the Sermon on the Mount (Matt., v, 44).—Theophilus of Antioch (Ad Autol., III, xiii-xiv) quotes a passage from Matthew (v, 28, 32), and, according to St. Jerome (In Matt. Prol.), wrote a commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew.—We find in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs—drawn up, according to some critics, about the middle of the second century—numerous passages that closely resemble the Gospel of Matthew (Test. Gad, v, 3; vi, 6; v, 7=Matt., xviii, 15, 35; Test. Jos., i, 5, 6=Matt., xxv, 35, 36, etc.), but Dr. Charles maintains that the Testaments were written in Hebrew in the first century before Jesus Christ, and translated into Greek towards the middle of the same century. In this event, the Gospel of Matthew would depend upon the Testaments and not the Testaments upon the Gospel. The question is not yet settled, but it seems to us that there is a greater probability that the Testaments, at least in their Greek version, are of later date than the Gospel of Matthew; they certainly received numerous Christian additions.—The Greek text of the Clementine Homilies contains some quotations from Matthew (Hom. iii, 52=Matt., xv, 13); in Hom. xviii, 15, the quotation from Matt., xiii, 35, is literal.—Passages which suggest the Gospel of Matthew might be quoted from heretical writings of the second century and from apocryphal gospels—the Gospel of Peter, the Protoevangelium of James, etc., in which the narratives, to a considerable extent, are derived from the Gospel of Matthew.—Tatian incorporated the Gospel of Matthew in his "Diatesseron"; we shall quote below the testimonies of Papias and St. Irenæus. For the latter, the Gospel of Matthew, from which he quotes numerous passages, was one of the four that constituted the quadriform Gospel dominated by a single spirit.—Tertullian (Adv. Marc., IV, ii) asserts, that the "Instrumentum evangelicum" was composed by the Apostles, and mentions Matthew as the author of a Gospel (De carne Christi, xii).—Clement of Alexandria (Strom., III, xiii) speaks of the four Gospels that have been transmitted, and quotes over three hundred passages from the Gospel of Matthew, which he introduces by the formula, *ἐν δὲ τῷ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγελίῳ* or by *φησὶν ὁ κύριος*.

It is unnecessary to pursue our inquiry further. About the middle of the third century, the Gospel of Matthew was received by the whole Christian Church as a Divinely inspired document, and consequently as canonical. The testimony of Origen ("In Matt.", quoted by Eusebius, "Hist. eccl.", III, xxv, 4), of Eusebius (op. cit., III, xxiv, 5; xxv, 1), and of St. Jerome ("De Viris Ill.", iii, "Prolog. in Matt.") are explicit in this respect. It might be added that this Gospel is found in the most ancient versions: Old Latin, Syriac, and Egyptian. Finally, it stands at the head of the Books of the New Testament in the Canon of the Council of Laodicea (363) and in that of St. Athanasius (326–73), and very probably it was in the last part of the Muratorian Canon. Furthermore, the canonicity of the Gospel of St. Matthew is accepted by the entire Christian world.

II. Authenticity of the First Gospel.—The question of authenticity assumes an altogether special aspect in regard to the First Gospel. The early Christian writers assert that St. Matthew wrote a Gospel in Hebrew; this Hebrew Gospel has, however, entirely disappeared, and the Gospel which we have, and from which ecclesiastical writers borrow quotations as coming from the Gospel of Matthew, is in Greek. What connexion is there between this Hebrew Gospel and this Greek Gospel, both of which tradition ascribes to St. Matthew? Such is the problem that presents itself for solution. Let us first examine the facts.

A. *Testimony of Tradition.*—According to Eusebius (Hist. eccl., III, xxxix, 16), Papias said that Matthew collected (*συνετάξατο;* or, according to two manuscripts, *συνεγράψατο*, composed) *τὰ λόγια* (the oracles or maxims of Jesus) in the Hebrew (Aramaic) language, and that each one translated them as best he could.

Three questions arise in regard to this testimony of Papias on Matthew: (1) What does the word *λόγια* signify? Does it mean only detached sentences or sentences incorporated in a narrative, that is to say, a Gospel such as that of St. Matthew? Among classical writers, *λόγιον*, the diminutive of *λόγος*, signifies the "answer of oracles", a "prophecy"; in the Septuagint and in Philo, "oracles of God" (*τὰ δέκα λόγια*, the Ten Commandments). It sometimes has a broader meaning and seems to include both facts and sayings. In the New Testament the signification of the word *λόγιον* is doubtful, and if, strictly speaking, it may be claimed to indicate teachings and narratives, the meaning "oracles" is the more natural. However, writers contemporary with Papias—e. g. St. Clement of Rome (Ad Cor., liii), St. Irenæus (Adv. Hær., I, viii, 2), Clement of Alexandria (Strom., I, cccxcii), and Origen (De Princip., IV, xi)—have used it to designate facts and sayings. The work of Papias was entitled "Exposition of the Oracles [*λογίων*] of the Lord", and it also contained narratives (Eusebius, "Hist. eccl.", III, xxxix, 9). On the other hand, speaking of the Gospel of Mark, Papias says that this Evangelist wrote all that Christ had said and done, but adds that he established no connexion between the Lord's sayings (*σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων*). We may believe that here *λογίων* comprises all that Christ said and did. Nevertheless, it would seem that, if the two passages on Mark and Matthew followed each other in Papias as in Eusebius, the author intended to emphasize a difference between them, by implying that Mark recorded the Lord's words and deeds and Matthew chronicled His discourses. The question is still unsolved; it is, however, possible that, in Papias, the term *λόγια* means deeds and teachings.

(2) Second, does Papias refer to oral or written translations of Matthew, when he says that each one translated the sayings "as best he could"? As there is nowhere any allusion to numerous Greek translations of the Logia of Matthew, it is probable that Papias speaks here of the oral translations made at Christian meetings, similar to the extemporaneous translations of the Old Testament made in the synagogues. This would explain why Papias mentions that each one (each reader) translated "as best he could".

(3) Finally, were the Logia of Matthew and the Gospel to which ecclesiastical writers refer written in Hebrew or Aramaic? Both hypotheses are held. Papias says that Matthew wrote the Logia in the Hebrew (*ἑβραΐδι*) language; St. Irenæus and Eusebius maintain that he wrote his Gospel for the Hebrews in their national language, and the same assertion is found in several writers. Matthew would, therefore, seem to have written in modernized Hebrew, the language then used by the scribes for teaching. But, in the time of Christ, the national language of the Jews was Aramaic, and when, in the New Testament, there is mention of the Hebrew language (*ἑβραΐς διάλεκτος*), it is Aramaic that is implied. Hence, the aforesaid

writers may allude to the Aramaic and not to the Hebrew. Besides, as they assert, the Apostle Matthew wrote his Gospel to help popular teaching. To be understood by his readers who spoke Aramaic, he would have had to reproduce the original catechesis in this language, and it cannot be imagined why, or for whom, he should have taken the trouble to write it in Hebrew, when it would have had to be translated thence into Aramaic for use in religious services. Moreover, Eusebius (Hist. eccl., III, xxiv, 6) tells us that the Gospel of Matthew was a reproduction of his preaching, and this, we know, was in Aramaic. An investigation of the Semitic idioms observed in the Gospel does not permit us to conclude as to whether the original was in Hebrew or Aramaic, as the two languages are so closely related. Besides, it must be borne in mind that the greater part of these Semitisms simply reproduce colloquial Greek and are not of Hebrew or Aramaic origin. However, we believe the second hypothesis to be the more probable, viz., that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Aramaic.

Let us now recall the testimony of the other ecclesiastical writers on the Gospel of St. Matthew. St. Irenæus (Adv. Hær., III, i, 2) affirms that Matthew published among the Hebrews a Gospel which he wrote in their own language. Eusebius (Hist. eccl., V, x, 3) says that, in India, Pantænus found the Gospel according to St. Matthew written in the Hebrew language, the Apostle Bartholomew having left it there. Again, in his "Hist. eccl." (VI, xxv, 3, 4), Eusebius tells us that Origen, in his first book on the Gospel of St. Matthew, states that he has learned from tradition that the First Gospel was written by Matthew, who, having composed it in Hebrew, published it for the converts from Judaism. According to Eusebius (Hist. eccl., III, xxiv, 6), Matthew preached first to the Hebrews and, when obliged to go to other countries, gave them his Gospel written in his native tongue. St. Jerome has repeatedly declared that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew ("Ad Damasum", xx; "Ad Hedib.", iv), but says that it is not known with certainty who translated it into Greek. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Gregory of Nazianzus, St. Epiphanius, St. John Chrysostom, St. Augustine, etc., and all the commentators of the Middle Ages repeat that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew. Erasmus was the first to express doubts on this subject: "It does not seem probable to me that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, since no one testifies that he has seen any trace of such a volume." This is not accurate, as St. Jerome uses Matthew's Hebrew text several times to solve difficulties of interpretation, which proves that he had it at hand. Pantænus also had it, as, according to St. Jerome ("De Viris Ill.", xxxvi), he brought it back to Alexandria. However, the testimony of Pantænus is only second-hand, and that of Jerome remains rather ambiguous, since in neither case is it positively known that the writer did not mistake the Gospel according to the Hebrews (written of course in Hebrew) for the Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew. However, all ecclesiastical writers assert that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, and, by quoting the Greek Gospel and ascribing it to Matthew, thereby affirm it to be a translation of the Hebrew Gospel.

B. *Examination of the Greek Gospel of St. Matthew.*—Our chief object is to ascertain whether the characteristics of the Greek Gospel indicate that it is a translation from the Aramaic, or that it is an original document; but, that we may not have to revert to the peculiarities of the Gospel of Matthew, we shall here treat them in full.

(1) The Language of the Gospel.—St. Matthew used about 1475 words, 137 of which are *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* (words used by him alone of all the New Testament writers). Of these latter 76 are classical; 21 are found in the Septuagint; 15 (*βαττολογεῖν, βιαστής, εὐνουχίζειν*, etc.) were introduced for the first time by Matthew, or at least he was the first writer in whom they were discovered; 8 words (*ἀφεδρών, γαμίζειν*, etc.) were employed for the first time by Matthew and Mark, and 15 others (*ἐκχύνεσθαι, ἐπιούσιος* etc.) by Matthew and another New Testament writer. It is probable that, at the time of the Evangelist, all these words were in current use. Matthew's Gospel contains many peculiar expressions which help to give decided colour to his style. Thus, he employs thirty-four times the expression *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*; this is never found in Mark and Luke, who, in parallel passages, replace it by *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*, which also occurs four times in Matthew. We must likewise note the expressions: *ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐπουράνιος, ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, συναίρειν λόγον, εἰπεῖν τι κατά τινος, μέχρι τῆς σήμερον, ποιῆσαι ὡς, ὥσπερ, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ, ἐγείρεσθαι ἀπό*, etc. The same terms often recur: *τότε* (90 times), *ἀπὸ τότε, καὶ ἰδού* etc. He adopts the Greek form *Ἱεροσόλυμα* for Jerusalem, and not *Ἱερουσάλημ*, which he uses but once. He has a predilection for the preposition *ἀπό*, using it even when Mark and Luke use *ἐκ*, and for the expression *υἱὸς Δαυίδ*. Moreover, Matthew is fond of repeating a phrase or a special construction several times within quite a short interval (cf. ii, 1, 13, and 19; iv, 12, 18, and v, 2; viii, 2–3 and 28; ix, 26 and 31; xiii, 44, 45, and 47, etc.). Quotations from the Old Testament are variously introduced, as: *οὕτως, καθὼς γέγραπται, ἵνα*, or *ὅπως, πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ Κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου*, etc. These peculiarities of language, especially the repetition of the same words and expressions, would indicate that the Greek Gospel was an original rather than a translation, and this is confirmed by the paronomasiæ (*βαττολογεῖν, πολυλογία; κόψονται καὶ ὄψονται*, etc.), which ought not to have been found in the Aramaic, by the employment of the genitive absolute, and, above all, by the linking of clauses through the use of *μέν . . . δέ*, a construction that is peculiarly Greek. However, let us observe that these various characteristics prove merely that the writer was thoroughly conversant with his language, and that he translated his text rather freely. Besides, these same characteristics are noticeable in Christ's sayings, as well as in the narratives, and, as these utterances were made in Aramaic, they were consequently translated; thus, the construction *μέν . . . δέ* (except in one instance) and all the examples of paronomasia occur in discourses of Christ. The fact that the genitive absolute is used mainly in the narrative portions, only denotes that the latter were more freely translated; besides, Hebrew possesses an analogous grammatical construction. On the other hand, a fair number of Hebraisms are noticed in Matthew's Gospel (*οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτήν, ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοί, εἰ ἔξεστιν, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί*, etc.), which favour the belief that the original was Aramaic. Still, it remains to be proved that these Hebraisms are not colloquial Greek expressions.

(2) General Character of the Gospel.—Distinct unity of plan, an artificial arrangement of subject-matter, and a simple, easy style—much purer than that of Mark—suggest an original rather than a translation. When the First Gospel is compared with books translated from the Hebrew, such as those of the Septuagint, a marked difference is at once apparent. The original Hebrew shines through every line of the latter, whereas, in the First Gospel Hebraisms are comparatively rare, and are merely such as might be looked for in a book written by a Jew and reproducing Jewish teaching. However, these observations are not conclusive in favour of a Greek original. In the first place, the unity of style that prevails throughout the book, would rather prove that we have a translation. It is certain that a good portion of the matter existed first in Aramaic—at all events, the sayings of Christ, and thus almost three-quarters of the Gospel. Consequently, these at least the Greek writer has translated. And, since no difference in language and

style can be detected between the sayings of Christ and the narratives that are claimed to have been composed in Greek, it would seem that these latter are also translated from the Aramaic. This conclusion is based on the fact that they are of the same origin as the discourses. The unity of plan and the artificial arrangement of subject-matter could as well have been made in Matthew's Aramaic as in the Greek document; the fine Greek construction, the lapidary style, the elegance and good order claimed as characteristic of the Gospel, are largely a matter of opinion, the proof being that critics do not agree on this question. Although the phraseology is not more Hebraic than in the other Gospels, still it is not much less so. To sum up, from the literary examination of the Greek Gospel no certain conclusion can be drawn against the existence of a Hebrew Gospel of which our First Gospel would be a translation; and inversely, this examination does not prove the Greek Gospel to be a translation of an Aramaic original.

(3) Quotations from the Old Testament.—It is claimed that most of the quotations from the Old Testament are borrowed from the Septuagint, and that this fact proves that the Gospel of Matthew was composed in Greek. The first proposition is not accurate, and, even if it were, it would not necessitate this conclusion. Let us examine the facts. As established by Stanton ("The Gospels as Historical Documents", II, Cambridge, 1909, p. 342), the quotations from the Old Testament in the First Gospel are divided into two classes. In the first are ranged all those quotations the object of which is to show that the prophecies have been realized in the events of the life of Jesus. They are introduced by the words: "Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which the Lord spoke by the prophet," or other similar expressions. The quotations of this class do not in general correspond exactly with any particular text. Three among them (ii, 15; viii, 17; xxvii, 9, 10) are borrowed from the Hebrew; five (ii, 18; iv, 15, 16; xii, 18–21; xiii, 35; xxi, 4, 5) bear points of resemblance to the Septuagint, but were not borrowed from that version. In the answer of the chief priests and scribes to Herod (ii, 6), the text of the Old Testament is slightly modified, without, however, conforming either to the Hebrew or the Septuagint. The Prophet Micheas writes (v, 2): "And thou Bethlehem, Ephrata, art a little one among the thousands of Juda"; whereas Matthew says (ii, 6): "*And thou Bethlehem the land of Juda art not the least among the princes of Juda*". A single quotation of this first class (iii, 3) conforms to the Septuagint, and another (i, 23) is almost conformable. These quotations are to be referred to the first Evangelist himself, and relate to facts, principally to the birth of Jesus (i, ii), then to the mission of John the Baptist, the preaching of the Gospel by Jesus in Galilee, the miracles of Jesus, etc. It is surprising that the narratives of the Passion and the Resurrection of Our Lord, the fulfilment of the very clear and numerous prophecies of the Old Testament, should never be brought into relation with these prophecies. Many critics, e. g. Burkitt and Stanton, think that the quotations of the first class are borrowed from a collection of Messianic passages, Stanton being of opinion that they were accompanied by the event that constituted their realization. This "catena of fulfilments of prophecy", as he calls it, existed originally in Aramic, but whether the author of the First Gospel had a Greek translation of it is uncertain. The second class of quotations from the Old Testament is chiefly composed of those repeated either by the Lord or by His interrogators. Except in two passages, they are introduced by one of the formulæ: "It is written"; "As it is written"; "Have you not read?" "Moses said". Where Matthew alone quotes the Lord's words, the quotation is sometimes borrowed from the Septuagint (v, 21 a, 27, 38), or, again, it is a free translation which we are unable to refer to any definite text (v, 21 b, 23, 43). In those passages where Matthew runs parallel with Mark and Luke or with either of them, all the quotations save one (xi, 10) are taken almost literally from the Septuagint.

(4) Analogy to the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke.—From a first comparison of the Gospel of Matthew with the two other Synoptic Gospels we find (α) that 330 verses are peculiar to it alone; that it has between 330 and 370 in common with both the others, from 170 to 180 with Mark's, and from 230 to 240 with Luke's; (β) that in like parts the same ideas are expressed sometimes in identical and sometimes in different terms; that Matthew and Mark most frequently use the same expressions, Matthew seldom agreeing with Luke against Mark. The divergence in their use of the same expressions is in the number of a noun or the use of two different tenses of the same verb. The construction of sentences is at times identical and at others different. (γ) That the order of narrative is, with certain exceptions which we shall later indicate, almost the same in Matthew, Mark, and Luke. These facts indicate that the three Synoptists are not independent of one another. They borrow their subject-matter from the same oral source or else from the same written documents. To declare oneself upon this alternative, it would be necessary to treat the synoptic question, and on this critics have not yet agreed. We shall, therefore, restrict ourselves to what concerns the Gospel of St. Matthew. From a second comparison of this Gospel with Mark and Luke we ascertain: (a) that Mark is to be found almost complete in Matthew, with certain divergences which we shall note; (b) that Matthew records many of our Lord's discourses in common with Luke; (c) that Matthew has special passages which are unknown to Mark and Luke. Let us examine these three points in detail, in an endeavour to learn how the Gospel of Matthew was composed.

(a) Analogy to Mark.—(i) Mark is found complete in Matthew, with the exception of numerous slight omissions and the following pericopes: Mark, i, 23–28, 35–39; iv, 26–29; vii, 32–36; viii, 22–26; ix, 39, 40; xii, 41–44. In all, 31 verses are omitted. (ii) The general order is identical except that, in chapters v–xiii, Matthew groups facts of the same nature and sayings conveying the same ideas. Thus, in Matt., viii, 1–15, we have three miracles that are separated in Mark; in Matthew, viii, 23–ix, 9, there are gathered together incidents otherwise arranged in Mark, etc. Matthew places sentences in a different environment from that given them by Mark. For instance, in chapter v, 15, Matthew inserts a verse occurring in Mark, iv, 21, that should have been placed after xiii, 23, etc. (iii) In Matthew the narrative is usually shorter because he suppresses a great number of details. Thus, in Mark, we read: "And the wind ceased: and there was made a great calm", whereas in Matthew the first part of the sentence is omitted. All unnecessary particulars are dispensed with, such as the numerous picturesque features and indications of time, place, and number, in which Mark's narrative abounds. (iv) Sometimes, however, Matthew is the more detailed. Thus, in chapter xii, 22–45, he gives more of Christ's discourse than we find in Mark, iii, 20–30, and has in addition a dialogue between Jesus and the scribes. In chapter xiii, Matthew dwells at greater length than Mark, iv, upon the object of the parables, and introduces those of the cockle and the leaven, neither of which Mark records. Moreover, Our Lord's apocalyptic discourse is much longer in Matthew, xxiv–xxv (97 verses), than in Mark, xiii (37 verses). (v) Changes of terms or divergences in the mode of expression are extremely frequent. Thus, Matthew often uses εὐθέως, when Mark has εὐθύς; μέν . . . δέ, instead of καί, as in Mark, etc.; the aorist instead of the imperfect employed by Mark. He avoids double negatives and the construction of the participle with εἰμί; his style is more correct and less harsh than that of Mark; he

resolves Mark's compound verbs, and replaces by terms in current use the rather unusual expressions introduced by Mark, etc. (vi) He is free from the lack of precision which, to a slight extent, characterizes Mark. Thus, Matthew says "the tetrarch" and not "the king" as Mark does, in speaking of Herod Antipas; "on the third day" instead of "in three days". At times the changes are more important. Instead of "Levi, son of Alpheus," he says: "a man named Matthew"; he mentions two demoniacs and two blind persons, whereas Mark mentions only one of each, etc. (vii) Matthew extenuates or omits everything which, in Mark, might be construed in a sense derogatory to the Person of Christ or unfavourable to the disciples. Thus, in speaking of Jesus, he suppresses the following phrases: "And looking round about on them with anger" (Mark, iii, 5); "And when his friends had heard of it, they went out to lay hold on him. For they said: He is beside himself" (Mark, iii, 21), etc. Speaking of the disciples, he does not say, like Mark, that "they understood not the word, and they were afraid to ask him" (ix, 31; cf. viii, 17, 18); or that the disciples were in a state of profound amazement, because "they understood not concerning the loaves; for their heart was blinded" (vi, 52), etc. He likewise omits whatever might shock his readers, as the saying of the Lord recorded by Mark: "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath" (ii, 27). Omissions or alterations of this kind are very numerous. It must, however, be remarked that between Matthew and Mark there are many points of resemblance in the construction of sentences (Matt., ix, 6 = Mark, ii, 10; Matt., xxvi, 47 = Mark, xiv, 43, etc.); in their mode of expression, often unusual, and in short phrases (Matt., ix, 16 = Mark, ii, 21; Matt., xvi, 28 = Mark, ix, 1; Matt., xx, 25 = Mark, x, 42); in some pericopes, narratives, or discourses, where the greater part of the terms are identical (Matt., iv, 18–22 = Mark, i, 16–20; Matt., xxvi, 36–38 = Mark, xiv, 32–34; Matt., ix, 5, 6 = Mark, ii, 9–11), etc. (Cf. Hawkins, "Horæ synopticæ", pp. 54–67.)

(b) Analogy to Luke.—A comparison of Matthew and Luke reveals that they have but one narrative in common, viz., the cure of the centurion's servant (Matt., viii, 5–13 = Luke, vii, 1–10). The additional matter common to these Evangelists, consists of the discourses and sayings of Christ. In Matthew His discourses are usually gathered together, whereas in Luke they are more frequently scattered. Nevertheless, Matthew and Luke have in common the following discourses: the Sermon on the Mount (Matt., v–vii = the Sermon in the Plain, Luke, vi); the Lord's exhortation to His disciples whom He sends forth on a mission (Matt., x, 19–20, 26–33 = Luke, xii, 11–12, 2–9); the discourse on John the Baptist (Matt., xi = Luke, vii); the discourse on the Last Judgment (Matt., xxiv = Luke, xvii). Moreover, these two Evangelists possess in common a large number of detached sentences, e. g., Matt., iii, 7b–10, 12 = Luke, iii, 7b–9, 17; Matt., iv, 3–11 = Luke, iv, 3–13; Matt., ix, 37, 38 = Luke, x, 2; Matt., xii, 43–45 = Luke, xi, 24–26, etc. (cf. Rushbrooke, "Synopticon", pp. 134–70). However, in these parallel passages of Matthew and Luke there are numerous differences of expression, and even some divergences in ideas or in the manner of their presentation. It is only necessary to recall the Beatitudes (Matt., v, 3–12 = Luke, vi, 20b–25): in Matthew there are eight beatitudes, whereas in Luke there are only four, which, while approximating to Matthew's in point of conception, differ from them in general form and expression. In addition to having in common parts that Mark has not, Matthew and Luke sometimes agree against Mark in parallel narratives. There have been counted 240 passages wherein Matthew and Luke harmonize with each other, but disagree with Mark in the way of presenting events, and particularly in the use of the same terms and the same grammatical emendations. Matthew and Luke omit the very pericopes that occur in Mark.

(c) Parts peculiar to Matthew.—These are numerous, as Matthew has 330 verses that are distinctly his own. Sometimes long passages occur, such as those recording the Nativity and early Childhood (i, ii), the cure of the two blind men and one dumb man (ix, 27–34), the death of Judas (xxvii, 3–10), the guard placed at the Sepulchre (xxvii, 62–66), the imposture of the chief priests (xxviii, 11–15), the apparition of Jesus in Galilee (xxviii, 16–20), a great portion of the Sermon on the Mount (v, 17–37; vi, 1–8; vii, 12–23), parables (xiii, 24–30; 35–53; xxv, 1–13), the Last Judgment (xxv, 31–46), etc., and sometimes detached sentences, as in xxiii, 3, 28, 33; xxvii, 25, etc. (cf. Rushbrooke, "Synopticon", pp. 171–97). Those passages in which Matthew reminds us that facts in the life of Jesus are the fulfilment of the prophecies, are likewise noted as peculiar to him, but of this we have already spoken.

These various considerations have given rise to a great number of hypotheses, varying in detail, but agreeing fundamentally. According to the majority of present critics—H. Holtzmann, Wendt, Jülicher, Wernle, von Soden, Wellhausen, Harnack, B. Weiss, Nicolardot, W. Allen, Montefiore, Plummer, and Stanton—the author of the First Gospel used two documents: the Gospel of Mark in its present or in an earlier form, and a collection of discourses or sayings, which is designated by the letter *Q*. The repetitions occurring in Matthew (v, 29, 30 = xviii, 8, 9; v, 32 = xix, 9; x, 22a = xxiv, 9b; xii, 39b = xvi, 4a, etc.) may be explained by the fact that two sources furnished the writer with material for his Gospel. Furthermore, Matthew used documents of his own. In this hypothesis the Greek Gospel is supposed to be original, and not the translation of a complete Aramaic Gospel. It is admitted that the collection of sayings was originally Aramaic, but it is disputed whether the Evangelist had it in this form or in that of a Greek translation. Critics also differ regarding the manner in which Matthew used the sources. Some would have it that Matthew the Apostle was not the author of the First Gospel, but merely the collector of the sayings of Christ mentioned by Papias. "However", says Jülicher, "the author's individuality is so strikingly evident in his style and tendencies that it is impossible to consider the Gospel a mere compilation". Most critics are of a like opinion. Endeavours have been made to reconcile the information furnished by tradition with the facts resulting from the study of the Gospel as follows: Matthew was known to have collected in Aramaic the sayings of Christ, and, on the other hand, there existed at the beginning of the second century a Gospel containing the narratives found in Mark and the sayings gathered by Matthew in Aramaic. It is held that the Greek Gospel ascribed to Matthew is a translation of it, made by him or by other translators whose names it was later attempted to ascertain.

To safeguard tradition further, while taking into consideration the facts we have already noted, it might be supposed that the three Synoptists worked upon the same catechesis, either oral or written and originally in Aramaic, and that they had detached portions of this catechesis, varying in literary condition. The divergences may be explained first by this latter fact, and then by the hypothesis of different translations and by each Evangelist's peculiar method of treating the subject-matter, Matthew and Luke especially having adapted it to the purpose of their Gospel. There is nothing to prevent the supposition that Matthew worked on the Aramaic catechesis; the literary emendations of Mark's text by Matthew may have been due to the translator, who was more conversant with Greek than was the popular preacher who furnished the catechesis reproduced by Mark. In reality, the only difficulty lies in explaining the simi-

larity of style between Matthew and Mark. First of all, we may observe that the points of resemblance are less numerous than they are said to be. As we have seen, they are very rare in the narratives at all events, much more so than in the discourses of Christ. Why, then, should we not suppose that the three Synoptists, depending upon the same Aramaic catechesis, sometimes agreed in rendering similar Aramaic expressions in the same Greek words? It is also possible to suppose that sayings of Christ, which in the three Synoptic Gospels (or in two of them) differed only in a few expressions, were unified by copyists or other persons. To us it seems probable that Matthew's Greek translator used Mark's Greek Gospel, especially for Christ's discourses. Luke, also, may have similarly utilized Matthew's Greek Gospel in rendering the discourses of Christ. Finally, even though we should suppose that Matthew were the author only of the *Logia*, the full scope of which we do not know, and that a part of his Greek Gospel is derived from that of Mark, we would still have a right to ascribe this First Gospel to Matthew as its principal author.

Other hypotheses have been put forth. In Zahn's opinion, Matthew wrote a complete Gospel in Aramaic; Mark was familiar with this document, which he used while abridging it. Matthew's Greek translator utilized Mark, but only for form, whereas Luke depended upon Mark and secondary sources, but was not acquainted with Matthew. According to Belser, Matthew first wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, a Greek translation of it being made in 59–60, and Mark depended on Matthew's Aramaic document and Peter's preaching. Luke made use of Mark, of Matthew (both in Aramaic and Greek), and also of oral tradition. According to Camerlynck and Coppieters, the First Gospel in its present form was composed either by Matthew or some other Apostolic writer long before the end of the first century, by combining the Aramaic work of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke.

III. Plan and Contents of the First Gospel.—The author did not wish to compose a biography of Christ, but to demonstrate, by recording His words and the deeds of His life, that He was the Messias, the Head and Founder of the Kingdom of God, and the promulgator of its laws. One can scarcely fail to recognize that, except in a few parts (e. g. the Childhood and the Passion), the arrangement of events and of discourses is artificial. Matthew usually combines facts and precepts of a like nature. Whatever the reason, he favours groups of three (thirty-eight of which may be counted)—three divisions in the genealogy of Jesus (i, 17), three temptations (iv, 1–11), three examples of justice (vi, 1–18), three cures (viii, 1–15), three parables of the seed (xiii, 1–32), three denials of Peter (xxvi, 69–75), etc.; of five (these are less numerous)—five long discourses (v–vii, 27; x; xiii, 1–52; xviii; xxiv–xxv), ending with the same formula (Καὶ ἐγένετο, ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς), five examples of the fulfilment of the law (v, 21–48), etc.; and of seven—seven parables (xiii), seven maledictions (xxiii), seven brethren (xxii, 25), etc. The First Gospel can be very naturally divided as follows:—

A. *Introduction* (i–ii).—The genealogy of Jesus, the prediction of His Birth, the Magi, the Flight into Egypt, the Massacre of the Innocents, the return to Nazareth, and the life there.

B. *The Public Ministry of Jesus* (iii–xxv).—This may be divided into three parts, according to the place where He exercised it.

(1) In Galilee (iii–xviii).—(a) Preparation for the public ministry of Jesus (iii, 1–iv, 11): John the Baptist, the Baptism of Jesus, the Temptation, the return to Galilee. (b) The preaching of the Kingdom of God (iv, 17–xviii, 35): (i) the preparation of the Kingdom by the preaching of penance, the call of the disciples, and numerous cures (iv, 17–25), the promulgation of the code of the Kingdom of God in the Sermon on the Mount (v, 1–vii, 29); (ii) the propagation of the Kingdom in Galilee (viii, 1–xviii, 35). He groups together: (α) the deeds by which Jesus established that He was the Messias and the King of the Kingdom: various cures, the calming of the tempest, missionary journeys through the land, the calling of the Twelve Apostles, the principles that should guide them in their missionary travels (viii, 1–x, 42); (β) divers teachings of Jesus called forth by circumstances: John's message and the Lord's answer, Christ's confutation of the false charges of the Pharisees, the departure and return of the unclean spirit (xi, 1–xii, 50); finally, the parables of the Kingdom, of which Jesus makes known and explains the end (xiii, 3–52). (iii) Matthew then relates the different events that terminate the preaching in Galilee: Christ's visit to Nazareth (xiii, 53–58), the multiplication of the loaves, the walking on the lake, discussions with the Pharisees concerning legal purifications, the confession of Peter at Cæsarea, the Transfiguration of Jesus, prophecy regarding the Passion and Resurrection, and teachings on scandal, fraternal correction, and the forgiveness of injuries (xiv, 1–xviii, 35).

(2) Outside Galilee on the way to Jerusalem (xix–xx).—Jesus leaves Galilee and goes beyond the Jordan; He discusses divorce with the Pharisees; answers the rich young man, and teaches self-denial and the danger of wealth; explains by the parable of the labourers how the elect will be called; replies to the indiscreet question of the mother of the sons of Zebedee, and cures two blind men of Jericho.

(3) In Jerusalem (xxi–xxv).—Jesus makes a triumphal entry into Jerusalem; He curses the barren figtree and enters into a dispute with the chief priests and the Pharisees who ask Him by what authority He has banished the sellers from the Temple, and answers them by the parables of the two sons, the murderous husbandmen, and the marriage of the king's son. New questions are put to Jesus concerning the tribute, the resurrection of the dead, and the greatest commandment. Jesus anathematizes the scribes and Pharisees and foretells the events that will precede and accompany the fall of Jerusalem and the end of the world.

C. *The Passion and the Resurrection of Jesus* (xxvi–xxviii).—(1) The Passion (xxvi–xxvii).—Events are now hurrying to a close. The Sanhedrin plots for the death of Jesus, a woman anoints the feet of the Lord, and Judas betrays his Master. Jesus eats the pasch with His disciples and institutes the Eucharist. In the Garden of Olives, He enters upon His agony and offers up the sacrifice of His life. He is arrested and brought before the Sanhedrin. Peter denies Christ; Judas hangs himself. Jesus is condemned to death by Pilate and crucified; He is buried, and a guard is placed at the Sepulchre (xxvi, 1–xxvii, 66).

(2) The Resurrection (xxviii).—Jesus rises the third day and appears first to the holy women at Jerusalem, then in Galilee to His disciples, whom He sends forth to propagate throughout the world the Kingdom of God.

IV. Object and Doctrinal Teaching of the First Gospel.—Immediately after the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles, Peter preached that Jesus, crucified and risen, was the Messias, the Saviour of the World, and proved this assertion by relating the life, death, and resurrection of the Lord. This was the first Apostolic teaching, and was repeated by the other preachers of the Gospel, of whom tradition tells us that Matthew was one. This Evangelist proclaimed the Gospel to the Hebrews and, before his departure from Jerusalem, wrote in his mother tongue the Gospel that he had preached. Hence the aim of the Evangelist was primarily apologetic. He wished to demonstrate to his readers, whether these were converts or still unbelieving Jews, that in Jesus the ancient prophecies had been realized in their entirety. This thesis includes three principal ideas: (A) Jesus is the Messias, and the kingdom He inaugurates is the Messianic kingdom foretold by the prophets; (B) be-

cause of their sins, the Jews, as a nation, shall have no part in this kingdom; (C) the Gospel will be announced to all nations, and all men are called to salvation.

A. St. Matthew has shown that in Jesus all the ancient prophesies on the Messias were fulfilled. He was the Emmanuel, born of a Virgin Mother (i, 22, 23), announced by Isaias (vii, 14); He was born at Bethlehem (ii, 6), as had been predicted by Micheas (v, 2); He went to Egypt and was recalled thence (ii, 15) as foretold by Osee (xi, 1). According to the prediction of Isaias (xl, 3), He was heralded by a precursor, John the Baptist (iii, 1 sqq.); He cured all the sick (viii, 16 sq.), that the prophecy of Isaias (liii, 4) might be fulfilled; and in all His actions He was indeed the same of whom this prophet had spoken (xlii, 1). His teaching in parables (xiii, 3) was conformable to what Isaias had said (vi, 9). Finally, He suffered, and the entire drama of His Passion and Death was a fulfilment of the prophecies of Scripture (Isaias, liii, 3–12; Ps. xxi, 13–22). Jesus proclaimed Himself the Messias by His approbation of Peter's confession (xvi, 16, 17) and by His answer to the high priest (xxvi, 63, 64). St. Matthew also endeavours to show that the Kingdom inaugurated by Jesus Christ is the Messianic Kingdom. From the beginning of His public life, Jesus proclaims that the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand (iv, 17); in the Sermon on the Mount He promulgates the charter of this kingdom, and in parables He speaks of its nature and conditions. In His answer to the envoys of John the Baptist Jesus specifically declares that the Messianic Kingdom, foretold by the Prophets, has come to pass, and He describes its characteristics: "The blind see, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, the poor have the gospel preached to them." It was in these terms, that Isaias had described the future kingdom (xxxv, 5, 6; lxi, 1). St. Matthew records a very formal expression of the Lord concerning the coming of the Kingdom: "But if I by the Spirit of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you" (xii, 28). Moreover, Jesus could call Himself the Messias only inasmuch as the Kingdom of God had come.

B. The Jews as a nation were rejected because of their sins, and were to have no part in the Kingdom of Heaven. This rejection had been several times predicted by the prophets, and St. Matthew shows that it was because of its incredulity that Israel was excluded from the Kingdom; he dwells on all the events in which the increasing obduracy of the Jewish nation is conspicuous, manifested first in the princes and then in the hatred of the people who beseech Pilate to put Jesus to death. Thus the Jewish nation itself was accountable for its exclusion from the Messianic kingdom.

C. That the pagans were called to salvation instead of the Jews, Jesus declared explicitly to the unbelieving Israelites: "Therefore I say to you that the kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and shall be given to a nation yielding the fruits thereof" (xxi, 43); "He that soweth the good seed, is the Son of man. And the field is the world" (xiii, 37–38). "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony to all nations, and then shall the consummation come" (xxiv, 14). Finally, appearing to His Apostles in Galilee, Jesus gives them this supreme command: "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Going therefore, teach ye all nations" (xxviii, 18, 19). These last words of Christ are the summary of the First Gospel. Efforts have been made to maintain that these words of Jesus, commanding that all nations be evangelized, were not authentic, but in a subsequent paragraph we shall prove that all the Lord's sayings, recorded in the First Gospel, proceed from the teaching of Jesus. For this particular question see, Meinertz, "Jesus und die Heidenmission" (Münster, 1908).

V. Destination of the Gospel.—The ecclesiastical writers Papias, St. Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, and St. Jerome, whose testimony has been given above (II, A), agree in declaring that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel for the Jews. Everything in this Gospel proves, that the writer addresses himself to Jewish readers. He does not explain Jewish customs and usages to them, as do the other Evangelists for their Greek and Latin readers, and he assumes that they are acquainted with Palestine, since, unlike St. Luke, he mentions places without giving any indication of their topographical position. It is true that the Hebrew words, *Emmanuel, Golgotha, Eloi*, are translated, but it is likely that these translations were inserted when the Aramaic text was reproduced in Greek. St. Matthew chronicles those discourses of Christ that would interest the Jews and leave a favourable impression upon them. The law is not to be destroyed, but fulfilled (v, 17). He emphasizes more strongly than either St. Mark or St. Luke the false interpretations of the law given by the scribes and Pharisees, the hypocrisy and even the vices of the latter, all of which could be of interest to Jewish readers only. According to certain critics, St. Irenæus (Fragment xxix) said that Matthew wrote to convert the Jews by proving to them that Christ was the Son of David. This interpretation is badly founded. Moreover, Origen (In Matt., i) categorically asserts that this Gospel was published for Jews converted to the Faith. Eusebius (Hist. eccl., III, xxiv) is also explicit on this point, and St. Jerome, summarizing tradition, teaches us that St. Matthew published his Gospel in Judea and in the Hebrew language, principally for those among the Jews who believed in Jesus, and did not observe even the shadow of the Law, the truth of the Gospel having replaced it (In Matt. Prol.). Subsequent ecclesiastical writers and Catholic exegetes have taught that St. Matthew wrote for the converted Jews. "However," says Zahn (Introd. to the New Testament, II, 562), "the apologetical and polemical character of the book, as well as the choice of language, make it extremely probable that Matthew wished his book to be read primarily by the Jews who were not yet Christians. It was suited to Jewish Christians who were still exposed to Jewish influence, and also to Jews who still resisted the Gospel".

VI. Date and Place of Composition.—Ancient ecclesiastical writers are at variance as to the date of the composition of the First Gospel. Eusebius (in his Chronicle), Theophylact, and Euthymius Zigabenus are of opinion that the Gospel of Matthew was written eight years, and Nicephorus Callistus fifteen years, after Christ's Ascension—i. e. about A. D. 38–45. According to Eusebius, Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew when he left Palestine. Now, following a certain tradition (admittedly not too reliable), the Apostles separated twelve years after the Ascension, hence the Gospel would have been written about the year 40–42; but following Eusebius (Hist. eccl., III, v, 2), it is possible to fix the definitive departure of the Apostles about the year 60, in which event the writing of the Gospel would have taken place about the year 60–68. St. Irenæus is somewhat more exact concerning the date of the First Gospel, as he says: "Matthew produced his Gospel when Peter and Paul were evangelizing and founding the Church of Rome, consequently about the years 64–67." However, this text presents difficulties of interpretation which render its meaning uncertain and prevent us from deducing any positive conclusion.

In our day opinion is rather divided. Catholic critics, in general, favour the years 40–45, although some (e. g. Patrizi) go back to 36–39 or (e. g. Aberle) to 37. Belser assigns 41–42; Cornély, 40–50; Schäfer, 50–51; Hug, Reuschl, Schanz, and Rose, 60–67. This last opinion is founded on the combined testimonies of St. Irenæus and Eusebius, and on the remark inserted parenthetically in the discourse of Jesus in chapter xxiv, 15: "When therefore you shall see the abomination of desolation, which was spoken of by Daniel the

prophet, standing in the holy place": here the author interrupts the sentence and invites the reader to take heed of what follows, viz.: "Then they that are in Judea, let them flee to the mountains." As there would have been no occasion for a like warning had the destruction of Jerusalem already taken place, Matthew must have written his Gospel before the year 70 (about 65–70 according to Batiffol). Protestant and Liberalistic critics also are greatly at variance as regards the time of the composition of the First Gospel. Zahn sets the date about 61–66, and Godet about 60–66; Keim, Meyer, Holtzmann (in his earlier writings), Beyschlag, and Maclean, before 70; Bartlet about 68–69; W. Allen and Plummer, about 65–75; Hilgenfeld and Holtzmann (in his later writings), soon after 70; B. Weiss and Harnack, about 70–75; Renan, later than 85; Réville, between 69 and 96; Jülicher, in 81–96; Montefiore, about 90–100; Volkmar, in 110; Baur, about 130–34. The following are some of the arguments advanced to prove that the First Gospel was written several years after the Fall of Jerusalem. When Jesus prophesies to His Apostles that they will be delivered up to the councils, scourged in the synagogues, brought before governors and kings for His sake; that they will give testimony of Him, will for Him be hated and driven from city to city (x, 17–23); and when He commissions them to teach all nations and make them His disciples, His words intimate, it is claimed, the lapse of many years, the establishment of the Christian Church in distant parts, and its cruel persecution by the Jews and even by Roman emperors and governors. Moreover, certain sayings of the Lord —such as: "Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church" (xvi, 18); "If he [thy brother] will not hear them: tell the Church" (xviii, 10)—carry us to a time when the Christian Church was already constituted, a time that could not have been much earlier than the year 100. The fact is, that what was predicted by Our Lord, when He announced future events and established the charter and foundations of His Church, is converted into reality and made coexistent with the writing of the First Gospel. Hence, to give these arguments a probatory value it would be necessary either to deny Christ's knowledge of the future or to maintain that the teachings embodied in the First Gospel were not authentic.

VII. Historic Value of the First Gospel.—*Of the Narratives.*—(1) Apart from the narratives of the Childhood of Jesus, the cure of the two blind men, the tribute money, and a few incidents connected with the Passion and Resurrection, all the others recorded by St. Matthew are found in both the other Synoptists, with one exception (viii, 5–13) which occurs only in St. Luke. Critics agree in declaring that, regarded as a whole, the events of the life of Jesus recorded in the Synoptic Gospels are historic. For us, these facts are historic even in detail, our criterion of truth being the same for the aggregate and the details. The Gospel of St. Mark is acknowledged to be of great historic value because it reproduces the preaching of St. Peter. But, for almost all the events of the Gospel, the information given by St. Mark is found in St. Matthew, while such as are peculiar to the latter are of the same nature as events recorded by St. Mark, and resemble them so closely that it is hard to understand why they should not be historic, since they also are derived from the primitive catechesis. It may be further observed that the narratives of St. Matthew are never contradictory to the events made known to us by profane documents, and that they give a very accurate account of the moral and religious ideas, the manners and customs of the Jewish people of that time. In his recent work, "The Synoptic Gospels" (London, 1909), Montefiore, a Jewish critic, does full justice to St. Matthew on these different points. Finally, all the objections that could possibly have been raised against their veracity vanish, if we but keep in mind the standpoint of the author, and what he wished to demonstrate. The comments that we are about to make concerning the Lord's utterances are also applicable to the Gospel narratives. For a demonstration of the historic value of the narratives of the Holy Childhood, we recommend Father Durand's scholarly work, "L'enfance de Jésus-Christ d'après les évangiles canoniques" (Paris, 1907).

(2) *Of the Discourses.*—The greater part of Christ's short sayings are found in the three Synoptic Gospels, and consequently spring from the early catechesis. His long discourses, recorded by St. Matthew and St. Luke, also formed part of an authentic catechesis, and critics in general are agreed in acknowledging their historic value. There are, however, some who maintain that the Evangelist modified his documents to adapt them to the faith professed in Christian communities at the time when he wrote his Gospel. They also claim that, even prior to the composition of the Gospels, Christian faith had altered Apostolic reminiscences. Let us first of all observe that these objections would have no weight whatever, unless we were to concede that the First Gospel was not written by St. Matthew. And even assuming the same point of view as our adversaries, who think that our Synoptic Gospels depend upon anterior sources, we maintain that these changes, whether attributable to the Evangelists or to their sources (i. e. the faith of the early Christians), could not have been effected.

The alterations claimed to have been introduced into Christ's teachings could not have been made by the Evangelists themselves. We know that the latter selected their subject-matter and disposed of it each in his own way, and with a special end in view; but this matter was the same for all three, at least for the whole contents of the pericopes, and was taken from the original catechesis, which was already sufficiently well established not to admit of the introduction into it of new ideas and unknown facts. Again, all the doctrines which are claimed to be foreign to the teachings of Jesus are found in the three Synoptists, and are so much a part of the very framework of each Gospel that their removal would mean the destruction of the order of the narrative. Under these conditions, that there might be a substantial change in the doctrines taught by Christ, it would be necessary to suppose a previous understanding among the three Evangelists, which seems to us impossible, as Matthew and Luke at least appear to have worked independently of each other, and it is in their Gospels that Christ's longest discourses are found. These doctrines, which were already embodied in the sources used by the three Synoptists, could not have resulted from the deliberations and opinions of the earliest Christians. First of all, between the death of Christ and the initial drawing up of the oral catechesis, there was not sufficient time for originating, and subsequently enjoining upon the Christian conscience, ideas diametrically opposed to those said to have been exclusively taught by Jesus Christ. For example, let us take the doctrines claimed, above all others, to have been altered by the belief of the first Christians, namely that Jesus Christ had called all nations to salvation. It is said that the Lord restricted His mission to Israel, and that all those texts wherein He teaches that the Gospel should be preached throughout the entire world originated with the early Christians and especially with Paul. Now, in the first place, these universalist doctrines could not have sprung up among the Apostles. They and the primitive Christians were Jews of poorly developed intelligence, of very narrow outlook, and were moreover imbued with particularist ideas. From the Gospels and Acts it is easy to see that these men were totally unacquainted with universalist ideas, which had to be urged upon them, and which, even then, they were slow to accept. Moreover, how could this first Christian generation, who, we are told, believed that Christ's Second Coming was close at hand, have originated

these passages proclaiming that before this event took place the Gospel should be preached to all nations? These doctrines do not emanate from St. Paul and his disciples. Long before St. Paul could have exercised any influence whatever over the Christian conscience, the Evangelical sources containing these precepts had already been composed. The Apostle of the Gentiles was the special propagator of these doctrines, but he was not their creator. Enlightened by the Holy Spirit, he understood that the ancient prophecies had been realized in the Person of Jesus, and that the doctrines taught by Christ were identical with those revealed by the Scriptures.

Finally, by considering as a whole the ideas constituting the basis of the earliest Christian writings, we ascertain that these doctrines, taught by the prophets, and accentuated by the life and words of Christ, form the framework of the Gospels and the basis of Pauline preaching. They are, as it were, a kind of fasces which it would be impossible to unbind, and into which no new idea could be inserted without destroying its strength and unity. In the prophecies, the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, and the first Christian writings an intimate correlation joins all together, Jesus Christ Himself being the centre and the common bond. What one has said of Him, the others reiterate, and never do we hear an isolated or a discordant voice. If Jesus taught doctrines contrary or foreign to those which the Evangelists placed upon His lips, then He becomes an inexplicable phenomenon, because, in the matter of ideas, He is in contradiction to the society in which He moved, and must be ranked with the least intelligent sections among the Jewish people. We are justified, therefore, in concluding that the discourses of Christ, recorded in the First Gospel and reproducing the Apostolic catechesis, are authentic. We may, however, again observe that, his aim being chiefly apologetic, Matthew selected and presented the events of Christ's life and also these discourses in a way that would lead up to the conclusive proof which he wished to give of the Messiahship of Jesus. Still the Evangelist neither substantially altered the original catechesis nor invented doctrines foreign to the teaching of Jesus. His action bore upon details or form, but not upon the basis of words and deeds.

Catholic Authors: MALDONATUS, *In Matt.* (Mainz, 1874); VAN STEENKISTE, *Comment. in Evang. secundum Matt.* (4 vols., 3rd ed., Bruges, 1880–2); FILLION, *Evang. selon s. Matthieu* (Paris, 1878); SCHANZ, *Commentar über das Evang. des hl. Matt.* (Freiburg, 1879); KNABENBAUER, *Comment. in Evang. secundum Matt.* (2 vols., Paris, 1892–3); ROSE, *Evang. selon s. Matthieu* (Paris, 1904); GUTJAHR, *Das hl. Evang. nach Matthäus* (Graz, 1904); JACQUIER, *Hist. des livres du Nouveau Testament*, II (6th ed., Paris, 1910); MAAS, *Comment. of Gospel of St. Matthew* (New York, 1898); MACEVILLY, *Exposition of the Gospels* (Dublin, 1876).

Non-Catholic Authors: MANSEL AND COOK, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew* in *The Speaker's Com. New Testament*, I (London, 1878); BRUCE, *The Synoptic Gospel according to St. Matthew* (London, 1905, 1906); WILLOUGHBY ALLEN, *Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (Edinburgh, 1907); PLUMMER, *Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew* (London, 1909); HAWKINS, *Horæ Synopticæ* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1909); B. WEISS, *Evangelium Matthäi* (Göttingen, 1898); IDEM, *Das Matthäus Evangelium und seine Lucasparallelen* (2nd ed., Halle, 1902); HOLTZMANN, *Die Synoptiker* (3rd ed., Tübingen; 1901); ZAHN, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus* (Leipzig, 1903), WELHAUSEN, *Das Evangelium Matthæi* (Berlin, 1904); J. WEISS *Die Schriften des N. T.*, I, *Matthäus* (3rd ed., Göttingen, 1908); GRESSMANN AND KLOSTERMANN, *Matthäus* (Tübingen, 1909).

E. JACQUIER.

Matthew, LITURGY OF SAINT. See SYRO-JACOBITE LITURGY.

Matthew, PSEUDO-GOSPEL OF. See APOCRYPHA.

Matthew, SIR TOBIE, English priest, b. at Salisbury, 3 Oct., 1577; died at Ghent, 13 Oct., 1655. He was the son of Dr. Tobie Matthew, then Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, afterwards Anglican Bishop of Durham, and finally Archbishop of York, and Frances, daughter of William Barlow, Anglican Bishop of Chichester. Tobie Matthew matriculated from Christ Church, Oxford, 13 March, 1589–90, and became M.A. 5 July, 1597. He seems to have been harshly treated by his parents, who were angered at his youthful extravagance. On 15 May, 1599, he was admitted at Gray's Inn, where he began his close intimacy with Sir Francis Bacon, and two years later became M.P. for Newport, Cornwall. During this period of his life he frequented the dissolute court of Elizabeth. On the accession of James I he sat in Parliament for St. Alban's, and joined the new court, receiving a large grant from the Crown which amply provided for his future. Having always desired to travel, he left England in November, 1604, visiting France on his way to Florence, though he had promised his father he would not go to Italy. At Florence he came into the society of several Catholics and ended by being received into the Church. A new persecution was raging in England, but he determined to return. He was imprisoned in the Fleet for six months, and every effort was made to shake his resolution. Finally he was allowed to leave England, and he travelled in Flanders and Spain. In 1614 he studied for the priesthood at Rome and was ordained by Cardinal Bellarmine (20 May). The king allowed him to return to England in 1617, and he stayed for a time with Bacon, whose essays he translated into Italian. From 1619 to 1622 he was again exiled, but on his return was favourably received by the king, and acted as an agent at court to promote the marriage of Prince Charles with the Spanish Infanta. In the same cause James sent him to Madrid and on his return knighted him, 20 Oct., 1623. During the reign of Charles I he remained in high favour at court, where he laboured indefatigably for the Catholic cause. When the Civil War broke out in 1640 he, now an old man, took refuge with the English Jesuits at their house at Ghent, where he died. He was always an ardent supporter of the Jesuits, and, though it has long been denied that he was ever himself a Jesuit, papers recently discovered at Oulton Abbey show strong reason for supposing that he was in fact a member of the Society. Besides the Italian version of Bacon's "Essays", he translated St. Augustine's "Confessions" (1620), the Life of St. Teresa written by herself (1623), and Father Arias's "Treatise of Patience" (1650). His original works were: "A Relation of the death of Troilo Savelle, Baron of Rome" (1620); "A Missive of Consolation sent from Flanders to the Catholics of England (1647); "A True Historical Relation of the Conversion of Sir Tobie Matthews to the Holie Catholic Faith" (first published in 1904); some manuscript works (see Gillow, "Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.", IV, 541–42). His letters were edited by Dr. John Donne in 1660.

MATHEW, *Life of Sir Tobie Matthew* (with portrait and many new documents) (London, 1907); IDEM, *A True Historical Relation of the Conversion of Sir Tobie Matthew* (London, 1904); ALBAN BUTLER, *The Life of Sir Tobie Matthews*, ed. by CHARLES BUTLER (London, 1795); GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, IV, 531-43 (giving references to many other sources); SECCOMBE in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* (with numerous and valuable other references).

EDWIN BURTON.

Matthew of Cracow, renowned scholar and preacher of the fourteenth century, b. at Cracow about 1335; d. at Pisa, 5 March, 1410. The view, once generally held, that he was descended from the Pomeranian noble family of Crakow, is now entirely discredited (cf. Sommerlad, "Matthäus von Krakow", 1891). His father was probably a notary in Cracow. Entering the University of Prague, Matthew graduated bachelor of arts in 1355 and master in 1357, and later filled for several terms the office of dean in the same faculty. In 1387 we first find documentary reference to him as professor of theology, and one manuscript speaks of him as "city preacher of Prague". About 1382 he headed an embassy from his university to Urban VI, before whom he delivered a dissertation in favour of reform. Accepting an invitation from the University of Heidelberg, he joined its professorial staff in 1395, and a year later was appointed rector. In 1395 he was

named councillor to Ruprecht II, and the raising of Ruprecht III to the dignity of King of Rome in 1400 marks the begining of Matthew's career as a statesman. Frequently employed by the king both at court and on embassies, he appeared at Rome in 1403 to solicit Boniface IX's confirmation of Ruprecht's claims. On the elevation of Innocent VII to the papal throne in 1404, Matthew greeted him on behalf of Ruprecht. During the same year Matthew was appointed Bishop of Worms, but, beyond his settling of the dispute between the people and clergy of that city, we know little of his episcopal activity.

That he continued to reside at Heidelberg is very probable, and also that he continued to act as professor. Gregory XII wished to name him Cardinal Priest of S. Cyriaci in Thermis, but Matthew declined the honour. As ambassador of Ruprecht to the Council of Pisa, he displayed the greatest zeal on behalf of Gregory XII, whom he regarded as the legitimate occupant of the papal throne. He was a very prolific theological writer. Apart from Biblical commentaries, sermons, and works on current topics, the most important of his writings are: "De consolatione theologiæ"; "De modo confitendi"; "De puritate conscientiæ"; "De corpore Christi"; "De celebratione Missæ". That he wrote "De arte moriendi"—to be distinguished from a similar work by Cardinal Capran—cannot be maintained with certainty, and recent investigation has shown beyond doubt that the work "De squaloribus curiæ Romanæ" is not from his hands (Scheuffgen, "Beiträge zur Gesch. des grossen Schismas", 1889, p. 91).

In addition to the works already mentioned, consult SOMMERFELDT, *Zu M.' kanzelredner. Schriften* in *Deutsche Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, XXII (Tübingen, 1901), 465–84; XXV (1904), 604–25; LOFFEN, *Staat u. Kirche in der Pfalz am Ausgange des M. A.* (1907), 45 sqq.; BLIEMETZRIEDER, *Matthäus v. K., der Verfasser der Postillen?* in *Studien u. Mitteil. aus dem Benediktiner- u. dem Cisterzienerorden*, XXV (1904), 544–56; FINKE in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Matthäus von Krakau.*

THOMAS KENNEDY.

Matthew Westminster. See WESTMINSTER, MATTHEW.

Matthias, SAINT, APOSTLE.—The Greek *Ματθίας*, ℵ A C E, or *Μαθθίας*, B* D, is a name derived from *Ματταθίας*, Heb. Mattithiah, signifying "gift of Jahveh." Matthias was one of the seventy disciples of Jesus, and had been with Him from His baptism by John to the Ascension (Acts, i, 21, 22). It is related (Acts, i, 15–26) that in the days following the Ascension, Peter proposed to the assembled brethren, who numbered one hundred and twenty, that they choose one to fill the place of the traitor Judas in the Apostolate. Two disciples, Joseph, called Barsabas, and Matthias were selected, and lots were drawn, with the result in favour of Matthias, who thus became associated with the eleven Apostles. Zeller has declared this narrative unhistoric, on the plea that the Apostles were in Galilee after the death of Jesus. As a matter of fact they did return to Galilee, but the Acts of the Apostles clearly state that about the feast of Pentecost they went back to Jerusalem.

All further information concerning the life and death of Matthias is vague and contradictory. According to Nicephorus (Hist. eccl., 2, 40), he first preached the Gospel in Judea, then in Ethiopia (that is to say, Colchis), and was crucified. The Synopsis of Dorotheus contains this tradition: Matthias in interiore Æthiopia, ubi Hyssus maris portus et Phasis fluvius est, hominibus barbaris et carnivoris prædicavit Evangelium. Mortuus est autem in Sebastopoli, ibique prope templum Solis sepultus (Matthias preached the Gospel to barbarians and cannibals in the interior of Ethiopia, at the harbour of the sea of Hyssus, at the mouth of the river Phasis. He died at Sebastopolis, and was buried there, near the Temple of the Sun). Still another tradition maintains that Matthias was stoned at Jerusalem by the Jews, and then beheaded (cf. Tillemont, "Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire eccl. des six premiers siècles", I, 406–07). It is said that St. Helena brought the relics of St. Matthias to Rome, and that a portion of them was at Trier. Bollandus (Acta SS., May, III) doubts if the relics that are in Rome are not rather those of the St. Matthias who was Bishop of Jerusalem about the year 120, and whose history would seem to have been confounded with that of the Apostle. The Latin Church celebrates the feast of St. Matthias on 24 February, and the Greek Church on 9 August.

Clement of Alexandria (Strom., III, 4) records a sentence that the Nicolaitans ascribe to Matthias: "We must combat our flesh, set no value upon it, and concede to it nothing that can flatter it, but rather increase the growth of our soul by faith and knowledge". This teaching was probably found in the Gospel of Matthias which was mentioned by Origen (Hom. i in Lucam); by Eusebius (Hist. eccl., III, 25), who attributes it to heretics; by St. Jerome (Præf. in Matth.); and in the Decree of Gelasius (VI, 8) which declares it apocryphal. It is at the end of the list of the Codex Barroccianus (206). This Gospel is probably the document whence Clement of Alexandria quoted several passages, saying that they were borrowed from the traditions of Matthias, *Παραδόσεις*, the testimony of which he claimed to have been invoked by the heretics Valentinus, Marcion, and Basilides (Strom., VII, 17). According to the Philosophoumena, VII, 20, Basilides quoted apocryphal discourses, which he attributed to Matthias. These three writings: the Gospel, the Traditions, and the Apocryphal Discourses were identified by Zahn (Gesch. des N. T. Kanon, II, 751), but Harnack (Chron. der altchrist. Litteratur, 597) denies this identification. Tischendorf ("Acta apostolorum apocrypha", Leipzig, 1851) published after Thilo, 1846, "Acta Andreæ et Matthiæ in urbe anthropophagarum", which, according to Lipsius, belonged to the middle of the second century. This apocrypha relates that Matthias went among the cannibals and, being cast into prison, was delivered by Andrew. Needless to say, the entire narrative is without historical value. Moreover, it should be remembered that, in the apocryphal writings, Matthew and Matthias have sometimes been confounded.

E. JACQUIER.

Matthias, GOSPEL OF. See APOCRYPHA.

Matthias Corvinus, King of Hungary, son of János Hunyady (see HUNYADY, JÁNOS) and Elizabeth Szilágyi of Horogssey, was born at Kolozsvar, 23 Feb., 1440; d. at Vienna, 6 April, 1490. In the house of his father he received along with his brother Ladislaus, a careful education under the supervision of Gregor Sanocki, who taught him the humanities. Johann Vitez, Bishop of Grosswardein from 1445, the friend of Matthias's father when a boy, and himself an enthusiastic patron and promoter of classical studies, had a decided influence on his education. The chequered career of his father likewise left its imprint on the life of Matthias. On political grounds he was betrothed in 1455 to Elizabeth, the daughter of Count Ulric Czilley, his father's deadly enemy, with the aim of effecting the reconciliation of the two families. The early death of Elizabeth interfered with this plan, and after the death of János Hunyady, Czilley's emnity was directed against the sons. At the instigation of Czilley and his accomplices, who accused Ladislaus and Matthias Hunyady of a conspiracy against King Ladislaus V, both were arrested, Ladislaus being executed, and Matthias being taken to Vienna to the court of the king. Later he followed the king to Prague. After the death of King Ladislaus at Prague, Matthias settled down at the court of the Bohemian king, George Podiebrad, who betrothed him to his daughter Catharine. On 23 Jan., 1458, Matthias was proclaimed King of Hungary at

Buda, his uncle Michael Szilágyi at the same time being appointed governor for five years. Matthias soon freed himself, however, from the regency of Szilágyi, and took the reins of government into his own hands. At the very beginning of his reign he had to contend with a movement among discontented Hungarians, who offered the crown to the Emperor Frederick III, who had assumed the title of King of Hungary. The quarrel with Frederick lasted till 1462, when an agreement was made by which, among other things, it was settled that if Matthias should die without leaving an heir, Frederick would be authorized to bear the title of King of Hungary as long as he lived. At the same time Frederick adopted Matthias as his son, and pledged himself to deliver up the Hungarian crown which he had in his possession. The treaty was confirmed by the Hungarian Reichstag and Matthias was crowned king in 1463. Not long before he had married Catharine, the daughter of the Bohemian king Podiebrad, who, however, died at the beginning of 1464. Relations with the Emperor Frederick again became strained; political conditions and, in particular, the question of the Bohemian crown, affected them considerably. The friction between the Holy See and King Podiebrad led to the deposition of the latter, and Matthias was now called upon by the pope to take up arms against the deposed king. In 1468 came the Bohemian expedition of Matthias, elected king by the Catholics of Bohemia. The war continued till the death of Podiebrad in 1471, when the Bohemians, defeating Matthias, chose Wladislaw, son of Casimir, King of Poland, as king. The years up to 1474 were marked by indecisive battles with the Bohemian king and with the Emperor Frederick. An armistice caused a brief cessation of hostilities, but from 1476 relations with the Emperor Frederick grew continually more strained. In 1477 Matthias, invading Austria, besieged Vienna. Peace was effected between Matthias and Frederick by the intervention of the papal legate in 1477, but war soon broke out again, and in 1485 Matthias took Vienna. In the war with the Emperor Frederick, Matthias had in view the Roman crown. In this connexion he was led not merely by the aim of securing for Hungary a leading position in the West of Europe, but also by the design to unite the powers of Europe in a crusade against the Turks. He was obliged, however, to abandon this scheme. Equally fruitless was the plan of a crusade against the Turks; nevertheless he managed to fix a limit to the advance of the Turks, and to strengthen the supremacy of Hungary over Bosnia. In 1463 Bosnia fell again into the hands of the Turks. The victory of Matthias over the Turks in Servia, Bosnia, and Transylvania resulted in 1483 in a truce with the Sultan Bajazet. Matthias's relations with the Catholic Church were good till the year 1471; but the second part of his reign was marked by a series of most serious blunders and acts of violence. In spite of legal enactments, he gave bishoprics to foreigners, and rewarded political services with gifts of church property, which he dealt with as though it were the property of the state. His relations with the Holy See were at first decidedly cordial, but later there was danger of a rupture, which was happily avoided. Under Matthias the humanities made their entry into Hungary. His library in Buda, the *Bibliotheca Corviniana*, wins just admiration even to-day by virtue of the remnants of it scattered over Europe. During his reign the first printing press in Hungary was established, that at Buda, the first known production of which is the "Chronicle of Buda", printed in 1473. The arts, too, found in Matthias a generous Mæcenas. Matthias introduced reforms in the army, in finance, and in the administration of the courts and the law. The reorganization of military affairs was based on the principle of a standing army. With this body, the so-called black troops, he defeated the Turks and the Hussite troops of Giskra, which were laying waste Upper Hungary. In financial affairs, a reform in the mode of taxation was introduced, while his enactments in judicial affairs earned for him among the people the title of "The Just". In 1476 he married Beatrice, the daughter of the King of Naples, but the union was childless. His exertions to secure the throne for his illegitimate son, Johann Corvinus, were rendered futile by the opposition of Hungary and the plotting of Beatrice. Matthias was buried at Székes-Fehérvár (Stuhlweissenburg).

MATTHIAS CORVINUS
King of Hungary, 1458–1490

TELEKI, *A Hunyadyak kora Magyarországon* (Pesth, 1852), in Hungarian: i. e. The Age of the Hunyadys in Hungary, 9 vols.; CSÁNKI, *Magyarország történeti földrajza a Hunyadyak korában* (Budapest, 1890), i. e. The Historical Geography of Hungary in the Age of the Hunyadys, 3 vols. have appeared; FRAKNÓI, *A Hunyadyak és Jagellok kora 1440–56* (Budapest, 1896), Hungarian: i. e. The Age of the Hunyadys and Jagellons; IDEM, *Mathias Corvinus, König von Ungarn* (Freiburg im Br., 1891). For information as to church conditions in Hungary see the bibliography of HUNGARY. For Matthias's relations with the Holy See, see the Latin introduction to *Monumenta Vaticana Hungarica; Mathiæ Corvini Hungariæ regis epistolæ ad Romanos pontifices datæ et ab eis acceptæ* (Budapest, 1891). For the foreign politics of Matthias see *Monumenta Hungariæ Historica, Acta extera, 1458–90* (Budapest, 1875); *Mátyás Király levelei Külügyi osztály* (Budapest, 1893–95), i. e. Letters of King Matthias, foreign section, 2 vols. For information concerning Joannes Corvinus see SCHÖNHERR, *Corvin János* (Budapest, 1894); concerning Queen Beatrice see BERZEVICZY, *Beatrix királyné* (Budapest, 1908).

A. ÁLDÁSY.

Matthias of Neuburg or NEUENBURG (NEOBURGENSIS), chronicler, b. towards the close of the thirteenth century, possibly at Neuburg, in Baden; d. between 1364 and 1370, probably at Strasburg, in Alsace. He studied jurisprudence at Bologna, and later received minor orders, but never became a priest. In 1327 we meet him as solicitor of the episcopal court at Basle, and shortly after, while clerk to Bishop Berthold von Buchecke, holding a similar position in Strasburg. At present he is generally considered the author of a Latin chronicle from 1243 to 1350, and of its first continuation from 1350 to 1355. Later, three other writers carried on the work to 1368, 1374, and 1378 respectively. It is an important contribution to Alsatian and Habsburg history and for the times in which Matthias lived; indeed, the part covering the period between 1346 and 1350 is one of the best authorities, not only for the history of his own country, but for that of the entire empire. It has been attributed to different writers, among them to the Speyer notary, Jacob of Mainz (cf. Wichert, "Jacob von Mainz", Königsberg, 1881), also to Albert of Strasburg, especially by earlier editors, while those of later times attribute it to Matthias of Neuburg. For the voluminous literature on this controversy see Potthast, "Bibliotheca Kin. Med. Ævi." (Berlin, 1896). Among the editions may be mentioned: "Alberti Argentinensis Chronici fragmentum", an appendix to Cuspinian's work "De consulibus Romanorum commentarii" (Basle, 1553), 667–710, very much abridged; G. Studer, "Matthiæ Neoburgensis

chronica cum continuatione et vita Berchtoldi"; "Die Chronik des Matthias von Neuenburg", from the Berne and Strasburg manuscripts (Berne, 1866); A. Hüber, "Mathiæ Neuwenburgensis Cronica, 1273–1350" in Böhmer, "Fontes rerum Germanicarum", IV (Stuttgart, 1868), 149–276; "Continuationes", 276–297. It has also been edited from a Vienna and a Vatican manuscript in "Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften", xxxvii–viii (Göttingen, 1891–2), and translated into German by Grandaur (Leipzig, 1892).

POTTHAST, *Bibliotheca* (Berlin, 1896), 780 sq.; WEILAND, Introduction to the above-mentioned German version, pp. i–xxviii.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Maturins. See TRINITARIAN ORDER.

Matz, NICHOLAS C. See DENVER, DIOCESE OF.

Maundy Thursday.—The feast of Maundy (or Holy) Thursday solemnly commemorates the institution of the Eucharist and is the oldest of the observances peculiar to Holy Week. In Rome various accessory ceremonies were early added to this commemoration, namely the consecration of the holy oils and the reconciliation of penitents, ceremonies obviously practical in character and readily explained by the proximity of the Christian Easter and the necessity of preparing for it. Holy Thursday could not but be a day of liturgical reunion since, in the cycle of movable feasts, it brings around the anniversary of the institution of the Liturgy. On that day, whilst the preparation of candidates was being completed, the Church celebrated the *Missa chrismalis* of which we have already described the rite (see HOLY OILS) and, moreover, proceeded to the reconciliation of penitents. In Rome everything was carried on in daylight, whereas in Africa on Holy Thursday the Eucharist was celebrated after the evening meal, in view of more exact conformity with the circumstances of the Last Supper. Canon xxix of the Council of Carthage dispenses the faithful from fast before communion on Holy Thursday, because, on that day, it was customary to take a bath, and the bath and fast were considered incompatible. St. Augustine, too, speaks of this custom (Ep. cxviii ad Januarium, n. 7); he even says that, as certain persons did not fast on that day, the oblation was made twice, morning and evening, and in this way those who did not observe the fast could partake of the Eucharist after the morning meal, whilst those who fasted awaited the evening repast.

Holy Thursday was taken up with a succession of ceremonies of a joyful character: the baptism of neophytes, the reconciliation of penitents, the consecration of the holy oils, the washing of the feet, and the commemoration of the Blessed Eucharist, and, because of all these ceremonies, the day received different names, all of which allude to one or another of its solemnities.

Redditio symboli was so called because, before being admitted to baptism, the catechumens had to recite the creed from memory, either in presence of the bishop or his representative.

Pedilavium (washing of the feet), traces of which are found in the most ancient rites, occurred in many churches on Holy Thursday, the *capitilavium* (washing of the head) having taken place on Palm Sunday (St. Augustine, "Ep. cxviii, cxix", c. 18).

Exomologesis, and reconciliation of penitents: the letter of Pope Innocent I to Decentius of Gubbio, testifies that in Rome it was customary "quinta feria ante Pascha" to absolve penitents from their mortal and venial sins, except in cases of serious illness which kept them away from church (Labbe, "Concilia", II, col. 1247; St. Ambrose, "Ep. xxxiii ad Marcellinam"). The penitents heard the *Missa pro reconciliatione pœnitentium*, and absolution was given them before the offertory. The "Sacramentary" of Pope Gelasius contains an *Ordo agentibus publicam pœnitentiam* (Muratori, "Liturgia romana vetus", I, 548–551).

Olei exorcizati confectio.—In the fifth century the custom was established of consecrating on Holy Thursday all the chrism necessary for the anointing of the newly baptized. The "Comes Hieronymi", the Gregorian and Gelasian sacramentaries and the "Missa ambrosiana" of Pamelius, all agree upon the confection of the chrism on that day, as does also the "Ordo romanus I".

Anniversarium Eucharistiæ.—The nocturnal celebration and the double oblation early became the object of increasing disfavour, until in 692 the Council of Trullo promulgated a formal prohibition. The Eucharistic celebration then took place in the morning, and the bishop reserved a part of the sacred species for the communion of the morrow, *Missa præsanctificatorum* (Muratori, "Liturg. rom. Vetus", II, 993).

Other Observances.—On Holy Thursday the ringing of bells ceases, the altar is stripped after vespers, and the night office is celebrated under the name of Tenebræ.

H. LECLERCQ.

Maunoury, AUGUSTE-FRANÇOIS, Hellenist and exegete, b. at Champsecret, Orne, France, 30 Oct., 1811; d. at Séez, Orne, 17 Nov., 1898. He made brilliant classical studies at the preparatory seminary at Séez, to which institution he returned after his theological course, and where he spent the whole of his long priestly career. Until 1852, he taught the classics with great success, and then became professor of rhetoric, a position which he occupied for twenty-two years. During this period, keeping abreast of the progress of Hellenistic studies in France and Germany, he composed, published, and revised those of his works ("Grammaire de la Langue Grecque"; "Chrestomathie" etc.) which proved him to be one of the best Greek scholars of his day. Towards 1866, Maunoury began his work as a commentator of Holy Writ, by treating some sections of the Gospel in the "Semaine Catholique" of his native diocese; but it was only after 1875, that he gave himself fully to the pursuit of Biblical studies. In 1877, he became canon of the cathedral of Séez; and the following year, he began to publish his commentaries on all the Epistles of the New Testament.

These commentaries appeared in five volumes, as follows: (1) "Com. sur L'Epître aux Romains" (Paris, 1878); (2) "Com. sur les deux Epîtres aux Corinthiens" (Paris, 1879); (3) "Com. sur les Epîtres aux Galates, aux Ephésiens, aux Phillippiens, aux Colossiens, et aux Thessaloniciens" (Paris, 1880); (4) "Com. sur les Epîtres à Timothée, à Tite, à Philémon, aux Hébreux" (Paris, 1882); (5) "Com. sur les Epîtres Catholiques de St. Jacques, St. Pierre, St. Jean et St. Jude" (Paris, 1888). In explaining the Sacred Text he made an excellent use of his great familiarity with Greek grammar and authors, availed himself chiefly of the commentaries of St. John Chrysostom and Theodoret, and always remained an enlightened and safe theologian. In 1894, he published his "Com. in Psalmos" (2 vols., Paris), a Latin work, written with elegance, almost exclusively on the basis of the Vulgate and the Septuagint. His only contribution to apologetics is a volume entitled "Soirées d'Automne, ou la Religion prouvée aux gens du monde" (Paris, 1887).

HURTER, *Nomenclator;* VIG., *Dict. de la Bible,* s. v.

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Maurice, SAINT, leader (*primicerius*) of the Theban Legion, massacred at Agaunum, about 287 (286, 297, 302, 303), by order of Maximian Herculius. Feast, 22 Sept. The legend (Acta SS., VI, Sept., 308, 895) relates that the legion, composed entirely of Christians, had been called from Africa to suppress a revolt

of the Bagandæ in Gaul. The soldiers were ordered to sacrifice to the gods in thanksgiving but refused. Every tenth was then killed. Another order to sacrifice and another refusal caused a second decimation and then a general massacre. (On the value of the legend, etc., see *Agaunum* and *Theban legion.*) St. Maurice is represented as a knight in full armour (sometimes as a Moor), bearing a standard and a palm; in Italian paintings with a red cross on his breast, which is the badge of the Sardinian Order of St. Maurice. Many places in Switzerland, Piedmont, France, and Germany have chosen him as celestial patron, as have also the dyers, clothmakers, soldiers, swordsmiths, and others. He is invoked against gout, cramps, etc.

See CHEVALIER, *Bio-Bibl.*, s. v.; *Histor. Jahrbuch*, XIII, 782.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Maurice (MAURICIUS, Μαυρίκιος), Roman Emperor, b. in 539; d. in Nov., 602. He sprang from an old Roman (Latin) family settled in Cappadocia, and began his career as a soldier. Under the Emperor Tiberius II (578–582) he was made commander of a new legion levied from allied barbarians, with which he did good service against the Persians. When he returned triumphant to Constantinople, Tiberius gave him his daughter Constantina in marriage and appointed him his successor (578). Almost immediately afterwards (Theophylact, *infra*, says the next day) Tiberius died and Maurice succeeded peaceably. At his accession he found that through the reckless extravagance of his predecessor the exchequer was empty and the State bankrupt. In order to remedy this Maurice established the expenses of the court on a basis of strict economy. He gained a reputation for parsimony that made him very unpopular and led eventually to his fall. The twenty years of his reign do not in any way stand out conspicuously from early Byzantine history. The forces at work since Justinian, or even Constantine, continued the gradual decay of the Empire under Maurice, as under Tiberius his predecessor and Phocas his successor. For the first ten years the long war with the Persians continued; then a revolution among the enemy brought a respite and the Roman Emperor was invoked by Chosroes II to restore him to his throne. Unfortunately Maurice was not clever enough to draw any profit for the Empire from this situation. The Avars and Slavs continued their invasion of the northern provinces. The Slavs penetrated even to the Peloponnesus. The Lombards ravaged Italy with impunity. As the Empire could do nothing to protect the Italians, they invited the Franks to their help (584). This first invasion of Italy by the Franks began the process that was to end in the separation of all the West from the old Empire and the establishment of the rival line of Emperors with Charles the Great (800). Maurice had to buy off the Avars with a heavy bribe that further reduced his scanty resources and made economy still more imperative. The emperor became more and more unpopular. In 599 he could not or would not ransom 12,000 Roman soldiers taken prisoners by the Avars, and they were all murdered. Further harassing regulations made for the army with a view to more economy caused a revolt that became a revolution. In 602 the soldiers drove away their officers, made a certain centurion, Phocas, their leader and marched on Constantinople. Maurice, finding that he could not organize a resistance, fled across the Bosporus with his family. He was overtaken at Chalcedon and murdered with his five sons. Phocas then began his tyrannical reign (602–610).

THE CONVERSION OF ST. MAURICE
Domenico Theotocopuli (El Greco), Escorial, Madrid

In Church history Maurice has some importance through his relations with Gregory I (590–604). As soon as Gregory was elected, he wrote to the emperor begging him to annul the election. The fact has often been quoted as showing Gregory's acceptance of an imperial right of veto. Later the pope's organization of resistance against the Lombards was very displeasing to the emperor, though the government at Constantinople did nothing to protect Italy. Further trouble was caused by the tyranny of the imperial exarch at Ravenna, Romanus. Against this person the pope took the Italians under his protection. On the other hand the exarch and the emperor protected the bishops in the North of Italy who still kept up the schism that began with the Three Chapters quarrel (Pope Vigilius, 540–555). The assumption of the title of "œcumenical patriarch" by John IV of Constantinople (see JOHN THE FASTER) caused more friction. All this explains St. Gregory's unfriendly feeling towards Maurice; and it also helps to explain his ready and friendly recognition of Phocas which has been alleged by some to be a blot in the great pope's career. But it is quite probable that the pope was misinformed and not placed in full possession of all the circumstances attending the change of government in the distant East.

EVAGRIUS, *Hist. Eccl.*, VI; THEOPHYLACTUS, *Historia*, ed. DE BOORS (Leipzig, 1887); ADAMEK, *Beiträge zur Gesch. des Kaisers Mauricius* (Graz, 1891); GIBBON, *Decline and Fall*, xlv, xlvi: ed. BURY, V (London, 1898), 19–22, 57–63; BURY, *History of the Later Roman Empire*, II (London, 1889), 83–94.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Maurice and Lazarus, KNIGHTS OF. See LAZARUS, KNIGHTS OF SAINT.

Maurienne. See SAINT-JEAN DE MAURIENNE.

Maurists, THE, a congregation of Benedictine monks in France, whose history extends from 1618–1818. It began as an offshoot from the famous reformed Congregation of St-Vannes. The reform had spread from Lorraine into France through the influence of Dom Laurent Bénard, Prior of the Collège de Cluny in Paris, who inaugurated the reform in his own college. Thence it spread to St-Augustin de Limoges, to Nouaillé, to St-Faron de Meaux, to Jumièges, and to the Blancs-Manteaux in Paris. In 1618 a general chapter of the Congregation of St-Vannes was held at St-Mansuet de Toul, whereat it was decided that an independent congregation should be erected for the

reformed houses in France, having its superior residing within that kingdom. This proposal was supported by Louis XIII as well as by Cardinals de Retz and Richelieu; letters patent were granted by the king, and the new organization was named the Congregation of St-Maur in order to obviate any rivalry between its component houses. It was formally approved by Pope Gregory XV on 17 May, 1621, an approval that was confirmed by Urban VIII six years later. The reform was welcomed by many of great influence at the Court as well as by some of the greater monastic houses in France. Already, under the first president of the congregation, Dom Martin Tesnière (1618–21), it had included about a dozen great houses. By 1630 the congregation was divided into three provinces, and, under Dom Grégoire Tarisse, the first Superior-General (1630–48), it included over 80 houses. Before the end of the seventeenth century the number had risen to over 180 monasteries, the congregations being divided into six provinces: France, Normandy, Brittany, Burgundy, Chezal-Benoît, and Gascony.

In its earlier years, however, the new congregation was forced, by Cardinal Richelieu, into an alliance with the Congregation of Cluny. Richelieu desired an amalgamation of all the Benedictines in France and even succeeded in bringing into existence, in 1634, an organization that was called the "Congregation of St. Benedict" or "of Cluny and St-Maur". This arrangement, however, was short-lived, and the two congregations were separated by Urban VIII in 1644. From that date the Congregation of St-Maur grew steadily both in extent and in influence. Although the twenty-one superior-generals who succeeded Dom Tarisse steadily resisted all attempts to establish the congregation beyond the borders of France, yet its influence was widespread. In several of its houses schools were conducted for the sons of noble families, and education was provided gratuitously at St-Martin de Vertou for those who had become poor. But from the beginning the Maurists refused to admit houses of nuns into the congregation, the only exception being the Abbey of Chelles, where, through Richelieu's influence, a house was established with six monks to act as confessors to the nuns.

The congregation soon attracted to its ranks many of the most learned scholars of the period, and though its greatest glory undoubtedly lies in the seventeenth century, yet, throughout the eighteenth century also, it continued to produce works whose solidity and critical value still render them indispensable to modern students. It is true that the Maurists were not free from the infiltration of Jansenist ideas, and that the work of some of its most learned sons was hampered and coloured by the fashionable heresy and by the efforts of ecclesiastical superiors to eradicate it. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, also, there had crept into at least the central house, St-Germain-des-Prés, a desire for some relaxation of the strict regularity that had been the mark of the congregation; a desire that was vigorously opposed by other houses. And, though there is reason to believe that the laxity was much less serious than it was represented to be by the rigorists, the dissensions caused thereby and by the taint of Jansenism had weakened the congregation and lowered it in public esteem when the crash of the Revolution came. Yet, right up to the suppression of the religious orders in 1790, the Maurists worked steadily at their great undertakings, and some of their publications were, by general consent, carried on by learned Academies after the disturbance of the Revolution had passed. In 1817 some of the survivors of those who had been driven from France in 1790 returned, and an attempt was made to restore the congregation. The project, however, did not meet with the approbation of the Holy See and the congregation ceased to exist. The last surviving member, Dom Brial, died in 1833. In 1837, when Gregory XVI established the Congregation of France under the governance of the Abbey of Solesmes, the new congregation was declared the successor of all the former congregations of French Benedictines, including that of St-Maur.

CONSTITUTION.—The early Maurists, like the Congregation of St-Vannes from which they sprang, imitated the constitution of the reformed Congregation of Monte Cassino. But before many years the need of new regulations more suitable to France was recognized and Dom Grégoire Tarisse, the first Superior-General, was entrusted with the task of drawing them up. Dom Maur Dupont, who was elected president in 1627, had already made an attempt to accomplish this; but the Chapter of 1630 appointed a commission, of which Dom Tarisse was the chief member, to reconstruct the whole work. The result of their labours was first submitted to Dom Athanase de Mongin in 1633, then again to Dom Tarisse and three others in 1639, and was finally confirmed by the General Chapter of 1645. Under these constitutions the president (now styled "superior-general") and the priors of the commendatory houses of the congregation were to be elected every three years. They were eligible for re-election. The superior-general was to reside at the Abbey of St-Germain-des-Prés and was to be subject only to the general chapter, which met every three years. With him, however, were associated two "assistants" and six "visitors", one for each province. These also resided at St-Germain-des-Prés, were elected by the general chapter every three years, and constituted, with the superior-general, the executive council of the congregation. Besides these officials, the general chapter was composed of three priors and three conventuals from each province. Every three years, there were chosen from its ranks nine "definitors" who appointed the six visitors, the heads of all the houses that possessed no regular abbot, the novice-masters, the *procurator in curia*, the preachers, professors, etc., of the congregation. Each province also possessed its provincial chapter, which was presided over by the visitor, and consisted of the priors and one elected representative from each house. In each province there were to be two novitiates. Those who desired to embrace the monastic state spent one year as "postulants", a second as "novices", and then, when they had completed the five years' course of philosophy and theology, spent a "year of recollection" before they were admitted to the priesthood. The discipline was marked by a return to the strict rule of St. Benedict. All laboured with their hands, all abstained from flesh-meat, all embraced regular poverty; the Divine Office was recited at the canonical hours with great solemnity, silence was observed for many hours, and there were regular times for private prayer and meditation. And this discipline was uniform throughout every house of the congregation. None were dispensed from its strict observance save the sick and the infirm. Until the movement towards relaxation at the end of the eighteenth century, the Maurists were as renowned for the austerity of their observance as for the splendour of their intellectual achievements.

To the great body of students, indeed, the Maurists are best known by their services to ecclesiastical and literary history, to patrology, to Biblical studies, to diplomatics, to chronology and to liturgy. The names of DD. Luc d'Achery, Jean Mabillon, Thierry, Ruinart, François Lami, Pierre Coustant, Denys de Sainte-Marthe, Edmond Martène, Bernard de Montfaucon, Maur François Dantine, Antoine Rivet de la Grange and Martin Bouquet recall some of the most scholarly works ever produced. To these and to their confrères we are indebted for critical and still indispensable editions of the great Latin and Greek Fathers, for the history of the Benedictine Order and the lives of its saints, for the "Gallia Christiana" and the

"Histoire Littéraire de la France," for the "De re Diplomatica" and "L'art de vérifier les dates", for "L'antiquité expliquée et representée" and the "Palæographia Græca", for the "Recueil des historiens des Gaules", the "Veterum scriptorum amplissima collectio", the "Thesaurus Anecdotorum", the "Spicilegium veterum scriptorum", the "Museum Italicum", the "Voyage littéraire", and numerous other works that are the foundation of modern historical and liturgical studies. For nearly two centuries the great works that were the result of the foresight and high ideals of Dom Grégoire Tarisse, were carried on with an industry, a devotion, and a mastery that aroused the admiration of the learned world. To this day, all who labour to elucidate the past ages and to understand the growth of Western Christendom, must acknowledge their indebtedness to the Maurist Congregation.

The following were the monasteries of the Maurist Congregation in the latter half of the eighteenth century:—

(1) Province of France.—Diocese of Amiens: Corbie, St-Fuscien-aux-Bois, St-Josse-sur-mer, St. Riquier, St-Valéry.—Diocese of Beauvais: Breteuil-sur-Noye, St-Lucien-de-Beauvais.—Diocese of Boulogne: St-Sauve-de-Montreuil, Samer.—Diocese of Chartres: Meulan.—Diocese of Laon: Nogent-sous-Coucy, Ribemont, St-Jean-de-Laon, St-Nicholas-aux-Bois, St-Vincent-de-Laon.—Diocese of Meaux: Rebais, St-Faron-de-Meaux, St-Fiacre.—Diocese of Noyon: Mont-Saint-Quentin, St-Eloi-de-Noyon, St-Quentin-en-l'Isle.—Diocese of Paris: Argenteuil, Chelles, Lagny, Les-Blancs-Manteaux-de-Paris, St-Denis-de-France, St-Germain-des-Prés.—Diocese of Reims: Notre-Dame-de-Rethel, St-Basle, St-Marcoul-de-Corbeny, St-Nicaise-de-Reims, St-Remi-de-Reims, St-Thierry.—Diocese of Rouen; Le Tréport, St-Martin-de-Pontoise.—Diocese of Soissons: Chézy, Orbais, St-Corneille-de-Compiègne, St-Crépin-de-Soissons, St-Médard-de-Soissons.

(2) Province of Normandy.—Diocese of Bayeux: Cerisy-la-Foret, Fontenay, St-Etienne-de-Caen, St-Vigor-le-Grand.—Diocese of Beauvais: St-Germer-de-Flay.—Diocese of Chartres: Coulombs, Josaphat-lès-Chartres, St-Florentin-de-Bonneval, St-Père-en-Vallée, Tiron.—Diocese of Coutances: Lessay.—Diocese of Evreux: Conches, Ivry-la-Bataille, Lyre, St-Taurin d'Evreux.—Diocese of Le Mans: Lonlay-l'Abbaye.—Diocese of Lisieux: Beaumont-en-Auge, La Couture-de-Bernay, St-Evroult d'Ouches, St-Pierre de Préaux.—Diocese of Rouen: Aumale, Bonne-Nouvelle, Fécamp, Jumièges, Le Bec, St-Georges-de-Boscherville, St-Ouen-de-Rouen, St-Wandrille-Rençon, Valmont.—Diocese of Séez: St-Martin-de-Séez, St-Pierre-sur-Dive.

(3) Province of Brittany.—Diocese of Angers: Bourgeuil, Château-Gontier, Craon, Notre-Dame-de-l'Evière, St-Aubin-d'Angers, St-Florent-de-Saumur, St-Florent-le-Vieil, St-Maur-sur-Loire, St-Nicolas-d'Angers, St-Serge-d'Angers.—Diocese of Avranches: Mont-Saint-Michel.—Diocese of Dol: Le Tronchet, St-Jacut-de-la-Mer.—Diocese of Le Mans: Evron, St-Pierre-de-la-Couture, St-Vincent-du-Mans, Solesmes, Tuffé.—Diocese of Nantes: Blanche-Couronne, Notre-Dame-de-la-Chaume, Pirmil, St-Gildas-des-Bois, Vertou.—Diocese of Poitiers: Montreuil-Bellay.—Diocese of Quimper: Landevenec, Quimperlé.—Diocese of Rennes: St-Magloire-de-Lehon, St-Melaine-de-Rennes, Ste-Croix-de-Vitré.—Diocese of St-Brieuc: Lantenac.—Diocese of Saint-Malo: St-Malo.—Diocese of St-Pol-de-Léon: St-Mathieu-de-Fine-Terre.—Diocese of Tours: Beaulieu, Cormery, Marmoutier, Noyers, St-Julien-de-Tours, Turpenay, Villeloin.—Diocese of Vannes: St-Gildas-de-Rhuis, St-Sauveur-de-Redon.

(4) Province of Burgundy.—Diocese of Autun: Corbigny, Flavigny, St-Martin-de-Cures.—Diocese of Auxerre: St-Germain.—Diocese of Blois: Pont-le-Voy, St-Laumer-de-Blois, Ste-Trinité-de-Vendôme.—Diocese of Chalon-sur-Saône: St-Pierre.—Diocese of Dijon: St-Benigne-de-Dijon, St-Seine-l'Abbaye.—Diocese of Langres: Bèze, Molesmes, Molosme, Moutier-Saint-Jean, St-Michel-de-Tonnerre.—Diocese of Le Mans: St-Calais.—Diocese of Lyons; Ambronay.—Diocese of Orleans: Bonne-Nouvelle, St-Benoît-sur-Loire.—Diocese of Sens: Ferrières, St-Pierre-de-Melun, St-Pierre-le-Vif-de-Sens, Ste-Colombe-lès-Sens.

(5) Province of Chezal-Benoît.—Diocese of Bourges: Chezal-Benoît, St-Benoît-du-Sault, St-Sulpice-de-Bourges, Vierzon.—Diocese of Cahors: Souillac.—Diocese of Clermont: Chaise-Dieu, Issoire, Mauriac, St-Allyre-de-Clermont.—Diocese of La Rochelle: Mortagne-sur-Sèvre.—Diocese of Limoges: Beaulieu, Meymac, St-Angel, St-Augustin-de-Limoges, Solignac.—Diocese of Lucon: St-Michel-en-l'Herm.—Diocese of Lyons: Savigneux.—Diocese of Périgueux: Brantôme.—Diocese of Poitiers: Nouaillé, St-Cyprien-de-Poitiers, St-Jouin-de-Marnes, St. Léonard der Ferrières, St-Maixent, St-Savin.—Diocese of St-Flour: Chanteuges.—Diocese of Saintes: Bassac, St-Jean-d'Angely.

(6) Province of Gascony.—Diocese of Agde: St-Tiberi.—Diocese of Agen: Eysses, St-Maurin, Ste-Livrade.—Diocese of Aire: La Reule, St-Pé-de-Generez, St-Savin, St-Sever-Cap-de-Gascogne.—Diocese of Alais: St-Pierre-de-Salve.—Diocese of Arles: Montmajeur.—Diocese of Avignon: Rochefort, St-André-de-Villeneuve.—Diocese of Béziers: Villemagne.—Diocese of Bordeaux: La Sauve-Majeure, Ste-Croix-de-Bordeaux.—Diocese of Carcassonne: Montolieu, Notre-Dame-de-la-Grasse.—Diocese of Dax: St-Jean-de-Sorde.—Diocese of Grenoble: St-Robert-de-Cornillon.—Diocese of Laveur: Sorèze.—Diocese of Lescar: St-Pierre-de-la-Réole.—Diocese of Lodève: St-Guilhem-le-Désert.—Diocese of Mirepoix: Camon.—Diocese of Montpellier: St-Sauveur-d'Aniane.—Diocese of Narbonne: La Morguier, St-Pierre-de-Caunes.—Diocese of Nimes: St-Bausille.—Diocese of St-Pons: St-Chinian.—Diocese of Toulouse: Le-Mas-Garnier, Notre-Dame-de-la-Daurade.

The Superiors of the Congregation were:—Presidents: D. Martin Tesnière (1618–21), D. Columban Régnier (1621–24), D. Martin Tesnière (1624–27), D. Maur Dupont (1627–30).

Superiors-general:—D. Grégoire Tarisse (1630–48), D. Jean Harel (1648–60), D. Bernard Audebert (1660–72), D. Vincent Marsolle (1672–81), D. Michel Benôit Brachet (1681–87), D. Claude Boistard (1687–1705), D. Simon Bougis (1705–11), D. Arnoul de Loo (1711–14), D. Petey de l'Hostallerie (1714–20), D. Denys de Sainte-Marthe (1720–25), D. Pierre Thibault (1725–29), D. Jean Baptiste Alaydon (1729–32), D. Hervé Ménard (1732–36), D. Claude Dupré (1736–37), D. Réné Laneau (1737–54), D. Jacques Maumousseau (1754–56), D. Marie Joseph Delrue (1756–66), D. Pierre François Boudier (1766–72), D. Réné Gillot (1772–78), D. Charles Lacroix (1778–81), D. Chartié-Mousso (1781–83), D. Antoine Chevreux (1783–92).

The Procurators-General in Rome, who were all of importance in the history of the Congregation, were:—D. Placide Le Simon (1623–61); D. Gabriel Flambart (1665–72), D. Antoine Durban (1672–81), D. Gabriel Flambart (1681–84), D. Claude Estiennot (1684–99), D. Bernard de Montfaucon (1699–1701), D. Guillaume Laparre (1701–11), D. Philippe Rafier (1711–16), D. Charles Conrade (1716–25), D. Pierre Maloet (1721–33). No successor to D. Maloet was appointed.

ALSTON, *The Congregation of St-Maur* in *Downside Review* (March and July, 1906); ANGER, *Les dépendances de St-Germain-des-Prés*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1906–9); IDEM, *Les mitigations demandées par les moines de St-Germain-des-Prés en 1765* in *Revue Mabillon* IV, (1909); BEAUNIER, *Recueil historique des archevêchés, évêchés, abbayes, et prieurés de France, Introduction* (Ligugé, 1906), 90–120; BERLIÈRE, *Die Lehranstalten der Mauriner* in *Studien O.S.B.*, VIII (1887), 589–93; IDEM, *Les correspondants littéraires de bénédictins de St-Maur dans les*

monastères belges in *Revue Bénédictine*, VI (1889), 542–49; IDEM, *Lettres inédites de bénédictins de St-Maur au Cardinal Gualterio* in *Revue Bénédictine*, XXIV (1907), 415–19; BESSE, *Les fondateurs de la congrégation de St-Maur* in *Revue des sciences ecclésiastiques*, II (1902), 143 sq., 230 sq., 532 sq.; CHAVIN DE MALAN, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la congrégation de St-Maur* (Le Mans, 1881); DANTIER, *Rapports sur la correspondance inédite des bénédictins de St-Maur* (Paris, 1857); DE LA BORDERIE, *Correspondance historique des bénédictins bretons* (Paris, 1880); DE LAMA, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la congrégation de St-Maur* (Munich, 1882); GIGAS, *Lettres des bénédictins de la congrégation de St-Maur* (1652–1741) (Copenhagen, 1893); HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der Katholischen Kirche*, I (Paderborn, 1907), 305–13; HELYOT, *Histoire des ordres religieux et militaires*, VI (Paris, 1792), 288–98; INGOLD, *Histoire de l'édition bénédictine de St-Augustin* (Paris, 1902); KUKULA, *Die Maurinerausgabe des Augustinus* (Vienna, 1890–98); LE CERF, *Bibliothèque historique et critique des auteurs de la congrégation de Saint-Maur* (The Hague, 1726); LECOMTE, *L'histoire littéraire de la France par Dom Rivet et autres* in *Revue Mabillon*, II (1906), 210–85; III (1907), 22–42, 134–46; MCCARTHY, *The lives of the principal writers of the Congregation of St-Maur* (London, 1868); MANGENOT, *Les travaux des bénédictins de St-Maur, de St-Vanne et St-Hydulphe sur les anciennes versions latines de la Bible* (Amiens, 1889); PEZ, *Bibliotheca benedictino-mauriana* (Augsburg, 1716); ROBERT, *Supplément à l'histoire littéraire de la congrégation de St-Maur* (Paris, 1881); SICARD, *Les études classiques avant la révolution* (Paris, 1887); STEIN, *Le premier supérieur général de la congrégation de St-Maur* in *Archives de la France Monastique*, V (Ligugé, 1908), 51–89; TASSIN, *Histoire littéraire de la congrégation de St-Maur* (Brussels, 1770); VABUTI, *Los benedictinos de San Mauro* (Palma de Mallorca, 1899); VANEL, *Les Bénédictins de St-Maur à St-Germain-des-Prés* (Paris, 1896); WILHELM ET BERLIÈRE, *Nouveau supplément à l'histoire littéraire de la congrégation de St-Maur*, I (Paris, 1908); ZÖCKLER in HERZOG AND HAUCK, *Real-Encyklopädie*, s. v. See also the bibliographies attached to the articles on celebrated Maurists in THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA.

LESLIE A. ST. L. TOKE.

Mauritius. See PORT LOUIS, DIOCESE OF.

Mauritius de Portu. See O'FIHELY, MAURICE.

Maurus, SAINT, deacon, son of Equitius, a nobleman of Rome, but claimed also by Fondi, Gallipoli, Lavello etc. (Delehaye, "Legends", London, 1907, 59); d. 584. Feast, 15 Jan. He is represented as an abbot with crozier, or with book and censer, or holding the weights and measures of food and drink given him by his holy master. He is the patron of charcoal-burners, coppersmiths etc.—in Belgium of shoemakers—and is invoked against gout, hoarseness etc. (Kerler). He was a disciple of St. Benedict, and his chief support at Subiaco. By St. Gregory the Great (Lib. Dialog., II) he is described as a model of religious virtues, especially of obedience. According to the Vita ("Acta SS." II Jan., 320, and Mabillon, "Acta SS. O. S. B.", I, 274) he went to France in 543, and became the founder and superior of the abbey at Glanfeuil, later known by his name. This Vita, ascribed to a companion, the monk Faustus of Monte Cassino, has been severely attacked. Delehaye (loc. cit., 106) calls it a forgery of Abbot Odo of Glanfeuil in the ninth century, but Adlhoch (Stud. u. Mittheil., 1903, 3; 1906, 185) makes a zealous defence. On the Signum S. Mauri, a blessing of the sick with invocation of St. Maurus given in the Appendix of Rituale Romanum, see "Studien u. Mittheil." (1882), 165.

SAINT MAURUS
Perugino, Church of St. Peter, Perugia

Anal. Boll. (1907), 342; *Bibl. Hag. Lat.*, 845; BIHLMEYER, *Hag. Jahresbericht* (Kempten, 1908), 228; *Revue Bénéd.*, XII, 326; XIII, 170; XIV, 23, 315; XVI, 430; LANDREAU, *Les vicissitudes de l'abbaye de S. Maur aux VIII^e et IX^e siècles* (Angers, 1905); IDEM, *Les deux hist. manuscrites de l'abbaye de S. M.* (Angers, 1907); CHEVALIER, *Bio-Bibl.*, s. v. *Maur, St.*

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Maurus, RABANUS. See RABANUS MAURUS.

Maurus, SYLVESTER, writer on philosophy and theology, b. at Spoleto, 31 Dec., 1619; d. in Rome, 13 Jan., 1687. He entered the Society of Jesus, 21 April, 1636. After finishing his course of studies and teaching humanities at the College of Macerata, he held in the same place the chair of philosophy for three years, and subsequently in Rome for several years. Then he was promoted to the chair of theology at the Roman College, and remained in this position for a considerable number of years. For a period he was also rector of the latter institution. The mental endowment of Father Maurus was a happy combination of the speculative and the practical turn of mind. His doctrine was noted for its soundness and solidity; at the same time, he constantly put in practice St. Paul's principle, "not to be more wise than it behoveth to be wise, but to be wise unto sobriety". Though he was a good philosopher and theologian, he was a better religious. Those well acquainted with him are convinced that he never lost his baptismal innocence. Neither his holiness nor his learning made him a disagreeable companion or an undesirable friend. It would be hard to say whether he was more admired or loved by those who came into contact with him.

The following works of Father Maurus deserve mention: (1) "Quæstionum philosophicarum Sylvestri Mauri, Soc. Jesu, in Collegio Romano Philosophiæ Professoris". This work is divided into four books, and appeared at Rome in 1658. A second edition was issued in 1670. The latest edition, in three volumes, is prefaced by a letter of Father Liberatore, and appeared in Le Mans, 1875–76. (2) "Aristotelis opera quæ extant omnia, brevi paraphrasi, ac litteræ perpetuo inhærente explanatione illustrata". The work appeared in six volumes, Rome, 1668. The second volume, containing Aristotle's moral philosophy, was edited anew in 1696–98. The whole work was published again in Paris, 1885–87, by Fathers Ehrle, Felchlin, and Beringer; this edition formed part of the collection entitled "Bibliotheca Theologiæ et Philosophiæ scholasticæ". (3) "Quæstionum theologicarum ll. 6", published at Rome, 1676–79; this work contains all the principal theological treatises. (4) "Opus theologicum", published in three folio volumes at Rome, 1687, treats of all the main questions of theology accurately, concisely, and clearly. The first volume contains some information concerning the author, and also his picture engraved by Louis Lenfant.

HURTER, *Nomenclator;* SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la C. de J.*, V, c. 765 sq.

A. J. MAAS.

Maury, JEAN-SIFFREIN, cardinal and statesman, born at Valréas, near Avignon, 26 June, 1746; died at Rome on 10 May, 1817. He made his early studies in his native town and at Avignon, and by the age of nineteen had completed his theological course. He then proceeded to Paris and entered the Collège de France. Ordained in 1769, he attracted the attention of a grand-nephew of Fénelon by a eulogy of the great archbishop, and was appointed Vicar-General of the Diocese of Lombez in Gascony. In 1772 he was selected by the Academy to preach the panegyric of St. Louis at the Louvre. His success was such that the audience interrupted him with loud

applause. As a reward he received a benefice and appointment as royal preacher. At the General Synod of 1775 he fearlessly exposed the failings of the court bishops, and in 1784, preaching on St. Vincent of Paul, he denounced the ingratitude of France towards one of her worthiest sons. These two sermons have been preserved; the remainder were burnt by Maury himself—to save, as he said, his reputation. Nevertheless, it was owing to them that he obtained a seat in the Academy (1784). In 1789 he was elected by the clergy of Péronne to be their deputy in the States-General, and soon became the acknowledged leader of the Court and Church party. Mirabeau's name at once occurs whenever the National Assembly is mentioned. Little is heard of the Abbé Maury, who was the great tribune's most doughty adversary, and who, though always defeated on the vote, was not seldom the conqueror in the debate. In September, 1791, the Assembly was dissolved, and Maury quitted France for Coblenz, the headquarters of the emigrants. Here he was received by the king's brothers with extraordinary attention. Pius VI invited him to reside in Rome, and created him Archbishop of Nicæa (April, 1792). Soon afterwards he represented the Holy See at the Diet of Frankfort, where Francis II was elected emperor. The royal and noble personages assembled there vied with one another in showing him honour. On his return he was made cardinal and Archbishop of Montefiascone. When the Republican armies overran Italy in 1798, Maury fled to Venice, and took a prominent part, as representative of Louis XVIII, in the conclave at which Pius VII was elected (1800). He did his best to stop the drawing up of the Concordat, but this did not prevent him from deserting his royal master and returning to Paris. Just as he had given his whole energies to the royal cause, so now he devoted himself entirely to Napoleon. In the difficult question of the divorce he sided with the emperor, and it was he who suggested a means of dispensing with the papal institution of the bishops. He accepted from Napoleon in this way the See of Paris, though he never styled himself anything but archbishop-elect. At the fall of the Empire (April, 1814), he was ordered to quit France, and was suspended by the pope. During the Hundred Days he was confined in the Castle of St. Angelo. Consalvi obtained his release, and brought about his reconciliation with Pius VII. His position as cardinal was restored to him, and he was made a member of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars. Maury did not live long to enjoy his restoration to papal favour. The hardships of his prison life had destroyed his constitution, and aggravated the malady from which he had long been suffering. Early in May, 1817, his strength had so failed that the Last Sacraments were administered to him. During the night of 10 May his attendants found him lying dead with his rosary still in his grasp.

Louis XVIII had obstinately refused all reconciliation, and now forbade his body to be buried in his titular church, Trinità dei Monti. By order of the pope the remains were laid before the high altar of the Chiesa Nuova, by the side of Baronius and Tarugi. When Pius VII heard of his death he said: "He committed many faults, but who is there that has not done the like? I myself have committed many grave ones."

Œuvres Choisies (Paris, 1827); POUJOULAT, *Le Cardinal Maury: sa Vie et ses Œuvres* (Paris, 1855); RICARD, *L'Abbé Maury, 1746–1791* (Paris, 1887); IDEM, *Correspondance Diplomatique et Mémoires inédits du Cardinal Maury, 1792–1817* (Lille, 1891); BONET-MAURY, *Le Cardinal Maury d'après sa Correspondance et ses Mémoires inédits* (Paris, 1892); SAINTE-BEUVE, *Causeries du Lundi*, IV (Paris, 1853); SCANNELL in *Irish Eccl. Record* (1892).

T. B. SCANNELL.

Maxentius, JOANNES, leader of the so-called Scythian monks, appears in history at Constantinople in 519 and 520. These monks adopted the formula: "One of the Trinity suffered in the flesh" to exclude Nestorianism and Monophysitism, and they sought to have the works of Faustus of Riez condemned as being tainted with Pelagianism. On both these points they met with opposition. John Maxentius presented an appeal to the papal legates then at Constantinople (Ep. ad legatos sedis apostolicæ, P. G., LXXXVI, i, 75–86); but it failed to bring forth a favourable decision. Some of the monks (not Maxentius, however) proceeded, therefore, to Rome to lay the case before Pope Hormisdas. As the latter delayed his decision, they addressed themselves to some African bishops, banished to Sardinia, and St. Fulgentius, answering in the name of these prelates, warmly endorsed their cause (Fulg. ep., xvii in P. L., LXV, 451–93). Early in August, 520, the monks left Rome. Shortly after, 13 August, 520, Hormisdas addressed a letter to the African bishop, Possessor, then at Constantinople, in which he severely condemned the conduct of the Scythian monks, also declaring that the writings of Faustus were not received among the authoritative works of the Fathers and that the sound doctrine on grace was contained in the works of St. Augustine (Hormisdæ ep., cxxiv in Thiel, p. 926). Maxentius assailed this letter in the strongest language as a document written by heretics and circulated under the pope's name (Ad epistulam Hormisdæ responsio, P. G., LXXXVI, i, 93–112). This is the last trace of the Scythian monks and their leader in history. The identification of John Maxentius with the priest John to whom Fulgentius addressed his "De veritate prædestinationis etc." and with the priest and archimandrite, John, to whom the African bishops sent their "Epistula synodica", rests on a baseless assumption. Maxentius is also the author of: (1) two dialogues against the Nestorians; (2) twelve anathematisms against the Nestorians; (3) a treatise against the Acephali (Monophysites). As to the "Professio de Christo", printed as a separate work, it is but a part of the "Epistola ad legatos sedis apostolicæ". His works, originally written in Latin, have reached us in a rather unsatisfactory condition. They were first published by Cochlæus (Basle and Hagenau, 1520), reprinted in P. G., LXXXVI, i, 75–158.

NORIS, *Opera Omnia* (Verona, 1729), I, 474–504; III, 775–942; LOOFS, *Leontius von Byzanz*, 228–61, in *Texte und Untersuch.*, III (Leipzig, 1887); DAVIDS in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v. *Maxentius* (4); BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (St. Louis, 1908), 548–49.

N. A. WEBER.

Maxentius, MARCUS AURELIUS, Roman Emperor 306–12, son of the Emperor Maximianus Herculius and son-in-law of the chief Emperor Galerius. After his father's abdication he lived in Rome as a private citizen; but when Galerius established in Rome and Italy the new poll and land taxes decreed by Diocletian he was elected (28 October, 306) rival emperor. Maxentius owed his elevation not to personal merit but to the senators and pretorians who, because of the unusual measures of the emperor, feared lest they should lose their privileged position. Maxentius's adherents then summoned his father from Campania to Rome; and the young ruler invested him with the purple as co-regent. Thus the Roman empire had six rulers. Severus, the Augustus of the West, received a commission from Galerius to expel the youthful usurper from Rome; but when he reached the capital, part of his army deserted to their old commander, Maximian. Severus with a few followers escaped to Ravenna so as to maintain military relations with Galerius. He then made terms with Maximian and surrendered to him, expecting honourable treatment, but he was imprisoned soon afterwards and, Galerius approaching from Illyria with an army, he was forced to commit suicide. Alarmed at Galerius's intervention, Maximian on behalf of Maxen-

tius, negotiated with Constantine to whom he gave his daughter Fausta as bride. Meanwhile Galerius with his Illyrian legions pushed forward to the neighbourhood of Rome, but finding that he was unable to occupy it or any of the fortified places, he withdrew his forces. At his suggestion a conference of all the Cæsars took place at Carnuntum on the Danube (307) in which the prestige of Diocletian had great influence. Maxentius retained his imperial dignity. Though it is true that soon after this he put an end to the persecution of the Christians in Italy and Africa, his reign was stained with acts of debauchery and cruelty.

After his father's death, Maxentius and Maximin, Emperor of the East, fearing the political alliance of Constantine and Licinius, came to an understanding unfriendly to Constantine. Maxentius made extensive military preparations, and destroyed the statues and paintings of Constantine. Constantine advanced over what is now Mont Cenis with a comparatively small but well-drilled army and, victorious in several battles, occupied Upper Italy; he then marched against Rome, where his opponent, strongly entrenched behind the Tiber and the walls of Aurelius, hoped to resist him successfully. Thoughtlessly and shortsightedly, Maxentius, abandoning this excellent position, made a bridge of boats across the Tiber (near the Milvian Bridge now Ponte Molle), and awaited the troops of Constantine on the right bank of the river. It was then that occurred the miracle related by Eusebius (Vita Constant. I, 28–30), that when Constantine implored supernatural aid, a fiery cross appeared over the sun with the legend: τούτῳ νίκα (conquer with this). Further, he had been advised by Christ, in a dream the previous night, to go into battle armed with this sign. Maxentius's soldiers were thrown into confusion by the impetuosity of the Gallic horsemen, and in the efforts of the retreating masses to escape over the narrow bridge, many were thrown into the river and drowned, among them Maxentius (28 October, 312). His son and counsellors were put to death, but his officials and dependents retained their positions.

Schiller, *Gesch. d. römischen Kaiserzeit*, II (Gotha, 1887); de Waal, *Roma Sacra* (Munich, 1905).

Karl Hoeber.

Maxfield (*vere* Macclesfield), Thomas, Venerable, English priest and martyr, b. in Stafford gaol, about 1590, martyred at Tyburn, London, Monday, 1 July, 1616. He was one of the younger sons of William Macclesfield of Chesterton and Maer and Aston, Staffordshire (a firm recusant, condemned to death in 1587 for harbouring priests, one of whom was his brother Humphrey), and Ursula, daughter of Francis Roos, of Laxton, Nottinghamshire. William Macclesfield is said to have died in prison and is one of the *prætermissi* as William Maxfield; but, as his death occurred in 1608, this is doubtful. Thomas arrived at the English College at Douai on 16 March, 1602–3, but had to return to England 17 May, 1610, owing to ill health. In 1614 he went back to Douai, was ordained priest, and in the next year came to London. Within three months of landing he was arrested, and sent to the Gatehouse, Westminster. After about eight months' imprisonment, he tried to escape by a rope let down from the window in his cell, but was captured on reaching the ground. This was at midnight 14–15 June, 1616. For seventy hours he was placed in the stocks in a filthy dungeon at the Gatehouse, and was then on Monday night (17 June) removed to Newgate, where he was set amongst the worst criminals, two of whom he converted. On Wednesday, 26 June, he was brought to the bar at the Old Bailey, and the next day was condemned solely for being a priest, under 27 Eliz., c, 2. The Spanish ambassador did his best to obtain a pardon, or at least a reprieve; but, finding his efforts unavailing, had solemn exposition of the Blessed Sacrament in his chapel during the martyr's last night on earth. The procession to Tyburn early on the following morning was joined by many devout Spaniards, who, in spite of insults and mockery, persisted in forming a guard of honour for the martyr. Tyburn-tree itself was found decorated with garlands, and the ground round about strewn with sweet herbs. The sheriff ordered the martyr to be cut down alive, but popular feeling was too strong, and the disembowelling did not take place till he was quite senseless. Half of his relics are now at Downside Abbey, near Bath.

Life and Martyrdom of Mr. Maxfield, Priest 1616, ed. Pollen, in *Catholic Record Society*, III, 30–58; Challoner, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*, II (Manchester, 1803), 51; Pollard in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; Stanton, *Menology of England and Wales* (London, 1887), 298; *The William Salt Archæological Society's Collections for a History of Staffordshire* (London, 1882–1909), III, iii; V, ii, 207; new series, V, 128; XII, 248.

John B. Wainewright.

Maximianopolis, a titular see of Palestina Secunda, suffragan of Scythopolis. Its ancient name, Adad-Remmon, according to the Vulgate (according to the Hebrew, Hadad-Rimmon) is found in Zach., xii, 11: "... there shall be a great lamentation in Jerusalem like the lamentation of Adadremmon in the plain of Mageddon," an allusion to the death of Josias, King of Jerusalem, killed by the Pharaoh Nechao in the battle fought near this place (IV Kings, xxiii, 29; II Par. xxxv, 20–25). In the time of the so-called "Pilgrim of Bordeaux" (ed. Geyer, 19, 27) and of St. Jerome ("Comment. in Zachar.", ad cap. xii, 11; "Comment. in Oz.", 5), Adad-Remmon already bore the name of Maximianopolis. Three of its ancient bishops are known: Paul, in 325 (Gelzer, "Patrum Nicænorum nomina", lxi)—not Maximus, as Le Quien gives it in "Oriens Christianus", III, 703; Megas, in 518, and Domnus, in 536 (Le Quien, op. cit., 703–06). Maximianopolis has resumed its ancient name of Rimmon, and is now the almost deserted little village of Roummaneh, nearly four miles to the south of Ledjun, or Mageddo (see Legio).

Guérin, *Description de la Palestine: Samarie* (Paris, 1875), II, 228–230; Gelzer, *Georgii Cyprii Descriptio orbis romani* (Leipzig, 1890), 193–96; Legendre in Vig., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Adadremmon*.

S. Vailhé.

Maximianus, Marcus Aurelius Valerius, surnamed Herculius, Roman Emperor, was adopted by Diocletian and named his co-regent in 285, because by this division of the sovereignty the danger of the warriors' mutiny, the ambitious efforts of the usurpers, and the attacks of foreign enemies seemed to be prevented in the surest way. Diocletian gave him, who had been hitherto his brother-in-arms and was now his fellow regent, the surname Herculius, in remembrance of the help which the mythological Hercules rendered his father Jupiter in the latter's struggle against the giants. Like Diocletian, Maximianus came from Illyria, from the neighbourhood of Sirmium; as the son of a simple peasant, he possessed only very little education; he was violent and brutal, but was a brave fighter. For this reason, when Diocletian was struggling with the Persians in Asia, Maximianus was entrusted with the leadership of the punitive expedition against the peasants and field slaves (Bagaudans) in Gaul who, driven by economical causes, had risen against Diocletian. The new emperor soon restored peace, and received from Diocletian, in token of the latter's gratitude, the title of Augustus on 1 April, 286. However, only the administration of the empire was divided; the sovereignty remained centralized now as ever, and the will of the emperor-in-chief, Diocletian, was absolute. While Maximianus, having established his head-quarters at Mainz, was successful in the struggles with the Burgundians and the Alamanni, who had crossed the frontier and the Rhine, he found many obstacles in repulsing the Menapian pirate chief Carausius. Originally commander-in-chief of the Roman

navy, Carausius had pursued and conquered the pirates of the German ocean; then, driven by greed and ambition, he had forced Britain to do homage to him, and seized the whole trade in Gaul and Britain. In 286 he even appropriated the title of Augustus, and caused coins to be struck which bore his own portrait. Even Diocletian, by a compromise in 290, was forced to recognize Carausius as the legal emperor, while the latter agreed to supply Diocletian with corn, as had been the custom.

As Diocletian left Syria to enter the countries of the Lower Danube, he met Maximianus, and both the emperors crossed the Alps in the beginning of 291 in order to attend a conference at Milan, there to discuss the better administration of the empire and the improvement of the constitution. Henceforward two substitutes, called *Cæsars*, were to supplement the two governing emperors. Constantius and Galerius were proclaimed Cæsars 1 March, 293; the first was forced to marry the stepdaughter of Maximianus, Theodora, after the exile of his mother Helena. Maximianus now took charge of the administration of Italy, Africa, and Spain. His residence was Milan, where he was surrounded by 6000 Illyrian picked troops, called Herculians. Constantius on his part was now successful in his struggle with Carausius. The war came quickly to an end, as Carausius was assassinated by Allectus, prefect of his guard, in 293. Constantius then reunited Britain with the Roman Empire, while Maximianus protected the frontiers of Gaul against the Teutons on the Upper Rhine. When Constantius had returned from Britain, Maximianus went in 297 to Africa, where he sucessfully made war upon rebellious tribes of the Moors, and sent a great many captives into the other provinces. In 302 he celebrated a great triumph with Diocletian in Rome; seventeen times he had borne the title of Imperator. The persecution of the Christians, which Diocletian had conducted with reckless brutality in the East since 303, was also taken up by Maximianus in the western provinces, of which he was governor.

It is said that during these persecutions—it is impossible to state the time correctly—the Christian soldiers of the Theban legion also suffered martyrdom in Agaunum (St-Maurice, Canton of Valais, Switzerland) in the then Diocese of Octodurum. The Christian soldiers of this legion refused to execute his orders when Maximianus, on a march over what is now the Great St. Bernard, commanded them to punish the Christians living in these districts; for this refusal the legion was twice decimated by the sword, and, as the survivors held out to the last, all the soldiers were massacred by order of the emperor. Because Rome was degraded by Diocletian more and more to the position of a provincial town, and because Galerius's new and hard system of taxes was to be extended also to Italy and to Rome, the senators and the pretorians proclaimed as Cæsar M. Aurelius Maxentius, the son of Maximianus; the latter laid down the purple at Milan. But the new emperor proved to be incapable of governing, and Maximianus, who was popular with the army, was recalled to restore order for the new Augustus. This he did not accomplish, and the old Diocletian, living as a private person in Salona, called a meeting of all the members of the dynasties at Carnuntum for the end of the year 307. Maximianus had to renounce the purple for the second time. He now went to Gaul, and gave his youngest daughter Fausta in marriage to Constantine. As his hope to regain his former imperial dignity failed here also, he returned to his son Maxentius in Italy. Repulsed by the latter and spurned by Galerius on account of his ambitions, he departed once more for Gaul and donned the imperial purple for the third time. When the news of Constantine's approach reached his own soldiers, they surrendered him to his rival and opponent at Marsilia. Although Constantine in his generosity pardoned him, he returned to the forging of nefarious schemes against his son-in-law, and finally was compelled to take his own life in 310.

SCHILLER, *Gesch. d. römischen Kaiserzeit;* ALLARD, *La persécution de Dioclétien et le triomphe de l'église* (Paris, 1890).

KARL HOEBER.

Maximilian, the name of several martyrs. (1) MAXIMILIAN OF ANTIOCH, a soldier, martyred at Antioch, Jan. 353, with Bonosus, a fellow soldier, of the Herculean cohort; they were standard-bearers, and refused to remove the *chrismon* (monogram of Christ) from the the standard, as had been ordered by Julian the Apostate. Count Julian, uncle of the emperor, commanded them to replace the *chrismon* with images of idols, and, upon their refusal, had them tortured and beheaded. The Roman martyrology and most other calendars mention them on 21 August, while in a few martyrologies and in the heading which is prefixed to their Acts, 21 Sept. (XII Kal. Oct.) is designated as the day of their martyrdom. Both dates are wrong, as is evident from the Acts of the two martyrs, which represent Count Julian as infected with an ugly disease, contracted at the martyrdom of St. Theodoret 23 Oct., 362. (2) MAXIMILIAN OF CELEIA.—His Acts, composed in the thirteenth century and unreliable, say he was b. at Celeia (Cilli, Styria), made a pilgrimage to Rome, went as missionary to Noricum, became Archbishop of Laureacum (Lorch, near Passau), and suffered martyrdom under Numerianus (283–4). It is historically certain that Maximilian was a missionary in Noricum during the latter half of the third century, founded the church of Lorch, and suffered martyrdom. His cult dates at least from the eighth century. In that century St. Rupert built a church in his honour at Bischofshofen, and brought his relics thither. They were transferred to Passau in 985. His feast is celebrated 12 Oct., at some places 29 Oct. (3) MAXIMILIAN OF THEBESTE, martyred at Thebeste near Carthage, 12 March, 295. Thinking a Christian was not permitted to be a soldier, he refused to enter the army and was beheaded. Since death was not then the legal punishment for those who refused to join the army (Arrius Menander, Digest XLIX, xvi, 4 P. 10), it is probable that he was beheaded because he gave his Christianity as the reason of his refusal. He was buried at Carthage by the noble matron Pompejana.

Acta SS., Aug., IV, 425–430; RUINART, *Acta Martyrum* (Ratisbon, 1859), 609–12; LECLERCQ, *Les Martyrs*, III (Paris, 1904), 100–04; TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'hist. ecclés. des six premiers siècles*, VII (Paris, 1700), 405–09; TAMAYO, *Discursos apologéticos de las reliquias d. S. Bonoso y Maximiliano* (Baeza, 1632). (2) *Vita ac legenda S. Maximiliani* in PEZ, *Script. rerum Austr.*, I, 22–34. Concerning its value see RETTBERG, *Kirchengesch. Deutschl.*, I (Göttingen, 1846), 158 sq. RATZINGER, *Forsch. zur Bayr. Gesch.* (Kempten, 1898), 325 sq.; KERSCHBAUMER, *Gesch. des Bist. St. Poelten* (1875), I, 61–78. (3) ALLARD, *La persécution de Dioclétien*, I (Paris, 1908), 99–105; HARNACK *Militia Christi* (Tübingen, 1905), 114 sq.; RUINART, *Acta Martyrum* (Ratisbon, 1859), 340-2, Fr. tr. LECLERCQ, *Les Martyrs*, II (Paris, 1903), 152–5.

MICHAEL OTT.

Maximilian I, Duke of Bavaria, 1598–1622, Elector of Bavaria and Lord High Steward of the Holy Roman Empire, 1623–1651; b. at Munich, 17 April, 1573; d. at Ingolstadt, 27 September, 1651. The lasting services he rendered his country and the Catholic Church justly entitle him to the surname of "Great". He was the son of zealous Catholic parents, William V, the Pious, of Bavaria, and Renate of Lorraine. Mentally well endowed, Maximilian received a strict Catholic training from private tutors and later (1587–91) studied law, history, and mathematics at the University of Ingolstadt. He further increased his knowledge by visits to foreign courts, as Prague and Naples, and to places of pilgrimage including Rome, Loretto, and Einsiedeln. Thus equipped Maximilian assumed (15 Oct., 1597) the government of the small, thinly populated country at his father's wish during the latter's lifetime. Owing to the over-lenient rule of

the two preceding rulers the land was burdened with a heavy debt. By curtailing expenditure and enlarging the revenues, chiefly by working the salt-mines himself and by increasing the taxes without regard to the complaints of the powerless estates, the finances were not only brought into a better condition but it was also possible to collect a reserve fund which, in spite of the unusually difficult conditions of the age, was never quite exhausted. At the same time internal order was maintained by a series of laws issued in 1616. Maximilian gave great attention to military matters. No other German prince of that time possessed an army so well organized and equipped. Its commander was the veteran soldier from the Netherlands Johann Tserclaes, Count of Tilly, who, austere himself, knew how to maintain discipline among his troops. The fortifications at Ingolstadt on the Danube were greatly strengthened, and Munich and other towns were surrounded by walls and moats. Well-filled arsenals were established in different places as preparation for time of need. Opportunity for the use of this armament soon offered itself.

The small free city of Donauwörth fell under the imperial ban for violating the religious peace. In executing the imperial decree Maximilian not only succeeded in bringing this city into subjection to Bavaria but also in re-establishing the Catholic Church as the one and only religion in it. This led to the forming (1608) of the Protestant Union, an offensive and defensive confederation of Protestant princes, in opposition to which arose in 1609 the Catholic League organized by Maximilian. Oddly enough, both coalitions were headed by princes of the Wittelsbach line: Maximilian I as head of the League, Frederick IV of the Palatinate, of the Union. The Thirty Years' War, during which Bavaria suffered terribly, broke out in 1619. Under Tilly's leadership the Bohemian revolt was crushed at the battle of the White Mountain (Weissen Berg) near Prague, 8 November, 1620, and the newly elected King of Bohemia, Frederick V, forced to flee. His allies, the Margrave of Baden and the Duke of Brunswick, were defeated by the forces of Bavaria and the League at Wimpfen and Höchst (1622), as was also at a later date (1626) King Christian of Denmark. Conditions, however, changed when Maximilian, through jealousy of the House of Hapsburgh, was led in 1630 to seek the dismissal of the head of the imperial army, Wallenstein. The youthful Swedish king, Gustavus Adolphus, defeated Tilly, the veteran leader of the army of the League, at Breitenfeld (1631), and in a battle with Gustavus Adolphus near the Lech, 16 April, 1632, Tilly was again vanquished, receiving a wound from which he died two weeks later at Ingolstadt. Although the siege of this city by the Swedes was unsuccessful, Gustavus plundered the Bavarian towns and villages, laid waste the country and pillaged Munich.

Maximilian, who since 1623 had been both Elector and ruler of the Upper Palatinate, implored Wallenstein, now once more the head of the imperial forces, for help in vain until he agreed to place himself and his army under Wallenstein's command. The united forces under Wallenstein took up an entrenched position near Nuremberg where Wallenstein repulsed the Swedish attacks; by advancing towards Saxony he even forced them to evacuate Maximilian's territories. The relief to Bavaria, however, was not of long duration. After the death of Gustavus Adolphus at the battle of Lützen (1632) Bernhard of Weimar, unmolested by Wallenstein, ravaged Bavaria until he received a crushing defeat at the battle of Nördlingen (6 Sept., 1634). Even in the last ten years of the war the country was not spared from hostile attacks. Consequently Maximilian sought by means of a truce with the enemy (1647) to gain for Bavaria an opportunity to recover. The desired result, however, not being attained, he united his forces to those of the imperial army, but the allied troops were not sufficient to overthrow the confederated French and Swedes, and Bavaria once more suffered all the terrors of a pitiless invasion. The fighting ended with the capture of the Swedish generals, 6 Oct., 1648, and the Peace of Westphalia was signed at Münster, 24 Oct. of the same year. The material benefits derived by Maximilian from his attitude in politics were meagre: the Electoral dignity, the office of Lord High Steward, and the Upper Palatinate. The abstract gains, on the other hand, appear far greater. Not only since then has Bavaria had the second place among the Catholic principalities of Germany, ranking next to Austria, but for centuries a strong bulwark was opposed to the advance of Protestantism, and the latter was, at times, even driven back. A few years after the Peace of Westphalia and eighteen months after the administration of Bavaria had been transferred to his still minor son Ferdinand Maria, Maximilian's eventful and toilsome life closed. He was buried in the church of St. Michael at Munich. A fine equestrian statue, designed by Thorwaldsen and cast by Stiglmayer, was erected at Munich by King Louis I in 1839.

Maximilian I of Bavaria

Although there was almost incessant war during his reign, and Bavaria in the middle of the seventeenth century was like a desert, nevertheless Maximilian did much for the arts, e. g. by building the palace, the *Mariensäule* (Mary's Column), etc. Learning also, especially at the University of Ingolstadt, had in this era distinguished representatives. The Jesuit Balde was a brilliant writer both of Latin and German verse, and Father Scheiner, another member of the same order, was the first to discover the spots on the sun; historians also, such as Heinrich Canisius, Matthäus Rader, etc., produced important works of lasting merit.

Maximilian, however, gave far more attention to the advancement of religion among the people than to art and learning. He founded five Jesuit colleges: Amberg, Burghausen, Landshut, Mindelheim, and Straubing. Besides establishing a monastery for the Minims and one for the Carmelites at Munich, he founded nine monasteries for Franciscans and fourteen for Capuchins who venerate him as one of their greatest benefactors. He also founded at Munich a home for aged and infirm Court officials, and gave 30,000 guldens for the Chinese missions, as well as large sums to the Scotch-English college of the Jesuits at Liège.

His private charities among the poor and needy of all descriptions were unlimited.

Maximilian was endowed with an uncommon ability for work. He was also sincerely religious and rigidly moral in conduct; he even went beyond the permissible in his efforts to uphold and spread the faith. Maintaining like all princes of his time the axiom "Cujus regio ejus religio", he not only put down every movement in opposition to the Church in his own country but also exterminated Calvinism and Lutheranism root and branch in the territories he had acquired. Where admonition and instruction were not sufficient the soldier stepped in, and the poor people, who had already been obliged to change their faith several times with change of ruler, had now no choice but return to the Church or exile. Maximilian, in addition, never lost sight of secular advantage, as is shown by his numerous acquisitions of territory. Especially valuable was the purchase of two-thirds of the countship of Helfenstein, now a part of Würtemberg, which as a Bavarian dependence was preserved to the Church and has remained Catholic up to the present time, notwithstanding its Protestant surroundings. Maximilian was twice married. The first marriage was childless. By his second wife Maria, daughter of the Emperor Ferdinand II, whom he married 15 July, 1635, he had two sons; the elder of these, Ferdinand Maria, as already mentioned, succeeded him.

STIEVE, *Maximilian I* in *Allgem. deutsche Biog.*, XXI (1885), 21 sq., gives bibliography before 1885; cf. the statements in DÖBERL, *Entwickelungsgeschichte Bayerns*, I (2nd ed., 1908).—HAGL, *Die Bekehrung der Oberpfalz* (2 vols., 1903); RÄBEL, *Das ehemalige Benediktiner-Adelstift Weissenohe* in *Jahrb. des Hist. Vereins Bomberg* (1908).—For the founding of monasteries by Maximilian: EBERL, *Gesch. d. bay. Kapuzinerordensprovinz 1593–1902* (1902).—DEUTINGER, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Erzbisthums München-Freising*, New Series, I (1901).—LAVISSE-RAMBAUD, *Histoire générale*, V, 508 sqq.; HIMLY, *Hist. de la formation territoriale des états de l'Europe centrale*, II (1876), 164 sqq.; CORRÉARD, *Précis d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*, 36 sqq.

PIUS WITTMANN.

Maximinus, SAINT, Bishop of Trier, b. at Silly near Poitiers, d. there, 29 May, 352 or 12 Sept., 349. He was educated and ordained priest by St. Agritius, whom he succeeded as Bishop of Trier in 332 or 335. At that time Trier was the government seat of the Western Emperor and, by force of his office, Maximinus stood in close relation with the Emperors Constantine II and Constans. He was a strenuous defender of the orthodox faith against Arianism and an intimate friend of St. Athanasius, whom he harboured as an honoured guest during his exile of two years and four months (336–8) at Trier. He likewise received with honours the banished patriarch Paul of Constantinople in 341 and effected his recall to Constantinople. When four Arian bishops came from Antioch to Trier in 342 with the purpose of winning Emperor Constans to their side, Maximinus refused to receive them and induced the emperor to reject their proposals. In conjunction with Pope Julius I and Bishop Hosius of Cordova, he persuaded the Emperor Constans to convene the Synod of Sardica in 343 and probably took part in it. That the Arians considered him as one of their chief opponents is evident from the fact that they condemned him by name along with Pope Julius I and Hosius of Cordova at their heretical synod of Philippopolis in 343 (Mansi, "Sacrorum Conc. nova et ampl. Coll.", III, 136 sq.). In 345 he took part in the Synod of Milan and is said to have presided over a synod held at Cologne in 346, where Bishop Euphratas of Cologne was deposed on account of his leanings towards Arianism. [Concerning the authenticity of the Acts of this synod see the new French translation of Hefele's "Conciliengeschichte", I, ii (Paris, 1907), pp. 830–34.] He also sent Sts. Castor and Lubentius as missionaries to the valleys of the Mosel and the Lahn. It is doubtful whether the Maximinus whom the usurper Magnentius sent as legate to Constantinople in the interests of peace is identical with the Bishop of Trier (Athanasius, "Apol. ad Const. Imp.", 9). His cult began right after his death. His feast is celebrated on 29 May, on which day his name stands in the martyrologies of St. Jerome, St. Bede, St. Ado, and others. Trier honours him as its patron. In the autumn of 353 his body was buried in the church of St. John near Trier, where in the seventh century was founded the famous Benedictine Abbey of St. Maximinus, which flourished till 1802.

A life, full of fabulous accounts, by a monk of St. Maximinus in the eighth century, is printed in *Acta SS.*, May, VII, 21–24. The same life, revised by SERVATUS LUPUS, is found in MIGNE, *P. L.*, CXIX, 21–24, and in *Mon. Germ. Script. rerum Merov.*, III, 74–82; DIEL, *Der heilige Maximinus und der heilige Paulinus, Bischöfe von Trier* (Trier, 1875); CHAMARD, *St. Maximin de Trèves, St. Athanase et les semi-Ariens* in *Revue des Quest. hist.*, II (Paris, 1867), 66–96; BENNETT in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.

MICHAEL OTT.

Maximinus, CAIUS VALERIUS DAJA, under his uncle Augustus Galerius, the Cæsar of Syria and Egypt, from the year 305; in 307 following the example of Constantine, he assumed the title of Augustus. When Galerius died in 311, the Cæsar, Licinius, set out for the Hellespont to besiege the provinces of the Near East. Maximinus obtained the sympathy of the population by granting a remission of taxation to the threatened provinces; also, he had in his power Galerius's widow and Valeria, Diocletian's daughter. An agreement was made fixing the Ægean Sea and the straits between Europe and Asia as the boundaries of the dominions and as no new Cæsars were appointed, there were three legal emperors. Thus Diocletian's plan of governing the empire was abandoned. Maximinus, a fanatical idolater and tyrant, continued the persecution of the Christians in his part of the empire with especial severity and persistency, even where the cruel Galerius had ceased. Besides sanguinary measures for the suppression of Christianity, he made attempts to establish in both town and country a heathen organization similar to the Christian Church. The emperor made the heathen high-priests and magicians of equal rank with the governors of provinces. His attempt to achieve renown by a war against the Persians in Armenia was frustrated by pestilence and bad harvests (Eusebius). When Constantine and Licinius published the edict of toleration for the Christians at Milan in 312, and Maximinus was asked to promulgate it in his part of the empire, he did so, because he saw clearly that it was directed against his anti-Christian policy. When in the winter of 312 Constantine's Gallic troops were withdrawn from Italy, and Licinius was still at Milan, Maximinus pushed on by forced marches to the capital, Byzantium, and captured it together with Heraclea. Licinius, taken by surprise, offered to make terms with him, which Maximinus trusting to gain an easy victory refused. Contrary to his expectation, and in spite of the superiority in numbers of his troops, he was defeated near Adrianople, 30 April, 313, and fled precipitately to Nicomedia to endeavour to rally his army. Licinius harassing him incessantly, published an edict of toleration for the Christians of Nicomedia so that Maximinus was obliged to withdraw to the Taurus where he entrenched himself in the passes. He then tried to win the Christians by issuing an edict of toleration; but his military situation was hopeless and he took poison (313). Licinius exterminated the Jovian family, murdering all the relatives of Diocletian who were at the court of Maximin. The edicts of the deceased emperor were cancelled, and decrees favourable to the Christians were now promulgated in the East.

SCHILLER, *Gesch. der römischen Kaiserzeit*, II (Gotha, 1887).

KARL HOEBER.

Maximinus Thrax, CAIUS JULIUS VERUS, Roman Emperor 235–8, son of a Goth and an Alanic mother. When the Emperor Septimius Severus was returning

through Thrace in 202, Maximinus, a shepherd of enormous stature and strength, distinguished himself in a contest with the soldiers by such Herculean strength and bravery that the emperor enrolled him in the Roman body-guard. Refusing to serve under the worthless emperors, Macrinus and Heliogabalus, he withdrew from the army; but under the righteous Alexander Severus he was entrusted with the command of the newly raised Pannonian troops. These, desiring a real warrior at their head instead of the youthful and timid Alexander, who was entirely subject to his mother Julia Mamæa, invested him with the purple at Mainz, in March, 235, at the same time proclaiming his son Maximus co-regent. The adherents of the former Syrian dynasty and of the senate tried unsuccessfully to overthrow him. Maximinus taking the field with great energy and persistence against the Germans across the Rhine, regained the district of the *Agri Decumates* and then waged successful war against the Sarmatians and the Dacians on the Danube. Assuming the names of Germanicus and Sarmaticus, he proceeded with sentences of death and confiscation against the patrician Romans, who disliked him as a wild and uncultured barbarian; on the other hand he distributed the State revenues among the soldiers who were devoted to him. He had the bronze statues of the gods and their treasures melted down and coined; he plundered cities and temples, and caused so much discontent that a rebellion broke out in February, 238, among the peasantry in Africa. The procurator and the octogenarian consul at Carthage were killed.

M. Antonius Gordianus and his son of the same name, were made co-regent emperors. The Roman senate willingly recognized them, because they promised, like the Antonines in former times, to govern according to its decisions; the people despising Maximinus, who had never once set foot in the capital of the empire, agreed with the senate. Maximinus was outlawed, and his death was rumoured, but he sent Capellianus, Procurator of Numidia, against the adherents of the Gordiani, and in the struggle, the younger Gordian lost his life whereupon the senior hanged himself in despair. Their reign had lasted little more than a month. The senate now decided to elect two emperors with equal authority, M. Clodius Pupienus Maximus who was to exercise the military power *de facto*, and Decimus Cælius Balbinus who was to direct the civil government in the capital. The Romans dissatisfied with this arrangement, for they had expected great advantages from the rule of the African emperors, raised to the rank of Cæsar the elder Gordian's twelve year old grandson (afterwards Gordian III), then residing in Rome. Severe street fighting occurred in Rome between the veterans of Maximinus and the people. Owing to scanty commissariat Maximinus could only move his troops slowly from Pannonia. Meanwhile the senate levied troops, constructed arsenals, and by creating twenty military districts, placed Italy in a satisfactory defensive position. When Maximinus arrived in Upper Italy, he could not at once cross the Isonzo on account of the floods and his attacks on the stronghold of Aquileia were repulsed. Under the foolish impression that his officers were the cause of his misfortunes, he had several of them executed, thereby arousing discontent among the soldiers, especially in the Second Parthian Legion whose wives and children were in the power of the Roman Senate at Albano. A mutiny suddenly occurring, Maximin and his son were murdered. Pupienus, who hastened thither from Ravenna, rewarded the troops liberally and administered to them the oath of fidelity on behalf of the three senator emperors resident in Rome.

Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, V (Berlin, 1885); Schiller *Gesch. d. röm. Kaiserzeit*, vol. I, pt. II (Gotha, 1883); Domaszewski, *Gesch. der röm. Kaiserzeit*. II (Leipzig, 1909).

Karl Hoeber.

Maximopolis, a titular see of Arabia, suffragan of Bostra. The true name of the city is Maximianopolis, and it so appears in the "Notitia episcopatuum" of the Patriarch Anastasius in the sixth century ("Echos d'Orient", X, Paris, 1907, 145). Pursuant to a decree of the Propaganda (1885), the title is to be suppressed in future; Torquato Armellini having confounded this town with Maximianopolis in Palestina Secunda ("Catalogo dei vescovati titolari", Rome, 1884, appendix 8). Its last titular was consecrated in 1876. Two ancient bishops of this see are known: Severus, a signatory of the Council of Chalcedon in 451 (Mansi, "Coll. Conc.", VII, 168), and Peter, known by an inscription (Waddington, "Inscriptions grecques et latines de Grèce et l'Asie-Mineure", no. 2361). The name which preceded that of Maximianopolis is not known, and we are equally ignorant of its actual identification, though many authorities place it at Sheikh-Miskin, a locality in the Hauran, famous for the extent and beauty of its ruins, where an inscription has been found bearing the name of Bishop Thomas ("Bulletin de corresp. hellénique," Paris, 1897, 52). S. Vailhé.

Maximus of Constantinople, Saint, known as the Theologian and as Maximus Confessor, b. at Constantinople about 580; d. in exile 13 August, 662. He is one of the chief names in the Monothelite controversy, one of the chief doctors of the theology of the Incarnation and of ascetic mysticism, and remarkable as a witness to the respect for the papacy held by the Greek Church in his day. This great man was of a noble family of Constantinople. He became first secretary to the Emperor Heraclius, who prized him much; but he quitted the world and gave himself up to contemplation in a monastery at Chrysopolis, opposite Constantinople. He became abbot there; but seems to have left this retreat on account of its insecurity from hostile attacks. He speaks of the Palestinian ascetic, St. Sophronius, afterwards Patriarch of Jerusalem, as his master, father, and teacher (Ep. 13), so that he probably passed some time with him, and he was with him in Africa with other monks during the preparations which issued in the "watery union" by which Cyrus the Patriarch reconciled a number of Monophysites to the Church by rejecting the doctrine of "two operations" in Christ (see Monothelism). The first action of St. Maximus that we know of in this affair is a letter sent by him to Pyrrhus, then an abbot at Chrysopolis, a friend and supporter of Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, the patron of the Monothelite expression "two operations". As the letter is said to have entailed a long voyage on the monks who carried it, St. Maximus was perhaps already in Africa when he wrote it. Pyrrhus had published a work on the Incarnation, for which St. Maximus gives him rather fulsome praise, as an introduction to the question (which he puts with much diffidence and many excuses) what Pyrrhus means by one ἐνέργεια or ἐνέργημα. Maximus is clearly anxious to get him to withdraw or explain the mistaken expression, without exasperating him by contradiction.

The Ecthesis of Heraclius was published in 638, and Sergius and Pope Honorius both died in that year. A letter of Maximus tells us on the authority of his friends at Constantinople, that the Roman apocrisiarii who had come thither to obtain the emperor's confirmation for the newly elected Pope Severinus, were met by the clergy of Constantinople with the demand that they should promise to obtain the pope's signature to the Ecthesis, otherwise they should receive no assistance in the matter for which they had made so long a voyage: "Having discovered the tenor of the document, since by refusing they would have caused the first and Mother of Churches, and the city, to remain so long a time in widowhood, they replied quietly: We cannot act with authority in this matter, for we have received a commission to execute, not an order to

make a profession of faith. But we assure you that we will relate all that you have put forward, and we will show the document itself to him who is to be consecrated, and if he should judge it to be correct, we will ask him to append his signature to it. But do not therefore place any obstacle in our way now, or do violence to us by delaying us and keeping us here. For none has a right to use violence especially when faith is in question. For herein even the weakest waxes mighty and the meek becomes a warrior, and by comforting his soul with the Divine Word, is hardened against the greatest attack. How much more in the case of the clergy and Church of the Romans, which from of old until now, as the elder of all the Churches under the sun, presides over all? Having surely received this canonically, as well from councils and the Apostles, as from the princes of the latter, and being numbered in their company, she is subject to no writings or issues of synodical documents, on account of the eminence of her pontificate, even as in all these things all are equally subject to her according to sacerdotal law. And so when without fear but with all holy and becoming confidence, those ministers of the truly firm and immovable rock, that is, of the most great and Apostolic Church at Rome, had so replied to the clergy of the royal city, they were seen to have conciliated them and to have acted prudently, that the others might be humble and modest, while they made known the orthodoxy and purity of their own faith from the beginning. But those of Constantinople, admiring their piety, thought that such a deed ought to be recompensed; and ceasing from urging the document on them, they promised by their diligence to procure the issue of the emperor's order with regard to the episcopal election . . . Of the aforesaid document a copy has been sent to me also. They have explained in it the cause for being silent about the natural operations in Christ our God, that is, in His natures, of which and in which He is believed to be; and how in future neither one nor two are to be mentioned. It is only to be allowed to confess that the divine and human (works) proceeded from the same Word of God incarnate, and are to be attributed to one and the same (person)." This passage does not call the prohibition of "two operations" yet by the name of heresy, and does not mention the "one Will" confessed in the Ecthesis. But it gives very clearly St. Maximus's view that the smallest point of faith is to be held at the risk of one's life, and it demonstrates the ample admission made at Constantinople, before the struggles began, of the prerogatives of Rome.

When in 641 John IV wrote his defence of Pope Honorius, it was re-echoed by St. Maximus in a letter to Marinus, a priest of Cyprus. He declares that Honorius, when he confessed one will of our Lord, only meant to deny that Christ had a will of the flesh, of concupiscence, since he was conceived and born without stain of sin. Maximus appeals to the witness of Abbot John Symponus, who wrote the letter for Honorius. Pyrrhus was now Sergius's successor, but on the accession of the Emperor Constans in 642 he was exiled. Maximus then sent a letter to the patrician Peter, apparently the Governor of Syria and Palestine, who had written to him concerning Pyrrhus, whom he now calls simply abbot. Pyrrhus was in Palestine, and Peter had restrained him from putting forward his heretical views. Pyrrhus had declared that he was ready to satisfy Maximus as to his orthodoxy. The latter says he would have written to Peter before, "but I was afraid of being thought to transgress the holy laws, if I were to do this without knowing the will of the most holy see of Apostolic men, who lead aright the whole plenitude of the Catholic Church, and rule it with order according to the divine law." The new Ecthesis is worse than the old heresies; Pyrrhus and his predecessor have accused Sophronius of error; they persuaded Heraclius to give his name to the Ecthesis: "they have not conformed to the sense of the Apostolic see, and what is laughable, or rather lamentable, as proving their ignorance, they have not hesitated to lie against the Apostolic see itself . . . but have claimed the great Honorius on their side. . . . What did the divine Honorius do, and after him the aged Severinus, and John who followed him? Yet further, what supplication has the blessed pope, who now sits, not made? Have not the whole East and West brought their tears, laments, obsecrations, deprecations, both before God in prayer and before men in their letters? If the Roman see recognizes Pyrrhus to be not only a reprobate but a heretic, it is certainly plain that everyone who anathematizes those who have rejected Pyrrhus, anathematizes the see of Rome, that is, he anathematizes the Catholic Church. I need hardly add that he excommunicates himself also, if indeed he be in communion with the Roman see and the Church of God. . . . It is not right that one who has been condemned and cast out by the Apostolic see of the city of Rome for his wrong opinions should be named with any kind of honour, until he be received by her, having returned to her—nay, to our Lord—by a pious confession and orthodox faith, by which he can receive holiness and the title of holy. . . . Let him hasten before all things to satisfy the Roman see, for if it is satisfied all will agree in calling him pious and orthodox. For he only speaks in vain who thinks he ought to persuade or entrap persons like myself, and does not satisfy and implore the blessed pope of the most holy Church of the Romans, that is, the Apostolic see, which from the incarnate Son of God Himself, and also by all holy synods, according to the holy canons and definitions, has received universal and supreme dominion, authority and power of binding and loosing over all the holy Churches of God which are in the whole world; for with it the Word who is above the celestial powers binds and looses in heaven also. For if he thinks he must satisfy others, and fails to implore the most blessed Roman pope, he is acting like a man who, when accused of murder or some other crime, does not hasten to prove his innocence to the judge appointed by the law, but only uselessly and without profit does his best to demonstrate his innocence to private individuals, who have no power to acquit him."

Pyrrhus thought he might regain his see by the help of the pope. He came to Africa, and in July, 645, a public disputation took place between him and Maximus, in the presence of the Governor Gregory (called George in the MSS. of St. Maximus), who was a friend and correspondent of the saint. The minutes are interesting. Pyrrhus argues that two wills must imply two Persons willing; Maximus replies that in that case there must be three wills in the Holy Trinity. He shows that the will belongs to the Nature, and distinguishes between will as a faculty and will as the act of the faculty. Pyrrhus then admits two wills, on account of the two natures, but adds that we should also confess one will on account of the perfect union. Maximus replies that this would lead us to confess one nature on account of the perfect union. He then cites many passages of Scripture for two wills and two operations. Pyrrhus puts forward Honorius and Vigilius. Maximus defends the former from the charge of teaching two wills, and denies that the latter ever received the letter of Mennas, the authenticity of which is assumed. He complains of the changeableness of Sergius. Lastly the famous "new theandric operation" of the Pseudo-Dionysius is discussed, and is explained and defended by St. Maximus. Then Pyrrhus gives in, and consents to go to Rome, where in fact he condemned his former teaching, and was reconciled to the Church by the pope. But the revolt of Gregory, who made himself emperor in Africa, but was defeated in 647, brought Maximus into disfavour at court, and destroyed the hope of restoring Pyrrhus as

orthodox patriarch. After the Ecthesis had been withdrawn, and the Type, Τύπος, substituted by the Emperor Constans, St. Maximus was present at the great Lateran council held by St. Martin at his instance in 649. He wrote from Rome (where he stayed some years): "The extremities of the earth, and all in every part of it who purely and rightly confess the Lord, look directly towards the most holy Roman Church and its confession and faith, as it were to a sun of unfailing light, awaiting from it the bright radiance of the sacred dogmas of our Fathers, according to what the six inspired and holy councils have purely and piously decreed, declaring most expressly the symbol of faith. For from the coming down of the incarnate Word amongst us, all the Churches in every part of the world have held that greatest Church alone as their base and foundation, seeing that according to the promise of Christ our Saviour, the gates of hell do never prevail against it, that it has the keys of a right confession and faith in Him, that it opens the true and only religion to such as approach with piety, and shuts up and locks every heretical mouth that speaks injustice against the Most High."

Pope Martin was dragged from Rome in 653, and died of ill treatment at Inkerman in March, 655. It was probably later in that year that an official named Gregory came to Rome to get Pope Eugene to receive the Type. He came to the cell of St. Maximus, who argued with him and denounced the Type. As the saint was recognized as the leader of the orthodox Easterns, he was sent to Constantinople at the end of 655 (not, as is commonly stated, at the same time as St. Martin). He was now seventy-five years old. The acts of his trials have been preserved by Anastasius Bibliothecarius. He was accused of conspiring with the usurper Gregory, together with Pope Theodore, and it was said that he had caused the loss to the empire of Egypt, Alexandria, Pentapolis, and Africa. He refused to communicate with the See of Constantinople, "because they have cast out the four holy councils by the propositions made at Alexandria, by the Ecthesis and by the Type . . . and because the dogmas which they asserted in the propositions they damned in the Ecthesis, and what they proclaimed in the Ecthesis they annulled in the Type, and on each occasion they deposed themselves. What mysteries, I ask, do they celebrate, who have condemned themselves, and have been condemned by the Romans and by the (Lateran) synod, and stripped of their sacerdotal dignity?" He disbelieved the statement made to him that the envoys of the pope had accepted the confession of "two wills on account of the diversity and one will on account of the union", and pointed out that the union not being a substance could have no will. He wrote on this account to his disciple the Abbot Anastasius, who was able to send a letter to warn "the men of elder Rome firm as a rock" of the deceitful confession which the Patriarch Peter was despatching to the pope. On the day of the first trial, a council of clergy was held, and the emperor was persuaded to send Maximus to Byzia in Thrace, and his disciples, Abbot Anastasius and Anastasius the papal apocrisiarius, to Perberis and Mesembria.

They suffered greatly from cold and hunger. On 24 September, 656, Theodosius, Bishop of Cæsarea in Bithynia, visited Maximus by the emperor's command, accompanied by the consuls, Theodosius and Paul. The saint confounded his visitors with the authority of the Fathers, and declared that he would never accept the Type. The bishop then replied: "We declare to you in response that if you will communicate, our master the emperor will annul the Type." Maximus answered that the Ecthesis, though taken down, had not been disowned, and that the canons of the Lateran Council must be formally accepted before he would communicate. The Byzantine bishop unblushingly urged: "The synod is invalid, since it was held without the Emperor's orders." Maximus retorts: "If it is not pious faith but the order of the emperor that validates synods, let them accept the synods that were held against the *Homoousion* at Tyre, at Antioch, at Seleucia, and the Robber council of Ephesus." The bishop is ready to consent to two wills and two operations: but St. Maximus says he is himself but a monk and cannot receive his declaration; the bishop, and also the emperor, and the patriarch and his synod, must send a supplication to the pope. Then all arose with joy and tears, and knelt down and prayed, and kissed the Gospels and the crucifix and the image of the Mother of God, and all embraced. But the consul doubted: "Do you think," he said "that the emperor will make a supplication to Rome?" "Yes", said the abbot, "if he will humble himself as God has humbled Himself." The bishop gave him money and a tunic; but the tunic was seized by the Bishop of Byzia. On 8 September, the abbot was honourably sent to Rhegium, and next day two patricians arrived in state with Bishop Theodosius, and offered the saint great honour if he would accept the Type and communicate with the emperor. Maximus solemnly turned to the bishop and reminded him of the day of judgment. "What could I do if the emperor took another view?" whispered the miserable man. The abbot was struck and spat upon. The patrician Epiphanius declared that all now accepted two wills and two operations, and that the Type was only a compromise. Maximus reiterated the Roman view that to forbid the use of an expression was to deny it. Next morning, 19 September, the saint was stripped of his money and even of his poor stock of clothes, and was conveyed to Salembria, and thence to Perberis (Perbera).

Six years later, in 662, Maximus and the two Anastasii were brought to trial at Constantinople. They were anathematized, and with them St. Martin and St. Sophronius. The prefect was ordered to beat them, to cut out their tongues and lop off their right hands, to exhibit them thus mutilated in every quarter of the city, and to send them to perpetual exile and imprisonment. A long letter of the Roman Anastasius tells us of their sufferings on the journey to Colchis where they were imprisoned in different forts. He tells us that St. Maximus foresaw in a vision the day of his death, and that miraculous lights appeared nightly at his tomb. The monk Anastasius had died in the preceding month; the Roman lived on until 666.

Thus St. Maximus died for orthodoxy and obedience to Rome. He has always been considered one of the chief theological writers of the Greek Church, and has obtained the honourable title of the Theologian. He may be said to complete and close the series of patristic writings on the Incarnation, as they are summed up by St. John of Damascus. His style is unfortunately very obscure; but he is accurate in his thought and deeply learned in the Fathers. His exegetical works explain Holy Scripture allegorically. We have commentaries on Psalm lix, on the Lord's Prayer, and a number of explanations of different texts. These are principally intended for the use of monks, and deal much with mystical theology. More professedly mystical are his "Scholia" on Pseudo-Dionysius, his explanations of difficulties in Dionysius and St. Gregory Nazianzen and his "Ambigua" on St. Gregory. This last work was translated into Latin by Scotus Erigena at the request of Charles the Bald. The polemical writings include short treatises against the Monophysites, and a more important series against the Monothelites, beside which must be placed the letters and the disputation with Pyrrhus. The numerous ascetical writings have always received great honour in Eastern monasteries. The best known is a beautiful dialogue between an abbot and a young monk on the spiritual life; there are also various collections of *sententiæ*,

ethical and devotional, for use in the cloister. The "Mystagogia" is an explanation of ecclesiastical symbolism, of importance for liturgical history. Three hymns are preserved, and a chronological work (published in Petavius's "Uranologium", Paris, 1630, and in P. G., XIX). Some writings exist only in MS. St. Maximus's literary labours had thus a vast range. He was essentially a monk, a contemplative, a mystic, thoroughly at home in the Platonism of Dionysius. But he was also a keen dialectician, a scholastic theologian, a controversialist. His influence in both lines has been very great. His main teaching may be summed up under two heads, the union of God with humanity by the Incarnation, and the union of man with God by the practice of perfection and contemplation. St. Maximus is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology on 13 August, and in the Greek Menæa on 21 January and 12 and 13 August. His Greek office is given by Combéfis (P. G., XC, 206).

A complete edition of his works was begun by the Dominican Combéfis. Two volumes appeared (Paris, 1675), but the third is wanting In the reprint by Migne (P. G., XC–XCI) there is added the "De Locis difficilibus Dionysii et Gregorii", from Oehler's edition (Halle, 1857), and the hymns from Daniel "Thesaurus Hymnolog." III. Anastasius Bibliothecarius has preserved some letters and other documents in Latin in his "Collectanea" (P. L., CXXIX, and Mansi, X). The "Scholia" on Dionysius the Areopagite are printed with the works of the latter (P. G., IV). The ancient "Vita et certamen" (P. G., XC; Acta SS., 13 Aug.) is not contemporary and cannot be trusted.

For literature see HONORIUS I and MONOTHELISM; *Acta SS.*, 13 Aug.; WAGENMANN AND SEEBERG in *Realencyclop.* (with a good account of M.'s theology); DORNER, *Person of Christ* (Edinburgh, 1861); BACH, *Dogmengesch. des Mittelalters*, I (Vienna, 1873); EHRHARD in KRUMBACHER, *Gesch. der byzant. Litt.* (Munich, 1897); WESER, *S. Maximi Confessoris precepta de Incarnatione Dei et deificatione hominis* (Berlin, 1869); PREUSS, *Ad Maximi Conf. de Deo hominisque deificatione doctrinam adnotationes* (Schneeberg, 1894); MICHAUD, *St. Maxime et l'apocatastase* in *Revue internat. de théol.* (1902), 257. On the authenticity of the anthology *Capita theologica*, see HOLL, *Die Sacra parallela des Joh. v. Damascus* in *Texte u. Untersuch. zur Gesch. der altchristl. Lit.* (Leipzig, 1897); IDEM, *Fragmente vornicänischer Väter, ibid.* (1899); EHRHARD in *Byzant. Zeitschr.* (1901), 394.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Maximus of Turin, SAINT, Bishop and theological writer, b. probably in Rhætia, about 380; d. shortly after 465. Only two dates are historically established in his life. In 451 he was at the synod of Milan where the bishops of Northern Italy accepted the celebrated letter (*epistola dogmatica*) of Leo I, setting forth the orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation against the Nestorians and Eutychians (Mansi, "SS. Conc. Coll. Ampl.", VI, 143). Among nineteen subscribers Maximus is the eighth, and since the order was determined by age, Maximus must then have been about seventy years old. The second established date is 465, when he was at the Synod of Rome. (Mansi, VII, 959, 965 sq.) Here the subscription of Maximus follows immediately after the pope's, showing he was the oldest of the forty-eight bishops present. The approximate time and place of his birth may be surmised from a passage in Sermo 81 (P. L., LVII, 695), where he designates himself as a witness of the martyrdom of three missionary priests in 397 at Anaunia in the Rhætian Alps. History does not mention him after 465. He is the first known bishop of Turin, then a suffragan see of Milan. His successor was St. Victor. His name is in the Roman martyrology on 25 June, and the city of Turin honours him as its patron. A life which, however, is entirely unreliable, was written after the eleventh century, and is printed in "Acta SS.", June, VII, 3rd ed., 44–46. It states that a cleric one day followed him with an evil intention to a retired chapel, where the saint was wont to pray. The cleric suddenly became so thirsty that he implored Maximus for help. A roe happened to pass which the saint caused to stop, so that the cleric could partake of its milk. This legend accounts for the fact that St. Maximus is represented in art as pointing at a roe.

He is the author of numerous discourses, first edited by Bruni, and published by order of Pius VI at the Propaganda in 1784 (reprinted in P. L., LVII). These discourses, delivered to the people by the saint, consist of one hundred and eighteen homilies, one hundred and sixteen sermons, and six treatises (*tractatus*). Homilies 1–63 are *de tempore*, i. e. on the seasons of the ecclesiastical year and on the feasts of Our Lord; 64–82, *de sanctis*, i. e. on the saints whose feast was commemorated on the day on which they were delivered; 83–118, *de diversis*, i. e. exegetical, dogmatical, or moral. Sermons 1–55 are *de tempore;* 56–93, *de sanctis;* 93–116, *de diversis*. Three of the treatises are on baptism, one against the Pagans, and one against the Jews. The last two are extant only in fragments, and their genuineness is doubtful. The sixth treatise, whose genuineness is also doubtful, contains short discourses on twenty-three topics taken from the Four Gospels. An appendix contains writings of uncertain authorship; thirty-one sermons, three homilies, and two long epistles addressed to a sick friend. Many writings, however, which Bruni ascribes to Maximus are of doubtful origin. The discourses are usually very brief, and couched in forcible, though at times over flowery language. Among the many facts of liturgy and history touched on in the discourses are: abstinence during Lent (hom. 44), no fasting or kneeling at prayers during paschal time (hom. 61), fasting on the Vigil of Pentecost (hom. 62), the synod of Milan in 389 at which Jovinianus was condemned (hom. 9), the impending barbarian invasion (hom. 86–92), the destruction of the Church of Milan by the barbarians (hom. 94), various pagan superstitions still prevalent at his time (hom. 16, 100–02), the supremacy of St. Peter (hom. 54, 70, 72, serm. 114). All his discourses manifest his solicitude for the eternal welfare of his flock, and in many he fearlessly rebukes the survivals of paganism and defends the orthodox faith against the inroads of heresy.

FERRERI, *S. Massimo, vescovo di Torino e i suoi tempi* (3rd ed., Turin, 1868); SAVIO, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia* (Turin, 1899), 283–294; FESSLER-JUNGMANN, *Institutiones Patrologiæ*, II (Innsbruck, 1892), ii, 256–76; ARGLES in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v. *Maximus* (16); BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (St. Louis, 1908), 527–8.

MICHAEL OTT.

Maxwell, WILLIAM, fifth Earl of Nithsdale (Lord Nithsdale signed as Nithsdaill) and fourteenth Lord Maxwell, b. in 1676; d. at Rome, 2 March, 1744. He succeeded his father at the early age of seven. His mother, a daughter of the House of Douglas, a clever energetic woman, educated him in sentiments of devotion to the Catholic faith and of loyalty to the House of Stuart, for which his family was famous. When he was about twenty-three, Lord Nithsdale visited the French Court to do homage to King James, and there met and wooed Lady Winifred Herbert, youngest daughter of William, first Marquis of Powis. The marriage contract is dated 2 March, 1699. The young couple resided chiefly at Terregles, in Dumfriesshire, and here probably their five children were born. Until 1715 no special event marked their lives, but in that year Lord Nithsdale's principles led him to join the rising in favour of Prince James Stuart, and he shared in the disasters which attended the royal cause, being taken prisoner at Preston and sent to the Tower. In deep anxiety Lady Nithsdale hastened to London and there made every effort on behalf of her husband, including a personal appeal to George I, but no sort of hope was held out to her. She, therefore, with true heroism, planned and carried out his escape on the eve of the day fixed for his execution. Lord Nithsdale had prepared himself for death like a good Catholic and loyal servant of his king, as his "Dying Speech" and farewell letter to his family attest. After his es-

cape he fled in disguise to France. He and Lady Nithsdale spent their last years in great poverty, in Rome, in attendance on their exiled king.

M. M. Maxwell Scott.

Maxwell, Winifred, Countess of Nithsdale, d. at Rome, May, 1749. She was the daughter of William, first Marquis of Powis, who followed James II into exile. She is famous in history for the heroic deliverance of her husband from the Tower on 23 Feb., 1716. Her married life was passed chiefly at the family seat of Terregles, and here she received the fatal news of her husband's defeat at Preston. After concealing the family papers in a spot still pointed out, she hastened to London to intercede for her husband, having little hope however, for, to use her own words: "A Catholic upon the borders and one who had a great following and whose family had ever upon all occasions stuck to the royal family, could not look for mercy". And so it proved; even her personal appeal to George I was disregarded, and Lord Nithsdale was to owe his safety to her alone. With great courage and ingenuity she contrived his escape from the Tower in female dress—on the eve of the day appointed for his execution, according to Lady Cowper's "Diary," 1st ed., p. 85, a reprieve was signed for Lord Nithsdale on the very night of his escape—and after concealing him in London and arranging for his journey to France, this heroic lady returned again to Scotland to secure the family papers which she knew would be of vital importance to her son. In fact her zeal made Lady Nithsdale's position a hazardous one, and King George declared she had done him "more mischief than any woman in Christendom". As soon as she was able she joined Lord Nithsdale abroad and they spent their long exile in Rome, where she survived her husband for about five years. The autograph letter in which Lady Nithsdale gives the account of her husband's escape, and the brown cloak worn by him on the occasion, are now in possession of the Duchess of Norfolk, who represents the Nithsdales in the female line.

Fraser, *Book of Caerlaveroch* (Edinburgh, 1873); Paul, *The Scots Peerage* (Edinburgh, 1909), VI; Maxwell Scott, *The Making of Abbotsford and Incidents in Scottish History* (London, 1897).

M. M. Maxwell Scott.

Maya Indians, the most important of the cultured native peoples of North America, both in the degree of their civilization and in population and resources, formerly occupying a territory of about 60,000 square miles, including the whole of the peninsula of Yucatan, Southern Mexico, together with the adjacent portion of Northern Guatemala, and still constituting the principal population of the same region outside of the larger cities. Their language, which is actually supplanting Spanish to a great extent, is still spoken by about 300,000 persons, of whom two-thirds are pure Maya, the remainder being whites and of mixed blood. The Mayan linguistic stock includes some twenty tribes, speaking closely related dialects, and (excepting the Huastec of northern Vera Cruz and south-east San Luis Potosí, Mexico) occupying contiguous territory in Tabasco, Chiapas, and the Yucatan peninsula, a large part of Guatemala, and smaller portions of Honduras and Salvador. The ancient builders of the ruined cities of Palenque and Copán were of the same stock. The most important tribes or nations, after the Maya proper, were the Quiché and Cakchiquel of Guatemala. All the tribes of this stock were of high culture, the Mayan civilization being the most advanced, and probably the most ancient, in aboriginal North America. They still number altogether about two million souls.

I. History.—The Maya proper seem to have entered Yucatan from the west. As usual with ancient nations, it is difficult in the beginning to separate myth from history, their earliest mentioned leader and deified hero, Itzamná, being considered by Brinton to be simply the sun-god common to the whole Mayan stock. He is represented as having led the first migration from the Far East, beyond the ocean, along a pathway miraculously opened through the waters. The second migration, which seems to have been historic, was led from the west by Kukulcan, a miraculous priest and teacher, who became the founder of the Maya kingdom and civilization. Fairly good authority, based upon study of the Maya chronicles and calendar, places this beginning near the close of the second century of the Christian Era. Under Kukulcan the people were divided into four tribes, ruled by as many kingly families: the Cocom, Tutul-xiu, Itzá, and Chelé. To the first family belonged Kukulcan himself, who established his residence at Mayapan, which thus became the capital of the whole nation. The Tutul-xiu held vassal rule at Uxmal, the Itzá at Chichen-Itzá, and the Chelé at Izamal. To the Chelé was appointed the hereditary high priesthood, and their city became the sacred city of the Maya. Each provincial king was obliged to spend a part of each year with the monarch at Mayapan. This condition continued down to about the eleventh century, when, as the result of a successful revolt of the provincial kings, Mayapan was destroyed, and the supreme rule passed to the Tutul-xiu at Uxmal. Later on Mayapan was rebuilt and was again the capital of the nation until about the middle of the fifteenth century, when, in consequence of a general revolt against the reigning dynasty, it was finally destroyed, and the monarchy was split up into a number of independent petty states, of which eighteen existed on the peninsula at the arrival of the Spaniards. In consequence of this civil war a part of the Itzá emigrated south to Lake Petén, in Guatemala, where they established a kingdom with their capital and sacred city on Flores Island, in the lake.

On his second voyage Columbus heard of Yucatan as a distant country of clothed men. On his fifth voyage (1503–04) he encountered, south-west of Cuba, a canoe-load of Indians with cotton clothing for barter, who said that they came from the country of Maya. In 1506 Pinzon sighted the coast, and in 1511 twenty men under Valdivia were wrecked on the shores of the sacred island of Cozumel, several being captured and sacrificed to the idols. In 1517 an expedition under Francisco de Cordova landed on the north coast, discovering well-built cities, but, after several bloody engagements with the natives, was compelled to retire. Father Alonso Gonzalez, who accompanied this expedition, found opportunity at one landing to explore a temple, and bring off some of the sacred images and gold ornaments. In 1518 a strong expedition under Juan de Grijalva, from Cuba, landed near Cozumel and took formal possession for Spain. For Father Juan Diaz, who on this occasion celebrated Mass upon the summit of one of the heathen temple the honour is also claimed of having afterwards been the first to celebrate Mass in the City of Mexico. Near Cozumel, also, was rescued the young monk Aguilar, one of the two survivors of Valdivia's party, who, though naked to the breech-cloth, still carried his Breviary in a pouch. Proceeding northwards, Grijaba made the entire circuit of the peninsula before returning, having had another desperate engagement with the Maya near Campeche. After the conquest of Mexico, in 1521, Francisco de Montejo, under commission as Governor of Yucatan, landed (1527) to effect the conquest of the country, but met with such desperate resistance that after eight years of incessant fighting every Spaniard had been driven out. In 1540, after two more years of the same desperate warfare, his son Francisco established the first Spanish settlement at Campeche. In the next year, in a bloody battle at Tihoo, he completely broke the power of Maya resistance, and a few months later (Jan., 1542) founded on the site of the ruined city the new capital, Mérida. In

1546, however, there was a general revolt, and it was not until a year later that the conquest was assured.

In the original commission to Montejo it had been expressly stipulated that missionaries should accompany all his expeditions. This, however, he had neglected to attend to, and in 1531 (or 1534), by special order, Father Jacobo de Testera and four others were sent to join the Spanish camp near Campeche. They met a kindly welcome from the Indians, who came with their children to be instructed, and thus the conquest of the country might have been effected through spiritual agencies but for the outrages committed by a band of Spanish outlaws, in consequence of which the priests were forced to withdraw. In 1537 five more missionaries arrived and met the same willing reception, remaining about two years in spite of the war still in progress. About 1545 a large number of missionaries were sent over from Spain. Several of these —apparently nine, all Franciscans—under the direction of Father Luis de Villalpando, were assigned to Yucatan. Landing at Campeche, the governor explained their purpose to the chiefs, the convent of St. Francis was dedicated on its present site, and translations were begun into the native language. The first baptized convert was the chief of Campeche, who learned Spanish and thereafter acted as interpreter for the priests.

Sculptured Figures and Hieroglyphs
Maya stone carving in British Museum

Here, as elsewhere, the missionaries were the champions of the rights of the Indians. In consequence of their repeated protests a royal edict was issued, in 1549, prohibiting Indian slavery in the province, while promising compensation to the slave-owners. As in other cases, local opposition defeated the purpose of this law; but the agitation went on, and in 1551 another royal edict liberated 150,000 male Indian slaves, with their families, throughout Mexico. In 1557 and 1558 the Crown intervened to restrain the tyranny of the native chiefs. Within a very short time Father Villalpando had at his mission station at Mérida over a thousand converts, including several chiefs. He himself, with Father Malchior de Benavente, then set out, barefoot, for the city of Maní, in the mountains farther south, where their success was so great that two thousand converts were soon engaged in building them a church and dwelling. All went well until they began to plead with the chiefs to release their vassals from certain hard conditions, when the chiefs resolved to burn them at the altar. On the appointed night the chiefs and their retainers approached the church with this design, but were awed from their purpose on finding the two priests, who had been warned by an Indian boy, calmly praying before the crucifix. After remaining all night in prayer, the fathers were fortunately rescued by a Spanish detachment which, almost miraculously, chanced to pass that way. Twenty-seven of the conspirators were afterwards seized and condemned to death, but were all saved by the interposition of Villalpando. In 1548–49 other missionaries arrived from Spain, Villalpando was made custodian of the province, and a convent was erected near the site of his chapel at Maní. The Yucatan field having been assigned to the Franciscans, all the missionary work among the Maya was done by priests of that order.

In 1561 Yucatan was made a diocese with its see at Mérida. In the next year the famous Diego de Landa, Franciscan provincial, and afterwards bishop (1573–79), becoming aware that the natives throughout the peninsula still secretly cherished their ancient rites, instituted an investigation, which he conducted with such cruelties of torture and death that the proceedings were stopped by order of Bishop Toral, Franciscan provincial of Mexico, immediately upon his arrival, during the same summer, to occupy the See of Mérida. Before this could be done, however, there had been destroyed, as is asserted, two million sacred images and hundreds of hieroglyphic manuscripts—practically the whole of the voluminous native Maya literature. As late as 1586 a royal edict was issued for the suppression of idolatry. In 1575–77, a terrible visitation of a mysterious disease, called *matlalzahuatl*, which attacked only the Indians, swept over Southern Mexico and Yucatan, destroying, as was estimated, over two million lives. This was its fourth appearance since the conquest. At its close it was estimated that the whole Indian population of Mexico had been reduced to about 1,700,000 souls. In 1583 and 1597 there were local revolts under chiefs of the ancient Cocom royal family. By this latter date it was estimated that the native population of Mexico had declined by three-fourths since the discovery, through massacre, famine, disease, and oppression. Up to 1593 over 150 Franciscan monks had been engaged in missionary work in Yucatan.

The Maya history of the seventeenth century is chiefly one of revolts, viz., 1610–33, 1636–44, 1653, 1669, 1670, and about 1675. Of all these, that of 1636–44 was the most extensive and serious, resulting in a temporary revival of the old heathen rites. In 1697 the island capital of the Itzá, in Lake Petén, Guatemala, was stormed by Governor Martín de Ursua, and with it fell the last stronghold of the independent Maya. Here, also, the manuscripts discovered were destroyed. In 1728 Bishop Juan Gomez Parada died, beloved by the Indians for the laws which he had procured mitigating the harshness of their servitude. The reimposition of the former hard conditions brought about another revolt in 1761, led by the chief Jacinto Canek, and ending, as usual, in the defeat of the Indians, the destruction of their chief stronghold, and the death of their leader under horrible torture.

In 1847, taking advantage of the Government's difficulties with the United States, and urged on by their "unappeasable hatred toward their rulers from the earliest time of the Spanish conquest", the Maya again broke out in general rebellion, with the declared purpose of driving all the whites, half-breeds and negroes from the peninsula, in which they were so far successful that all the fugitives who escaped the wholesale massacres fled to the coast, whence most of them were taken off by ships from Cuba. Arms and ammunition for the rising were freely supplied to the Indians by the British traders of Belize. In 1851 the rebel Maya

established their headquarters at Chan-Santa-Cruz in the eastern part of the peninsula. In 1853 it seemed as if a temporary understanding had been reached, but next year hostilities began again. Two expeditions against the Maya stronghold were repulsed, Valladolid was besieged by the Indians, Yecax taken, and more than two thousand whites massacred. In 1860 the Mexican Colonel Acéreto, with 3,000 men, occupied Chan-Santa-Cruz, but was finally compelled to retire with the loss of 1,500 men killed, and to abandon his wounded—who were all butchered—as well as his artillery and supplies and all but a few hundred stand of small arms. The Indians burned and ravaged in every direction, nineteen flourishing towns being entirely wiped out, and the population in three districts being reduced from 97,000 to 35,000. The war of extermination continued, with savage atrocities, through 1864, when it gradually wore itself out, leaving the Indians still unsubdued and well supplied with arms and munitions of war from Belize. In 1868 it broke out again in resistance to the Juarez government. In 1871 a Mexican force again occupied Chan-Santa-Cruz, but retired without producing any permanent result. In 1901, after long preparation, a strong Mexican force invaded the territory of the independent Maya both by land and sea, stormed Chan-Santa-Cruz and, after determined resistance, drove the defenders into the swamps. The end is not yet, however, for, even in this year of 1910, Mexican troops are in the field to put down a serious rising in the northern part of the peninsula.

II. Institutions, Arts, and Literature.—Under the ancient system, the Maya Government was an hereditary absolute monarchy, with a close union of the spiritual and temporal elements, the hereditary high priest, who was also king of the sacred city of Izamal, being consulted by the monarch on all important matters, besides having the care of ritual and ceremonials. On public occasions the king appeared dressed in flowing white robes, decorated with gold and precious stones, wearing on his head a golden circlet decorated with the beautiful *quetzal* plumes reserved for royalty, and borne upon a canopied palanquin. The provincial governors were nobles of the four royal families, and were supreme within their own governments. The rulers of towns and villages formed a lower order of nobility, not of royal blood. The king usually acted on the advice of a council of lords and priests. The lords alone were military commanders, and each lord and inferior official had for his support the produce of a certain portion of land which was cultivated in common by the people. They received no salary, and each was responsible for the maintenance of the poor and helpless of his district. The lower priesthood was not hereditary, but was appointed through the high priest. There was also a female priesthood, or vestal order, whose head was a princess of royal blood. The plebeians were farmers, artisans, or merchants; they paid taxes and military service, and each had his interest in the common land as well as his individual portion, which descended in the family and could not be alienated. Slaves also existed, the slaves being chiefly prisoners of war and their children, the latter of whom could become freemen by putting a new piece of unoccupied ground under cultivation. Society was organized upon the clan system, with descent in the male line, the chiefs being rather custodians for the tribe than owners, and having no power to alienate the tribal lands. Game, fish, and the salt marshes were free to all, with a certain portion to the lords. Taxes were paid in kind through authorized collectors. On the death of the owner, the property was divided equally among his nearest male heirs.

The more important cases were tried by a royal council presided over by the king, and lesser cases by the provincial rulers or local judges, according to their importance, usually with the assistance of a council and with an advocate for the defence. Crimes were punished with death—frequently by throwing over a precipice—enslavement, fines, or, rarely, by imprisonment. The code was merciful, and even murder could sometimes be compounded by a fine. Children were subject to parents until of an age to marry, which for boys was about twenty. The children of the common people were trained only in the occupation of their parents, but those of the nobility were highly educated, under the care of the priests, in writing, music, history, war, and religion. The daughters of nobles were strictly secluded, and the older boys in each village lived and slept apart in a public building. Birthdays and other anniversaries were the occasions of family feasts.

Marriage between persons of the same *gens* was forbidden, and those who violated this law were regarded as outcasts. Marriage within certain other degrees of relationship—as with the sister of a deceased wife, or with a mother's sister—was also prohibited. Polygamy was unknown, but concubinage was permitted, and divorce was easy. Marriages were performed by the priests, with much ceremonial rejoicing, and preceded by a solemn confession and a baptismal rite, known as the "rebirth", without which there could be no marriage. No one could marry out of his own rank or without the consent of the chief of the district. Religious ritual was elaborate and imposing, with frequent festival occasions in honour of the gods of the winds, the rain, the cardinal points, the harvest, of birth, death, and war, with special honours to the deified national heroes Itzamná and Kukulcan. The whole country was dotted with temples, usually great stone-built pyramids, while certain places—as the sacred city of Izamal and the island of Cozumel—were places of pilgrimage. There was a special "feast of all the gods". The prevailing mildness of the Maya cult was in strong contrast to the bloody ritual of the Aztec. Human sacrifice was forbidden by Kukulcan, and crept in only in later years. It was never a frequent or prominent feature, excepting at Chichen-Itzá, where it at least became customary, on occasion of some great national crisis, to sacrifice hundreds of voluntary victims of their own race, frequently virgins, by drowning them in one of the subterranean rock wells or *cenotes*, after which the bodies were drawn out and buried.

The Maya farmer cultivated corn, beans, cacao, chile, maguey, bananas, and cotton, besides giving attention to bees, from which he obtained both honey and wax. Various fermented drinks were prepared from corn, maguey, and honey. They were much given to drunkenness, which was so common as hardly to be considered disgraceful. Chocolate was the favourite drink of the upper classes. Cacao beans, as well as pieces of copper, were a common medium of exchange. Very little meat was eaten, except at ceremonial feasts, although the Maya were expert hunters and fishers. A small "barkless" dog was also eaten. The ordinary garment of men was a cotton breechcloth wrapped around the middle, with sometimes a sleeveless shirt, either white or dyed in colors. The women wore a skirt belted at the waist, and plaited their hair ln long tresses. Sandals were worn by both sexes. Tattooing and head-flattening were occasionally practised, and the face and body were always painted. The Maya, then as now, were noted for personal neatness and frequent use of both cold and hot baths. They were expert and determined warriors, using the bow and arrow, the dart with throwing-stick, the wooden sword edged with flints, the lance, sling, copper axe, shield of reeds, and protective armour of heavy quilted cotton. They understood military tactics and signalling with drum and whistle, and knew how to build barricades and dig trenches. Noble prisoners were usually sacrificed to the gods, while those of ordinary rank became slaves. Their object in war



MAYA

TABLET WITH HIEROGLYPH INSCRIPTION
TEMPLE OF THE SUN, PALENQUE

CARVING ABOVE CENTRAL ENTRANCE (DETAIL)
HOUSE OF THE GOVERNOR, CHICHEN-ITZÁ

STUCCO ALTAR-PIECE, WITH HIEROGLYPH INSCRIPTION
TEMPLE OF INSCRIPTIONS, PALENQUE

DOORWAY
HOUSE OF THE GOVERNOR, CHICHEN-ITZÁ

was rather to make prisoners than to kill. As the peninsula had no mines, the Maya were without iron or any metal excepting a few copper utensils and gold ornaments imported from other countries. Their tools were almost entirely of flint or other stone, even for the most intricate monumental carving. For household purposes they used clay pottery, dishes of shell, or gourds. Their pottery was of notable excellence, as were also their weaving, dyeing, and feather work. Along the coast they had wooden dugout canoes capable of holding fifty persons.

They had a voluminous literature, covering the whole range of native interests, either written, in their own peculiar "calculiform" hieroglyphic characters, in books of maguey paper or parchment which were bound in wood, or carved upon the walls of their public buildings. Twenty-seven parchment books were publicly destroyed by Bishop Landa at Maní in 1562, others elsewhere in the peninsula, others again at the storming of the Itzá capital in 1697, and almost all that have come down to us are four codices, as they are called, viz., the "Codex Troano", published at Paris in 1869; another codex, apparently connected with the first, published at Paris in 1882; the "Codex Peresianus", published at Paris in 1869–71; and the "Dresden Codex", originally mistakenly published as an Aztec book in Kingsborough's great work on the "Antiquities of Mexico" (London, 1830–48). Besides these pre-Spanish writings, of which there is yet no adequate interpretation, we have a number of later works written in the native language by Christianized Maya shortly after the conquest. Several of these have been brought together by Brinton in his "Maya Chronicles". The intricate calendar system of the Maya, which exceeded in elaboration that of the Aztec, Zapotec, or any other of the cultured native races, has been the subject of much discussion. It was based on a series of *katuns*, or cycles, consisting of 20 (or 24), 52, and 260 years, and by its means they carried their history down for possibly thirteen centuries, the completion of each lesser *katun* being noted by the insertion of a memorial stone in the wall of the great temple at Mayapan.

The art in which above all the Maya excelled, and through which they are best known, is architecture. The splendid ruins of temples, pyramids, and great cities—some of which were intact and occupied at the time of the conquest—scattered by scores and hundreds throughout the forests of Yucatan, have been the wonder and admiration of travellers for over half a century, since they were first brought prominently to notice by Stephens. Says Brinton: "The material was usually a hard limestone, which was polished and carved, and imbedded in a firm mortar. Such was also the character of the edifices of the Quiches and Cakchiquels of Guatemala. In view of the fact that none of these masons knew the plumb-line or the square, the accuracy of the adjustments is remarkable. Their efforts at sculpture were equally bold. They did not hesitate to attempt statues in the round of life size and larger, and the façades of the edifices were covered with extensive and intricate designs cut in high relief upon the stones. All this was accomplished without the use of metal tools, as they did not have even the bronze chisels familiar to the Aztecs." The interior walls were also frequently covered with hieroglyphic inscriptions carved in the stone or wood, or painted upon the plaster. Among the most noted of the Maya ruins are those of Palenque (in Chiapas), Uxmal, Chichen-Itzá, and Mayapan.

The Maya language has received much attention from missionaries and scientists from an early period. Of grammars the earliest is the "Arte y Vocabulario de la lengua de Yucatan" of Luis de Villalpando, published about 1555. Others of note are "Arte de la Lengua Maya" by Father Gabriel San Buenaventura (Mexico, 1684), and republished by the Abbé Brasseur de Bourbourg in volume two of the "Mission Scientifique au Mexique" (Paris, 1870); "Arte de el Idioma Maya" by Father Pedro de Santa Rosa Maria Beltran, a native of Yucatan and instructor in the Maya language in the Franciscan convent of Mérida (Mexico, 1746, and Mérida, 1859); "Gramática Yucateca" by Father Joaquin Ruz, of the Franciscan convent of Mérida, also a native of Yucatan and "the most fluent of the writers in the Maya language that Yucatan has produced" (Mérida, 1844), and republished in an English translation by the Baptist missionary, Rev. John Kingdom (Belize, 1847). Each of these writers was also the author of other works in the language.

Of published dictionaries may be mentioned: first and earliest, a "Diccionario", credited to Father Villalpando (Mexico, 1571); then "Diccionario de la Lengua Maya", by Juan Perez (Mérida, 1866–77); and "Dictionnaire, Grammaire et Chrestomathie de la langue Maya", by the Abbé Brasseur de Bourbourg (Paris, 1872). The most valuable dictionaries of the language are still in manuscript. Chief is the one known as the "Diccionario del Convento de Motul", from the name of the Franciscan convent in Yucatan in which it was found; it is now in the Carter Brown library at Providence. It is beautifully written and is supposed to be a copy of an original written by a Franciscan priest, who was evidently a master of the language, about 1590. "In extent the dictionary is not surpassed by that of any aboriginal language of America" (Bartlett). Other manuscript dictionaries are those of the Convent of Mérida (about 1640); of the Convent of Ticul (about 1690); and one by the Rev. Alexander Henderson, a Methodist missionary of Belize (1859–66), now the property of the Bureau of American Ethnology. (See also Brinton, "Maya Chronicles", and Maya titles in Pilling, "Bibliography, Proofsheets" (Washington, 1885).)

Physically, the Maya are dark, short, muscular, and broad-headed. Intellectually, they are alert, straightforward, reliable, of a cheerful disposition, and neat and orderly habits. Their wars with Mexico have been waged, however, with the utmost savagery, the provocation being as great on the other side. Their daily life differs little from that of the ordinary Mexican peasant, their ordinary dwellings being thatched huts, their dress the common white shirt and trousers, with sandals and straw hat, for men, and for women white embroidered skirt and sleeveless gown. They cultivate the ordinary products of the region, including sugar and hennequin hemp, while the independent bands give considerable attention to hunting. While they are all now Catholics, with resident priests in all the towns, that fact in no way softens their animosity towards the conquering race. They still keep up many of their ancient rites, particularly those relating to the planting and harvesting of the crops. Many of these survivals are described by Brinton in a chapter of his "Essays of an Americanist". The best recent account (1894) of the independent Maya is that of the German traveller Sapper, who praises in the highest terms their honesty, punctuality, hospitality, and peaceful family life. A translation of it is given in the Bowditch collection. At that time the Mexican government officially recognized three independent Maya states, or tribes, in Southern and Eastern Yucatan, the most important being the hostiles of the Chan-Santa-Cruz district, estimated at not more than 10,000 souls as against about 40,000 at the outbreak of the rebellion of 1847. The other two bands together numbered perhaps as many, having decreased in about the same ratio.

Ancona, *Hist. de Yucatan* (2 vols., Mérida, 1878); Bancroft (H. H.), *Native Races:* II, *Civilized Nations:* III, *Mythology and Language* (San Francisco, 1882); Idem, *Hist. of Central America* (3 vols., San Francisco, 1886–87); Idem, *Hist. of Mexico* (6 vols., San Francisco, 1886–88); Bowditch (ed.), *Mexican and Central American Antiquities* (tr. from the German of Förstemann, Seler, Sapper, Schellhas, Dieseldorff), in *Bulletin 28, Bureau of Am. Ethn.* (Washington,

1904); BRASSEUR DE BOURBOURG, *Hist. des nations civilisées du Mexique et de l'Amérique-Centrale* (4 vols., Paris, 1857–59); IDEM, *Monuments anciens du Mexique: Palenqué*, etc. (Paris, 1866); IDEM, *Manuscrit Troano* (2 vols., Paris, 1869–70); IDEM, *Catalogue des caractères mayas* (Paris, 1869); BRINTON, *The Maya Chronicles* (Philadelphia, 1882); IDEM, *American Hero-Myths* (Philadelphia, 1882); IDEM, *Essays of an Americanist* (Philadelphia, 1890); IDEM, *The American Race* (New York, 1891); IDEM, *The Native Calendars of Central America and Mexico* (Philadelphia, 1893); CARRILLO Y ANCONA, *Compendio de la Hist. de Yucatan* (Mérida, 1871); IDEM, *Manual de Hist. y Geografía de la Peninsula de Yucatan* (Mérida, 1868); IDEM, *Biblioteca de autores Yucatecos* (Mérida, 1881); IDEM, *Hist. antigua de Yucatan* (Mérida, 1881; 1883); CASTILLO, *Dicionario Histórico, Biográfico y Monumental de Yucatan* (Mérida, 1866); COGOLLUDO, *Hist. de Yucatan* (Madrid, 1688; reprints 1842 and 1867); DIAZ DEL CASTILLO, *Verdadera Hist. de la Conquista de Nueva España* (Madrid, 1632; 1796) (tr. London, 1800; 1844; Salem, 1803); FANCOURT, *Hist. of Yucatan* (London, 1854); GARCÍA Y GARCÍA, *Hist. de la Guerra de Castas en Yucatan* (Mérida, 1865); GÓMARA, *Crónica de la Nueva España* (Saragossa, 1554); IDEM, *Historia general de las Indias* (Antwerp, 1554); HERRERA, *Hist. general de los hechos de los Castellanos*, etc. (Madrid, 1601; 1726–30; Fr. tr. Paris, 1671; tr. London, 1740); HOLMES, *Archæological Studies among the Ancient Cities of Mexico:* pt. I, *Monuments of Yucatan* (Field Museum, Chicago, 1895); LANDA, *Relación de las cosas de Yucatan* (Madrid, 1881); Fr. tr. BRASSEUR DE BOURBOURG (Paris, 1864); LAS CASAS, *Brevisima Relación de la Destruyción de las Indias* (Seville, 1552; 1822) (for translations see CASAS, BARTOLOMÉ DE LAS); MENDIETA, *Hist. Eclesiástica Indiana* (Mexico, 1870); MORLEY, *Correlation of Maya and Christian Chronology* in *Am. Jour. of Archæology*, 2nd series, XIV (Norwood, Massachusetts, 1910), no. 2; OVIEDO Y VALDÉS, *Hist. general y natural de las Indias* (Toledo, 1526; 4 vols., Madrid, 1851–55); PEREZ, *Cronología antigua de Yucatan*, opp. to STEPHEN'S *Yucatan*, LANDA'S *Relación*, DE BOURBOURG, etc.; PIMENTEL, *Lenguas indígenas de México* (2 vols., Mexico, 1862–65; 3 vols., Mexico, 1874–75); SAHAGUN, *Hist. general de Nueva España* (*1529–1590*) (3 vols., Mexico, 1829–30); STARR, *Ethnog. of Southern Mexico* in *Proceed. Davenport Acad. Sciences*, VIII (Davenport, 1901); IDEM, *In Indian Mexico* (Chicago, 1908); STEPHENS, *Incidents of Travel in Central America, Chiapas and Yucatan* (2 vols., New York, 1841, etc.); IDEM, *Incidents of Travel in Yucatan* (2 vols., New York, 1843); THOMAS, *Aids to the Study of the Maya Codices* in *Sixth Report, Bur. of Am. Ethn.* (Washington, 1889); IDEM, *Day Symbols of the Maya Year* in *Sixteenth Rep., Bur. of Am. Ethn.* (Washington, 1897); IDEM, *Mayan Calendar Systems* in *Nineteenth Rep., Bur. of Am. Ethn.*, pt. II (Washington, 1900); IDEM, *The Maya Year, Bulletin 18, Bur. of Am. Ethn.* (Washington, 1894); IDEM, *Notes on Certain Maya and Mexican Manuscripts* in *Third Rep., Bur. of Am. Ethn.* (Washington, 1885); IDEM, *Numeral Systems of Mexico and Central America* in *Nineteenth Rep., Bur. of Am. Ethn.* (Washington, 1900); IDEM, *A Study of the Manuscript Troano* in *Cont. to North Am. Ethnology*, V (Washington, 1882); THOMPSON, *Ruins of Xkichmook, Yucatan* (Field Museum, Chicago, 1898); TORQUEMADA, *Monarquía Indiana* (3 vols., Seville, 1615; Madrid, 1723); VALENTINI, *The Katunes of Maya Hist.* in *Proc. Am. Antiq. Soc. for 1879* (Worcester, 1880); VILLAGUTIERRE SOTO-MAYOR, *Hist. de la Conquista de la Provincia de la Itzá* (Madrid, 1701).

JAMES MOONEY.

Mayer, CHRISTIAN, Moravian astronomer, b. at Mederizenhi in Moravia, 20 Aug., 1719; d. at Heidelberg, 16 April, 1783. He entered the Society of Jesus at Mannheim on 26 Sept., 1745, and after completing his studies taught the humanities for some time at Aschaffenburg. He likewise cultivated his taste for mathematics, and later was appointed professor of mathematics and physics in the University of Heidelberg. In 1755 he was invited by the Elector Palatine Charles Theodore to construct and take charge of the astronomical observatory at Mannheim. Here as well as at Schwetzingen, where he had also built an observatory, he carried on his observations which led to numerous memoirs, some of which were published in the "Philosophical Transactions" of London. One of his observations, recorded in the "Tables d'aberration et de mutation" (Mannheim, 1778) of his assistant Mesge, gave rise to much discussion. He claimed to have discovered that many of the more conspicuous stars in the southern heavens were surrounded by smaller stars, which he regarded as satellites. His contemporaries, including Herschel and Schröter, who were provided with much more powerful telescopes, failed to verify his observations. Mayer, however, defended their reality and replied to one of his critics, the well-known astronomer Father Höll, in a work entitled "Gründliche Vertheidigung neuer Beobachtungen von Fixstern-trabanten welche zu Mannheim auf der kurfürstl. Sternwarte endeckt worden sind" (Mannheim, 1778). In the following year he published a Latin work on the same subject. The observations, which were made in good faith, were evidently due to an optical illusion. Mayer spent some time at Paris in the interests of his science, and visited Germany in company with Cassini. Upon the invitation of Empress Catherine of Russia, he went to St. Petersburg to observe the transit of Venus in 1769. He was a member of numerous learned societies, including those of Mannheim, Munich, London, Bologna, Göttingen, and Philadelphia. He published a number of memoirs, among which may be mentioned "Basis Palatina" (Mannheim, 1763), "Expositio de transitu Veneris" (St. Petersburg, 1769), "Pantometrum Pacechianum, seu instrumentum novum pro elicienda ex una statione distantia loci inaccessi" (Mannheim, 1762); "Nouvelle méthode pour lever en peu de temps et à peu de frais une carte générale et exacte de toute la Russie" (St. Petersburg, 1770); "Observations de la Comète de 1781" in the "Acta Acad. Petropolit." (1782), etc.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la Comp. de Jésus*, V, 794; DELAMBRE in *Biogr. Univers.*, s. v.

HENRY M. BROCK.

Mayhew, EDWARD, b. in 1569; d. 14 Sept., 1625. He belonged to the old English family of Mayhew or Mayow of Winton, near Salisbury, Wiltshire, which had endured much persecution for the Faith. On 10 July, 1583, he entered, with his elder brother Henry, the English College at Reims, where he displayed conspicuous talents, and received the tonsure and minor orders on 22 August, 1590. Thence proceeding to Rome, he there continued his studies until his ordination, after which he left for the English missions in 1595. Having served for twelve years on the mission as a secular priest, he joined the Benedictine Order, being professed by Dom Sigebert Buckley, the sole survivor of the English congregation, in his cell at the Gatehouse prison, Westminster, on 21 November, 1607. The old English congregation would thus have ended with Dom Buckley, had not Mayhew and another secular priest, Father Robert Sadler, sought profession, thus preserving its continuity to the present day. Under these two new members the English congregation began to revive. Becoming affiliated with the Spanish congregation in 1612, it was given an equal share in St. Lawrence's monastery at Dieulwart, Lorraine, henceforth the centre of the English congregation. Retiring from the English mission in 1613, Mayhew took up his residence at Dieulwart, where he filled the office of prior from 1613 to 1620. The union of the three congregations engaged on the English missions had for some time been canvassed, and in 1617 Mayhew was appointed one of the nine definitors to bring this about. That of the English and Spanish congregations was accomplished by the Apostolic Brief, "Ex incumbenti", of August, 1619, but the members of the Italian congregation refused to become united. The zeal for the strict observance of the Benedictine Rule, so characteristic of Dieulwart, was in great part due to Mayhew's religious earnestness and strength of character. From 1623 until his death he acted as vicar to the nuns at Cambrai. His remains lie in the parish church at St. Vedast. The most important of Mayhew's works are: "Sacra Institutio Baptizandi etc." (Douai, 1604); "Treatise on the Groundes of the Olde and Newe Religion etc." (s. l., 1608); "Congregationis Anglicanæ Ordinis S. Benedicti Trophæa" (2 vols., Reims, 1619, 1625).

PITTS, *De Illust. Angl. Script.*, p. 815; WOOD, *Athenæ Oxon.*, I (ed. 1691), 347; DODD, *Church History*, ii; *Records of the English Cath.*, i; SNOW, *Bened. Necrol.*, pp. 12, 35; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.

THOMAS KENNEDY.

May Laws. See KULTURKAMPF.

Maynas. See CHACHAPOYAS, DIOCESE OF.

Mayne, CUTHBERT, BLESSED, martyr, b. at Youlston, near Barnstaple, Devonshire (baptized 20 March, 1543–4); d. at Launceston, Cornwall, 29 Nov., 1577. He was the son of William Mayne; his uncle was a schismatical priest, who had him educated at Barnstaple Grammar School, and he was ordained a Protestant minister at the age of eighteen or nineteen. He then went to Oxford, first to St. Alban's Hall, then to St. John's College, where he took the degree of M. A. in 1570. He there made the acquaintance of Blessed Edmund Campion, Gregory Martin, the controversialist, Humphrey Ely, Henry Shaw, Thomas Bramston, O.S.B., Henry Holland, Jonas Meredith, Roland Russell, and William Wiggs. The above list shows how strong a Catholic leaven was still working at Oxford. Late in 1570 a letter from Gregory Martin to Blessed Cuthbert fell into the Bishop of London's hands. He at once sent a pursuivant to arrest Blessed Cuthbert and others mentioned in the letter. Blessed Cuthbert was in the country, and being warned by Blessed Thomas Ford, he evaded arrest by going to Cornwall, whence he arrived at Douai in 1573. Having become reconciled to the Church, he was ordained in 1575; in Feb., 1575–6 he took the degree of S.T.B. at Douai University; and on 24 April, 1576 he left for the English mission in the company of Blessed John Payne. Blessed Cuthbert took up his abode with the future confessor, Francis Tregian, of Golden, in St. Probus's parish, Cornwall. This gentleman suffered imprisonment and loss of possessions for this honour done him by our martyr. At his house our martyr was arrested 8 June, 1577, by the high sheriff, Grenville, who was knighted for the capture. He was brought to trial in September; meanwhile his imprisonment was of the harshest order. His indictment under statutes of 1 and 13 Elizabeth was under five counts: first, that he had obtained from the Roman See a "faculty", containing absolution of the queen's subjects; second, that he had published the same at Golden; third, that he had taught the ecclesiastical authority of the pope in Launceston Gaol; fourth, that he had brought into the kingdom an Agnus Dei and had delivered the same to Mr. Tregian; fifth, that he had said Mass.

As to the first and second counts, the martyr showed that the supposed "faculty" was merely a copy printed at Douai of an announcement of the Jubilee of 1575, and that its application having expired with the end of the jubilee, he certainly had not published it either at Golden or elsewhere. As to the third count, he maintained that he had said nothing definite on the subject to the three illiterate witnesses who asserted the contrary. As to the fourth count, he urged that the fact that he was wearing an Agnus Dei at the time of his arrest was no evidence that he had brought it into the kingdom or delivered it to Mr. Tregian. As to the fifth count, he contended that the finding of a Missal, a chalice, and vestments in his room did not prove that he had said Mass.

Nevertheless the jury found him guilty of high treason on all counts, and he was sentenced accordingly. His execution was delayed because one of the judges, Jeffries, altered his mind after sentence and sent a report to the Privy Council. They submitted the case to the whole Bench of Judges, which was divided in opinion, though the weight of authority inclined to Jeffries's view. Nevertheless, for motives of policy, the Council ordered the execution to proceed. On the night of 27 November his cell was seen by the other prisoners to be full of a strange bright light. The details of his martyrdom must be sought in the works hereinafter cited. It is enough to say that all agree that he was insensible, or almost so, when he was disembowelled. A rough portrait of the martyr still exists; and portions of his skull are in various places, the largest being in the Carmelite Convent, Lanherne, Cornwall.

CAMM, *Lives of the English Martyrs*, II (London, 1905), 204–222, 656; POLLEN, *Cardinal Allen's Briefe Historie* (London, 1908), 104–110; COOPER in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v.; CHALLONER, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*, I; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; DASENT, *Acts of the Privy Council* (London, 1890–1907), IX, 375, 390; X, 6, 7, 85.

JOHN B. WAINEWRIGHT.

Maynooth College, The National College of Saint Patrick, at Maynooth in County Kildare, about twelve miles from Dublin, founded in the year 1795. Ireland at that date still had her own Parliament; and, although Catholics could not sit in it, the spirit of toleration and liberty which had swept over the United States and France could not be excluded from its debates. Several relaxations had already been granted in the application of the penal laws, and it is to the credit of Irish Protestants that during their short period of Parliamentary liberty (1782–1801), they should have entered so heartily on the path of national brotherhood, and have given to the world two such illustrious names as Edmund Burke and Henry Grattan. It was to these two men, more than to any statesmen of their time, that the foundation of Maynooth College may be ascribed. Other circumstances were also favourable. On the one hand, the programme of the "United Irishmen" (1798) proclaimed the doctrine of universal toleration and liberty of conscience. On the other hand, the British Government was glad of an opportunity to withdraw young Irish ecclesiastics as far as possible from the revolutionary influences to which they were exposed on the Continent. Moreover, soldiers were needed at a time when war was raging or threatening on all sides; and it had become necessary to conciliate the class from amongst whom the best Irish soldiers could be recruited.

In 1794 a memorial was presented to the Irish Viceroy by Dr. Troy, Archbishop of Dublin, on behalf of all the Catholic prelates of Ireland. This memorial set forth that the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland had never been charged with disaffection to the State or irregularity in their conduct; that, on the contrary, they had been complimented more than once for inculcating obedience to the laws and veneration for His Majesty's royal person and government. It was then pointed out that the foreign colleges, in which about 400 students were educated for the Irish mission, had been closed, and their funds confiscated; and that, even had they remained open, it would no longer be safe to send Irish students abroad, "lest they should be contaminated with the contagion of sedition and infidelity" and thus become the means of introducing into Ireland the pernicious maxims of a licentious philosophy. The memorial was favourably received, and, in the following year Mr. Pelham, the Secretary of State, introduced his Bill for the foundation of a Catholic college. The Bill passed rapidly through all its stages and received the royal assent on 5 June, 1795. The management of the institution was given to a Board of Trustees who were to appoint all the officers, the president, masters, fellows, and scholars; to fix their salaries and make all necessary by-laws, rules, and statutes. No Catholic could act as trustee, or fill any other office, or be admitted as a student, who did not first take the oath of allegiance prescribed for Catholics in the thirteenth and fourteenth years of George III. No Protestant or son of a Protestant could be received in the new Academy under the severest pains and penalties. The Lord Chancellor, however, and several judges of the high courts, were to act as Trustees ex officio. The endowment voted by Parliament was £8,000 (about $40,000) a year. Dr. Thomas Hussey, a graduate of the Irish College of Salamanca, who had long been chaplain to the Spanish Embassy in London, was appointed first president. The next step was to fix upon the site. At first Dublin, or the suburbs of Dublin, seemed to offer the chief advantages; finally, however, after a variety of pro-

posals had been considered, Maynooth was chosen, because it was considered favourable to the morals and studies of a college; also, because the Duke of Leinster, who had always been a friend of the Catholics, wished to have the new institution on his estate. The money granted by Parliament was voted for a Catholic college for the education of the Irish clergy: that was the express intention of the Government, but, as the Act was drawn in general terms, the trustees proceeded to erect a college for laymen in connexion with the ecclesiastical establishment. This college was suppressed by the Government in 1801. Another lay college was then erected in the immediate vicinity of the ecclesiastical college, and was continued up to 1817 under lay trustees. The establishment of various colleges in other parts of the country for the education of laymen made it unnecessary. Not long after the foundation of Maynooth, the whole country being convulsed by the rebellion of 1798, the general disturbance found an echo in the new institution. Of its sixty-nine students no fewer than eighteen or twenty were expelled for having taken the rebel oath.

St. Mary's, Maynooth College, Ireland

A valuable endowment was obtained for the new college on the death of John Butler, twelfth Baron Dunboyne, who had been Bishop of Cork from 1763 to 1786. On the death of his nephew, Pierce Butler, the eleventh baron, the bishop succeeded to the title and estates. This temporal dignity, however, proved his undoing; he gave up his bishopric, abjured the Catholic Faith, and took a wife. In his last illness he repented and endeavoured to make reparation for his conduct by willing his property in Meath, valued at about £1,000 (about $5,000) a year, to the newly founded college. The will was disputed at law by the next of kin. The case of the college was pleaded by John Philpot Curran, and a compromise was effected by which about one half of the property was secured to the college. The income from the bequest became the foundation of a fund for the maintenance of a higher course of ecclesiastical studies in the case of such students as should have distinguished themselves in the ordinary course. This is still known as the "Dunboyne Establishment". After the union with England the financial subsidy to Maynooth from the State underwent various changes and gave rise to debates of considerable acrimony in the House of Commons. In 1845, however, the government of Sir Robert Peel raised the grant from £9,500 (about $47,500) to £26,000 ($130,000) a year and placed it on the consolidated fund, where it formed part of the ordinary national debt and was free from annual discussion on the estimates. Sir Robert Peel also granted a sum of £30,000 (about $150,000) for suitable buildings; and it was then that the Gothic structure designed by Pugin, one of the handsomest college buildings in Europe, was erected. The disestablishment of the Irish Church by Mr. Gladstone in 1869, had serious financial results for Maynooth which was also disendowed; but a sum of about £370,000 (about $1,850,000) was given once for all to enable the college to continue its work. This sum was invested for the most part in land, and has been very ably managed by the trustees. Some of the most prominent Catholic laymen in the country, such as the Earls of Fingall and Kenmare, had acted as Trustees up to the date of the disendowment: from that time no further lay trustees were appointed.

Among the most distinguished of the past presidents of Maynooth were Hussey, Renehan, and Russell, a full account of whom is to be found in the College History by the Most Rev. Dr. Healy, Archbishop of Tuam. Dr. Hussey was the first president, and to his tact, judgment and skill the success of the original project was mainly due. Dr. Renehan was a distinguished Irish scholar, who did a great deal to rescue Irish manuscripts from destruction. Dr. Russell is chiefly known for his "Life of Cardinal Mezzofanti" and for the part he took in the conversion of Cardinal Newman. Amongst the most distinguished teachers and men of letters who shed lustre on the college during its first century were John MacHale, Paul O'Brien, Daniel Murray, Edmund O'Reilly, Nicholas Callan, Patrick Murray, Mathew Kelly, John O'Hanlon, William Jennings, James O'Kane, and Gerald Molloy. It is interesting to notice that, on the staff of the college in its early years, were four French refugees—the Rev.

Peter J. Delort, the Rev. Andrew Darré, the Rev. Louis Delahogue and the Rev. Francis Anglade—all Doctors of the Sorbonne. On the original staff may also be found the name of the Rev. John C. Eustace, author of the well-known "Classical Tour in Italy". Amongst the distinguished personages who have visited the college were Thackeray, Montalembert, Carlyle, Robert Owen, Cardinal Perraud, Huxley, the late Empress of Austria, and King Edward VII. The college possesses several memorials of the Empress of Austria, who lived in the neighbourhood during her visits to Ireland. The Centenary of the foundation of the college was celebrated in 1895, on which occasion congratulations were sent from all the Catholic educational centres in the world. The college library contains upwards of 40,000 volumes. It possesses a great many rare and precious works and some very valuable manuscripts. The *Aula Maxima* which was opened about the year 1893 was the gift to his *Alma Mater* of the Right Rev. Mgr. MacMahon of the Catholic University at Washington, D. C., and previously of New York. The chapel which has just been completed is a work of rare beauty both in design and ornamentation. Maynooth has already sent out into the world upwards of 7,000 priests. Her alumni are in all lands and in almost every position that an ecclesiastic could occupy. The average number of students in recent years is about 600. The ordinary theological course is four years, and the extra course of the "Dunboyne Establishment" three years more. Students in arts and philosophy have to graduate in the National University of which Maynooth is now a "recognized College".

HEALY, *Maynooth College, Its Centenary History* (Dublin, 1895); *Calendarium Collegii Sancti Patricii* (Dublin); *A Record of the Centenary Celebration . . . Maynooth College* (Dublin, 1895); *Cornwallis Correspondence; Memoirs of Viscount Castlereagh; Life and Times of Henry Grattan; Hansard's Parliamentary Debates; Correspondence of Edmund Burke;* GLADSTONE, *The State in its Relation to the Church*; HOGAN, *Maynooth College and the Laity* (Dublin).

J. F. HOGAN.

Mayo, SCHOOL OF (Irish *Magh Eo*, which means, according to Colgan, the Plain of the Oaks, and, according to O'Donovan, the Plain of the Yews), was situated in the present parish of Mayo, County Mayo, almost equidistant from the towns of Claremorris and Castlebar. The founder, St. Colman, who flourished about the middle of the seventh century, was in all probability a native of the West of Ireland, and made his ecclesiastical studies at Iona during the abbacy of the renowned Segenius. After the death of Finian, the second Bishop of Lindisfarne, Colman was appointed to succeed him. His episcopate was much disturbed by a fierce renewal of the Easter Controversy. Colman vigorously advocated the old Irish custom, and cited the example of his predecessors, but all to no effect. At a synod specially summoned to meet at Whitby in 664, the Roman method of calculation triumphed, and Colman, unwilling to abandon the practice of the "holy elders of the Irish Church", resolved to quit Lindisfarne forever.

In 668 he crossed the seas to his native land again, and in a remote island on the western coast called Inishbofin, he built a monastery and school. These things are clearly set out in the "Historia Ecclesiastica" of Bede, who then proceeds to describe how they led to the founding of the great school of Mayo. "Colman the Irish Bishop", says Bede, "departed from Britain and took with him all the Irish that he had assembled in the Island of Lindisfarne, and also about thirty of the English nation who had been instructed in the monastic life. . . . Afterwards he retired to a small island which is to the west of Ireland, and at some distance from the coast, called in the language of the Irish, Inishbofinde [island of the white cow]. Arriving there he built a monastery, and placed in it the monks he had brought with him of both nations".

It appears, however, the Irish and English monks could not agree. "Then Colman sought to put an end to their dissensions, and travelling about at length found a place in Ireland fit to build a monastery, which in the language of the Irish is called *Magh Eo* (Mayo)". Later on we are told by the same historian that this monastery became an important and flourishing institution, and even an episcopal see.

Though Colman, we may assume, lived mainly with his own countrymen at Inishbofin, he took a deep and practical interest in his new foundation at Mayo—"Mayo of the Saxons", as it came to be called. In the year 670, with his consent, its first canonical abbot was appointed. This was St. Gerald, the son of a northern English king, who, annoyed at the way Colman's most cherished convictions had been slighted at Whitby, resolved to follow him to Ireland. The school gained greatly in fame for sanctity and learning under this youthful abbot. About 679 St. Adamnan, the illustrious biographer of St. Columba, visited Mayo and, according to some writers, ruled there for seven years after Gerald's death. This latter statement is not, on the face of it, improbable if Gerald, as Colgan thinks, did not live after 697; but the Four Masters give the date of his death as 13 March, 726, and the "Annals of Ulster" put the event as late as 731. After Gerald's death we have only the record of isolated facts concerning the school he ruled so wisely and loved so well, but they are often facts of considerable interest and importance. We read, for example, that the monastery was burned in 783, and again in 805; also—but only in the old Life of St. Gerald—that it was plundered by Turgesius the Dane in 818. That the monastic grounds were regarded as exceptionally holy we can gather from the entry that Domhnall, son of Torlough O'Conor, Lord of North Connacht, "the glory and the moderator and the good adviser of the Irish people" (d. 1176), was interred therein. That it had the status of an episcopal see long after the Synod of Kells (1152), is clear from the entry under date of 1209, recording the death of "Cele O'Duffy, Bishop of Magh Eo of the Saxons".

Mayo, like the other ancient Irish monastic schools, suffered from the raids of native and foreigner, especially during the fourteenth century. But it survived them all, for the death under date 1478 is recorded of a bishop—"Bishop Higgins of Mayo of the Saxons". The time at which the See of Mayo, on the ground that it contained not a cathedral but a parochial church, was annexed to Tuam, cannot with certainty be ascertained, but as far back as 1217, during the reign of Honorius III, the question was before the Roman authorities for discussion. It was probably not settled definitively for centuries after. James O'Healy, "Bishop of Mayo of the Saxons", was put to death for the Catholic Faith at Kilmallock in 1579.

BEDE, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (London, 1907); COLGAN, *Acta Sanctorum Hiberniæ* (Louvain, 1645); O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints* (Dublin, s. d.); HEALY, *Ireland's Ancient Schools and Scholars* (5th ed., Dublin, 1906).

JOHN HEALY.

Mayo Indians.—An important tribe occupying some fifteen towns on Mayo and Fuerte rivers, southern Sonora and northern Sinaloa, Mexico. Their language is known as the Cahita, being the same as that spoken, with dialectic differences, by their neighbours, the Tehueco and Yaqui, and belonging to the Piman branch of the great Shoshonean stock. The name Mayo is said by Ribas to be properly that of their principal river and to signify "boundary". The known history of the tribe begins in 1532 with the naval expedition of Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, who landing at the mouth of the Fuerte, went up the river to the villages, where he was killed with his companions while asleep. In 1533 a land expedition under Diego de Guzman crossed through their country and penetrated to beyond the Yaqui river in the north. In 1609–10 they aided the Spaniards against the Yaqui, the two tribes being hereditary enemies,

and on the suppression of the revolt it was made a condition of the agreement that the Yaqui should live at peace with the Mayo. In 1613, at their own request, the first mission was established in their territory by the Jesuit Father Pedro Mendez, who had visited them some years before, over 3000 persons receiving baptism within fifteen days, in a population variously estimated at from nine to twenty thousand. Within a short time seven mission churches were built in as many towns of the tribe. This was the beginning of regular mission work in Sonora.

In 1740 the Mayo, hitherto friendly as a tribe, joined the Yaqui in revolt, apparently at the instance of Spanish officials jealous of missionary influence. The churches were burned, priests and settlers driven out of the country; and although the rising was put down in the following year after hard fighting, it marked the beginning of the decline of the missions which culminated in the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767. After their departure the Indians were for some time without religious teachers, but are now served by secular priests. In 1825–7 they again joined the Yaqui, led by the famous Bandera (Juzucanea) in revolt against Mexican aggression, and have several times since taken occasion to show their sympathy with their fighting kinsmen. The Mayo are sedentary and industrious farmers and mine laborers, and skilful artisans in the towns. They cultivate corn, squashes, beans, tobacco, cotton, and maguey, from which last they distill the mescal intoxicant. Their houses are light structures of cane and poles, thatched with palm leaves. They are all Catholic and very much Mexicanized, though they retain their language, and have many of the old Indian ideas still latent in them. Their principal town is Santa Cruz de Mayo, and they are variously estimated at from 7000 to 10,000 souls. The most important study of the language, the Cahita, is a grammar (Arte) by an anonymous Jesuit published in Mexico in 1737.

ALEGRE, *Hist. de la Compañía de Jesus* (Mexico, 1841); BANCROFT, *North Mexican States* (San Francisco, 1886–9); RIBAS, *Triumphos de Nuestra Santa Fe* (Madrid, 1645); WARD, *Mexico in 1827* (London, 1828).

JAMES MOONEY.

Mayor (MAJOR, MAIR), JOHN, also called JOANNES MAJORIS and HADDINGTONUS SCOTUS, a Scotch philosopher and historian, b. at Gleghornie near Haddington, 1496; d. at St. Andrew's, 1550. He studied at Oxford, Cambridge, and Paris, where he was graduated as master of arts in the College of St. Barbe in 1494 and as doctor of theology in the College of Montaigu in 1505. He spent the greater part of his remaining life as professor of logic and theology; from 1505–18 at the University of Paris, from 1518–23 at the University of Glasgow, from 1523–5 at the University of St. Andrew's, and from 1525–1530 again at Paris. In 1530 he returned to St. Andrews and was made provost of St. Salvator's College, a position which he occupied till his death. One of the greatest scholastic philosophers of his times, he had among his pupils the future Scotch reformers John Knox, Patrick Hamilton, and George Buchanan. In philosophy he was the chief exponent of the nominalistic or terministic tendency which was then prevalent at the University of Paris, while, as a canonist, he held that the chief ecclesiastical authority does not reside in the pope but in the whole Church. In like manner he held that the source of civil authority lies with the people who transfer it to the ruler and can wrest it from him, even by force, if necessary. He remained a Catholic till his death, though in 1549 he advocated a national Church for Scotland. His numerous literary productions were all written in Latin. His chief work, "Historia majoris Britanniæ, tam Angliæ quam Scotiæ" (Paris, 1521 and Edinburgh, 1740), translated into English for the first time by Archibald Constable, "History of Greater Britain, both England and Scotland" (Edinburgh, 1892), is written in barbarous Latin, but truthfully and faithfully portrays the author's vigour and spirit of independence. His other works are mostly philosophical, viz.: a commentary on Peter Lombard's Books of Sentences (Paris, 1508), "Introductorium" or a commentary on Aristotle's dialectics (Paris, 1508), the lectures which he delivered on logic in the College of Montaigu (Lyons, 1516), commentaries on Aristotle's physical and ethical writings (Paris, 1526), "Quæstiones logicales" (Paris, 1528), a commentary on the four Gospels (Paris, 1529). He was also the first to edit the so-called "Reportata Parisiensia" of Duns Scotus (Paris, 1517–8).

MACKAY, *Life of John Major*, prefixed to Constable's tr. of Mayor's History (Edinburgh, 1892). The preceding work contains also a complete list of works written by Mayor, and an estimate of them by the translator; BROWN, *George Buchanan, Humanist and Reformer* (Edinburgh, 1890), 38–41; LAW, *John Major* in *Scottish Review*, July, 1892.

MICHAEL OTT.

Mayoruna Indians, a noted and savage tribe of Panoan linguistic stock ranging the forests between the Ucayali, the Yavari and the Marañon (Amazon) rivers, in north-east Peru and the adjacent portion of Brazil. From the fact that some of them are of light skin and wear beards, a legend has grown up that they are descended from Spanish soldiers of Ursua's expedition (1569), but it is probable that the difference comes from later admixture of captive blood. As a tribe they are full-blood and typically Indian. It has been suggested that the story may have originated from a confusion of "Marañones", the name given to the followers of Ursua and Aguirre, with Mayorunas, which seems to be from the Quichua language of Peru. Markham interprets the name as "Men of Muyu" (Muyu-runa), indicating an ancient residence about Moyobamba (Muyubamba), farther to the west. One of their subtribes is known as "Barbudo" (Spanish, Bearded). Other subtribes are Itucale, Musimo or Musquima, Urarina. The Mayoruna tribes were among those gathered into the missions of the Mainas province (see MAINA INDIANS) in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, being represented in the missions of San Joaquin (Mayoruna proper), Nuestra Señora del Carmen (Mayoruna proper), and San Xavier (Urarina and Itucale). By the repeated attacks of the Portuguese slave-hunters (see MAMELUCO) between 1680 and 1710, and the revolts of the mission Indians in 1695 and 1767 the Mayoruna were driven to take refuge in their forests and are now wholly savage and particularly hostile to either whites or Indians who enter their territory, even successfully repelling a joint government exploring expedition in 1866. In person they are tall and well formed, with rather delicate features, going perfectly naked, with flowing hair cut across the forehead. Instead of bows, they use spears, clubs and blow-guns, and are famous for the strength of the deadly *curari* poison with which they tip their arrows. They avoid the river banks and do not use canoes. The charge of cannibalism has not been proven. (See also PANO.)

RODRIGUEZ, *Amazonas y Marañon* (Madrid, 1684); HERVAS, *Catalogo de las Lenguas* (Madrid, 1800); MARKHAM, *Tribes in the Valley of the Amazons* in *Journ. Anth. Inst., XXIV* (London, 1885); BRINTON, *The American Race* (New York, 1891).

JAMES MOONEY.

Mayotte, Nossi-Bé, and Comoro, PREFECTURE APOSTOLIC OF (MAYOTTÆ, NOSSIBEÆ, ET COMORÆ).— Mayotte is the farthest south and most important of the group of Comoro Islands: Mayotte (Maote), Anjuan (Inzuani), Mohilla (Moheli), and Great Comoro (Komoro, i. e. where there is fire, or Angazidya). These islands, with Nossi-Bé (large island) and Santa Maria (Nossi Burai, Nossi Ibrahim), form the archipelago known as "the Satellites of Madagascar". The Comoro Islands, with their craggy evergreen shores, look like the cones of submerged groves separated from the mainland by deep abysses. The

summits are not all of the same altitude; the highest point of Mayotte is not over 1800 feet, whereas the highest peak of Anjuan is about 5000 feet, while the central cone of Great Comoro, whose volcanic activity is not yet exhausted, rises to over 7000 feet. Two monsoons, consequently two seasons, alternately affect the climate of the archipelago, which is sometimes visited by cyclones. The soil of these islands is very fertile, and produces in abundance vanilla, cloves, sugar-cane, coffee, etc. The total population is about 80,000, mostly African negroes, often erroneously called Makoas (a Mozambique tribe). There are also some Sakalavas from Madagascar, mostly former slaves freed when the islands were occupied by the French. This Comoro Archipelago was for many centuries an Arabian colony and was once very prosperous. As they navigated along the African coast, the merchants of Idumea and Yemen created a special and interesting type, the Comorinos. Commingled with these Arabian half-breeds, once the sole owners of the country, there are now Banians from Cutch and Hindus from Bombay, who carry on almost the entire commerce. There are also a few European or creole planters and officials from Réunion or Mauritius. In 1843 the French Government, called in by the sultan, took possession of Mayotte, which became, with Nossi-Bé, a post of surveillance over Madagascar. All these islands now form a French colony. In 1844, Mayotte, Nossi-Bé, and the Comoros were made an Apostolic prefecture and confided to the Fathers of the Holy Ghost. In 1898, when the same missionaries were given the ecclesiastical administration of Northern Madagascar, these smaller islands and Santa Maria were attached to the Apostolic Vicariate at Diego Suarez. Santa Maria and Nossi-Bé have resident missionaries; the other islands are regularly visited.

The population of these islands is largely Mohammedan and therefore strongly anti-Christian; for this reason little religious progress is made. In all of the islands there are hardly three or four thousand Catholics. There are no Protestants.

Missiones Catholicæ (Rome, 1907).

ALEXANDER LE ROY.

Mayr, BEDA, a Bavarian Benedictine philosopher, apologist, and poet, b. 15 January, 1742, at Daiting near Augsburg; d. 28 April, 1794, in the monastery of Heiligenkreuz in Donauwörth. After studying at Scheyern, Augsburg, Munich and Freiburg im Breisgau, he took vows in the Benedictine monastery of Heiligenkreuz on 29 September, 1762, studied theology at the common study-house of the Bavarian Benedictines in Benediktbeuern, was ordained priest on 6 January, 1766, taught mathematics, philosophy, rhetoric, theology and canon law at his monastery, where he was also librarian and, for some time, prior. The last 28 years of his life he spent in his monastery, with the exception of four years during which he was pastor of Mündling. He was an exemplary religious and a popular preacher, but, as a philosopher, he was imbued with the subjectivistic criticism of Kant and, as a theologian, he was irenic beyond measure. In a letter to Henry Braun, superintendent of the Bavarian schools, he sets forth the opinion that a unification of the Catholic and the Protestant religion is possible. Braun published this letter without the consent of the author under the title "Der erste Schritt zur künftigen Vereinigung der katholischen und evangelischen Kirche" (Munich, 1778). In consequence Mayr was censured by the Bishop of Augsburg and temporarily forbidden to teach theology. His chief work, "Vertheidigung der natürlichen, christlichen und katholischen Religion nach den Bedürfnissen unserer Zeiten" in three parts (Augsburg, 1787–90), is equally irenic and permeated with the philosophy of Kant. It was placed on the Index in 1792 and ably refuted by the ex-Jesuit Hochbichler (Augsburg, 1790). Lindner (infra) enumerates 58 literary productions of Mayr. They include 21 dramas, four volumes of sermons (Augsburg, 1777), numerous occasional poems, and various treatises on philosophical, theological, and mathematical subjects.

BAADER, *Lexikon verstorbener baierischer Schriftsteller des 18 u. 19 Jahrh.*, I, ii (Augsburg u. Leipzig, 1825), 12–16; LINDNER, *Die Schriftsteller des Benediktiner Ordens im heutigem Königreich Bayern seit 1750*, II (Ratisbon, 1880), 137–41.

MICHAEL OTT.

Mayron (DE MAYRONIS), FRANCIS, b. about 1280, probably at Mayronnes, Department of Basses-Alpes, he entered the Franciscan order at the neighbouring Digne (or Sistéron). He had been teaching at the University of Paris for a long time as bachelor of theology, when, on 24 May, 1323, John XXII, at the request of King Robert of Naples, commanded the chancellor of the university to confer the degree of master of theology upon him. On 27 Sept., 1317, St. Elzear de Sabran died at Paris in Francis's arms. Francis was afterwards sent to Italy, and died at Piacenza, probably 26 July, 1327. It is generally accepted that Mayron introduced the famous "Actus Sorbonicus" into the University of Paris. This occurred at a disputation lasting from 5 a. m. to 7 p. m., in which the advocate had to defend his theses against any and all opponents who might offer to attack them, without any assistance and without either food or drink. Denifle has, however, denied this ("Chartularium Universit. Paris", II, Paris, 1891, 273), though only for this reason, that no "document" mentions anything about any such introduction by Mayron. Mayron was a distinguished pupil of Duns Scotus, whose teaching he usually followed. He was surnamed Doctor acutus, or Doctor illuminatus, also Magister abstractionum. His "Scripta super 4 libros Sententiarum" appeared at Venice, in 1507–8, 1519–20, 1520, 1526, 1556, 1567.

The treatises added thereto, "De formalitatibus", "De primo principio", "Explanatio divinorum terminorum", are not his, but have been collected from his teachings. The "De univocatione entis", edited with other writings at Ferrara before 1490, is Mayron's. His work "Conflatus", on the sentences, appeared at Treviso in 1476; Basle, 1489, 1579(?); Cologne, 1510. Distinct from the latter are the "Conflatile", Lyons, 1579; "Passus super Universalia", "Prædicamenta", etc., Bologna, 1479, Lerida, 1485, Toulouse, 1490, Venice, 1489; "Sermones de tempore cum Quadragesimali", two editions without place or date, probably Brussels, 1483, and Cologne, Venice, 1491; "Sermones de Sanctis", Venice, 1493, Basle, 1498 (with fourteen dissertations); "Tractatus de Conceptione B.M.V.", ed. Alva and Astorga in "Monumenta Seraphica pro Immaculata Conceptione", Louvain, 1665; "Theologicæ Veritates in St. Augustinum de Civitate Dei", Cologne, 1473, Treviso, 1476, Toulouse, 1488, Venice, 1489(?); "Veritates ex libris St. Augustini de Trinitate", Lyons, 1520. There are many other unedited writings on the works of St. Augustine, and philosophical and theological works, which testify to the extensive knowledge and the penetrating intellect of this eminent pupil of Duns Scotus. The treatise, "De celebratione Missæ", is also probably by him (cf. Ad. Franz, "Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter", Freiburg, 1902, 493–5).

RINONICO A PISIS, *Liber Conformitatum* in *Analecta Franciscana*, IV (Quaracchi, 1906), 339, 523, 540, 544; WADDING, *Scriptores Ordinis Minorum* (Rome, 1650), 123–5; *ibid.* (1806), 84; *ibid.* (1906), 85–6; SBARALEA, *Supplementum ad Scriptores O.M.* (Rome, 1806), 267–72 (2nd ed., ibid., 1908), 283–88; JOH. A S. ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca universa franciscana*, I (Madrid, 1732), 405 sq.; FERET, *La Faculté de Théologie de Paris*, III, 323–30 (Paris, 1884—); STÖCKL, *Geschichte der Philosophie im Mittelalter*, II (Mainz, 1865), II, 868; HAURÉAU, *Histoire de la Philosophie scolastique*, II, ii (Paris, 1880), 298 sq.; HURTER, *Nomenclator literarius*, II (Innsbruck, 1906), 522–25; CHEVALIER, *Répertoire de sources hist.*, II (Paris, 1907), 3271.

MICHAEL BIHL.

Mazarin, JULES, b. either at Rome or at Piscina in the Abruzzi, of a very old Sicilian family, 14 July, 1602; d. at Vincennes, 9 March, 1661. His father was majordomo to the Colonna family at Rome. One of his uncles, Giulio Mazarini (1544–1622), a Jesuit, enjoyed a great reputation in Italy, particularly at Bologna, as a preacher, and published several volumes of sacred eloquence. His youth was full of excitement: he accompanied the future Cardinal Colonna to Madrid; he was in turn a captain of pontifical troops and then a pontifical diplomat in the Valtelline War (1624) and the Mantuan War of Succession (1628–30). The truce which he negotiated (26 October, 1630) between the French, on one side, and the Spaniards and the Duke of Savoy, on the other, won for him the esteem of Richelieu, who was well pleased at his letting Pignerol

TOMB OF CARDINAL MAZARIN
Coysevox, Louvre

fall into the hands of the French. The Spaniards tried to injure him with Pope Urban VIII, but the influence of Cardinal Antonio Barberini and a letter from Richelieu saved him. He became canon of St. John Lateran, vice-legate at Avignon (1632), and nuncio extraordinary in France (1634). The Spaniards complained that in this last post Mazarin made it his exclusive business to support Richelieu's policy, and he was dismissed from the nunciature by Urban VIII (17 Jan., 1636). Soon after leaving the papal service, he went to Paris, placed himself at Richelieu's disposition, and was naturalized as a French subject in April, 1639. Richelieu commissioned him, late in 1640, to sign a secret treaty between France and Prince Thomas of Savoy, and caused him to be made a cardinal on 16 Dec., 1641. Shortly before Richelieu's death, Mazarin by a piece of clever management, had been able to effect the reoccupation of Sedan by French troops, and Richelieu on his deathbed(4 Dec., 1642) recommended him to the king. On the death of Louis XIII (14 May, 1642), Anne of Austria, leaving the Duc d'Orléans the shadowy title of lieutenant-general of the kingdom, gave the reality of power to Mazarin, who first pretended to be on the point of setting out for Italy, and then pretended that his acceptance of office was only provisional, until such time as the peace of Europe should be re-established.

But Mazarin, like Richelieu, was, in the event, to retain power until his death, first under the queen regent and then under the king after Louis XIV (q. v.) had attained his majority. His very humble appearance and manner, his gentle and kindly ways, had contributed to his elevation, and Anne's affection for him was the best guarantee of his continuance in office. The precise character of his relations with Anne of Austria is one of the enigmas of history. Certain letters of Anne of Austria to Mazarin, published by Cousin, and admissions made by Anne to Mme de Brienne and recorded in the Memoirs of Loménie de Brienne, prove that the queen regent was deeply attached to the cardinal. Still, "my sensibilities have no part in it", she said to Mme de Brienne. Few historians give credence to Anne's assertion on this point, and some go so far as to accept the allegations of the Princess Palatine in her letters of 1717, 1718, and 1722, according to which Anne of Austria and Mazarin were married. M. Loiseleur, who has made a careful study of the problem, believes that Mazarin was never married; it is certain that he retained the title and insignia of a cardinal until his death; probably he was even a cardinal-priest, though he never visited Rome after his elevation to the purple and seems never to have received the hat. And in any case he held the title of Bishop of Metz from 1653 to 1658.

Mazarin continued Richelieu's policy against the House of Austria. Aided by the victories of Condé and Turenne, he succeeded in bringing the Thirty Years' War to a conclusion with the Treaties of Münster and Osnabrück (Treaty of Westphalia), which gave Alsace (without Strasburg) to France; and in 1659 he ended the war with Spain in the Peace of the Pyrenees, which gave to France Roussillon, Cerdagne, and part of the Low Countries. Twice, in 1651 and 1652, he was driven out of the country by the Parliamentary Fronde and the Fronde of the Nobles, with the innumerable pamphlets (*Mazarinades*) which they published against him, but the final defeat of both Frondes was the victory of royal absolutism, and Mazarin thus prepared the way for Louis XIV's omnipotence. Lastly, in 1658, he placed Germany, in some sort, under the young king's protection, by forming the League of the Rhine, which was destined to hold the House of Austria in check. Thus did he lay the foundation of Louis XIV's greatness. His foreign policy was, as Richelieu's had often been, indifferent to the interests of Catholicism: the Peace of Westphalia gave its solemn sanction to the legal existence of Calvinism in Germany, and, while the nuncio vainly protested, Protestant princes were rewarded with secularized bishoprics and abbacies for their political opposition to Austria. Neither did it matter much to him whether the monarchical principle was respected or contemned in a foreign country: he was Cromwell's ally. Towards the Protestants he pursued an adroit policy. In 1654 Cromwell opened negotiations with the Calvinists of the South of France, who, the year before, had taken up arms in Ardèche to secure certain liberties for themselves. Mazarin knew how to keep the Calvinists amused with fine words, promises, and calculated delays: for six years they believed themselves to be on the eve of recovering their privileges, and in the end they obtained nothing. The cardinal well knew how to retain in the king's service valuable Protestants like Turenne and Gassion.

His personal relations with the Holy See were hardly cordial. He could not prevent Cardinal Pamfili, a friend of Spain, from being elected pope (15 Sept., 1644) as Innocent X. He received in France, one after the other, Cardinals Antonio and Francesco Barberini, nephews of the late pope, and the Bull of 21 February, 1646, fulminated by Innocent X against the cardinals, who were absenting themselves without authorization, (by the tenor of which Bull Mazarin himself was bound to repair to Rome), was voted by the Parliament of Paris "null and abusive". Mazarin obtained a decree of the Royal Council forbidding money to be remitted to Rome for expediting Bulls, there was a show of preparing an expedition against Avignon, and Innocent X, yielding to these menaces, ended by restoring their

CARDINAL MAZARIN

PAINTING BY PHILIPPE DE CHAMPAGNE

property and dignities to Mazarin's protégés, the Barberini. Following up his policy of bullying the pope, Mazarin sent two fleets to the Neapolitan coast to seize the Spanish *presidios* nearest to the papal frontiers. Apart from this, he had no Italian policy, properly speaking, and his demonstrations in Italy had no other object than to compel Spain to keep her troops there, and to bring the pope to a complaisant attitude towards France and towards Mazarin's own relations. The elevation of his brother Michael Mazarin to the cardinalate (October, 1647) was one of his diplomatic victories.

Though not interested in questions of theology, Mazarin detested the Jansenists for the part taken by some of them—disavowed, however, by Antoine Arnauld—in the Fronde, and for their support of Cardinal de Retz (q. v.). A declaration of the king in July, 1653, and an assembly of bishops in May, 1655, over which Mazarin presided, gave executive force to the decrees of Innocent X against Jansenism. The order condemning Pascal's "Provinciales" to be burnt, the order for the dismissal of pupils, novices, and postulants from the two convents of Port-Royal, the formula prepared by the Assembly of the Clergy against the "Augustinus" (1661), which formula all ecclesiastics had to sign—all these must be regarded as episodes of Mazarin's anti-Jansenist policy. On his deathbed he warned the king "not to tolerate the Jansenist sect, not even their name".

Having little by little become "as powerful as God the Father when the world began", enjoying the revenues of twenty-seven abbacies, always ready to enrich himself by whatever means, and possessing a fortune equivalent to about $40,000,000 in twentieth-century American money, Mazarin, towards the end of his life, multiplied in Paris the manifestations of his wealth. He organized a free lottery, at his own expense, with prizes amounting to more than a million francs, collected in his own palace more wonderful things than the king's palace contained, had no objection to presiding at tournaments, exhibitions of horsemanship, and ballets, and patronized the earliest efforts of the comic poet Molière. The young Louis XIV entertained a profound affection for him and, what is more, fell in love with the cardinal's two nieces, Olympe Mancini and Marie Mancini, one after the other. Mazarin sent Marie away, to prevent the king from entertaining the idea of marrying her. But if, for reasons of state, he refused to become the uncle of the King of France, it seems that there were moments when he dreamed of the tiara: the Abbé Choisy asserts that Mazarin died "in the vision of being made pope". One reminiscence at least of the old political ideas of Christian Europe is to be found in his will: he left the pope a fund (600,000 livres) to prosecute the war against the Turks. The cardinal, who throughout his life had given but little thought to the interests of Christianity, seems to have sought pardon by remembering them on his deathbed. The same will directed the foundation of the College of the Four Nations, for the free education of sixty children from those provinces which he had united to France. To this college he bequeathed the library now known as the Bibliothèque Mazarine. Mazarin's nieces made princely marriages: Anne Marie Martinozzi became the Princesse de Conti; Laura Martinozzi, the Duchesse de Modène; Laure Mancini died in 1657, Duchesse de Mercœur; Olympe Mancini became Comtesse de Soissons; Hortense Mancini, Marquise de la Meilleraie and Duchesse de Mazarin; Marie Mancini, Countess Colonna; Marie Anne Mancini, Duchesse de Bouillon. All these women, and particularly the last four, had singularly stormy careers.

CHÉRUEL AND D'AVENEL, eds., *Lettres du Cardinal Mazarin pendant son ministère* (9 vols., Paris, 1872–1906); RAVENEL, ed., *Lettres de Mazarin à la reine, écrites durant sa retraite hors de France en 1651 et 1652* (Paris, 1836); COUSIN, ed., *Carnets de Mazarin* in *Journal des Savants* (1855); MOREAU, *Bibliographie des Mazarinades* (3 vols., Paris, 1849–51); IDEM, *Choix de Mazarinades* (2 vols., Paris, 1852–53); LABADIE, *Nouveau supplément à la bibliographie des Mazarinades* (Paris, 1904); CHÉRUEL, *Hist. de France pendant la minorité de Louis XIV* (4 vols., Paris, 1879–80); IDEM, *Hist. de France sous le ministère de Mazarin* (1651–1661) (3 vols., Paris, 1883); PERKINS, *France under Mazarin* (2 vols., New York, 1886); HASSALL, *Mazarin* (London, 1903); BOUGEANT, *Hist. des guerres et des négociations qui précédèrent le traité de Westphalie* (Paris, 1727); IDEM, *Hist. du traité de Westphalie* (2 vols., Paris, 1744); COCHIN, *Les Eglises calvinistes du Midi, le cardinal Mazarin et Cromwell*, in *Revue des Questions Historiques* (July, 1904); RENÉE, *Les nièces de Mazarin* (Paris, 1856); CHANTELAUZE, *Les derniers jours de Mazarin* in *Correspondant* (10 July, 10 August, 1881); COUSIN, *Mme de Hautefort* (5th ed., Paris, 1886), 393-404; LOISELEUR, *Problèmes historiques* (Paris, 1867); COLQUHOUN-GRANT, *Queen and Cardinal* (London, 1906).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Mazatec Indians.—An important Mexican tribe of Zapotecan linguistic stock, occupying the mountain region of north-east Oaxaca, chiefly in the districts of Cuicatlan and Teotitlan, and estimated to number from 18,000 to 20,000 souls. Their chief town, Huantla, with its dependent villages, has a population of about 7,000. Their popular name "Mazateca" is that given them by the Aztec and is said to mean "Lords of the Deer"; they call themselves *A-ä*, with nasal pronunciation (Bauer). Although closely related to their neighbours, the formerly highly cultured Zapotec and Mixtec, the Mazatec were of ruder habit, as became a race of mountaineers. Like the Zapotec also they maintained their independence against the powerful Aztec empire, with which they maintained almost constant defensive war. The principal portion of the present state of Oaxaca was brought under Spanish dominion by Cortés in 1521. In 1535 it was established as a diocese, with Father Juan Lopez de Barate of the Dominicans, as its first bishop, through whose influence the conversion of the natives was intrusted to missionaries of that order, by whom it was successfully accomplished in spite of the extreme devotion of the Indians to their ancient rites, even to secreting their sacred images beneath the very altar in order that they might unsuspected do reverence to the one while appearing to venerate the other. In 1575 the Jesuits reinforced the Dominicans. Even to-day, while outwardly conforming to all the rules of the Church and manifesting the greatest deference and affection toward the resident priests, the Mazatec retain most of their ancient beliefs and many of their ceremonies. By tolerance of the Mexican Government they maintained their tribal autonomy under their hereditary chiefs up to 1857, as also a professional keeper of their sacred traditions, the last of whom, a descendant of their ancient kings, died in 1869.

Their native cult, still kept up to a large extent in combination with the newer rites, was an animal worship, the snake, panther, alligator, and eagle being most venerated. The soul after death went to the "kingdom of animals", where for a long time it wandered about, being assisted or attacked by the animals there, according as the dead person had been kind or cruel to them in life. At one point in the journey the soul was assisted across a wide stream by a black dog. It seems to have been held that the soul was finally reincarnated in an animal. Hence in many villages black dogs are still kept in almost every family and buried in the grave with the owner. The ancient sowing and harvest rites also are still kept up, with invocation of the animal gods and spirits of the mountain, and burial of curious sacred bundles in the fields. Marriages and baptisms are solemnized in regular church form by the priest, but the baptism is followed later by a house festival, of which a principal feature is the washing of the godfather's hands in order to cleanse him of the sin which has come upon him from holding the infant in his arms during the baptism. The occupations of the Mazatec are farming and the simpler trades. The women are expert weavers of cotton. The houses are light huts daubed with clay and thatched with palm leaves. Men and women are

fully dressed, the women being picturesque in shawls and gowns of their own weaving, decorated with ribbons and worked with human and animal figures, particularly that of the eagle. They have still their own calendar of thirteen months, with days bearing animal names. The second volume of Pimentel's "Cuadro" contains a sketch of the language. See also ZAPOTEC.

BANCROFT, *Hist. Mexico*, II (San Francisco, 1886); BAUER, *Heidentum und Aberglaube unter den Macateça-Indianern* in *Zeitschr. für Ethnologie*, XL (Berlin, 1908); BRINTON, *American Race* (N. Y., 1891); PIMENTEL, *Cuadro . . . de las Lenguas Indígenas de México* (2 vols., Mexico, 1862–5); STARR, *In Indian Mexico* (Chicago, 1908). JAMES MOONEY.

Mazdeism. See AVESTA, THE.

Mazenod, CHARLES JOSEPH EUGENE DE, Bishop of Marseilles, and Founder of the Congregation of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, b. at Aix, in Provence, 1 August, 1782; d. at Marseilles 21 May, 1861. De Mazenod was the offspring of a noble family of southern France, and even in his tender years he showed unmistakable evidence of a pious disposition and a high and independent spirit. Sharing the fate of most French noblemen at the time of the Revolution, he passed some years as an exile in Italy, after which he studied for the priesthood, though he was the last representative of his family. On 21 December, 1811, he was ordained priest at Amiens, whither he had gone to escape receiving orders at the hands of Cardinal Maury, who was then governing the archdiocese of Paris against the wishes of the pope. After some years of ecclesiastical labours at Aix, the young priest, bewailing the sad fate of religion resulting among the masses from the French Revolution, gathered together a little band of missionaries to preach in the vernacular and to instruct the rural populations of Provence. He commenced, 25 January, 1816, his Institute which was immediately prolific of much good among the people, and on 17 February, 1826, was solemnly approved by Leo XII under the name of Congregation of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate.

After having aided for some time his uncle, the aged Bishop of Marseilles, in the administration of his diocese, Father De Mazenod was called to Rome and, on 14 October, 1832, consecrated titular Bishop of Icosium, which title he had, in the beginning of 1837, to exchange for that of Bishop of Marseilles. His episcopate was marked by measures tending to the restoration in all its integrity of ecclesiastical discipline. De Mazenod unceasingly strove to uphold the rights of the Holy See, somewhat obscured in France by the pretensions of the Gallican Church. He favoured the moral teachings of Blessed (now Saint) Alphonsus Liguori, whose theological system he was the first to introduce in France, and whose first life in French he caused to be written by one of his disciples among the Oblates. At the same time he watched with a jealous eye over the education of youth, and, in spite of the susceptibilities of the civil power, he never swerved from what he considered the path of justice. In fact, by the apostolic freedom of his public utterances he deserved to be compared to St. Ambrose. He was ever a strong supporter of papal infallibility and a devout advocate of Mary's immaculate conception, in the solemn definition of which (1854) he took an active part. In spite of his well-known outspokenness, he was made a Peer of the French Empire, and in 1851 Pius IX gave him the pallium.

Meanwhile he continued as Superior General of the religious family he had founded and whose fortunes will be found described in the article on the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. Such was the esteem in which he was held at Rome that the pope had marked him out as one of the cardinals he was to create when death claimed him at the ripe age of almost seventy-nine.

COOKE, *Sketches of the Life of Mgr de Mazenod, Bishop of Marseilles* (London and Dublin, 1879); RAMBERT, *Vie de Mgr C. J. E. De Mazenod* (Tours, 1883); RICARD, *Mgr de Mazenod, évêque de Marseille* (Paris, n. d.). A. G. MORICE.

Mazzara del Vallo, DIOCESE OF (MAZARIENSIS).—The city is situated in the province of Trepani, Sicily, on the Mediterranean, at the mouth of the Mazzara River. It carries on a large lemon trade, has several mineral springs in the vicinity, and occupies the site of the emporium of ancient Selinus. The port very early attracted a Megarian colony (630 B. C.); in 409 B. C. it was taken by the Carthaginians; and in 249 was completely destroyed and its inhabitants deported to Lilybæum (Marsala). Gradually there arose around the port a new city, captured by the Saracens in 827. It was later made the capital of one of the three great *valli* into which the Saracens divided Sicily. In the struggle of the Saracens against the Normans for the possession of the island, Mazzara was hotly contested, especially in 1075 when the Saracens were completely routed by Count Roger. The episcopal See of Lilybæum was then transferred to Mazzara. Of the bishops of Lilybæum the best known is Paschasinus, legate of Leo I at the Council of Chalcedon (451). The first Bishop of Mazzara was Stefano de Ferro, a relative of Count Roger (1093). The cathedral was then founded, and later embellished by Bishop Tristiano (1157). Other noteworthy bishops were Cardinal Bessarion (1449); Giovanni da Monteaperto (1470), who restored the cathedral and founded a library; Bernardo Gasco (1579), of Toledo, founder of the seminary; Cardinal Gian Domenico Spinola (1637); the Franciscan Francesco M. Graffeo (1685). In 1844 the newly erected diocese of Marsala was separated from Mazzara. Mazzara is a suffragan of Palermo, has 23 parishes, 430 priests, 5 religious houses of men and 29 of women, 3 schools for boys and 25 for girls, and a population of 276,000.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XXI (Venice, 1857).

U. BENIGNI.

Mazzella, CAMILLO, theologian and cardinal, b. at Vitulano, 10 Feb., 1833; d. at Rome, 26 March, 1900. He entered the ecclesiastical seminary of Benevento when about eleven years of age, completed his classical, philosophical, and theological studies before his twenty-fourth year, and was ordained priest in Sept., 1855, a dispensation for defect of canonical age having been granted by Pius IX. For two years after his ordination he remained at Vitulano, attending to the duties of canon in the parish church, a position he held from his family. Resigning this office he entered the Society of Jesus, 4 Sept., 1857. On the expulsion of the Jesuits from Italy in 1860, he was sent to Fourvières, where after reviewing his theology for a year and making a public defence "de universa theologia", he taught dogmatic theology for three years, and moral theology for two. In the early autumn of 1867 he came to America and taught theology for two years to the members of the Society of Jesus at Georgetown University, Washington. On the opening of Woodstock College, Maryland, he was appointed prefect of studies and professor of dogmatic theology. While there he published four volumes: "De Religione et Ecclesia", "De Deo Creante", "De Gratia Christi", and "De virtutibus infusis", which went through several editions. In October, 1878, he was called to Rome by Leo XIII to fill the chair of theology at the Gregorian University, left vacant by Father Franzelin's elevation to the cardinalate, and shortly afterwards, on the retirement of Father Kleutgen, was made prefect of studies. On 7 June, 1886, Leo XIII created Father Mazzella a cardinal deacon. Ten years later he became cardinal priest. Not quite a year afterwards (18 April, 1897), at the express wish of the pope, he became Cardinal Bishop of Palestrina, to the government of which see he applied himself with untiring energy. He was the first Jesuit on whom was bestowed the dignity of cardinal bishop. As cardinal he took an active part in the deliberations of a number of Congregations, was for several years president

of the Academy of St. Thomas, and, at various times, prefect of the Congregations of the Index, of Studies, and of Rites.

TIMOTHY BROSNAHAN.

Mazzolini, LODOVICO (also known as MAZZOLINI DA FERRARA, LODOVICO FERRARESA, and IL FERRARESE), Italian painter, b. in Ferrara in 1480; d., according to one account, in 1528, and to another, in 1530; place of death unknown. This artist is generally represented as having been a pupil of Lorenzo Costa, and as having come under the influence of Ercole Roberti, but should be more correctly described as a pupil of Panetti. Morelli called him "the Glow-worm", "*der Glühwurm*", from his brilliant gem-like colour and luminous sparkling quality, and he proved that Mazzolini was a pupil of Panetti rather than Costa, by the form of the ear and hand in his paintings, by his landscape backgrounds with steep conical blue mountains and streaks of dazzling white, and by his scheme of colour. Comparing Lorenzo Costa with Perugino, Morelli compares Panetti with Pintorrichio, although he says as an artist the Perugian far surpassed the somewhat dry and narrow-minded artist of Ferrara, but it is perfectly clear that it was to this dry and so-called narrow-minded man that Mazzolini owed his excellent work. The architectural backgrounds of his pictures are their specially distinctive feature, and notably the creamy-toned marble. Attention should further be directed to his use of gold in the high lights of his draperies.

Of his personal history we know nothing, save that he worked both in Ferrara and Bologná, and that he married in 1521 Giovanna, the daughter of Bartolomeo Vacchi, a Venetian painter. His most notable picture represents Christ disputing with the doctors, is dated 1524, and to be seen at Berlin. It is in his pictures with small figures that he displays the power of imparting pleasure, as his gift was rather in the direction of *genre* than of historical painting, and to most observers there is something curiously Flemish about his work. There is a second important picture of his in Berlin, a Virgin and Child, two at the Louvre, one in Ferrara, three in the National Gallery, and three in Florence, other examples in Munich, and in various private collections. The chief work of his in England is one belonging to Lord Wimborne. He is also represented in the galleries of Turin, St. Petersburg, The Hague, and in the Capitol at Rome, the Doria, and the Borghese.

BARUFFALDI GIROLAMO, *Vite dei Pittori Ferraresi* (Ferrara), in MS., also the *Oretti MS.* (Bologna); ORLANDI, *Abbecedario Pittorico* (Bologna, 1719); VASARI, *Le Vite dei Pittori* (Florence, 1878, 1885).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Mazzolini (MOZOLINI, also PRIERIAS), SYLVESTER, theologian, b. at Priero, Piedmont, 1460; d. at Rome, 1523—sometimes confounded with Sylvester Ferrariensis (d. 1526). At the age of fifteen he entered the Order of St. Dominic. Passing brilliantly through a course of studies he taught theology at Bologna, Pavia (by invitation of the senate of Venice), and in Rome, whither he was called by Julius II in 1511. In 1515 he was appointed Master of the Sacred Palace, filling that office until his death. His writings cover a vast range, including treatises on the planets, the power of the demons, history, homiletics, the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, the primacy of the popes. He is credited with being the first theologian who by his writings attacked publicly the subversive errors of Martin Luther. John Tetzel's productions against the arch-reformer are called by Echard scattered pages (*folia volitantia*), and Mazzolini stands forth as the first champion of the Roman Pontiffs against Luther. The heresiarch replied to Mazzolini's arguments; the latter published rejoinders, and there was a regular controversy between the innovator and the defender of the ancient Faith. The necessity of promptness in attack and defence will account for defects of style in some of his writings. His principal works are: "De juridica et irrefragabili veritate Romanæ Ecclesiæ Romanique Pontificis" (Rome, 1520); "Epitoma responsionis ad Lutherum" (Perugia, 1519); "Errata et argumenta M. Lutheri" (Rome, 1520); "Summa Summarum, quæ Sylvestrina dicitur" (Rome, 1516), reprinted forty times; an alphabetical encyclopædia of theological questions; "Rosa aurea" (Bologna, 1510) an exposition of the Gospels of the year; "In theoricas planetarum" (Venice, 1513).

QUÉTIF-ECHARD, *SS. Ord. Præd.*, II, 55; TOURON, *Hommes illust. de l'Ordre de S. Dominique*, III, 716; MICHALSKI, *De Sylv. Prieratis . . . vita et scriptis* (Munster, 1892).

D. J. KENNEDY.

Mazzuchelli, PIETRO FRANCESCO (also known as IL MORAZZONE, MARAZZONE, and MORANZONE), Milanese painter, b. at Moranzone near Milan, either in 1571 or 1575; d. at Piacenza in 1626. In the early part of his life, this painter resided in Rome, where he painted various altar-pieces, then he passed on to Venice, and made a profound study of the work of Titian, Tintoretto, and Paolo Veronese, so entirely altering his style and improving his scheme of colour, that the pictures he painted when he came to Milan, although representing subjects similar to those he had carried out in Rome, could hardly be recognized as having come from the same hand. He was patronized by Cardinal Borommeo, and from the Duke of Savoy received the honour of knighthood and the order of St. Maurice. In 1626 he was called to Piacenza to paint the cupola of the cathedral, but was not able to finish this work, which he commenced in a grand and vigorous style, and died, it is believed, from an accident in connection with the scaffolding, in consequence of which Guercino was called in to complete the work. The chief painting by Mazzuchelli is that in the church of San Giovanni at Como, and represents St. Michael and the angels.

VASARI, G., *Le Vite dei Pittori* (Florence, 1878, 1885); ORLANDI, P. P., *Abbecedario Pittorico* (Bologna, 1719), also the *Oretti MS.* (Bologna).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Mazzuola, FRANCESCO. See PARMIGIANO, IL.

Mbaya Indians (GUAYCURÚ), a predatory tribe formerly ranging on both sides of the Paraguay River, on the north and northwest Paraguay frontier, and in the adjacent portion of the Province of Matto Grosso, Brazil. They are one of a group of equestrian warlike and savage tribes, constituting a distinct linguistic stock, the Guaycuran, formerly roving over Northern Paraguay and the upper Chaco region, and of which the best known are the Abipon, made famous by the missionary Dobrizhoffer, the Guaycurú proper, or Mbaya, the Mocobí and the still savage and powerful Toba. The Lengua, sometimes included under the same name, are now known to be a branch of the Chiquito of Bolivia. The name, *Mbaya*, given to them by the more peaceful Guaraní, signifies "terrible", "bad", or "savage". The name Guaycurú, now most commonly used, is said to mean "runner". They have also been called *Caballeros* by the Spaniards, on account of their fine horsemanship. According to Father Lozano they had three main divisions, viz: Epicua-yiqui (Eyiguayegi) in the North, Napin-yiqui in the West, and Taqui-yiqui in the South. Iolis, another authority, gives a different list of six divisions.

The Guaycurú were accustomed to prey upon the more sedentary and industrious Guaraní tribes, making sudden raids, with quick retreats into their own country, where tangled forests and treacherous swamps made pursuit difficult and subjection almost impossible. In 1542, Alvar Nuñez Cabeça de Vaca, governor of Buenos Aires, with a detachment of Spaniards and a contingent of Guaraní, inflicted upon them a signal defeat, chiefly by the terror of his field guns and horses, with both of which the Guaycurú

were still unacquainted. The acquisition of horses soon transformed them into a race of expert and daring equestrians, and for two centuries they continued their raids upon the Spanish settlements on the Paraguay River and the neighbouring missions. As early as 1610 the Jesuits unsuccessfully attempted their conversion. About the middle of the eighteenth century a peace was arranged, which, according to Dobrizhoffer, was faithfully kept by the Indians. The Jesuit Joseph Sanchez Labrador was then sent, at his own request, to work among these Guaycurú, who had been considered the wildest and most dangerous tribe of the region. Having made good progress in their difficult language, he established for them, in 1760, the mission of Virgen de Belen (now Belen) east of the present Concepción, in Paraguay. They were impatient of restraint, and, although many infants and dying adults received baptism, according to Dobrizhoffer, "the rest did little else than wander over the plains". The mission influence, however, effectually tamed their ferocity. At the expulsion of the Jesuits, in 1767, the Belen mission contained 260 Christian Indians, eight of the nine bands still remaining in the forest.

In this same year was established by Father Manuel Duran the last of the Paraguay Jesuit foundations, the mission of San Juan Nepomuceno, on the east bank of the river, among the Guana, or Chana, a numerous agricultural and pedestrian tribe of the same territory, subject to the Mbaya. When the missionaries were driven out, this station contained 600 Indians. The conversion of the Guana had been undertaken more than a century before by Father Pedro Romero, who lost his life in 1645 at the hands of a neighbouring wild tribe. Among the Guana, infanticide, polygamy, and intoxication were unknown, and men and women worked together in the fields. About the close of the eighteenth century the Franciscans took up the work begun by the Jesuits, and in the course of the next fifty years gathered a number of the Guaycurú and Guana into missions, which continued until the tribes themselves declined or were assimilated. Lieutenant Page, who commanded an expedition sent by the United States Government to explore the Paraguay River, gives an interesting and extended account of his visit to one of these missions, Nossa Senhora de Bon Conselho, near Albuquerque, Brazil, in 1853 (Page, "Report to the Secretary of the Navy", Washington, 1855). Here the Christian Guanas cultivated vegetables for the market afforded by neighbouring white settlements. Under the care, both temporal and spiritual, of a Franciscan father, these aborigines, who, only a few years earlier, had been wandering savages, were now a remarkably neat, orderly, and thrifty community of husbandmen. Fronting upon a public square, there stood the village church, the schoolhouse, and a number of well-constructed thatched dwellings, each dwelling having a frontage of 20 feet, the interiors partitioned with curtains and fitted with raised platforms to serve either as tables or as beds. Among the vegetables cultivated was a native rice, which they harvested in canoes. Cotton, too, was grown, spun, dyed, and woven by the women of the settlement. The men wore trousers and *ponchos;* the women, a chemise girdled at the waist; the boys were exercised in military tactics, and the children in general were not only taught "the rudiments of a common education, but made some progress in music and dancing". A few of the Mbaya proper still exist on the western bank of the Paraguay in the neighbourhood of the town of Concepción. Other bands known as Guaycurú roam over the adjacent districts of Matto Grosso, Brazil, and may number perhaps 1500 souls as against an estimated 15,000 or 18,000 about a century ago. The Guana, on the Taquari and Miranda Rivers in the same region, are now labourers among the whites, although still claimed as dependents by the Guaycurú.

In their primitive condition the men of the Guaycurú went entirely naked, while the women wore only a short skirt. The men trimmed their hair in a circular tuft. Girls had the head closely shaven. The men painted their bodies, and wore rings in the lower lip. Boys were painted black until about fourteen years old, then red for two years, when they were subjected to a painful ordeal, before taking their station as warriors. War was their chief business, their weapons being the bow, club, and bone knife. The children born of captives were sold as slaves. Their chief tribal ceremony was in honour of the Pleiades, and was accompanied by a sham battle between the men and women, ending with a general intoxication. They buried their dead in the ground, and voluntary human victims were sacrificed when a chief died. Polygamy was unknown, but separation was frequent, and infanticide common. They subsisted by fishing and hunting. Their villages consisted each of a simple communal structure in three large rooms, the middle of which was reserved for the chief and head men, and for the storage of weapons. The chief had great authority, and with his head men, seems to have belonged to a different clan, or *gens,* from the common warriors. Captives and their descendants constituted a permanent slave class. As a people, they were tall and strongly built. Those still remaining show the admixture of white captive blood and are gradually assimilating to the settled population.

BRINTON, *American Race* (New York, 1891); CHARLEVOIX, *Hist. of Paraguay,* I (London, 1796); DOBRIZHOFFER, *Account of the Abipones* (London, 1822); HERVÁS, *Catálogo de las lenguas,* I (Madrid, 1800); LOZANO, *Descripcion Chorographica del Gran Chaco* (Cordoba, 1733); PAGE, *La Plata, the Argentine Confederation and Paraguay* (New York, 1859); RECLUS, *South America,* II: *Amazonia and La Plata* (New York, 1897).

JAMES MOONEY.

Meade, JOHN. See ALMEIDA, JOHN.

Meagher, THOMAS FRANCIS, soldier, politician, b. at Waterford, Ireland, 3 August, 1823; accidentally drowned in the Missouri River, U. S. A., 1 July, 1867. Educated in the Jesuit colleges of Clongowes and Stonyhurst, he finished his college career in 1843 with a reputation for great oratorical ability which he devoted at once, under O'Connell, to the cause of Repeal. His impetuous nature chafed under the restraint of constitutional agitation, and his impassioned eloquence stimulated the more radical revolutionary efforts of the young Irelanders, who, in 1848, broke away from O'Connell's leadership. In the spring of that year he went with William Smith O'Brien to France as member of a deputation to Lamartine to congratulate the people of France on the establishment of a republic. A trial for "exciting the people to rise in rebellion", the following May resulted in a disagreement of the jury, but in the abortive rebellion in July he was among those arrested, tried for high treason, and sentenced on 23 October to be hanged. This was commuted to penal servitude for life and on 29 July, 1849, with O'Brien and Terence Bellew MacManus, he was transported to Tasmania. Escaping from this penal colony in 1852, he landed in

THOMAS FRANCIS MEAGHER

New York, where his countrymen gave him a hearty welcome. His popularity as a lecturer was immediate; he also studied law and, admitted to the bar in 1855, started a paper called the "Irish News" (12 April, 1856), in which he published his "Personal Recollections". Two years later he undertook an exploring expedition in Central America; his narrative was printed in "Harper's Magazine". When the Civil War broke out he espoused the cause of the Union, raised a company of Zouaves, went to the front with the Sixty-Ninth New York Volunteers, and participated in the first battle of Bull Run. He then organized the famous Irish Brigade, of which he was commissioned brigadier-general, and with it participated in the operations of the Army of the Potomac, in which it specially distinguished itself in the battles of Fair Oak (1 June, 1862), the seven days' fight before Richmond, Antietam, Fredericksburg (13 Dec., 1862), where it was almost annihilated, and Chancellorsville (1863). He then resigned his command because, he said, "it was perpetrating a public deception to keep up a brigade so reduced in numbers, and which he had been refused permission to withdraw from service and recruit". A command of a military district in Tennessee was at once given him, which he resigned after a short time. At the close of the war he was made (July, 1865) Territorial Secretary of Montana. During a trip made in the course of his administration of this office he fell from a steamer into the Missouri River at night and was drowned. His body was never found.

CAVANAGH, *Memorial of Gen. Thomas Francis Meagher* (Worcester, Mass., 1892); CONYNGHAM, *The Irish Brigade and its Campaigns* (New York, 1867); SAVAGE, *'98 and '48* (New York, 1856); DUFFY, *Young Ireland* (London, 1880); *Four Years of Irish History* (London, 1883); MCCARTHY, *History of Our Own Times*, II (New York, 1887); *Irish American* (New York), files.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Meath, DIOCESE OF (MIDENSIS), in Ireland, suffragan of Armagh. In extent it is the largest diocese in Ireland, and includes the greater part of the counties Meath, Westmeath, King's, and a small portion of the counties Longford, Dublin, and Cavan. The present Diocese of Meath anciently comprised eight episcopal sees, the chief of which was Clonard, founded in the middle of the sixth century by St. Finian, "Tutor of the Saints of Erin". At the national Synod of Kells, in 1172, over which Cardinal Paparo presided as legate of Eugene III, it was decided that these sees be joined together. The united see was assigned as first suffragan to Armagh, and ranks immediately after the metropolitan sees in Ireland. In his "Hibernia Dominicana" De Burgo says that Meath is the foremost suffragan of Armagh, and has precedence even though its bishop be the youngest of the Irish prelates in order of consecration. Meath being the country of the Pale, many Englishmen were appointed bishops of Meath, among them the notorious Staples who apostatized in the reign of Edward VI, and was deposed in 1554. Dr. Walsh, a Cistercian monk, succeeded, and more than repaired the scandal caused by his recreant predecessor. This noble confessor of the Faith bravely withstood all the threats and blandishments of Queen Elizabeth and her agents. He spent thirteen years in a dungeon in Dublin Castle, and finally died an exile at Alcalá in Spain. His name is reckoned in more than one Irish Martyrology. Like honour is paid to him by his own order, and his Cistercian biographer contends that the martyr's crown is his as truly as if he had died in torments. The succession of bishops in the See of Meath has been continued without interruption to the present day, except during a few brief interregnums in the penal days. It is a noteworthy fact that, omitting Dr. Logan's short reign of a few years, but three bishops ruled the Diocese of Meath from 1779 to 1899, Drs. Plunket, Cantwell, and Nulty. Dr. Plunket, who had been professor and superior in the Irish College of the Lombards, Paris, was consecrated bishop by the papal nuncio at Paris in 1779. The vessel in which he returned to Ireland was attacked and plundered by the famous Paul Jones, the American privateer, who, however, to his credit be it said, afterwards restored the episcopal property. For eight and forty years, with a truly Apostolic spirit, this great bishop traversed the whole diocese yearly, visiting every parish, preaching, catechizing, giving seasonable counsel to the clergy and suitable instruction to the people, so that in his declining years he was fittingly called, by the Primate of Armagh, "the ornament and father of the Irish Church". The catechism compiled by Dr. Plunket cannot easily be improved, and is still used in the schools of the diocese. He died in January, 1827, in his eighty-ninth year. His successor, Dr. Logan, lived only a few years, and was succeeded by Dr. Cantwell, the steadfast friend of Daniel O'Connell. With great energy Dr. Cantwell gathered the scattered stones of the sanctuary, and re-erected the temples levelled in the penal days. Dr. Nulty became bishop in 1864, and during his episcopate of thirty-four years spent himself in the service of God and his people. A

ST. MARY'S CATHEDRAL, MULLINGAR

profound theologian and ardent student, he put before his priests a high intellectual standard; at the same time he did much to overthrow landlordism and to root the people firmly in their native soil.

The population of the Diocese of Meath at the last census (1901) was 143,164, of whom 132,892 were Catholics. Since 1871 the population of the diocese has decreased 27 per cent.; during the same period the non-Catholic population decreased 35 per cent. There are 144 churches and 66 parishes, 155 secular priests and 12 regulars, 3 monastic houses of men with 17 members, and 13 convents of nuns with 134 members. St. Finian's College, an imposing structure erected in Mullingar and opened in 1908, replaces the old building in Navan, which had held, for more than one hundred years, an honoured place among the schools of Ireland. The new college, which cost over £40,000, has accommodation for 150 students and is intended both as a seminary to prepare priests for the diocese, and to impart a sound Catholic liberal education to those intended for worldly pursuits. There is a Jesuit novitiate and college at Tullamore, and a house of Carmelite Fathers at Moate. The Franciscans of the Irish province have a monastery and preparatory school at Multyfarnham, near the cathedral town of Mullingar. The Abbey of Multyfarnham has been in Franciscan hands since pre-Reformation times, and has witnessed the good and evil fortunes of the friars in Ireland. The Franciscan Brothers have a school at Clara, and the Christian Brothers have a school at Mullingar (500 pupils) and at Clara (200 pupils). At Rochfortbridge, St. Joseph's Institute for the Deaf and Dumb is conducted by the Sisters of Mercy. The Loreto Nuns have educational houses in Navan and Mullingar, which have won

favourable recognition. The Presentation Sisters have foundations in Mullingar and Rahan, where they have charge of the primary schools, while the Sisters of Mercy have orphanages at Navan and Kells, take care of the hospitals in Tullamore, Trim, Mullingar, Drogheda, and Navan, and at the same time conduct national schools in the principal towns of the diocese.

The Diocese of Meath, often called the "royal diocese", is rich in historic associations, pagan and Christian. In Meath was Tara "of the kings", the palace of the Ard-righ, whither came the chieftains and princes, the bards and brehons of Erin. The principal cemetery of the pagan kings of Ireland was at Brugh-na-Bóinne. Competent authorities declare that the surrounding tumuli are among the oldest in Europe. Close at hand is Rosnaree, where Cormac Mac Art, the first Christian King of Ireland, who refused to be buried in pagan Brugh, awaits the last summons. Uisneach in Westmeath, Tlachtgha, or the Hill of Ward, and Teltown were celebrated for their royal palaces, their solemn conventions, their pagan games, and their druidic ceremonies, and in Christian times were sanctified by the labours of St. Patrick and St. Brigid. Slane reminds us of St. Patrick's first Holy Saturday in Ireland, when he lit the paschal fire, symbolizing the lamp of Faith which has never since been extinguished. Trim, founded by St. Loman, one of the first disciples of St. Patrick, still retains in its many ruins striking evidences of its departed glories. Kells, with its round tower, its splendid sculptured crosses, and the house of Columcille, reminds us of that "Dove of the Irish Church", whose memory is also cherished in his beloved Durrow. Finally, Meath is the birthplace of the Venerable Oliver Plunket, the martyred Primate of Armagh, the last victim publicly sacrificed in England for the Faith.

COGAN, *Diocese of Meath* (Dublin, 1862); HEALY, *Ancient Schools of Ireland* (Dublin, 1890); *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (June, 1900); *Irish Catholic Directory* (Dublin, 1910).

PATRICK E. DUFFY.

Meaux, DIOCESE OF (MELDENSIS), comprises the entire department of Seine and Marne, suffragan of Sens until 1622, and subsequently of Paris. The Concordat of 1801 had given to the Diocese of Meaux the department of Marne, separated from it in 1821 and 1822 by the establishment of the archiepiscopal See of Reims and the episcopal See of Châlons. The present Diocese of Meaux is made up of the greater part of the former Diocese of Meaux, a large part of the former Diocese of Sens, a part of the former Diocese of Paris, and a few parishes of the former Dioceses of Troyes, Soissons and Senlis. Hildegaire, who lived in the ninth century, says in his "Life of St. Faro" (Burgundofaro), that this bishop was the twentieth since St. Denis. According to the tradition accepted by Hildegaire, St. Denis was the first Bishop of Meaux, and was succeeded by his disciple St. Saintin, who in turn was succeeded by St. Antoninus; and another saint, named Rigomer, occupied the See of Meaux at the close of the fifth century. In 876 or 877, Hincmar showed Charles the Bald a document which he claimed had been transcribed from a very old copy and according to which St. Antoninus and St. Saintin, disciples of St. Denis, had brought to Pope Anacletus the account of the martyrdom of St. Denis, and on their return to Gaul had successively occupied the See of Meaux. (For these traditions see PARIS.)

According to Mgr. Duchesne, the first Bishop of Meaux historically known is Medovechus, present at two councils in 549 and 552. Of the bishops of Meaux the following may be mentioned (following Mgr. Allou's chronology): St. Faro (626–72), whose sister St. Fara founded the monastery of Faremoutiers, and who himself built at Meaux the monastery of St-Croix; St. Hildevert (672–680); St. Pathus, who died about 684 before being consecrated; St. Ebrigisilus (end of the seventh century); St. Gilbert (first half of the eleventh century); Durand de St-Pourçain (1326–1334), commentator on the "Book of Sentences", known as the "resolutive doctor"; Philippe de Vitry (1351–1361), friend of Petrarch and author of the "Metamorphoses d'Ovide Moralisées"; Pierre Fresnel (1390–1409), several times ambassador of Charles VI; Pierre de Versailles (1439–1446), charged with important missions by Eugene IV, and who, when commissioned by Charles VII in 1429 to examine Joan of Arc, had declared himself convinced of the Divine mission of the Maid of Orleans; Guillaume Briçonnet (1516–1534), ambassador of Francis I to Leo X, and during whose episcopate the Reformation was introduced by Farel and Gérard Roussel, whom he had personally called to his diocese for the revival of studies; Cardinal Antoine du Prat (1534–1535), who had an active share in the drawing up of the concordat between Francis I and Leo X; the controversial writer and historian Jean du Tillet (1564–1570); Louis de Brézé, twice bishop, first from 1554 to 1564, then from 1570 to 1589, during whose episcopate the diocese was greatly disturbed by religious wars; Dominique Séguier (1637–1659), the first French bishop to establish "ecclesiastical conferences" in his diocese; the great Bossuet (1681–1704); Cardinal de Bissy (1705–1737), celebrated for his conflict with the Jansenists; De Barral (1802–1805), later Grand Almoner of Empress Josephine and Archbishop of Tours, who took a prominent part in 1810 and 1811 in the negotiations between Napoleon and Pius VII. In 1562 most of the inhabitants of Meaux had become Protestants, and Joachim de Montluc, sent by the king, proceeded with rigour against them. They were still sufficiently powerful in 1567 to attempt to carry off, in the vicinity of Meaux, Catherine de' Medici and Charles IX; and so for that reason, shortly after St. Bartholomew's day, Charles IX ordered the massacre of the Protestants of Meaux. At the château of Fontainebleau, built by Francis I, was held the theological conference of 4 May, 1600, between the Catholics (Cardinal du Perron, de Thou, Pithou) and the Calvinists (du Plessis Mornay, Philippe Canaye, Isaac Casaubon).

A number of saints are found in the history of this diocese: St. Autharius, a relative of St. Faro, who received St. Columbanus in his domain at Ussy-sur-Marne, and father of Blessed Ado, who founded about 630 the two monasteries of Jouarre, and of St. Ouen, who founded the monastery of Rebais in 634 and subsequently became Bishop of Rouen; the anchorite St. Féfre or Fiacre, and the missionary St. Chillen, both Irishmen, contemporaries of St. Faro (first half of the seventh century); St. Aile (Agilus), monk of Luxeuil, who became in 634 the first Abbot of Rebais; St. Telchilde, died about 660, first Abbess of Jouarre; St. Aguilberte, second Abbess of Jouarre, a sister of St. Ebrigisilus (end of seventh century); St. Bathilde, wife of Clovis II, foundress of the abbey of Chelles, died in 680; St. Bertille, first Abbess of Chelles, and St. Etheria, first Abbess of Notre-Dame of Soissons (658), both of them pupils at the abbey of Jouarre; finally, St. Vincent Madelgaire (or Mauger), founder of the monasteries of Haumont and Soignies; his wife, St. Waldetrude, foundress of the monastery of Mons; St. Aldegonde, sister of St. Waldetrude, first Abbess of Maubeuge; St. Landry, Abbot of Soignies, claimed by some as a Bishop of Meaux; St. Adeltrude and St. Malberte, nuns of Maubeuge, the last three being children of St. Vincent Madelgaire and St. Waldetrude (seventh century).

Eugene III stayed some days at Meaux in 1147. In 1664 Blessed Eudes preached for two months at Meaux. Mme Guyon passed the first six months of 1695 at the Visitation convent of Meaux, where Bossuet had frequent conferences with her, but failed to make her abandon her peculiar views. The celebrated Père Loriquet (1767–1845) was superior from 1812 to 1814 of the preparatory seminary of Châage, in the

Diocese of Meaux. The Paris massacres on 2 and 3 September, 1792, at the prisons of the Carmes and the Abbaye had their counterpart at Meaux where seven priests were massacred in prison on 4 September. The Abbey of Notre Dame de Juilly of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine was established in 1184, and adopted the rule of the Abbey of St-Victor of Paris. Cardinal de Joyeuse was abbot from 1613–1615. In 1637 Père de Condren, Superior of the Oratory, took possession of it, and in 1638 the house of Juilly became a royal academy for the education of young men. The new order of studies approved by Richelieu marked a pedagogical revolution: the Latin grammars written in Latin were abandoned and French textbooks were used in the study of the dead languages. The college became national property in 1791, and was re-purchased in 1796 by a few Oratorians; in 1828 by Salinis, future Bishop of Amiens and Scorbiac, chaplain-general of the university; in 1840 by the Abbé Bautain; finally, in 1867, the college returned into the hands of the new Congregation of the Oratory founded by the Abbé Pétetot. In the salon of the Abbé de Salinis, at Juilly, was established in December, 1830, the Agence générale pour la défense de la liberté religieuse. Lamennais resided at Juilly while editor of "L'Avenir". It was at Juilly, in 1836, that the future bishop, Gerbet, founded the review "L'Université Catholique". Among the students at Juilly in the seventeenth century were the Marshals de Berwick and de Villars; in the nineteenth, Mgr de Mérode and the famous lawyer, Berryer.

A council convoked in 845 at Meaux by Charles the Bald adopted important measures for the re-establishment of discipline in the three ecclesiastical provinces of Sens, Bourges, and Reims. Other councils were held at Meaux in 962, 1082, 1204, 1229 (ended in Paris), where the Count of Toulouse was reconciled with the Church; in 1240 a council was held in which the sentence of excommunication was pronounced against Frederick II by Joannes of Palestrina, legate of Gregory IX; there was held an important council in 1523. Four councils were held at Melun, in 1216, 1225, 1232, 1300. The city of Provins was famous in the Middle Ages for its burlesque ceremonies (fête de fous, fête de l'âne, fête des Innocents) held in the church. The cathedral of St-Etienne de Meaux is a fine Gothic edifice begun about 1170. The church of Champigny has a magnificent crypt dating from the thirteenth century. The principal pilgrimages of the diocese are: Notre Dame de Lagny, dating from 1128; Notre Dame du Chêne de Preuilly, dating from the foundation of the Cistercian Abbey (1118); Notre Dame du Chêne at Crouy-sur-Ourcq, dating from the beginning of the seventeenth century; Notre Dame de Bon Secours near Fontainebleau (the pilgrimage was established in 1661 by d'Auberon, an officer of the great Condé); Notre Dame de la Cave at Champigny; Notre Dame de Pitié at Verdelot; Notre Dame de Melun at Melun; Notre Dame du Puy at Sigy. The head of St. Veronica at Pomponne has long been the object of a pilgrimage, greatly furthered by the Jesuits in 1670; the cloak (*chape*) of St. Martin of which a large portion is preserved at Bussy-St-Martin, also attracts pilgrims.

Before the application of the Associations Law of 1901 religious communities were represented in the diocese by the Lazarists, Oratorians, Little Brothers of Mary, Fathers and Brothers of St. Mary of Tinchebray, School Brothers of the Christian Doctrine. Of the congregations of women the following may be mentioned: the Celestine Sisters, a teaching and nursing order founded in 1839 (mother-house at Provins); the Sisters of St. Louis, a nursing and teaching order, founded in 1841 by the Abbé Bautain (mother-house at Juilly), the Carmelites of Meaux, called Carmel of Pius IX, founded 30 August, 1860. The Benedictines of the Sacred Heart of Mary, devoted to teaching and contemplation, restored in 1837 the ancient abbey of Jouarre. The religious congregations had under their care: 4 crèches, 52 day nurseries, 1 orphanage for boys, 15 orphanages for girls, 14 industrial rooms, 10 houses of mercy, 26 hospitals or asylums, 19 houses for the care of the sick in their own homes, 1 house of retreat. In 1908 the Diocese of Meaux had 361,939 inhabitants, 39 parishes, 402 succursal parishes, 8 vicariates.

Gallia Christiana (nova, 1744), VIII, 1596–1670, instrumenta, 547–574; DUCHESNE, *Fastes Episcopaux*, II, 471–475; DU PLESSIS, *Histoire de l'Eglise de Meaux* (2 vols., Meaux, 1731); CARRO, *Histoire de Meaux et du pays Meldois* (Meaux, 1865); ALLOU, *Chronique des évêques de Meaux* (Meaux, 1876); NÉRET, *Martyrs et confesseurs de la foi du diocèse de Meaux*, 1792–1795 (Meaux, 1905); HAMEL, *Histoire de l'Eglise et du Collège de Juilly* (3rd ed., Paris, 1888); THIERCELIN, *Le monastère de Jouarre* (Paris, 1861); CHEVALIER, *Topo-Bibl.*, 1886–87.

GEORGES GOYAU.

Mecca, the capital of Arabia and the sacred city of the Mohammedans, is situated in the district of Hijaz about 21° 30′ N. latitude and 40° 20′ E. longitude, some seventy miles east of the Red Sea. It lies in a sandy valley surrounded by rocky hills from two hundred to five hundred feet in height, barren and destitute of vegetation. The birthplace of Mohammed and the seat of the famous Kaaba, it was celebrated even in pre-Islamic times as the chief sanctuary of the Arabs, and visited by numerous pilgrims and devotees. The city presents an aspect more pleasing than that of the ordinary Eastern town, with comparatively wide streets and stone houses, usually of three stories, and well aired and lighted. The inhabitants, numbering about 60,000, are with few exceptions Arabians whose chief employment consists in lodging the pilgrims and serving the temple, although no inconsiderable amount of trade is carried on with the Bedouins of the surrounding desert. Mecca, the seat of government during the reign of the first five Khalifs, is now governed by a Sharîf, chosen by the people from the Sayyids or the descendants of Mohammed, but under the immediate authority of the Sultan of Turkey (Hughes, "Dictionary of Islam", q. v.). Mecca is annually visited by some 80,000 pilgrims from all over the Mohammedan world. On their way the pilgrims pass through Medina, the second sacred town of Arabia, and on approaching Mecca they undress, laying aside even their headgear, and put on aprons and a piece of cloth over the left shoulder. Then they perform the circuit of the Kaaba, kiss the Black Stone, hear the sermon on Mount Arafât, pelt Satan with stones in the valley of Mina, and conclude their pilgrimage with a great sacrificial feast. In a year or two Mecca will be reached by the Hijaz Railway already completed as far as Medina, (about eight hundred and fifty miles from Damascus). From Medina to Mecca the distance is two hundred and eighty miles, and from Mecca to Damascus about one thousand one hundred and ten miles. The railway passes through the old caravan route, Damascus, Mezarib, Maan, Medawara, Tebuk, Madain Saleh, El-Ula, Medina, and Mecca.

The early history of Mecca is shrouded in obscurity, although Mohammedan writers have preserved an abundance of legendary lore according to which the city dates back to Abraham who is said to have there worshipped the true God. It is also stated that after the death of Abraham, the inhabitants of Mecca, owing to the evil influence of the heathen Amalekites, fell into idolatry and paganism, and the Kaaba itself became surrounded with their idols. Hundreds of these idols were destroyed by Mohammed on his entrance into the city at the head of a Moslem army in the eighth year of the Hejira, or A. D. 629. During the century before Mohammed we find the tribe of Quraish in undisputed possession of the city and the acknowledged guardians of the Kaaba. The leading events in Mecca at that period, such as the Abyssinian expedition against Yemen and the utter defeat of

Abraha's army at the hand of the Meccans, have been already discussed in the article CHRISTIANITY IN ARABIA.

See the bibliography appended to the articles ARABIA, MOHAMMED, AND MOHAMMEDANISM; BURKHARDT, *Travels in Arabia* (London, 1830); BURTON, *Personal narrative of a Pilgrimage to El Medina and Mecca* (London, 1857); HURGRONJE, SNOUCK, *Mecca, mit Bilder Atlas*, II (The Hague, 1888); IDEM, *Het Mekkanische Feest* (Leyden, 1888). GABRIEL OUSSANI.

Mechanism.—There is no constant meaning in the history of philosophy for the word Mechanism. Originally, the term meant that cosmological theory which ascribes the motion and changes of the world to some external force. In this view material things are purely passive, while according to the opposite theory (i. e., Dynamism), they possess certain internal sources of energy which account for the activity of each and for its influence on the course of events. These meanings, however, soon underwent modification. The question as to whether motion is an inherent property of bodies, or has been communicated to them by some external agency, was very often ignored. With a large number of cosmologists the essential feature of Mechanism is the attempt to reduce all the qualities and activities of bodies to quantitative realities, i. e. to mass and motion. But a further modification soon followed. Living bodies, as is well known, present at first sight certain characteristic properties which have no counterpart in lifeless matter. Mechanism aims to go beyond these appearances. It seeks to explain all "vital" phenomena as physical and chemical facts; whether or not these facts are in turn reducible to mass and motion becomes a secondary question, although Mechanists are generally inclined to favour such reduction. The theory opposed to this biological mechanism is no longer Dynamism, but Vitalism or Neo-vitalism, which maintains that vital activities cannot be explained, and never will be explained, by the laws which govern lifeless matter. As Mechanism professes to furnish a complete system of the world, its extreme partisans apply it to psychical manifestations and even to social phenomena; but here it is at best only tentative and the result very questionable. Its advocates merely connect, more or less thoroughly, psychological and social facts with the general laws or leading hypotheses of biology. It is preferable, therefore, in the present state of our knowledge, to disregard these features of mechanistic doctrine, which are certainly of a provisional character. In a word then, Mechanism in its various forms shows a tendency to interpret phenomena of a higher order in terms of the lower and less complex, and to carry this reduction down to the simplest attainable forms, i. e. to those quantitative realities which we call mass and motion. Psychology and sociology derive their explanation from biology; biology derives its explanation from the physical and chemical sciences, while these in turn borrow their explanation from mechanics. The science of mechanics becomes by a very simple process a particular phase of mathematical analysis, so that the ideal of Mechanism is Mathematism, that is to say, the representation of all phenomena by mathematical equations. Hence it is plain that Mechanism tends to eliminate from science and from reality all "qualitative" aspects, all "forms" and "ends". We shall first state the arguments brought forward in support of the theory, and then subject it to criticism.

I. ARGUMENTS.—(1) Modern Mechanism, which unquestionably goes back to Descartes, arose, it is said, from a legitimate reaction against the errors of decadent Scholasticism. The latter had abused the old theory of forms and latent qualities. Whenever a phenomenon called for explanation, it was furnished by endowing the substance with a new quality; and, as Molière jestingly puts it, "the poppy made one sleep, because it has the sleep-inducing property". Each thing was what it was by virtue of an appropriate form; man by the human form, a pebble by its pebble form; and each thing performed its characteristic functions by some "virtue". Thus, it is alleged, all explanations fell into tautology, and science was doomed a priori to pursue a monotonous round in complete sterility. If Mechanism did nothing more than deliver us from this absurd logomachy, it would possess at least a negative value, emphasizing by its opposition the weakness of qualitative explanations.

(2) The general laws of applied logic are cited in favour of the principles of Mechanism. The scientific fact is not the initial fact of observation. The scientist is not satisfied with seeing, he must understand; and the only way to understand is to explain. Now there is but one conceivable method of explaining the new reality; the things which are not understood must be reduced to known antecedents. The barrenness of formal and final causes is, according to the Mechanists, at once manifest. The form is what makes a thing what it is, but the fact or thing which is to be explained does not become intelligible by reason of its being what it is. Therefore, to allege the form as an explanation is to explain a thing by itself. The interpretations based on "ends" are not more productive of scientific results. Aside from the anthropomorphic illusions to which such interpretations are liable, the ends help us no better than the forms to avoid tautology. The end of a thing is only the action towards which it tends, the term of its development. But this action and this term can be known only through further observation; they constitute new facts which require an explanation of their own. We learn nothing from them as to the nature of the original thing; they do not tell us how or by what internal factors it performs its action or reaches its term. To explain the eye by declaring that it was made to see, is to state that it is an eye but nothing more. To understand the eye it is necessary to know by what internal structure, and under what sort of stimulation the organ performs its visual functions.

Hence, say the Mechanists, all ends and final causes must be banished from scientific systematizations. The unknown can be explained only by reduction, to the known, the new by reduction to the anterior, the complex by reduction to the simple. Now, if we look for the only genuinely scientific explanation, we cannot stop until we reach mass and motion. Such indeed is human intelligence, that we first grasp the most general and the simplest realities, and we grasp these the best. Take for example the very general phenomenon of life. To explain it by a vital force or principle would simply be not to explain it at all. We must, if we would understand life, reduce it to something which is not life, to something simpler and better known. We must therefore, the Mechanist asserts, have recourse to the physical and chemical phenomena, and our understanding of life is measured by the possibilities of this reduction. It may be that we have not explained by this method everything connected with vital phenomena, since their reduction to physical laws is as yet incomplete: but this does not justify the assumption of a latent quality; it only means that our biological knowledge is far from perfect. Chemical phenomena and physical qualities must likewise be accounted for. Under pain of fruitless tautology, we must reduce them to that which is already known. But we find here only quantitative matter and motion, realities which may be reduced to mathematical formulæ, thus bringing us to a practically pure idea of quantity. Beyond this we cannot go, for if we suppress quantity our mind loses all hold on the real. It apparently follows that by the very requirements of logic, Mechanism alone has an indisputable claim to a place in the realm of science. Any other system, the Mechanists claim, must necessarily

be provisional, tautological, and therefore misleading.

(3) There is another consideration which is said to outweigh all reasoning a priori: Mechanism succeeds. Its explanations, we are told, are clear and precise to a degree unattainable in any other theory, and they satisfy the mind with a synthetic view of reality. They alone have delivered us from an intolerable pluralism in the cosmic system, secured that unity of thought which seems to be an imperative need of our mind, and brought under control phenomena which had defied all analysis and which had to be accepted as primary data. Furthermore, the doctrines of Mechanism have enabled us to anticipate observation and to make forecasts which facts in nature have actually confirmed. Herein is a guarantee which, for the Mechanists, is well worth all theoretical proofs.

Such, in the main, is the line of reasoning followed by the adherents of Mechanism. That it is not conclusive will appear quite clearly from the following examination into its value.

Criticism.—It cannot be denied that mechanistic ideas have played a useful and creditable part in science. Whatever one may think of the Cartesian revolution in the realm of philosophy, it has certainly stimulated research in the scientific field. This service cannot be overlooked, even though one be convinced of the inability of Mechanism to provide us with a formula of the universe. It is none the less true, however, that Mechanism as a cosmic theory must be rejected.

(1) First of all, there is in the progress of natural phenomena a fundamental fact which Mechanism is unable to account for, the irreversibility of cosmic events. All motion is reversible: when a moving object has covered the distance from A to B, we at once understand that it can go back over the path from B to A. If, therefore, everything that happens is motion, it is not clear why events in nature should not at times retrace their march, why the fruit should not return to the flower, the flower to the bud, the tree itself to the plant and finally to the seed. True, it is shown that this reversion, even in the mechanistic hypothesis, is exceedingly improbable, but it would not be impossible. Now such reversion, in the case of certain phenomena at least, is more than improbable; it is inconceivable, for instance, that our limbs should be bruised before the fall which causes the bruise. This irreversibility of cosmic processes is undoubtedly, as the Mechanists themselves admit, the chief difficulty against their system.

(2) When we enter within the field of biology, the difficulties against Mechanism multiply. Granted that this doctrine has served as a guide to many successful investigators, what have they attained in the last analysis? They have not advanced one step nearer to the "formula of life." All the biological facts so far examined and understood have been brought into the category of physico-chemical activities—indeed, this might have been expected; but that is not life. A particular phase is isolated for examination, and the characteristic mark of life is thereby destroyed. For that which characterizes life experimentally considered, is the unity, the solidarity of all these particular activities; all converge to one common purpose, the constitution of the living being in its undeniable individuality. Its explanation surely cannot be found in disintegrating it by analysis. The conflict with Mechanism has now been carried into the experimental field, and the last few years have yielded an ever increasing number of observations which seem to defy all mechanistic reduction. These are chiefly concerned with abnormal conditions which are brought about during the first stages of individual development. Sea urchin embryos, taken when they have progressed far enough to permit the determination of the normal growth of each part, and divided into two or three segments, produce as many animals as there were artificial segments. Must not the conclusion be that there exists in each embryo a simple principle—an *entelechy* as Driesch says, using Aristotle's term—which is one in the whole organism and is entire within each part? Is not this the very contrary of Mechanism which claims to reduce everything to the movements (interwoven of course, but really independent) of the parts? It is not surprising, therefore, that the adherents of neo-Vitalism should now be numerous, and that their ranks are growing fast.

(3) But it is principally before logical and philosophical criticism, that Mechanism seems to give way completely. Those very ideas on the nature of explanation, according to which it is attempted to reduce all reality to terms of the supposed primary notions of mass and motion, preclude Mechanism from ever attaining *the whole* of reality. The present must be reduced to the past, the new to that which is already known, the complex to the more simple; but this original datum remains, that the complex and the simple are not identical, that the new fact is not the fact which was already known. If we suppose all that was contained in the complex to have been reduced by analysis to simple elements already known, we have still to explain their combination, their unity in the complex; and it is just these that have been destroyed by the explanatory analysis. Given that there is something to explain, something unknown, it is clear that there is something beyond the known and the old, and there must inevitably be some principle which moulds into unity the numerous elements, and which either for the species or for the individual, may in a very broad sense be called the "form". Explanations based on analysis do not discover the form, because they begin by destroying it. It may be said, in a particular but entirely acceptable sense, that "form" explains nothing, because to explain is to reduce, and form is by its very nature irreducible. But from this to the denial of form is a very far cry. The scholastics of the decadent period erred in regarding forms as explanatory principles, but Mechanism distorts the reality by reducing it to its "matter", by ignoring its specific and its individual unity. For the same reason, the mechanical interpretations of the dynamic aspect of things, that is to say of cosmic evolution, prove futile. It is of course instructive in the highest degree to know what previous state of the universe accounts for the present state of things; but to look on those anterior efficient causes of things as the adequate representations of their effects, is to lose sight of the fact that these latter are *effects,* while the former were *causes;* the consequence is an absolute "statism" and a denial of all causality.

Similar observations might be made on the subject of final causes. The meaning itself of the word finality has undergone singular changes since Aristotle and the thirteenth century. Let it suffice to note that finality has its basis in the intellectual nature of an efficient cause, or in the internal tendency of a form viewed from the standpoint of activity, of dynamism. The decadent Scholastics weakened their position when they relied on forms and ends only as means of scientific explanations strictly so called, while Mechanists are clearly in error when they seek in these same scientific explanations for an account of reality to the exclusion of forms and ends. More might be said of the manifest inadequacy of quantitative images, of cosmological Mathematism which reduces all continuity to discontinuity and all time to coincidences without duration, and of the anti-mechanistic reaction which asserts itself under the name of Energism, and with which the researches of Ostwald and of Duhem are associated. But these are complex and general problems. We may now resume and draw our conclusions.

Conclusion.—Mechanism is a cosmological theory which holds that all phenomena in nature are reduci-

ble to simple phenomena in such a manner that the ultimate realities of the material world are mass and motion. This system has rendered signal service; it exhibits in great clearness the material causes or phenomena; indeed, this explains why its formulæ may, in exceptional cases, provide a formula applicable to some fact as yet unknown. But it is impossble to regard Mechanism as a real representation of our universe. It wrought its own ruin when it claimed a scope and a significance which are denied it by the reality of things and the exigencies of logic.

All general treatises on philosophy give at least a few pages to Mechanism. See also: MERCIER, *Psychologie*, I (Louvain, 1905); NYS, *Cosmologie* (2nd ed., Louvain, 1906); TILMANN PESCH, *Die grossen Welträtsel* (Freiburg, 1907); GEMELLI, *L'Enigma della vita e i nuovi orizzonti della biologia* (Florence, 1910); OSTWALD, *Vorlesungen über Naturphilosophie* (Leipzig, 1905); DRIESCH, *Der Vitalismus als Gesch. u. als Lehre* (Leipzig, 1905); DE MUNNYNCK, *Les bases psychologiques du Mécanisme* in *Revue des sciences philos. et théol.* (Kain, Belgium, 1907); BRUNHES, *La Dégradation de l'Energie* (Paris, 1908).

M. P. DE MUNNYNCK.

Mechitar (MECHITHAR, MEKHITAR, MCHITAR or MOCHTOR, a word which means "Comforter"), is the name taken by Peter Manuk, founder of the religious order of Mechitarists, when he became a monk. A native of Sebaste (Sivas) in Lesser Armenia, b. 7 February, 1676, of parents reputed noble, he was left until the age of fifteen in the care of two pious nuns. Then he entered the cloister of the Holy Cross near Sebaste, and the same year (1691), was ordained deacon by Bishop Ananias. Shortly afterwards, impelled by his thirst for knowledge, he left the cloister—not putting off the habit or infringing his vows (the Eastern monk could, for a proper reason, lawfully leave the enclosure) and set forth, in the company of a doctor of that city, for Etchmiadzin, the capital of Greater Armenia, persuaded that it was the centre of civilization and the home of all the sciences. During the journey he met with a European missionary and a fellow Armenian, whose accounts of the wonders of the West changed the course of his life. Stirred with an admiration of Western culture and the desire to introduce it among his countrymen, he wandered from place to place, earning a scanty living by teaching. After eighteen months he returned to Sebaste where he remained for some time, still ambitious to study Western civilization. Even then he had conceived the idea of founding a religious society—suggested, doubtless, by the well-intentioned but long since suppressed association of the "United Brothers"—which would labour to introduce Western ideas and Western influence into Armenia. This would imply a formal re-union of the Armenian Church with Rome, and there would be an end of that wavering between Constantinople and Rome, so injurious to the spiritual and intellectual welfare of his country. At Sebaste, he devoted himself to the reading of the Armenian sacred writers and the Syrian and Greek Fathers in translations, and, after a vain attempt to reach Europe from Alexandria, he was ordained priest (1696) in his own city, and (1699) received the title and staff of doctor (Vartabed). Then he began to preach, and went to Constantinople with the intention of founding an Armenian College. He continued his preaching there, generally in the church of St. George, gathered some disciples around him, and distinguished himself by his advocacy of union with the Holy See. Serious trouble ensued with a violent persecution of the Catholics by the Turks, excited by the action of Count Ferrol, minister of Louis XIV at Stamboul, who carried off to Paris the anti-Catholic Patriarch of Constantinople. Naturally, the fervour of Mechitar and his disciples in the Catholic cause, and the success of their preaching singled them out for special attention. The two patriarchs, urged by a schismatic, Avedik, led the attack. Mechitar wisely dismissed his disciples and himself took refuge in a Capuchin convent under French protection. Pursued by his enemies, he escaped to the Morea, thence to Venetian territory, finding shelter in a Jesuit house. He attributed his safety to our Blessed Lady, under whose protection, on 8 Sept., the Feast of her Nativity, he had solemnly placed himself and his society.

The Venetians kindly gave him some property at Modon (1701), where he built a church and convent, and laid the foundations of the Mechitarist Order. Clement XI gave it formal approval in 1712, and appointed Mechitar Abbot. Three years later war broke out between Venice and the Porte, and the new abbey was in jeopardy. The abbot, leaving seventy of his monks behind, crossed over to Venice with sixteen companions with the intention of beginning a second foundation. It was well that he did so for the Venetians were defeated and the Morea was regained by the Turks. Modon was taken, the monastery destroyed and the monks dispersed. The house rented at Venice proved too small and Mechitar exerted all his influence to obtain the gift of San Lazzaro, an island about two miles south-east of the city, not far from the Lido. His request granted, he restored the old ruined church, and a second time built a monastery for his monks. This establishment has remained undisturbed in the hands of the Mechitarists to the present day. At S. Lazzaro he devised many schemes for the regeneration of his country. An accusation brought against him at Rome—not a personal charge but one connected with the labours undertaken by the order—resulted in a better understanding with the Holy See, and the personal friendship of the pope. He lived at S. Lazzaro for thirty years, busy with his printing-press and his literary labours, and died at the age of seventy-four, on 16 April, 1749. Since his death he is always spoken of by his children as the Abbas Pater, Abbai hairm (see MECHITARISTS).

The most important of his literary works are the following: "Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew" (1737); "Commentary on Ecclesiasticus" (Venice); "Armenian Grammar"; "Armenian Grammar of the Vulgar Tongue"; "Armenian Dictionary" (1744, and in two volumes, Venice, 1749–69); "Armenian Catechism", both in the literary and vulgar tongues; "A Poem on the Blessed Virgin"; "Armenian Bible" (1734).

Vita dell' abbate Mechitar (Venice, 1810); *La vie du serviteur de Dieu Mechitar, fondateur de l'ordre des moines arméniens Mechitaristes de Venise, ainsi que La vie des abbés généraux et des moines les plus célèbres de la congrégation* (Venice, 1901).

J. C. ALMOND.

Mechitarists, Armenian Benedictines, founded by Mechitar in 1712. In its inception the order was looked upon merely as an attempted reform of Eastern monachism. P. Filippo Bonanni, S.J., writes at Rome, in 1712 when the order received its approval, of the arrival of P. Elias Martyr and P. Joannes Simon, two Armenian monks sent by Mechitar to Pope Clement XI to offer His Holiness the most humble subjection of himself and convent (*ut ei se cum suis religiosis humillime subjiceret*). There is no mention, at the moment, of the Benedictine rule. The monks, such as St. Anthony instituted in Egypt (*quos St. Antonius in Aegypto instituerat*), have begun a foundation in Modon with Mechitar (Mochtàr) as abbot.

After two years' noviceship, they take the usual vows, with a fourth in addition—"to give obedience to the preceptor or master deputed by their superior to teach them the dogmas of the Catholic Faith". Many of them vow themselves also to missionary work in Armenia, Persia, and Turkey, where they live on alms and wear as a badge, beneath the tunic, a cross of red cloth, on which are certain letters signifying their desire to shed their blood for the Catholic Faith. They promise on oath to work together in harmony so that they may the better win the schismatics back to God. They elect an abbot for life, who has the power

to dismiss summarily any of his monks who should prove disorderly. They wear the beard, Oriental fashion, and have a black habit—tunic, cloak and hood. In the engraving attached to the description, the Mechitarist would be undistinguishable from a regular hermit of St. Augustine, except for his beard. When, however, Pope Clement XI gave them his approval, it was as monks under the rule of St. Benedict, and he appointed Mechitar the first abbot. This was a great innovation; nothing less than the introduction of Western monasticism into the East. There, up to this time, a monk undertook no duties but to fill his place in the monastery. He admitted no vocation but to save his soul in the cloister. He had, in theory, at least, broken off all relations with the outside world. He had no idea of making himself useful to mankind, or of any good works whatsoever save his choir duties, his prayers, his fastings, and the monastic observance. He belonged to no religious order but was simply a monk. Now, as a Benedictine, he would be expected to devote himself to some useful work and take some thought of his neighbour. It is clear, from P. Bonanni's description, that Mechitar and his monks wished this change and had already adopted the Western idea of the monk's vocation. The adoption of the Benedictine rule, therefore, was merely a recognition of their desire to devote themselves to apostolic work among their schismatic brethren, to instruct their ignorance, excite their devotion and bring them back into the communion of the one true Catholic and Apostolic Church. And it was also a security that they would not afterwards lapse into the apathy and inactivity associated in the Eastern mind with the life of the cloister. It is not quite accurate to speak of them as a Benedictine "Congregation", though it is their customary description. They are a new "Order" of monks living under the rule of St. Benedict, as distinct from the parent order as the Cistercians, Camaldolese, Silvestrines, or Olivetans. Hence we do not find them classed among the numerous congregations of the Benedictine order.

Missionaries, writers, and educationists, devoted to the service of their Armenian brethren wherever they might be found, such were and are these Benedictines of the Eastern Church. Their subjects usually enter the convent at an early age, eight or nine years old, receive in it their elementary schooling, spend about nine years in philosophical and theological study, at the canonical age of twenty-five, if sufficiently prepared, are ordained priests by their bishop-abbot, and are then employed by him in the various enterprises of the order. First, there is the work of the mission—not the conversion of the heathen, but priestly ministry to the Armenian communities settled in most of the commercial centres of Europe. With this is joined, where needed and possible, the apostolate of union with Rome. Next there is the education of the Armenian youth and, associated with this, the preparation and publication of good and useful Armenian literature.

The parent abbey is that of St. Lazzaro at Venice; next in importance is that at Vienna, founded in 1810; there is a large convent and college for lay-students at Padua, the legacy of a pious Armenian who died at Madras; in the year 1846 another rich benefactor, Samuel Morin, founded a similar establishment at Paris. Other houses are in Austria-Hungary, Russia, Persia and Turkey—fourteen in all, according to the latest statistics, with one hundred and fifty-two monks, the majority of whom are priests. Not a great development for an order two hundred years old; but its extension is necessarily restricted because of its exclusive devotion to persons and things Armenian. Amongst their countrymen the influence of the monks has been not only directive in the way of holiness and true service to God and His Church, but creative of a wholesome national ambition and self-respect. Apostles of culture and progress, they may be said, with strict justice, to have preserved from degradation and neglect the language and literature of their country, and in so doing, have been the saviours of the Armenian race. Individually, the monks are distinguished by their linguistic accomplishments, and the Vienna establishment has attracted attention by the institution of a Literary Academy, which confers honorary membership without regard to race or religion.

In every one of their many undertakings their founder, Mechitar, personally showed them the way. To him they owe the initiative in the study of the Armenian writings of the fourth and fifth centuries, which has resulted in the development and adoption of a literary language, nearly as distinct from the vulgar tongue as Latin is from Italian. Thus the modern Armenian remains in touch with a distinguished and inspiring past, and has at his service a rich and important literature which otherwise would have been left, unknown or unheeded, to decay. Mechitar, with his Armenian "Imitation" and "Bible", began that series of translations of great books, continued unceasingly during two centuries, and ranging from the early Fathers of the Church and the works of St. Thomas of Aquin (one of their first labours) to Homer and Virgil and the best known poets and historians of later days.

At one period, in connexion with their Vienna house, there existed an association for the propagation of good books, which is said to have distributed nearly half a million volumes, and printed and published six new works each year. To him also they owe the guidance of their first steps in exegesis—the branch of learning in which they have won most distinction—and the kindred studies of the Liturgy and the religious history of their country. At S. Lazzaro he founded the printing press from which the most notable of their productions have been issued, and commenced there the collection of Armenian manuscripts for which their library has become famous. To any but members of the order the history of the Mechitarists has been uneventful, because of the quiet, untiring plodding along ancient, traditional paths, and the admirable fidelity to the spirit and ideals of their founder (see MECHITAR).

It has been principally by means of the Mechitarists' innumerable periodicals, pious manuals, Bibles, maps, engravings, dictionaries, histories, geographies and other contributions to educational and popular literature, that they have done good service to the Armenian Church and nation. Following are the most valuable of their contributions to the common cause of learning. First, there is the recovery, in ancient Armenian translations, of some lost works of the Fathers of the Church. Among them may be noted "Letters (thirteen) of St. Ignatius of Antioch" and a fuller and more authentic "History of the Martyrdom of St. Ignatius"; some works of St. Ephrem the Syrian, notably a sort of "Harmony of the Gospels" and a "Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul"; an exceptionally valuable edition of "Eusebius's History". The publication of these works is due to the famous Mechitarist Dom J. B. Aucher, who was assisted in the last of them by Cardinal Mai. To Aucher also we are indebted for a German translation of the "Armenian Missal" (Tübingen, 1845) and "Dom Johannis philosophi Ozniensis Armeniorum Catholici (A. D., 718) Opera" (Venice, 1534). Two original historical works may also be noted: "The History of Armenia", by P. Michel Tschamtschenanz (1784–6) and the "Quadro della storia letteraria di Armenia" by Mgr. Pl. Sukias Somal (Venice, 1829).

TSCHAMTSCHENANZ, *Compendiose notizie sulla congregazione dei monachi Armeni Mechitaristici* (Venice, 1819); NEUMANN, *Essai d'une histoire de la Littérature arménienne* (Leipzig, 1836); KALEMKIAR, *Une esquisse de l'activité littéraire-typographique de la congrégation méchitariste à Vienne;* GOSCHLER, *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de la Théol. Cathol.*, XIV, Art. *Mechitaristes.*

J. C. ALMOND.

Mechlin (Lat. MECHLINIA; Fr. MALINES), ARCHDIOCESE OF (MECHLINIENSIS), comprises the two Belgian provinces of Antwerp and Brabant. This diocese derives its present configuration from the French Concordat of 1801. The ecclesiastical province of Mechlin is coextensive with the Belgian Kingdom (suffragan bishoprics: Tournai, Liège, Namur, Gand, Bruges); it extended to the Rhine under Napoleon I. The city of Mechlin, prior to 1559, belonged to the deanery of Brussels and to the archdeaconry of the same name in the diocese of Cambrai. Its importance ecclesiastically was due to the ancient Chapter of Canons of the collegiate church of St. Rombaut. Paul IV, by his bull "Super universi orbis ecclesias" (12 May, 1559) created a new hierarchy in the Netherlands composed of three metropolitan (Mechlin, Cambrai, Utrecht) and fifteen episcopal sees. The Archbishop of Mechlin was raised to the dignity of primate by the Constitutions of Pius IV in 1560 and 1561. The Christian Faith was zealously preached in the present diocese during the seventh and eighth centuries. It is known that Antwerp was visited by St. Eligius, Bishop of Tournai (d. 660), and by St. Amand, the Apostle of Flanders and Bishop of Maestricht (d. 679). The latter's successors in the see of Tongres-Maestricht-Liège, St. Lambert (d. about 700) and St. Hubert (d. 727) are said to have visited Mechlin and Brabant. This evangelical work was followed up by the Anglo-Saxon missionaries St. Willibrord (d. 738) and St. Rumold or Rombaut (d. about 775). St. Rombaut was martyred at Mechlin, and became the city's patron saint, and subsequently the patron of the whole diocese. Among the saints of this diocese are several members of Pepin of Landen's family, his widow St. Itta, foundress of the Abbey of Nivelles, his daughters, St. Gertrude (d. 659) and St. Begga (d. 698); the two sisters St. Gudule (d. 712) and St. Rainelde; in the ninth century St. Libert of Mechlin and St. Guidon of Anderlecht; St. Wivine, foundress of the Benedictine abbey of Grand Bigard (d. 1170); St. Albert of Louvain, Prince Bishop of Liège and martyr (d. 1192); St. Marie d'Orignies (d. 1232); St. Lutgard (d. 1246), and Blessed Alice (d. 1250), both Cistercian nuns, the former in Aywières, the latter at la Cambre; St. Boniface of Brussels, Bishop of Lausanne (d. 1265); Blessed Jean de Ruysbroeck, an Augustinian monk of Groenendael, because of his mystical writings known as the "divine and admirable doctor" (d. 1381); several priests put to death by the Calvinists at Gorcum (1572); the Jesuits, St. John Berchmans of Diest, patron of student youth (d. 1621), and Venerable Leonard Leys (Lessius) of Brecht, renowned for his piety and his theological works (d. 1623).

It was at the beginning of the twelfth century that Tanchelm, a native of Zealand, became known, chiefly in Antwerp, for his violent attacks on the hierarchy, and the Sacraments, especially the Holy Eucharist. He shared the pernicious errors of the Adamites, and gave an example of the worst kind of debauchery. Toward the middle of the century, Bishop Nicolas of Cambrai excommunicated Jonas, one of the promoters of Catharism in Brabant. A little later numerous Beghards and Beguines fell into the errors of the sect known as the Brothers of the Free Spirit. To this sect also belonged the nun, Sister Hadewijc (Hedwig) or Bloemardine, who gained numerous partisans in Brussels. Her writings were refuted by Jean de Ruysbroeck. Bloemardine died about 1336, but her followers lived on, and as late as about 1410 Pierre d'Ailly, Bishop of Cambrai, was compelled to take measures against them. The Black Plague of 1349 gave rise to the processions of Flagellants. These hailed from Germany and traversed the country practising the mortification from which their name has arisen. The ecclesiastical authorities were obliged to intervene on behalf of the Jews detested by the Flagellants. On the other hand, religious sentiment manifested itself in numerous monastic institutions. Afflighem, the principal Benedictine abbey, dates from 1086. The people of Antwerp, whom Tanchelm had fanaticized, were brought back by St. Norbert to a Christian mode of life. Soon arose in Brabant many Premonstratensian abbeys: St. Michel at Antwerp (1124), Tongerloo (1128), le Parc near Louvain (1129), Heylissem (1130), Grimberghen (1131), Averbode (1132), Dieligem and Postel (1140). Among other abbeys for men may be mentioned: the Benedictine abbeys of Vlierbeek (1125); the noble abbey of St. Gertrude at Louvain, belonging to the Augustinian canons; the Cistercian abbeys of Villers (1147) and of St. Bernard (1237). Some of the numerous colleges of Austin Canons are: St. Jacques sur Caudenberg at Brussels, Hanswijck at Mechlin, Corssendonck, Groenendael, Rougecloître and Septfontaines, all three in the forest of Soignes. In most places of consequence Augustinians, Franciscans, Carmelites and Dominicans were established. The military orders were represented at the Teutonic Commandery of Pitzemburg in Mechlin and in Becquevoort. The leading abbeys for women were: Grand Bigard and Cortenberg (Benedictines); la Cambre, Roosendael, Nazareth (Cistercians). The semi-monastic institution of the Beguinages (q. v.), small settlements in the heart of cities or just outside city walls, is a peculiar feature of religious life in the Netherlands. They were once numerous (the number of Beguines who went forth from Mechlin to greet Charles the Bold, on the occasion of his joyful entry in 1467, was 900), and still endure, though much reduced in numbers, at Mechlin, Antwerp, Louvain, Diest, Lierre, Turnhout, Hoogstraeten and Herenthals. The increase of the secular clergy and its improved material conditions caused the chapters of Canons to grow in number, and eventually the collegiate churches of the diocese reached a total of twenty. Public instruction was conducted by parochial and chapter schools. Finally Martin V, by his bull of 9 December, 1425, erected a university at Louvain.

At the close of the Middle Ages, it is well known, both faith and morals suffered a notable decay. More or less rightly, Jean Pupper de Goch (d. 1475), superior of the Thabor Convent at Mechlin, has been styled the precursor of Luther, who soon found numerous partisans in the diocese, especially at Antwerp where his Augustinian brethren declared in his favour. Protestantism, though vigorously opposed by Charles V, was again menacing at the end of his reign, when Lutheranism gave way to Calvinism. The creation in 1559 of new sees, though an indispensable measure, brought about a coalition of all discontented parties. Philip II, by removing the first Archbishop of Mechlin, Cardinal de Granvelle, deprived the Catholic and monarchical cause of its ablest champion, and thereby hastened the impending revolution. In 1556 the iconoclastic mob put to death both religious and priests, and sacked the churches and monasteries. Disorder continued until the advent of the Archduke Albert and Isabella. The people remained loyal to Catholicism and the University of Louvain proved a valiant defender, though Protestant theories exercised at the university a certain influence, particularly on Baius and Jansenius. The Archbishop of Mechlin, Jacques Boonen (1621–55), evaded the publication of the constitution "In eminenti", by which Urban VIII condemned the "Augustinus"; he was even temporarily suspended by Innocent X. Boonen's submission did not put an end to the Jansenistic quarrels in the diocese. Oratorians, brought in by him, were inclined to rigorism. They opened colleges for the education of youth, and found themselves both in this field, and in their Jansenistic views, in rivalry with the Jesuits already active in anti-Protestant controversy. The partisans and the adversaries of Jansenius took sides at once with one or other of the conflicting parties. The

firmness of the archbishops at Precipiano (1690–1711) and of Cardinal d'Alsace (1715–59) repelled Jansenism, which endured however in Josephinism and Febronianism. Joseph II suppressed many convents (1783), and created the General Seminary of Louvain (1786), the doctrines of which were condemned by Cardinal de Frankenberg (1759–1801). Persecution broke out afresh in the wake of the French Revolution; Catholic worship was abolished, churches were pillaged, a multitude of ecclesiastics exiled, among them Cardinal de Frankenberg. The anti-Concordat schism of the Stévenists arose under Napoleon Bonaparte. Later, King William revived the General Seminary under the name of Philosophical College, but met with as much opposition as Joseph II. The Belgian Revolution of 1830 freed the Church from these fetters. For the later history of Mechlin see BELGIUM. The following archbishops of Mechlin were made cardinals: Antoine Perrenot de Granvella, first archbishop (1560–83) and a remarkable statesman (q. v.); Thomas Philippe d'Alsace (1716–59); Henri de Frankenberg (1759–1801); Engelbert Sterckx (1832–67); Victor Auguste Dechamps, theologian and pulpit orator (q. v.) (1867–83); Pierre Lambert Goossens (1884–1906); Désiré Joseph Mercier (1906—), the chief originator of the neo-scholastic movement in Belgium.

Religious monuments: numerous edifices especially of Gothic style (Roman: St. Germain at Tirlemont, St. Gertrude at Nivelles). At Mechlin is the metropolitan church of St. Rombaut (thirteenth and fourteenth centuries), with a tower 318 feet high. There is also Notre Dame, and St. Pierre (Jesuit style). Principal other edifices: churches of Lierre, Hoogstraeten, Tirlemont, Hal, Diest; and the ruins of the Abbey of Villers, the most striking monastic ruins in Belgium. The ornamentation has suffered greatly from the disorders of the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, particularly the organ gallery at Lierre, the tabernacle at Léau, the tombs at Hoogstraeten and the stained glasses in Lierre and Hoogstraeten. Of the paintings still preserved, many belong to the Antwerp School. At Mechlin there are works of Rubens in the churches of Notre Dame and St. Jean. See ANTWERP, BRUSSELS, LOUVAIN. Pilgrimages: St. Sang at Hoogstraeten, St. Sauveur at Haekendover (Tirlemont), Notre Dame at Montaigu, at Hal, at Hanswÿck (Mechlin). Population (1909): 2,450,680 inhabitants; 745 parishes; 51 deaneries; one theological seminary; 3 petits séminaires; 24 episcopal colleges; 108 convents for men, and 726 for women.

The "Vie Diocésaine" is a monthly periodical founded in 1907. The "Theologia Mechliniensis" fundamental and sacramental theology, with treatises on virtues, indulgences, and reserved cases fills ten volumes; notable also are the "Scripture Commentary" of Ceulemans (nine volumes) on the Psalms and New Testament, and the work of Van der Stappen (five volumes) on the Liturgy.

Gallia Christiana, V (Paris, 1731); VAN GESTEL, *Historia sacra et profana archiepiscopatus Mechliniensis* (La Haye, 1725); CLAESSENS, *Histoire des archévêque de Malines*, II (Louvain, 1881); GODENNE, *Malines jadis et aujourd'hui* (Mechlin, 1908); FOPPENS, *Historia episcopatus Antverpiensis* (Brussels, 1717).

A. KEMPENEER.

Mechtel, JOHANN, chronicler; b. 1562 at Pfalzel near Trier (Germany); d. after 1631, perhaps as late as 1653 at Trier. He is often named Pfalzel after his native town where he first studied and then went to the university at Trier, conducted by the Jesuits, where the historian Christopher Brote acquired a lasting influence over him. After his ordination (about 1587), he was appointed pastor at Eltz, near Limburg; in 1592 he became canon at Limburg and as such administered for two years the troublesome parish of Camberg. In 1604 he was appointed dean, but soon got into difficulties with his canons and finally, by request of the elector of Trier in order to restore peace, he resigned, and accepted the canonry at St. Paulinus in Trier. In Limburg as well as in Trier he studied history assiduously and carefully, and conscientiously collected documents and records, as well as inscriptions on monuments. Many of his sources are now lost therefore his works almost possess the value of originals for us. Of his writings may be mentioned: "Limburg Chronicle", the "Pagus Lohenahe", and the "Introductio in Pagum Lohenahe." His chief work, the "Limburg Chronicle", was begun in 1610 and finished in 1612, but it was not edited until 1757 by Hontheim in his "Prodromus historiæ Trevirensis", II, 1046–1166. This edition, marked by many mistakes and omissions, was published in its entirety by Knetsch, in the "Publications of the Historical Commission for Nassau", VI (Wiesbaden, 1909). It is a revision and continuation of the old Limburg chronicle, begun by the town clerk, Tilemann, but utilizes also many other sources both printed and unprinted. His chronicle is of great value because Mechtel utilizes various accounts which contain important information as to social conditions, the price of corn and wine, the cultivation of the vine, climatic conditions and wages. In treating German and early medieval history he does not rise above the level of the historians of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Both his other works are as yet unpublished; Knetsch reviews their contents in his edition of the chronicle X–XVI.

CARL KNETSCH, *Die Limburger Chronik des Johannes Mechtel* (Wiesbaden, 1909), I-XXV.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Mechtilde (MATILDA VON HACKEBORN-WIPPRA), SAINT, Benedictine; b. in 1240 or 1241 at the ancestral castle of Helfta, near Eisleben, Saxony; d. in the monastery of Helfta, 19 Nov., 1298. She belonged to one of the noblest and most powerful Thuringian families, while her sister was the saintly and illustrious Abbess Gertrude von Hackeborn. Some writers have considered that Mechtilde von Hackeborn and Mechtilde von Wippra were two distinct persons, but, as the Barons of Hackeborn were also Lords of Wippra, it was customary for members of that family to take their name indifferently from either, or both of these estates. So fragile was she at birth, that the attendants, fearing she might die unbaptized, hurried her off to the priest who was just then preparing to say Mass. He was a man of great sanctity, and after baptizing the child, uttered these prophetic words: "What do you fear? This child most certainly will not die, but she will become a saintly religious in whom God will work many wonders, and she will end her days in a good old age." When she was seven years old, having been taken by her mother on a visit to her elder sister Gertrude, then a nun in the monastery of Rodardsdorf, she became so enamoured of the cloister that her pious parents yielded to her entreaties and, acknowledging the workings of grace, allowed her to enter the alumnate. Here, being highly gifted in mind as well as in body, she made remarkable progress in virtue and learning.

Ten years later (1258) she followed her sister, who, now abbess, had transferred the monastery to an estate at Helfta given her by her brothers Louis and Albert. As a nun, Mechtilde was soon distinguished for her humility, her fervour, and that extreme amiability which had characterized her from childhood and which, like piety, seemed hereditary in her race. While still very young, she became a valuable helpmate to Abbess Gertrude, who entrusted to her direction the alumnate and the choir. Mechtilde was fully equipped for her task when, in 1261, God committed to her prudent care a child of five who was destined to shed lustre upon the monastery of Helfta. This was that Gertrude who in later generations became known as St. Gertrude the Great. Gifted with a beautiful voice, Mechtilde also possessed a special talent for rendering the solemn and sacred music over which she presided as

domna cantrix. All her life she held this office and trained the choir with indefatigable zeal. Indeed, Divine praise was the keynote of her life as it is of her book; in this she never tired, despite her continual and severe physical sufferings, so that in His revelations Christ was wont to call her His "nightingale". Richly endowed, naturally and supernaturally, ever gracious, beloved of all who came within the radius of her saintly and charming personality, there is little wonder that this cloistered virgin should strive to keep hidden her wondrous life. Souls thirsting for consolation or groping for light sought her advice; learned Dominicans consulted her on spiritual matters. At the beginning of her own mystic life it was from St. Mechtilde that St. Gertrude the Great learnt that the marvellous gifts lavished upon her were from God.

Only in her fiftieth year did St. Mechtilde learn that the two nuns in whom she had especially confided had noted down the favours granted her, and, moreover, that St. Gertrude had nearly finished a book on the subject. Much troubled at this, she, as usual, first had recourse to prayer. She had a vision of Christ holding in His hand the book of her revelations, and saying: "All this has been committed to writing by my will and inspiration; and therefore you have no cause to be troubled about it." He also told her that, as He had been so generous towards her, she must make Him a like return, and that the diffusion of the revelations would cause many to increase in His love; moreover, He wished this book to be called "The Book of Special Grace", because it would prove such to many. When the saint understood that the book would tend to God's glory, she ceased to be troubled and even corrected the manuscript herself. Immediately after her death it was made public, and copies were rapidly multiplied, owing chiefly to the widespread influence of the Friars Preachers. Boccaccio tells how, a few years after the death of Mechtilde, the book of her revelations was brought to Florence and popularized under the title of "La Laude di donna Matelda". It is related that the Florentines were accustomed to repeat daily before their sacred images the praises learned from St. Mechtilde's book. St. Gertrude, to whose devotedness we owe the "Liber Specialis Gratiæ" exclaims: "Never has there arisen one like to her in our monastery; nor, alas! I fear, will there ever arise another such!"—little dreaming that her own name would be inseparably linked with that of Mechtilde. With that of St. Gertrude, the body of St. Mechtilde most probably still reposes at Old Helfta though the exact spot is unknown. Her feast is kept 26 or 27 February in different congregations and monasteries of her order, by special permission of the Holy See. (For an account of the general life at Helfta and an estimate of the writings of St. Mechtilde, see GERTRUDE OF HACKEBORN; GERTRUDE THE GREAT, SAINT.)

There is another honour, inferior certainly to that of sanctity, yet great in itself and worthy of mention here: the homage of a transcendent genius was to be laid at the feet of St. Mechtilde. Critics have long been perplexed as to one of the characters introduced by Dante in his "Purgatorio" under the name of Matelda. After ascending seven terraces of a mountain, on each of which the process of purification is carried on, Dante, in Canto xxvii, hears a voice singing: "Venite, benedicti patris mei"; then later, in Canto xxviii, there appears to him on the opposite bank of the mysterious stream a lady, solitary, beautiful, and gracious. To her Dante addresses himself; she it is who initiates him into secrets, which it is not given to Virgil to penetrate, and it is to her that Beatrice refers Dante in the words: "Entreat Matilda that she teach thee this." Most commentators have identified Matilda with the warrior-Countess of Tuscany, the spiritual daughter and dauntless champion of St. Gregory VII, but all agree that beyond the name the two have little or nothing in common. She is no Amazon who, at Dante's prayer that she may draw nearer to let him understand her song, turns towards him "not otherwise than a virgin that droppeth her modest eyes". In more places than one the revelations granted to the mystics of Helfta seem in turn to have become the inspirations of the Florentine poet. All writers on Dante recognize his indebtedness to St. Augustine, the Pseudo-Dionysius, St. Bernard, and Richard of St. Victor. These are precisely the writers whose doctrines had been most assimilated by the mystics of Helfta, and thus they would the more appeal to the sympathies of the poet. The city of Florence was among the first to welcome St. Mechtilde's book. Now Dante, like all true poets, was a child of his age, and could not have been a stranger to a book which was so popular among his fellow-citizens. The "Purgatorio" was finished between 1314 and 1318, or 1319—just about the time when St. Mechtilde's book was popular. This interpretation is supported by the fact that St. Mechtilde in her "Book of Special Grace" (pt. I, c. xiii) describes the place of purification under the same figure of a seven-terraced mountain. The coincidence of the simile and of the name, Matelda, can scarcely be accidental. For another among many points of resemblance between the two writers compare "Purgatorio", Canto xxxi, where Dante is drawn by Matelda through the mysterious stream with pt. II, c. ii, of the "Liber Specialis Gratiæ". The serene atmosphere which seems to cling about the gracious and beautiful songstress, her virgin modesty and simple dignity, all seem to point to the recluse of Helfta rather than to the stern heroine of Canossa, whose hand was thrice bestowed in marriage. Besides, in politics Dante, as an ardent Ghibelline, supported the imperial prétensions and he would have been little inclined to sing the praises of the Tuscan Countess. The conclusion may therefore be hazarded that this "Donna Matelda" of the "Purgatorio" personifies St. Mechtilde as representing mystic theology.

ST. MECHTILDIS, *Liber specialis gratiæ;* ST. GERTRUDIS, *Legatus divinæ pietatis;* Preface to *Revelationes Gertrudianæ ac Mechtildianæ*, I, II (Paris and Poitiers, 1875); LEDOS, *Ste. Gertrude* (Paris, 1907); ZIEGELBAUER, *Hist. Lit. Bened.* (Vienna, 1754); PREGER, *Gesch. deutsch. Mystik*, I (Leipzig, 1874); *Révélations de S. Mechtilde* (Paris and Poitiers, 1909).

GERTRUDE CASANOVA.

Mechtilde of the Blessed Sacrament. See ADORATION, PERPETUAL.

Mechtild of Magdeburg, a celebrated medieval mystic, b. of a noble family in Saxony about 1210; d. at the Cistercian nunnery of Helfta near Eisleben, c. 1285. She experienced her first inspirations at the age of twelve, when, as she herself states, she was greeted by the Holy Ghost. From that time, the greeting was repeated daily. Under this inspiration she desired to be despised by all without, however, deserving it, and for this purpose left her home, where she had always been loved and respected, to become a Beguine at Magdeburg in 1230. Here, under the spiritual guidance of the Dominicans, she led a life of prayer and extreme mortification. Her heavenly inspirations and ecstatic visions became more frequent and were of such a nature that they dispelled from the mind of her confessor all doubt as to their Divine origin. By his order she reluctantly wrote her visions. Shortly after 1270 she joined the Cistercian nuns at Helfta, where she spent the remaining twelve years of her life, highly respected as one signally favoured by God, especially by her namesake St. Mechtilde of Hackeborn and by St. Gertrude the Great. Mechtild left to the world a most wonderful book, in which she recorded her manifold inspirations and visions. According to her assertion, God ordered the title of the book to be "Vliessende licht miner gotheit in allu die herzen die da lebent ane valscheit", i. e. "Light of my divinity, flowing into all hearts that live without guile". The work is commonly styled "Das fliessende Licht der Gottheit". She wrote her inspirations on separate

sheets of paper, which she handed to the Dominican, Henry of Halle, lector in Rupin. The original, which was written in Low German, is not extant, but a South German translation, which was prepared by Henry of Nördlingen about the year 1344, is still preserved in the original manuscript in the library of Einsiedeln, Codex 277. Mechtild began the work in 1250 and finished the sixth volume at Magdeburg in 1264, to which she added a seventh volume at Helfta. A Latin translation of the six volumes written at Magdeburg was made by a Dominican, about the year 1290, and is reprinted, together with a translation of the seventh volume, in "Revelationes Gertrudianæ ac Mechtildianæ", II (Paris, 1877), 435–707. The manuscript of Einsiedeln was edited by Gall Morel, O.S.B., who also translated it into modern German (Ratisbon, 1869). Other modern German translations were prepared by J. Müller (Ratisbon, 1881) and Escherich (Berlin, 1909).

Mechtild's language is generally forcible and often exceedingly flowery. Her prose is occasionally interspersed with beautiful original pieces of poetry, which manifest that she had all the natural gifts of a poet. She is never at a loss to give vent to her feelings of joy and grief in the most impressive form. Often also she delights in aphoristic and abrupt sentences. It is sometimes difficult to ascertain just how far her narrations are faithful reproductions of her visions, and how far they are additions made by her own poetic fancy. This is especially true of her realistic description of the hereafter. Writing on hell, she says, "I saw a horrible and wretched place; its name is 'Eternal Hatred'." She then represents Lucifer as chained by his sins in the lowest abyss of hell, all sin, agony, pestilence and ruin, that fill hell, purgatory, and earth, flowing from his burning heart and mouth. She divides hell into three parts; the lowest and most horrible is filled with condemned Christians, the middle with Jews, and the highest with Pagans. Hell, purgatory and heaven are situated one immediately above the other. The lowest portion of purgatory is filled with devils, who torment the souls in the most horrible manner, while the highest portion of purgatory is identical with the lowest portion of heaven. Many a soul in the lowest purgatory does not know whether it will ever be saved. The last statement was condemned in the Bull "Exsurge Domine", 15 June, 1520, as one of the errors of Luther: "Animæ in purgatorio non sunt securæ de earum salute, saltem omnes". Mechtild's conception of the hereafter is believed by some to be the basis of Dante's "Divine Comedy", and the poet's Matelda ("Purgatory", Canto 27–33) to be identical with our Mechtild (see Preger, "Dante's Matelda", Munich, 1873). Whatever we may think of these and other statements in the work of Mechtild, much of it, no doubt, has all the signs of a special inspiration from above. That she did not seek the favour of man is evident from her fearless denunciation of the vices of the clergy in general and especially the clergy of Magdeburg. Some authors call her saint, though she has not been canonized and apparently has never received any public cult.

MICHAEL, *Kulturzustände des deutschen Volkes während des 13. Jahrhunderts*, III (Freiburg im Br., 1903), 187–199; IDEM in *Zeitschrift für Kath. Theologie*, XXV (Innsbruck, 1901), 177–180; GREITH, *Die deutsche Mystik im Predigerorden* (Freiburg im Br., 1861), 207–277; STRAUCH, *Kleine Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Mystik* in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur*, XXVII (Berlin, 1883), 368–381; PREGER, *Geschichte der deutschen Mystik im Mittelalter*, I (Leipzig, 1874), 91–112; STIERLING, *Studien zu Mechtild v. Magd.* (Göttingen, 1909).

MICHAEL OTT.

Mecklenburg, a division of the German Empire, consists of the two Grand Duchies of Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Mecklenburg-Strelitz.

History.—At the beginning of the Christian era, Mecklenburg was inhabited by Germanic tribes, but as early as the second century they began to leave the district; Slavonic tribes poured in, and by about A. D. 600 they had complete possession of the land. These Slavonic tribes were principally Wends, of whom the Obotrites occupied the western parts, the Lusici, or Wilzen, the eastern. Their chief occupations were forestry, cattle-raising, hunting, and fishing. Their religion was a pure worship of nature. The chief god was Radegast Zuarasici, whose sanctuary at Rethra was the centre of his worship for the whole of Mecklenburg until it was destroyed in the twelfth century, and replaced by Svantevit, the "holy oracle", whose temple was at Arkona on the Island of Rügen. After Charlemagne had brought the Saxons into subjection, the tribes of Mecklenburg became the immediate neighbours of the Frankish Empire, with which an active trade soon sprang up. Commerce was still further developed under the Saxon emperors (919–1024), the most important mart for the Slavs being Bardowiek.

Charlemagne's conquests in this region were lost soon after his death. Henry I of Germany (916–36) was the first to force the Slavonic territory again to pay tribute (about 928); he also placed it under the jurisdiction of Saxon counts. With the dominion of the Germans, Christianity found ingress into the land. Bishop Adalward of Verden brought the first Obotrite prince into the Church. Otto the Great (936–973) divided the territory of Mecklenburg between the two margravates he had formed. Ecclesiastically, the land belonged partly to the Dioceses of Havelberg and Brandenburg, partly to the Diocese of Oldenburg, that was erected in 968. However, there can hardly be said to have been a systematic attempt at conversion to Christianity, for the German authority had no secure foundation. The early successes in conversion to Christianity were swept away by an insurrection of the Slavs, after the defeat of the Emperor Otto II in Calabria in 928. The Obotrites under Mistiwoi, who had previously accepted Christianity, plundered and burned Hamburg, ravaged the whole of North Albingia (Holstein), crossed the Elbe and advanced as far as Milde. Every trace of Christianity was destroyed. There was much strife between German and Wend in the succeeding decades. It was not until the reign of Henry II (1002–1024) that the Lusici and Obotrites became allies of the German Empire against the Polish Duke Boleslaw. Towards the end of his life Mistiwoi turned in repentance once more to Christianity, and ended his days in the monastery of Bardowiek.

Archbishop Unwanus of Hamburg (from 1013) laboured with energy and success; but the Saxon dukes exacted a heavy tribute, which was the chief reason why the Christian teaching protected by them was regarded with little favour, even though the Wendic rulers Udo and Ratibor became Christians. Udo's son Gottschalk faithfully supported Archbishop Adalbert of Bremen, and frequently explained Christian doctrine at church to his people. Churches and monasteries rapidly appeared. New dioceses were founded in addition to the Diocese of Oldenburg, namely, Ratzeburg under Bishop Aristo, and Mecklenburg under Bishop John, a Scot. The conversion of the entire country to Catholicity seemed assured. But the ferment of the old antagonism to the tribute to the empire and the Saxon dukes led to a heathen reaction. The first victim was Gottschalk himself, in 1066. On 15 July of the same year the twenty-eight monks of the Benedictine monastery at Ratzeburg were stoned to death; in Mecklenburg the aged Bishop John and many other Christians were slain, and in a few months the German supremacy was thrown off. The Wends even plundered the Christian cities of Schleswig and Hamburg, the bishop of the latter being obliged to transfer his see to Bremen. The bloody national god Radegast of Rethra became once more dominant.

Cruto, Prince of the Island of Rügen, ruled the country for nearly thirty years. Finally in 1093, Cruto having been murdered, Gottschalk's son, Henry, was able to gain his inheritance. Although a Christian he never attempted to force Christianity upon the Wends. The only church was in his capital, Lübeck, where St. Vicelin proclaimed the word of God from 1126. Soon after Henry's death (1126) his family became extinct, and the Emperor Lothair granted the vacant territory in fief to Henry's Danish cousin, Knut Laward, Duke of Schleswig. Claims were also made by Henry's nephew Pribislaw, and by Niklot, an Obotrite noble. These two divided the rulerless land between them when in 1131 Knut Laward was killed by his cousin Magnus. Pribislaw, however, could not maintain himself long against the German advance. He was obliged to surrender in 1142 to Count Adolf of Schauenburg, who repeopled the almost desolate territory with colonists from Flanders, Holland, Westphalia, and Frisia. Niklot, on the other hand, preserved his independence until, after a protracted struggle, he was subdued by Henry the Lion, Duke of Saxony. Upon agreeing to accept Christianity and to acknowledge German supremacy, Niklot was allowed to retain his possessions (1147). However, he subsequently headed a revolt, which ended in his overthrow (1160). After Niklot's son, Pribislaw II, the ancestor of the reigning dynasty, had been baptized in the year 1167, he was established as ruler.

Hartwig of Stade, Bishop of Bremen, soon provided for the restoration of the former Wendic dioceses. In 1150 he consecrated Vicelin Bishop of Oldenburg, and Emmehard Bishop of Mecklenburg, Schwerin now becoming the see of the latter. Hartwig had not waited to secure an endowment sufficient for them from the Saxon duke. Henry the Lion, therefore, was soon able to obtain for himself what otherwise only belonged to the emperor, the right of investiture for the Obotrite dioceses. This privilege was granted by the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa (1152–1189), who regarded Henry as one of the most trustworthy supporters of his power. At the same time Henry was empowered to found dioceses and churches in the region on the farther side of the Elbe and to endow them with imperial domains, which was what the conquered Slavonic territory was held to be. In 1154 Henry re-established the Diocese of Ratzeburg, appointing as bishop Evermod, cathedral provost of Magdeburg. A number of Christian Germans came into the region, and the Wends were brought to accept Christianity. The land was rapidly covered with churches, parishes, and monasteries. Besides the Cistercian monastery of Dobberan that Pribislaw endowed largely with lands, there were founded monasteries of Benedictines, Franciscans, Premonstratensians, of the religious orders of Knights Hospitallers, of St. Anthony, etc.

In 1170 Frederick Barbarossa raised Pribislaw to the dignity of a prince of the empire. On Pribislaw's death in 1178, however, domestic disputes broke out, and the overthrow of Duke Henry the Lion of Saxony in 1180 weakened German power in the northern part of the empire. Denmark was thus enabled to bring under its authority large portions of North Germany, Mecklenburg being obliged to recognize Danish supremacy in the reign of Henry Burwy I (1178–1227). In 1227 Henry Burwy, in confederation with the Counts of Schwerin, the Archbishop of Bremen, and the city of Lübeck, cast off the Danish yoke. Thereupon the influx of German colonists received a new impetus, and, in the first half of the thirteenth century, a German municipality had already developed there. After the death of Henry Burwy, the territory was divided (1229) into four principalities: Mecklenburg, Werle, Rostock, and Parchim. The two latter lines died out in 1314 and 1316 respectively; that of Werle flourished until 1436. The main branch of the Mecklenburg line was founded by John II (1226–64). One of its members, Henry the Pilgrim (1264–1302) was captured at Cairo in 1271, while on a crusade, and kept prisoner until 1297. His son, Henry the Lion, obtained the district of Stargard as dowry with his wife, Beatrice of Brandenburg, and, on the Rostock line becoming extinct, forced the Danes to recognize him as the hereditary possessor of the city and territory of Rostock, then under Danish supremacy. Henry's two sons, Albert II (d. 1379) and John I (d. 1392), were made dukes and princes of the empire by the Emperor Charles IV. The partition of 1352 led to the founding of the Stargard line, which became extinct in 1471.

In 1358 Albert succeeded in obtaining the County of Schwerin by purchase; his scheme to place his eldest son, Henry III, on the Danish throne failed completely, but his second son, Albert III, was elected King of Sweden in 1363. However, soon after Albert III had succeeded his father in the government of Mecklenburg (1383), a rival claimant of the throne of Sweden appeared in the person of Queen Margaret of Denmark. In 1389 Margaret took Albert prisoner, and did not release him until, after six years of captivity, he renounced all claims to the Swedish throne. His son, Albert V (1412–22), was followed by his own cousin, Henry the Fat (1422–77), who, after the Stargard line—to which the foundation of a university at Rostock in 1418 is due—had become extinct, reigned over the whole of Mecklenburg, thus once more united under a single ruler (1471). Henry's successor, Magnus (1477–1503), was a very energetic prince. The cities had, under the weak rule of his predecessor, become insubordinate; Magnus directed his efforts towards bringing them under the control of the ruler and evolving a unified state out of a confused medley of districts, cities, and estates. For a time his sons, Henry V (1503–52) and Albert VII (1503–47), reigned jointly so as to maintain the country undivided. In 1523 the prelates, knighthood, and cities formed a Landesunion, which was the basis of the present constitution, and established a common diet for all the divisions of the territory without regard to any partitions. In 1536 the brothers divided their dominions, Henry becoming Duke of Schwerin and Albert Duke of Güstrow.

The Reformation in Mecklenburg was entirely the work of the two joint rulers, Henry V and Albert VII. Even Protestant historians have testified that before the Reformation the country had excellent bishops, a pious clergy, and a genuinely Catholic population. Both dukes were early won over to Luther's cause by the Humanist Konrad Pegel, whom Henry had called from the University of Rostock as tutor for his son Magnus, the postulated Bishop of Schwerin. The duke had permitted Pegel to go to Wittenberg, whence the latter returned an ardent adherent of Luther. Albert, indeed, soon abandoned the new doctrine and maintained the old faith in his part of the country. On the other hand, from 1524 Henry allowed the new doctrine to be proclaimed in the chapel of the castle at Schwerin, and protected the preachers even in his brother's domains. Henry's chief desire was to obtain the Bishopric of Schwerin. Its administrator, his son Magnus, who had married in 1543, died childless in 1550, and Henry saw to it that the chapter elected as successor his nephew Ulrich.

When after Albert's death in the year 1547 his son John Albert (1547–76) came to power, the Reformation was completely established. John Albert was first sole ruler in his father's dominions, then in 1552 he also succeeded his uncle in Schwerin, but he resigned the latter principality in 1555 to his brother Ulrich. In 1549 the joint diet at Sternberg proclaimed the Lutheran Faith to be the religion of the state, and from

1552 the monasteries were secularized, except Dobbedin, Malchow, and Ribnitz, which in 1572, in exchange for assuming the ducal debts, were kept in existence for the unmarried daughters of the nobility, and have so continued to the present day. The administration of the now Protestant Dioceses of Schwerin and Ratzeburg was carried on by members of the ruling dynasty. The Mass, pilgrimages, vows of religion etc., were forbidden, and by a consistorial decree of 1570 the public profession of the Catholic Faith was prohibited.

After a brief reunion of the two principalities in 1610, they were again divided (1621) into Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Mecklenburg-Güstrow by John Albert's grandsons, Adolf Frederick I and John Albert II. They still retained, however, in common the diet (held now in Sternberg and now in Malchow), the University of Rostock, and the consistory. During the Thirty Years' War both dukes formed a brief alliance with King Christian IV of Denmark. For this they were placed under a ban by the Emperor Ferdinand IV in 1628, and their territories, from which they were expelled, were granted to Wallenstein in 1629 as an imperial fief. In 1631 Gustavus Adolphus restored them their lands, and in 1635, after the fall of Wallenstein, they were again recognized by the emperor. During the war Mecklenburg suffered terribly from the oppression of both the Swedish and the imperial forces, and also from pestilence and famine. The Peace of Westphalia (1648) assigned the Dioceses of Schwerin and Ratzeburg as principalities to Schwerin, in return for which the city of Wismar and the districts of Poel and Neukloster were yielded to Sweden. Adolf Frederick I was succeeded in Mecklenburg-Schwerin by Christian Ludwig (1658–92), who, both before and after his succession, lived mainly at Paris, where he became a Catholic in 1663. Though this step opened Mecklenburg once more to Catholics (see below), it gave them no secure legal footing even in Schwerin, while in Mecklenburg-Güstrow the most bitter intolerance of everything Catholic continued to prevail.

When Christian Ludwig I died childless in 1692, his nephew Frederick William laid claim to the succession, and was opposed by Adolf Frederick II of Strelitz, the only brother of Christian then living. After a long dispute, the Hamburg Compact was made in 1701, through the mediation of the Emperor Leopold. Adolf Frederick II received the Principality of Ratzeburg, and other territories; the remaining territory (by far the greater part) was given to Frederick William. As the latter selected Schwerin for his residence, and Adolf Frederick Strelitz, the two ruling houses have since always been distinguished as Mecklenburg-Schwerin and Mecklenburg-Strelitz.

In Mecklenburg-Schwerin Frederick William and his successor Charles Leopold had to contend with the estates, especially with the landed proprietors (*Ritterschaft*), who since the Thirty Years' War had secured the farms of most of the peasants for themselves, and by oppression had forced the peasants into serfdom. With the aid of Russia the duke drove the estates out of the country. These applied to the Emperor Charles VI for help; after the Russians withdrew, an imperial commission with an army to execute its demands entered the country, and the duke was forced in 1719 to flee. For many years war was waged in Mecklenburg between the imperial army and the duke, who was supported by Prussia and other powers. The ruler and the estates, in the reign of Charles Leopold's successor Christian Ludwig II (1747–56), finally came to an agreement in 1755; this compact, still essentially the basis of the constitution of the country, gave the estates a large share in the enactment of laws and extensive rights in the voting of supplies. By this agreement feudalism won a complete victory over the power of the prince, in contrast to most of the other divisions of Germany, where at that era the absolutism of the ruler had retained its supremacy.

Christian Ludwig II's son Frederick (1756–85) improved the primary schools, strengthened the University of Rostock, founded the high school at Bützow, and by the Peace of Teschen obtained the *Privilegium de non appellando* (i. e., there could be no appeal to the imperial courts), against which the landed proprietors vehemently protested. In 1803 his nephew, Frederick Francis I (1785–1835) received the city of Wismar and the counties of Neukloster from Sweden as pledges for a loan of 1,250,000 talers (approximately $937,500); in 1903 Sweden finally relinquished its right of redemption. At the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire in 1806, the two dukes became independent sovereigns. In 1808 both princes entered the Confederation of the Rhine, but joined the Allies opposed to Napoleon in good time in 1813; in 1815 both took the title of grand duke and entered the German Confederation.

The movement of 1848 spread rapidly in both grand duchies, especially in the cities. A proclamation of 23 March, 1848, of Archduke Frederick Francis I of Mecklenburg-Schwerin (1842–83) acknowledged the necessity of a reform in the constitution—an example followed by Duke George of Strelitz (1816–60). An extraordinary diet (1848–9) drew up a liberal constitution, to which the Grand Duke of Schwerin swore in August, 1849, but against which the Grand Duke of Strelitz, the agnates of both houses, and also Prussia, on account of its rights of inheritance of 1442, protested. In September, 1850, a court of arbitration of the German Confederation decided in favour of the claimants, and on 14 September the Grand Duke of Schwerin annulled the new constitution and the old, semi-feudal constitution came again into force. In the war of 1866 both princes sided with Prussia against Austria; on 21 August of the same year they signed the Prussian draft of the North German Confederation, and in 1867 joined this confederacy. In 1866 both states became members of the Customs Union, and in 1871 they became constituent parts of the German Empire. Since their union with the German Empire in 1871, unceasing efforts have been made for a reasonable reform of their obsolete constitution, which is no longer in accord with the new empire. So far all attempts have failed, owing to the opposition of the estates, especially of the landed proprietors (*Ritterschaft*) who have held to their privileges with unusual obstinacy. The present Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin is Frederick Francis IV, succeeded 1897; the Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz is Adolf Frederick V, succeeded 1904.

Statistics.—Mecklenburg-Schwerin has an area of about 5068 sq. miles. In 1905 it had 625,045 inhabitants, of whom 609,914 were Lutherans, 12,835 Catholics, and 1482 Jews. Mecklenburg-Strelitz has an area of about 1131 sq. miles. In 1905 it had 103,451 inhabitants, of whom 100,314 were Lutherans, 2627 Catholics, and 298 Jews. Both grand duchies are hereditary monarchies; from 1523 they have had a common assembly or diet made up of the landed proprietors (*Ritterschaft*), and the burgomasters of specified towns (*Landschaft*). The *Ritterschaft* consists of about 750 owners, whether noble or not, of about 1200 landed properties which carry with them the right to a vote in the assembly. The *Landschaft* is composed of the burgomasters of the cities of Rostock and Wismar, and the municipal authorities of the forty inland cities of Schwerin and the seven inland cities of Strelitz. The principality of Ratzeburg, which has an assembly of estates of its own, is not represented in the general estates, neither are the city of Neustrelitz, nor the inhabitants of the crown domain (*domanium*), that is, the land personally owned by the ruler, in which he is still absolute

sovereign in making laws and levying taxes. The crown domain includes about 43 per cent of the area and about 32 per cent of the inhabitants. The estates have an important share in legislation and a deciding vote in questions of taxation, and in all questions pertaining to their rights; in other matters their opinion has to be obtained.

The Lutheran Church has a consistorial constitution. The head of the church is the sovereign, who exercises his rights in Mecklenburg-Schwerin by means of an upper consistory; in Mecklenburg-Strelitz by a consistory. Mecklenburg-Schwerin is divided into 7 superintendencies and 36 provostships or deaneries; Mecklenburg-Strelitz into 1 superintendency and 7 synods.

The Catholic Church in both grand duchies is under the supervision of the Vicar Apostolic of the Northern Missions, the Bishop of Osnabrück. After the Reformation Catholicism was almost extinguished in Mecklenburg, and its public exercise threatened with punishment. For nearly a hundred years it could only be practised in secret. The conversion of Duke Christian Ludwig I in 1663 produced the first change of conditions. Notwithstanding the protests of his ducal brothers and the estates, he called Catholic priests into the country and granted them the castle chapel at Schwerin for the celebration of Mass. The right to do this was confirmed to him in 1666 by the imperial Diet. Many of the chief nobility followed, at that time, the example of their ruler, and returned to the Church of their forefathers, as the hereditary Marshal Joachim Christian Hahn, of the same family as that from which the convert Ida, Countess Hahn-Hahn, came.

The Catholic Faith, notwithstanding this, did not attain a legal position, and the duke never permitted a Catholic church to be built, although the Vicar Apostolic of the Northern Missions, Nicholas Steno, who lived in Schwerin from 1685, made every exertion to gain his consent. Consequently, when Christian Ludwig died the Catholic services ceased. The only church services now allowed were held in the private chapel of the chancellor of the next duke, Count Horn, who had become a Catholic. With the death of the count this privilege expired. It was not until 1701 that the free exercise of the Catholic religion was again permitted, this time in the chapel of the imperial ambassador von Egk. In 1702, when the ambassador left Schwerin, Duke Frederick William transferred this right to a Catholic lady, Frau von Bibow. Through her efforts the Jesuits were entrusted with the mission in Schwerin; from 1709 they established themselves here permanently. Father von Stöcken (1730–43) was able to bring it about that in 1731 a house was secured for the mission, and that the church service, which up to then had been private, could be a public one. He also succeeded by unwearied effort in founding a school at Schwerin, where five to seven boys could be prepared for the Collegium Nordicum at Linz in Upper Austria.

From 1764 a priest from Schwerin was able to distribute communion to the Catholic soldiers at Rostock in the hall of the exchange, and to hold Mass for Catholics who attended the market there at Pentecost. Although Christian Ludwig II had granted permission for the building of a church, Frederick, who inclined to a rigorous pietism, forbade its erection. The preparatory school at Schwerin came to an end when the Emperor Joseph II suppressed the Collegium Nordicum. Frederick Francis I, two of whose children became Catholics, gave the money to build the Catholic church at Ludwigslust. On entering the Confederation of the Rhine, Frederick had agreed to place the exercise of the Catholic religion on a legal parity with that of the Lutheran, and in 1811 this was done.

From that time on the Catholics in reality enjoyed complete freedom, and in the year 1842 for the first time since the Reformation a Catholic bishop, Lüpcke of Osnabrück, was able to hold a confirmation at Schwerin. However, the conversion, from 1848 onwards, of many important men, among them von Vogelsang, von Bülow, von der Kettenburg, Professor Maassen, etc., gave an opportunity to the intolerant party to withdraw the freedom granted the Catholics, to which action both estates and Government gave their aid. In 1852 extension to other localities of the Catholic services was forbidden, also the coming into Mecklenburg of priests not natives of the country; these measures were so strictly enforced that the private chaplain of Herr von der Kettenburg was taken over the boundary by gendarmes.

In 1857 permission to bury the dead according to the Catholic ceremonial, and the right to celebrate Mass publicly were limited to Schwerin and Ludwigslust. The Government of Mecklenburg-Strelitz was still more intolerant. For many years, even in the nineteenth century, no priest was permitted to have a permanent residence in its territory; all that was conceded was that the Catholic priest at Wittstock in Brandenburg could stay at Neustrelitz one week of each month for ecclesiastical functions. This persecution of Catholics was kept up, not by the rulers, who were generally well inclined, but by the narrow-minded estates. Public opinion, even outside of Catholic Germany, repeatedly arose against this persecution, and was often expressed in sharp protest in the German Diet.

The Governments of the two duchies were finally forced by pressure from the empire to grant the Catholics a certain, yet still entirely insufficient, amount of freedom. There is however no equality as there should be to bring Mecklenburg into accord with the constitution of the empire or with a modern civilized state. Although an ordinance of 5 January, 1903 granted to Catholics the public exercise of their religion everywhere, nevertheless the permission of the ruler is necessary for the erection and alteration of parishes, the building of churches and chapels, appointment of priests, for the settling in the country of orders and congregations, and for the holding of processions; nor have the Catholics any legal redress if this consent is refused.

Furthermore in regard to educational matters, Catholics are not on an equality with Protestants. They must indeed contribute to the expenses of the schools, but for their purely private Catholic schools they receive no allowance from the civil communes, often indeed they are not allowed to use the state schools for giving instruction. There is no higher Catholic education in either grand duchy. Mecklenburg-Schwerin has two Catholic parishes, one each at Schwerin and Ludwigslust, and dependent churches at Rostock and Wismar; the priests altogether number 8. Mecklenburg-Strelitz has 1 parish with 2 priests. The spiritual care of the summer farm-labourers presents great difficulties. These men, who number about 20,000–22,000 and are chiefly Poles, sojourn in Mecklenburg annually from March until September in order to work on the farms and estates.

BACHMANN, *Die landeskundliche Literatur über die Grossherzogtümer Mecklenburg* (Wismar, 1890); LISCH, *Mecklenburger Urkunden* (3 vols., Schwerin, 1837–41); WIGGERS, *Kirchengeschichte Mecklenburgs* (Parchim and Ludwigslust, 1840); *Mecklenburger Urkundenbuch* (22 vols., Schwerin, 1863–1907); BOLL, *Geschichte Mecklenburgs* (2 pts., Neubrandenburg, 1855–56); PENTZ, *Geschichte Mecklenburgs* (2 pts., Wismar, 1872); LESKER, *Aus Mecklenburgs Vergangenheit* (Ratisbon, 1880); RAABE, *Mecklenburgische Vaterlandskunde* (2nd ed., 3 vols., 1893–96); *Mecklenburgische Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen* (12 pts., Berlin, 1899–1910); SCHMIDT, *Mecklenburgisches Kirchenrecht* (Berlin, 1908); SCHLESINGER, *Staats- und Verwaltungsrecht des Grossherzogtums Mecklenburg-Schwerin* (Hanover, 1909); BRUNSWIG, *Staats- und Verwaltungsrecht des Grossherzogtums Mecklenburg-Strelitz* (Hanover, 1910); WITTE, *Mecklenburgische Geschichte* (Wismar, 1909); SCHNELL, *Das Unterrichtswesen der Grossherzogtümer Mecklenburg-Schwerin und Mecklenburg-Strelitz* (3 vols.,

Berlin, 1907–10); *Jahrbücher des Vereins für Geschichte Mecklenburgs* (Schwerin, 1836—); SCHLIS, *Die Kunst- und Geschichtsdenkmäler des Grossherzogtums Mecklenburg-Schwerin* (5 vols., Schwerin, 1896–1902).

JOSEPH LINS.

Medaille, JEAN-PAUL, Jesuit missionary; b. at Carcassonne, the capital of the Department of Aude, France, 29 January, 1618; d. at Auch, the capital of the Department of Gers, France, 15 May, 1689. He entered the Society of Jesus, 15 August, 1640, and after completing his studies spent a number of years in the classroom, teaching both the lower and higher studies of the college courses and particularly, for the space of six years, philosophy. Later he was applied to the work of preaching, which may be regarded as his life work; to this he gave himself up almost exclusively for eighteen years, until advancing age and the infirmities brought on by his laborious and austere life forced him to devote himself to the less fatiguing work of directing sodalities and of hearing confessions, especially of the poor. He was one of the number of illustrious missioners formed in the school of St. Francis Regis of the Society of Jesus, and spent the best years of his life in the evangelization of Velay, Auvergne, Languedoc, and Aveyron. His apostolic labours were attended with greater and more lasting fruit, because he established wherever he preached fervent sodalities of men and women who, by all sorts of works of charity, such as instructing children, visiting the sick, helping the poor, perpetuated and extended the fruits of his missions. These pious sodalities, however, lacked certain elements which Father Medaille regarded as necessary for the stability of his work. Their members, although devoted, were hampered in many ways and by many ties in the exercise of their zeal. Father Medaille resolved, therefore, to start a congregation of nuns who should give themselves up wholly and unreservedly to all the spiritual and corporal works of mercy. Having matured his plans, he laid them before Mgr de Maupas, who gave them his fullest approval. Shortly after, Father Medaille founded the Congregation of the Sisters of St. Joseph. The general idea of the congregation was drawn, at least to a certain extent, from the works of St. Francis de Sales, but the details of its practical development were based almost entirely on the constitutions of the Society of Jesus. It is as the founder of this congregation that Father Medaille is best known. His active life left him no time for writing; consequently we have nothing from his pen, aside from some correspondence, except the "Constitutions pour la Congrégation des Sœurs de Saint-Joseph". These constitutions have been incorrectly attributed to Father Peter Medaille, S.J. It is true that Father Peter Medaille contributed much in later years to the establishment on a firm basis and to the spread of the congregation, but at the time of its foundation he was still a novice and had neither the experience nor the authority necessary for so responsible a work.

PRAT, *Le Disciple de St. Jean François Regis, notes supplémentaires* (Paris, 1850), 180 sq.; DE GUILHERMY, *Ménologe de la Comp. de Jésus, Assistance de France*, I (Paris, 1892), 631 sq.

J. H. FISHER.

Medals, DEVOTIONAL.—A medal may be defined to be a piece of metal, usually in the form of a coin, not used as money, but struck or cast for a commemorative purpose, and adorned with some appropriate effigy, device, or inscription. In the present article we are concerned only with religious medals. These are more varied even than secular medals, for they are produced not only to commemorate persons (e. g. Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints), places (e. g. famous shrines) and past historical events (e. g. dogmatic definitions, miracles, dedications, etc.), as well as personal graces like First Communion, Ordination, etc., but they are also often concerned with the order of ideas (e. g. they may recall the mysteries of our Faith, such as the Blessed Sacrament or the Divine Attributes), they are used to inculcate lessons of piety, are specially blessed to serve as badges of pious associations or to consecrate and protect the wearer, and finally are often enriched with indulgences.

IN THE EARLY CHURCH.—It was at one time doubted whether anything in the nature of a purely devotional medal was known in the early ages of Christianity. Certain objects of this kind were described and figured by seventeenth-century writers on the Catacombs, and a few such were preserved in museums. All these, however, were regarded with much suspicion before the appearance of an epoch-making article by de Rossi in the "Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana" for 1869, since which time the question has been practically set at rest and the authenticity of some at least of these specimens has remained undisputed. A moment's consideration will establish the intrinsic probability of the existence of such objects. The use of amulets in pagan antiquity

IVORY MEDALLION FOUND AT AKHMIM
From Forrer, "Die frühchristlichen Altertum aus Ackmin"

was widespread. The word *amuletum* itself occurs in Pliny, and many monuments show how talismans of this kind were worn around the neck by all classes. That the early Church should have found the abuse ineradicable and should have striven to counteract it by suggesting or tolerating some analogous practice of an innocent character, is in itself highly probable. Many parallel concessions of this kind might be quoted. The letter of Gregory the Great to St. Mellitus about the dedication of pagan temples, preserved to us by Bede (Hist. Eccl., I, xxx), supplies perhaps the most famous example. Moreover we know that the same St. Gregory sent to Theodolind, Queen of the Lombards, two phylacteria—the cases are still preserved at Monza—containing a relic of the True Cross and a sentence from the Gospels, which her child Adulovald was to wear around his neck.

This, however, and the practice of wearing "encolpia", little pectoral crosses, lent itself to abuses when magical formulæ began to be joined to Christian symbols, as was regularly the practice of the Gnostics. Hence we find many of the Fathers of the fourth and later centuries protesting more or less vigorously against these phylacteries (cf. St. Jerome, "In Matt.", iv, 33; P. L., XXVI, 174). But that Christians of good name did wear such objects of piety round their necks is certain, and it is consequently probable that tokens bearing various Christian devices, should have been cast in metal for a similar purpose. In Africa (see "Bullettino di Arch. Crist.", 1891), the moulds have been found in which little crosses were cast with rings to hang them by. It follows therefore that certain coin-like objects, for which there exists good evidence of their being actually discovered in the Catacombs, must be regarded as genuine relics of the devotional practices of the early Church. Two or three of these are specially famous. One, which de Rossi attributes to the close of the fourth century, bears upon

both faces the legend SUCCESSA VIVAS, an "acclamation" which probably indicates that the medal was cast for a certain Successa to commemorate, perhaps, her dedication to God. On one side we see represented the martyrdom of a saint, presumably St. Lawrence, who is being roasted upon a gridiron in the presence of the Roman magistrate. The Christian character of the scene is shown by the chrisma, ☧ the A and Ω, and the martyr's crown. On the reverse is depicted a cancellated structure, no doubt the tomb of St. Lawrence, while a figure stands in a reverent attitude before it holding aloft a candle.

A second remarkable medal, which bears the name of GAUDENTIANUS on the obverse and URBICUS on the reverse, depicts seemingly on one face the sacrifice of Abraham; on the other we see apparently a shrine or altar, above which three candles are burning, towards which a tall figure carrying a chalice in one hand is conducting a little child. The scene no doubt represents the consecration to God of the child as an *oblate* (q. v.) by his father before the shrine of some martyr, a custom for which there is a good deal of early evidence. Other medals are much more simple, bearing only the chrisma with a name or perhaps a cross. Others impressed with more complicated devices can only be dated with difficulty, and some are either spurious, or, as in the case particularly of some representations of the adoration of the Magi which seem to show strong traces of Byzantine influence, they belong to a much later epoch. Some of the medals or medallions reputedly Christian are stamped upon one side only, and of this class is a famous bronze medallion of very artistic execution discovered by Boldeti in the cemetery of Domitilla and now preserved in the Vatican Library. It bears two portrait types of the heads of the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul, and is assigned by de Rossi to the second century. Other medallions with the (confronted) heads of the two apostles are also known and a lively controversy largely based on these medallic materials has been carried on regarding the probability of their having preserved the tradition of an authentic likeness. (See particularly Weis-Liebersdorf, "Christus und Apostelbilder", pp. 83 sq.). Certain supposed early medals with the head of our Saviour are distinctly open to suspicion.

LEAD MEDAL
From "Bullettino di archeologia cristiana"

How far the use of such medals of devotion extended in the early Church, it is not easy to decide. One or two passages in the works of St. Zeno of Verona have suggested that a medal of this kind was commonly given as a memorial of baptism, but the point is doubtful. In the life of St. Geneviève, which, despite the opinion of B. Krusch, is of early date, we read that St. Germanus of Auxerre hung around her neck a perforated bronze coin marked with the sign of the cross, in memory of her having consecrated her virginity to God (Mon. Ger. Hist.: Script. Merov., III, 217). The language seems to suggest that an ordinary coin was bored for the purpose, and when we recall how many of the coins of the late empire were stamped with the chrisma or with the figure of the Saviour, it is easy to believe that the ordinary currency may often have been used for similar pious purposes.

DURING THE MIDDLE AGES.— Although it is probable that the traditions formed by the class of objects which we have been considering, and which were equally familiar at Rome and at Constantinople, never entirely died out, still little evidence exists of the use of medals in the Middle Ages. No traces of such objects survive remarkable either for artistic skill or for the value of the metal, and to speak positively of the date of certain objects of lead and pewter which may have been hung round the neck with a religious intent, is not always easy. But in the course of the twelfth century, if not earlier, a very general practice grew up at well-known places of pilgrimage, of casting tokens in lead, and sometimes probably in other metals, which served the pilgrim as a souvenir and stimulus to devotion and at the same time attested the fact that he had duly reached his destination. These signacula (*enseignes*) known in English as "pilgrims' signs" often took a medallic form and were carried in a conspicuous way upon the hat or breast. Giraldus Cambrensis referring to a journey he made to Canterbury about the year 1180, ten years after the martyrdom of St. Thomas, describes himself and his companions returning to London "cum signaculis Beati Thomæ a collo suspensis" [with the tokens of St. Thomas hanging round their neck] (Opera, Rolls Series, I, p. 53). Again the author of Piers the Plowman writes of his imaginary pilgrim:

An hundred of ampulles on his hat seten,
Signes of syse and shelles of Galice;
And many a crouche on his cloke, and keyes of Rome,
And the vernicle bifore, for men shulde knowe
And see by his signes whom he sought hadde.

The "ampulles" probably represent Canterbury, but may have been tokens of the Holy Tear of Vendôme (see Forgeais, "Collection", IV, 65 sq.); Syse stands for Assisi. The "shelles of Galice", i. e. the scallop-shells of St. James of Compostella; the crouche, or cross, of the Holy Land; the keys of St. Peter; the "vernicle", or figure of the Veronica, etc. are all very familiar types, represented in most collections of such objects. The privilege of casting and selling these pilgrim's signs was a very valuable one and became a regular source of income at most places of religious resort.

Then, as maner and custom is, signes there they bought . . .

Each man set his silver in such thing as he liked,

writes a fourteenth-century satirist of one of these shrines. Moreover we find that the custom was firmly established in Rome itself, and Pope Innocent III, by a letter of 18 Jan., 1200 (Potthast, "Regesta", n. 939), grants to the canons of St. Peter's the monopoly of casting and selling those "signs of lead or pewter impressed with the image of the Apostles Peter and



MEDAL OF GAUDENTIANUS
From "Bullettino di archeologia cristiana"

Paul with which those who visit their thresholds [*limina*] adorn themselves for the increase of their own devotion and in testimony of the journey which they have accomplished", and the pope's language implies that this custom had existed for some time. In form and fashion these pilgrims' signs are very various and a considerable literature exists upon the subject (see especially the work of Forgeais, "Collection de Plombs historiés", 5 vols., Paris, 1864). From about the twelfth century the casting of these devotional objects continued until the close of the Middle Ages

and even later, but in the sixteenth or seventeenth century they began to be replaced by medals properly so called in bronze or in silver, often with much greater pretensions to artistic execution. With these leaden signs should be noted the custom of casting coin-like tokens in connexion with the Feast of Fools (q. v.), the celebration of the Boy Bishop and the Innocents. The extant specimens belong mostly to the sixteenth century, but the practice must be much older. Though there is often a burlesque element introduced, the legends and devices shown by such pieces are nearly all religious; e. g., EX ORE INFANCIUM PERFECISTI LAUDEM; INNOCENS VOUS AIDERA, etc. (see Vanhende, "Plommés des Innocents," Lille, 1877).

Better deserving of attention are the vast collection of *jetons* and *méreaux* which, beginning in the thirteenth century, continued to be produced all through the Middle Ages and lasted on in some places down to the French Revolution. The jetons were strictly speaking counters, i. e., they were thin pieces of metal, mostly latten, a sort of brass, stamped on both sides with some device and originally used in conjunction with a *comptoir* (i. e., an abacus or counting board) to perform arithmetical computations. The name comes from *jeter*, through the form *jectoir*, because they were "thrown down" upon this board (see Rondot, "Médailleurs Français", Paris, 1904, p. 48). It soon became the fashion for every personage of distinction, especially those who had anything to do with finance, to have special jetons bearing his own device, and upon some of these considerable artistic skill was lavished. These pieces served various purposes besides that for which they were originally designed, and they were often used in the Middle Ages where we should now use a ticket or printed card. As might be expected, they tended to take a religious tone. Upon nearly half the medieval jetons which survive, pious mottoes are found and often pious devices (Rouyer, "Histoire du Jeton", p. 30). Among the commonest of these mottoes, which however vary infinitely, we might name AVE MARIA GRATIA PLENA; AMES DIEU ET LO (i. e. aimez dieu et louez le); IHS SON GRE SOIT FAIT CI; VIRGO MATER ECCLESIE ETERNE PORTA; DOMINE DOMINUS NOSTER, etc. Often these jetons were given as presents or "pièces de plaisir" especially to persons of high consideration, and on such occasions they were often specially struck in gold or silver. One particular and very common use of jetons was to serve as vouchers for attendance at the cathedral offices and meetings of various kinds. In this case they often carried with them a title to certain rations or payments of money, the amount being sometimes stamped on the piece. The tokens thus used were known as *jetons de présence* or *méreaux*, and they were largely used, especially at a somewhat later date, to secure the due attendance of the canons at the cathedral offices, etc. What, however, specially justifies their mention in the present place is the fact that in many cases the pious device they bore was as much or even more considered than the use to which they were put, and they seem to have discharged a function analogous to the Child-of-Mary medals, the scapulars, the badges and even the pious pictures of our own day. One famous example is the "méreau d'estaing" bearing stamped upon it the name of Jesus, which the famous Frère Richard, whose name is closely if not too creditably associated with the history of Blessed Joan of Arc, distributed to his followers in Paris, 1429 (see Rouyer, "Le Nom de Jésus" in "Revue Belge de Numis.", 1896–7). These jetons stamped with the IHS, which is only another way of writing the Holy Name, were very numerous and were probably closely connected with the apostolate of St. Bernardine of Siena. Finally it is to be noted that for the purpose of largess at royal coronations or for the Maundy, pieces were often struck which perhaps are rather to be regarded as medals than actual money (see Mazerolle, "Les Médailleurs Français", 1902–1904, vol. I, page lii).

IN MODERN TIMES.—Although roughly speaking it is correct to say that medals were unknown in the Middle Ages, still their introduction belongs to the early Renaissance period, and it is only when we consider them as a form of popular devotion that we can describe them as of post-Reformation origin. Medals properly so called, i. e. pieces of metal struck or cast with a commemorative purpose, began, though there are only a few rare specimens, in the last years of the fourteenth century (Rondot, loc. cit., 60–62). The first certainly known medal was struck for Francesco Carrara (Novello) on the occasion of the capture of Padua in 1390, but practically the vogue of this form of art was created by Vittore Pisano, called Pisanello



MEDALLION OF ENAMEL PASTE AND COLOURED BONE
From Armellini, "Il cimitero di Santa Agnese"

(c. 1380–1451), and its first developments were all Italian. These early Renaissance medals, magnificent as they are, belong to civil life and only touch upon our immediate subject, but though not religious in intent many of them possess a strong religious colouring. Nothing more devotional could be imagined than the beautiful reverse of Pisano's medal of Malatesta Novello, where the mail-clad warrior dismounting from his horse is represented as kneeling before the crucifix. So again the large medal, in the British Museum, of Savonarola holding the crucifix, probably executed by Andrea della Robbia, portrays with rare fidelity "his deep-set glowing eye, his bony cheeks, the strong nose and protruding lips" (Fabriczy, "Italian Medals", p. 133), while the reverse displays the avenging sword of God and the Holy Ghost hovering over the doomed city of Florence. Wonderful again in their religious feeling are Antonio Marescotti's (c. 1453) superb medals of San Bernardino da Siena, while among the series of early papal medals we have such masterpieces as the portrait of Sixtus IV by Andrea Guazzalotti (1435–95).

But it was long before this new art made its influence so far widely felt as to bring metal representations of saints and shrines, of mysteries and miracles, together with emblems and devices of all kinds, in a cheap form into the hands of the people. Undoubtedly the gradual substitution of more artistic bronze and silver medals for the rude pilgrim's signs at such great sanctuaries as Loreto or St. Peter's, did much to help on the general acceptance of medals as objects of devotion. Again the papal jubilee medals, which certainly began as early as 1475, and which from the nature of the case were carried into all parts of the world, must have helped to make the idea familiar. But this was not all. At some time during the sixteenth century the practice was adopted, possibly

following an usage long previously in vogue in the case of Agnus Deis (q. v.), of giving a papal blessing to medals and even of enriching them with indulgences. On the other hand it is noteworthy that among the benediction-forms of the Middle Ages no single example is found of a blessing for *numismata*. A pilgrim's "insignia" were often blessed no doubt, but by this term were only meant his scrip and staff (see Franz, "Kirchlichen Benedictionen im Mittelalter", II, 271–89), not the leaden tokens spoken of above. The story runs that the use of blessed medals began with the revolt of the Gueux in Flanders, A. D. 1566. A certain medal or rather set of medals bearing on the obverse the head of Philip II with the motto EN TOUT FIDELES AU ROI and on the reverse a beggar's wallet and the words JUSQUE A PORTER LA BESACE, was used by the Gueux faction as a badge. To this the Spaniards replied by striking a medal with the head of our Saviour and on the reverse the image of our Lady of Hal, and Pius V granted an indulgence to those who wore this medal in their hats (Simonis, "Art du Médailleur en Belgique", 1904, II, pp. 76–80).

From this the custom of blessing and indulgencing medals is said to have rapidly extended under the sanction of the popes. Certain it is that Sixtus V attached indulgences to some ancient coins discovered in the foundations of the buildings at the Scala Santa, which coins he caused to be richly mounted and sent to persons of distinction. Thus encouraged, and stimulated further by the vogue of the jubilee and other papal medals of which we have still to speak, the use of these devotional objects spread to every part of the world. Austria and Bohemia seem to have taken the lead in introducing the fashion into central Europe, and some exceptionally fine specimens were produced under the inspiration of the Italian artists whom the Emperor Maximilian invited to his court. Some of the religious medals cast by Antonio Abondio and his pupils at Vienna are of the highest order of excellence. But in the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries almost every considerable city in Catholic Europe came to have craftsmen of its own who followed the industry, and the tradition created by such Italian artists as Lesne Leoni at Brussels, with men like Jonghelinck and Stephen of Holland for his pupils, and by John de Candida, Nicholas of Florence and Benvenuto Cellini in France, was bound to have lasting effects.

The number and variety of the religious pieces produced at a later date, as Domanig (Die deutsche Privat-Medaille, p. 29) is fain to attest, defies all classification. Only one writer, the Benedictine L. Kuncze (in his "Systematik der Weihmünzen", Raab, 1885), seems to have seriously grappled with the task, and his success is very moderate. As an indication of the vast complexity of the subject, we may note that in the thirty-first of his fifty divisions, the section devoted to medals commemorative of churches and sanctuaries of the Blessed Virgin, he enumerates over 700 such shrines of which he has found some record—the number is probably immensely greater—while in connexion with the majority of these, special medals have at some time been struck, often, e. g. at Loreto, in an almost endless series. Under these circumstances, all that can be done is to point out a few illustrative groups rather apart from the common run of pious medals; those connected with places, confraternities, religious orders, saints, mysteries, miracles, devotions, &c., are types with which everyone is familiar.

(1) *Plague medals* struck and blessed as a protection against pestilence. The subjects are very various; e. g., the figure of St. Sebastian and St. Roch, and different shrines of the Blessed Virgin, often also with a view of some particular city. Round them are commonly inscribed mysterious letters analogous to those depicted on the famous medal of St. Benedict (q. v.). For example †. z. †. D. I. A. etc. These letters stand for "Crux Christi salva nos"; "Zelus domus Dei libera me"; "Crux Christi vincit et regnat, per lignum crucis libera me Domine ab hac peste"; "Deus meus expelle pestem et libera me, etc.". (See Beierlein, "Münzer bayerischer Klöster", and the monographs devoted to this subject by Pfeiffer and Ruland, "Pestilentia in Nummis", Tübingen, 1882, and "Die deutschen Pestamulette", Leipzig, 1885.)

(2) *Medals commemorating Miracles of the Eucharist.*—There were a very large number of these struck for jubilees, centenaries, etc., in the different places where these miracles were believed to have happened, often adorned with very quaint devices. There is one, for example, commemorative of the miracle at Seefeld, upon which the story is depicted of a nobleman who demanded to receive a large host at communion like the priest's. The priest complies, but as a punishment for the nobleman's presumption the ground opens and swallows him up (see Pachinger, "Wallfahrts Medaillen der Tirol", Vienna, 1908).

(3) *Private medals.*—These form a very large class, but particular specimens are often extremely scarce, for they were struck to commemorate incidents in the life of individuals, and were only distributed to friends. Baptisms, marriages, first communions, deaths formed the principal occasions for striking these private medals. The baptismal or sponsor medals (*pathen medaillen*) are particularly interesting, and often contain precise details as to the hour of birth which would enable the child's horoscope to be calculated. (See Domanig, "Die deutsche Privat-Medaille", Vienna, 1893, 3, pp. 25–26.)

(4) *Medals commemorative of special legends.*—Of this class the famous Cross of St. Ulrich of Augsburg may serve as a specimen. A cross is supposed to have been brought by an angel to St. Ulrich that he might bear it in his hands in the great battle against the Huns, A. D. 955. Freisenegger in his monograph "Die Ulrichs-kreuze" (Augsburg, 1895), enumerates 180 types of this object of devotion, sometimes in cross, sometimes in medal form, often associated with the medal of St. Benedict.

Papal medals do not immediately belong to this place, for they are not precisely devotional in purpose, but a very large number of these pieces are ultimately associated with ecclesiastical functions of various kinds, and more particularly with the opening and closing of the Holy Door in the years of Jubilee. The series begins with the pontificate of Martin V, in 1417, and continues down to the present day. Some types professing to commemorate the acts of earlier popes, e. g. the Jubilee of Boniface VIII, are reconstructions (i. e. fabrications) of later date. Nearly all the most noteworthy actions of each pontificate for the last five hundred years have been commemorated by medals in this manner, and some of the most famous artists, such as Benvenuto Cellini, Caradosso, and others have been employed in designing them, The wonderful family of the Hamerani, who from 1605 down to about 1807 acted as papal medallists and supplied the greater proportion of that vast series, deserve to be specially mentioned for the uniform excellence of their work.

Other semi-devotional medals are those which have been struck by important religious associations, as for example by the Knights of Malta, by certain abbeys in commemoration of their abbots, or in connexion with particular orders of knighthood. On some of these series of medals useful monographs have been written, as for example the work of Canon H. C. Schembri, on "The Coins and Medals of the Knights of Malta", (London, 1908). It has been said above that Agnus Deis seem to have been blessed by the popes with more or less solemnity from an early period, and similar forms of benediction were used in connexion with the Golden Rose, the Sword and Cap, and other

objects given by the popes as presents. In the sixteenth century this practice was greatly developed. The custom grew up not only of bringing objects which had touched certain relics or shrines to the pope to be blessed, but also of the pontiff blessing rosaries, "grains", medals, etc., enriching them with indulgences and sending them, through his privileged missionaries or envoys, to be distributed to Catholics in England. On these occasions a paper of instructions was often drawn up, defining exactly the nature of these indulgences and the conditions on which they could be gained. Several papers of this kind—one in favour of Mary Queen of Scots (1576) and others for English Catholics north of the Alps—have been preserved, emanating from Gregory XIII. One is printed by Knox in the "Douay Diaries", p. 367. The "Apostolic Indulgences" (see INDULGENCES, APOSTOLIC) attached to medals, rosaries and similar objects by all priests duly authorized, are analogous to these. They are imparted by making a simple sign of the cross, but for certain other objects, e. g. the medal of St. Benedict (q. v.), more special faculties are required, and an elaborate form of benediction is provided. Quite recently Pius X has sanctioned the use of a blessed medal to be worn in place of the brown and other scapulars. The concession was originally made for the benefit of the native Christians in the missions of the Congo, but the Holy Father has expressed his readiness to grant to other priests who apply, the faculty of blessing medals which may be worn in place of the scapular (see "Le Canoniste Contemporain", Feb., 1910, p. 115).

Almost the only attempt at a systematic classification of devotional medals in general seems to have been made by KUNCZE, *Systematik der Weihmünzen* (Raab, 1885), but the work is neither scholarly nor scientific. Much more satisfactory in every way, so far as regards the limited ground covered, are the researches of PACHINGER, who has published a valuable series of studies on the *Wallfahrts-Bruderschafts- und Gnaden-Medaillen* of various districts. These are concerned with Bavaria (1904), Duchy of Austria (1904), Salzburg (1908), and the Tyrol (1909), with some other more general articles. Other miscellaneous works are CORBIERRE, *Numismatique Bénédictine* (Rome, s. d.); IDEM, *Numismatique et Iconographie mariale* (Rome, s. d.); BLANCHET, *Nouveau Manuel de Numismatique* (Paris, 1890); a series of articles by ROUYER (especially in 1896–97) and by DE WITTE (especially 1905–1910) in the *Revue Belge de Numismatique;* MIGNE, *Encyclopédie*, Series II, XXXII, *Numismatique* (Paris, 1850); MERZBACHER, *Katalog der Bayrischen Wallfahrts-Klöster- und Kirchen-Medaillen* (Munich, 1895); VON HOHENVEST, *Weihmünzen für Sammler* (Graz, 1893); this is a slender pamphlet on the classification of religious medals; SCHRATZ, *Die Denk- und Weihmünzen der ehemaligen bayerischen Nonnenklöster* (Brünn); IDEM, *Münzen auf den h. Wolfgang* (Brünn, 1890); BEIERLEIN, *Münzen der Bayerischen Klöster &c.* (Munich, 1857–1879).

Upon early Christian medals, see DE ROSSI's various articles in *Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana*, especially in 1869, 1871, and 1891; LECLERCQ in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne*, s. v. *Amulettes;* BABINGTON in *Dict. of Christ. Antig.*, s. v. *Money;* and HEUSER in the *Realencyclopädie f. christ. Altertums*, s. v. *Medaillen*, and various articles in the *Römische Quartalschrift*, particularly 1889. On the papal medals see particularly BONANNI, *Numismata Pontificum Romanorum* (2 vols., Rome, 1699); VENUTI, *Numismata Pontificum Romanorum præstantiora* (Rome, 1744).

Other works dealing with the general history of Medals in modern times, but which also have many notices to the students of religious medals, are FORRER, *Biographical Dictionary of Medallists* (London, 1904–1910); DOMANIG, *Die deutsche Medaille in Kunst und Kulturhistorischer Hinsicht* (Vienna, 1907), a work magnificently illustrated; HEISS, *Les Médailleurs de la Renaissance* (8 vols., Paris, 1881–1892), also finely illustrated; RONDOT, *Les Médailleurs et Graveurs de Monnaies en France* (Paris, 1904), with admirable illustrations. Several other works have been mentioned in the course of the article.

HERBERT THURSTON.

MIRACULOUS MEDAL.—The devotion commonly known as that of the Miraculous Medal owes its origin to Zoe Laboure, a member of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, known in religion as Sister Catherine, to whom the Blessed Virgin Mary appeared three separate times in the year 1830, at the motherhouse of the community at Paris. The first of these apparitions occurred 18 July, the second 27 November, and the third a short time later, in December. On the second occasion, Sister Catherine records that the Blessed Virgin appeared as if standing on a globe, and bearing a globe in her hands. As if from rings set with precious stones dazzling rays of light were emitted from her fingers. These, she said, were symbols of the graces which would be bestowed on all who asked for them. Sister Catherine adds that around the figure appeared an oval frame bearing in golden letters the words "O Mary, conceived without sin, pray for us who have recourse to thee"; on the back appeared the letter M, surmounted by a cross, with a crossbar beneath it, and under all the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, the former surrounded by a crown of thorns, and the latter pierced by a sword. At the second and third of these visions a command was given to have a medal struck after the model revealed, and a promise of great graces was made to those who wear it when blessed. After careful investigation, M. Aladel, the spiritual director of Sister Catherine, obtained the approval of Mgr de Quelen, Archbishop of Paris, and on 30 June, 1832, the first medals were struck, and with their distribution the devotion spread rapidly. One of the most remarkable facts recorded in connection with the Miraculous Medal is the conversion of a Jew, Alphonse Ratisbonne (q. v.) of Strasburg, who had resisted the appeals of a friend to enter the Church. M. Ratisbonne consented, somewhat reluctantly, to wear the medal, and being in Rome, he entered, by chance, the church of Sant' Andrea delle Fratte and beheld in a vision the Blessed Virgin exactly as she is represented on the medal; his conversion speedily followed. This fact has received ecclesiastical sanction, and is recorded in the office of the feast of the Miraculous Medal. In 1847, M. Etienne, superior-general of the Congregation of the Mission, obtained from Pope Pius IX the privilege of establishing in the schools of the Sisters of Charity a confraternity under the title of the Immaculate Conception, with all the indulgences attached to a similar society established for its students at Rome by the Society of Jesus. This confraternity adopted the Miraculous Medal as its badge, and the members, known as the Children of Mary, wear it attached to a blue ribbon. On 23 July, 1894, Pope Leo XIII, after a careful examination of all the facts by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, instituted a feast, with a special Office and Mass, of the Manifestation of the Immaculate Virgin under the title of the Miraculous Medal, to be celebrated yearly on 27 November by the Priests of the Congregation of the Mission, under the rite of a double of the second class. For ordinaries and religious communities who may ask the privilege of celebrating the festival, its rank is to be that of a double major feast. A further decree, dated 7 September, 1894, permits any priest to say the Mass proper to the feast in any chapel attached to a house of the Sisters of Charity.

JOSEPH GLASS.

Medardus, SAINT, Bishop of Noyon, b. at Salency (Oise) about 456; d. in his episcopal city 8 June, about 545. His father, Nectardus, was of Frankish origin, while his mother, named Protagia, was Gallo-Roman. It is believed that St. Gildardus, Bishop of Rouen, was his brother. His youth was entirely consecrated to the practise of Christian virtues and to the study of sacred and profane letters. He often accompanied his father on business to Vermand and to Tournai, and frequented the schools, carefully avoiding all worldly dissipation. His exemplary piety and his knowledge, considerable for that time, decided the Bishop of Vermand (d. 530) to confer on him Holy Orders, and caused him to be chosen as his successor. Forced, in spite of his objections, to accept this heavy charge, he devoted himself zealously to his new duties, and to accomplish them in greater security, since Vermand and the northern part of France in general were then generally troubled by wars and

exposed to the incursions of the barbarians, he removed his episcopal see in 531 from Vermand, a little city without defence, to Noyon, the strongest place in that region. The year following, St. Eleutherius, Bishop of Tournai, having died, St. Medardus was invited to assume the direction of that diocese also. He refused at first, but being urged by Clotaire himself he at last accepted. This union of the two dioceses lasted until 1146, when they were again separated. Clotaire, who had paid him a last visit at Noyon, had his body transferred to the royal manor of Crouy at the gates of the city of Soissons. Over the tomb of St. Medardus was erected the celebrated Benedictine abbey which bears his name. St. Medardus was one of the most honoured bishops of his time, his memory has always been popularly venerated in the north of France, and he soon became the hero of numerous legends. The Church celebrates his feast on 8 June.

BARONIUS, *Ann.* (1597), 527, 80; 564, 31–4; BÉCU, *Dissert. sur quelques dates et quelques faits contestés de la vie de St. Médard* in *Com. Arch. de Noyon, compt. rend. et mém.*, II (1867), 307–20; CHIFFLETIUS in *Acta SS.*, June, II, 95–105; CORBLET, *Notice historique sur le culte de St. Médard* in *Bull. de la Soc. des ant. de Picardie* (Amiens, 1856); CORBLET, *Hagiogr. du diocèse d'Amiens*, IV (1874), 524–31; GUÉNEBAULT in *Rev. archéol*, XIII (Paris, 1857), 557–62; LEFÉBURE, *Saint Médard* (Paris, 1864); MAITRE, *Le culte de S. Médard dans le diocèse de Nantes* in *Ann. de Bretagne* (1900), XV, 292–8; SURIUS, *De vit. SS.*, III (Venice, 1551), 177–181.

LÉON CLUGNET.



CANONS OF EUSEBIUS
Evangeliarium of St-Medard of Soissons (fol. 11 recto), Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

Medea, a titular see of Thrace, suffragan of Heraclea. This name and the modern name (Midieh) are derived from the ancient Salmydessos or Almydessos. Herodotus (IV, 93) says that the inhabitants yielded to Darius after some resistance; Xenophon and his companions in arms subjugated it with much difficulty (Anab., VII, 5, 12). The city is also mentioned by Sophocles (Antig., 969), by Æschylus (Prom., 726), who places it wrongly in Asia, Diodorus Siculus (XIV, 37), Strabo (VII, vi, 1; XII, iii, 3; I, iii, 4, 7), Ptolemy (VII, xi, etc.), who all agree in locating its harbour on the Black Sea and very much exposed to the winds; moreover the shore was sandy and unfavourable for navigation. Theophanes (Chronogr., an. m. 6255) mentions it under the name Μήδεια in the year 763. The Emperor Joannes Cantacuzenus, having taken it in 1352, was almost killed there by the Turks (Histor., IV, 10); it is also frequently mentioned in official acts (Miklosich and Müller, "Acta patriarchatus Constantinopolitani", Vienna, II, 600). Medea is mentioned as a suffragan of Heraclea towards 900 in the "Notitia" of Leo the Wise (Gelzer, "Ungedruckte . . . Texte der Notitiæ episcopatuum", 552); it is mentioned in the same way in the "Notitia" of Manuel Comnenus about 1170 and of Michael VIII about 1270 (Parthey, "Hieroclis Synecdemus", 104, 204). Shortly after, under Andronicus II, Medea was made an autocephalous archbishopric, and towards 1330 a metropolitan see (Gelzer, op. cit., 601). In 1623 the metropolitan sees of Medea and Sozopolis were united, to be again separated in 1715. A little later Medea was united with Bizya, at least among the Orthodox Greeks, and it is so still. Le Quien (Oriens christianus, I, 1143–1146) gives the names of five Greek metropolitans, and Eubel (Hierarchia catholica medii ævi, I, 355) mentions two Latin titularies of the fourteenth century. To-day Medea or Midieh is a part of the sanjak of Kirk-Kélissi in the vilayet of Adrianople; there are two thousand Greeks and some Turks.

PTOLEMY, *Geographia* s. v. *Salmydessos*, ed. MÜLLER, I, 475; SMITH, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*, II, s. v. *Salmydessos*.

S. VAILHÉ.

Medellin, ARCHDIOCESE OF (MEDELLENSIS), in the Republic of Colombia, Metropolitan of Antioquia and Manizales, in the Departments of Medellin, Antioquia, and Manizales. Prior to 1908, when a new civil territorial division was adopted, the limits of the archdiocese were conterminous with the former Department of Antioquia (from native words meaning the "hill or mountain of gold") which lay in the basins of the Magdalena, Cauca, and Atrato rivers, had an area of over 22,000 square miles, and was divided into ten civil provinces, Aures (capital, Sonson), Centro (cap., Medellin), Fredonia (cap., Fredonia), Nordeste (cap., Sta Rosa de Osos), Norte (cap., Yarumal), Occidente (cap., Antioquia), Oriente (cap., Maranilla), Sopetran (cap., Sopetran), Sur (cap., Manizales), Uraba (cap., Frontino). The territory of the archdiocese is comprised in the Andes region; means of communication are poor, owing to the mountainous nature of the country; a railway, however, is being built from Puerto Berrio to Medellin. The Catholic religion is universally professed, but the exercise of all cults not contrary to Christian morality is permitted. The language is Spanish, and the inhabitants are descendants of the Spanish *conquistadores*, of the mestizos and negroes. There is no race antagonism, chiefly because of the influence and teaching of the Catholic religion. The Indians of the Cauca valley were originally cannibals.

Education is gratuitous and as far as possible compulsory; there are 400 primary schools with 35,000 pupils, besides many schools conducted by religious. During the civil disturbances of the past, many of the monasteries were confiscated, and are still used as public buildings; but the relations between Church and State were amicably settled by the Concordat of 1887.

Previous to 1804, the region was within the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Bogotá. On 31

August, 1804, the See of Antioquia was erected, and on 4 February, 1868, the title of the diocese was removed from Antioquia to the growing town of Medellin. On 29 Jan., 1873, the See of Antioquia (ANTIOQUIENSIS) was re-established, and on 11 April, 1900, a portion of the Diocese of Medellin went to constitute the newly erected See of Manizales (MANIZALENSIS). As the civil districts are now constituted, the Department of Antioquia embraces an area of 11,517 square miles with a population of 160,000; that of Medellin an area of 12,137 with a population of 275,000; that of Manizales an area of 4439 with a population of 242,000 (The Statesman's Year-Book, 1910). There are about 5000 savage Indians scattered in these regions.

MEDELLIN on the River Porce, 147 miles from Bogotá, and 4600 feet above sea-level, is the capital of the Department of Medellin. In 1910 it had a population of 60,000. It was named in 1575 after the Count of Medellin in Spain, but did not begin to prosper until the gold and silver mines were discovered in the neighbourhood early in the nineteenth century. It has 7 churches, 2 chapels, and a pro-cathedral; a new cathedral is being constructed in the Plaza de Bolivar. Among important institutions in the town are a seminary, a university, the College of St. Ignatius, under the Jesuits (founded by Father Friere in the eighteenth century), and the College of St. Joseph, under the Christian Brothers. The Presentation Nuns conduct schools for girls; the Sisters of Charity have charge of a hospital; and the Discalced Carmelites have a convent. Among the periodicals published in Medellin are "Registro Official", "Cronica Judicial", "El Preceptor", "El Elector", and "La Consigna".

The See of Medellin was raised to metropolitan rank on 24 Feb., 1902. The archdiocese has 363,710 inhabitants, 110 priests, 15 regulars, 75 churches and chapels, 141 Catholic schools, in which 16,035 pupils are being educated. The present archbishop is Mgr. Em. José de Cayzedo y Cuero, born in Bogotá, 16 Nov., 1850; chosen Bishop of Pasto, 11 Feb., 1892; transferred to Popayan, 2 Dec., 1895; made archbishop 14 Dec., 1901; and transferred to Medellin 14 Dec., 1905, to succeed Mgr. Pardo Vergara, the first Archbishop of Medellin.

ANTIOQUIA on the Cauca was founded by Jorge Robledo in 1542; until 1826 it was the capital of the Department of Antioquia. Its population is estimated at 10,077. In 1720 a Jesuit college was established at Antioquia under the auspices of Bishop Gomez Friar, of Popayan, and on 5 Feb., 1727, a royal charter was granted to the college, and the fathers were given charge of the church of St. Barbara. A few years later they opened a second college at Buga. Among the more important buildings of the city are the cathedral, the bishop's house, the Jesuit college, and a hospital. On account of malaria the seminary has been removed from Antioquia to San Pedro.

The diocese has a population of 211,315; 75 priests; 80 churches and chapels. The present bishop is Mgr Em. Ant. Lopez de Mesa, born at Rio Negro in the Diocese of Medellin, 22 March, 1846, and succeeded Mgr Rueda as Bishop of Antioquia, 2 June, 1902.

MANIZALES is about 100 miles from Bogotá and 7000 feet above sea-level. Founded in 1848 it has developed rapidly owing to the gold mining operations in the neighbourhood; population in 1905, 20,000. The town suffered severely from earthquakes in 1875 and 1878.

The Diocese of Manizales was created 11 April, 1900, from territory formerly belonging to the archdioceses of Popayan and Medellin. The cathedral is dedicated to the Blessed Virgin. The present and first bishop is Mgr. Gregory Hoyos, born at Vahos, 1 Dec. 1849; appointed 11 May, 1901.

PETRE, *The Republic of Colombia* (London, 1906); CASSANI, *Historia de la Compañía de Jesus;* BORDA, *Compendio de Historia de Colombia* (Bogotá, 1890); HOLTON, *Twenty Months in the Andes* (New York); NUÑEZ, *La République de Colombie* (Brussels, 1883); *Annuaire Pontifical* (1910).

J. C. GREY.

Media and Medes (Μηδία, Μῆδοι), an ancient country of Asia and the inhabitants thereof. The Hebrew and Assyrian form of the word Media is מדי (*Madai*) which corresponds to the *Mada* by which the land is designated in the earliest Persian cuneiform texts. The origin and signification of the word are unknown. In Gen., x, 2, Madai is mentioned among the sons of Japheth, between Magog (probably the Gimirrhi and the Lydians) and Javan, i. e. the Ionians. In IV Kings, xvii, 6 (cf. xviii, 11) we read that Salmanasar, King of the Assyrians "took Samaria, and carried Israel away to Assyria; and he placed them in Hala and Habor by the river of Gozan, in the cities of the Medes". Reference is made to the Medes in Jer., xiii, 17 (cf. xxi, 2) as enemies and future destroyers of Babylon, and again in chapter xxv, verse 25, the "kings of the Medes" are mentioned in a similar connection. The only reference to the Medes in the New Testament is in Acts, ii, 9, where they are mentioned between the Parthians and the Elamites.

The earliest information concerning the territory occupied by the Medes, and later in part by the Persians, is derived from the Babylonian and Assyrian texts. In these it is called Anshan, and comprised probably a vast region bounded on the north-west by Armenia, on the north by the Caspian Sea, on the east by the great desert, and on the south by Elam. It included much more than the territory originally known as Persia, which comprised the south-eastern portion of Anshan, and extended to Carmania on the east, and southward to the Persian Gulf. Later, however, when the Persian supremacy eclipsed that of the Medes, the name of Persia was extended to the whole Median territory. Ethnological authorities are agreed that the heterogeneous peoples who under the general name of Medes occupied this vast region in historic times, were not the original inhabitants. They were the successors of a prehistoric population as in the case of the historic empires of Egypt and Assyria; and likewise, little or nothing is known of the origin or racial ties of these earlier inhabitants. If the Medes who appear at the dawn of history had a written literature, which is hardly probable, no fragments of it have been preserved, and consequently nothing is directly known concerning their language. Judging, however, from the proper names that have come down to us, there is reason to infer that it differed only dialectically from the Old Persian. They would thus be of Aryan stock, and the Median empire seems to be the result of the earliest attempt on the part of the Aryans to found a great conquering monarchy.

The first recorded mention of the people whom the Greeks called Medes occurs in the cuneiform inscription of Shalmaneser II, King of Assyria, who claims to have vanquished the Madai in his twenty-fourth campaign, about 836 B. C. Whatever may have been the extent of this conquest, it was by no means permanent, for the records of the succeeding reigns down to that of Asshurbanipal (668–625), who vainly strove to hold them in check, constantly refer to the "dangerous Medes" (so they are called in the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser, IV, 747–727), in terms which show that their aggressive hostility had become a grave and ever-increasing menace to the power of the Assyrians. During that period the power of Anshan was gradually strengthened by the accession and assimilation of new peoples of Aryan stock, who established themselves in the territory once held by the Assyrians east of the Tigris. Thus after the year 640 B. C. the names of the native rulers of Elam

disappear from the inscriptions, and in their place we find references to the kings of Anshan. The capital of the kingdom was Ecbatana (the Agamatanu of the Babylonian inscriptions) the building of which is attributed by the author of the Book of Judith (i, 1) to "Arphaxad king of the Medes." Assuming that it is the city called Amadana in an inscription of Tiglath-Pileser I, its origin would go back to the twelfth century B. C. At variance with this, however, is the Greek tradition represented by Herodotus, who ascribes the origin of Ecbatana to Deiokes (the Daiukku of the Assyrian inscriptions, about 710 B. C.), who is described as the first great ruler of the Median empire. The "building of the city" is, of course, a rather elastic expression which may well have been used to designate the activities of monarchs who enlarged or fortified the already existing stronghold; and it is scarcely necessary to recall that most of these ancient records, though containing elements of truth, are to a certain extent artificial. At all events, it is with the reign of Deiokes that the Median empire emerges into the full light of history, and henceforward the Greek sources serve to check or corroborate the information derived from the native monuments.

According to the somewhat questionable account of Herodotus, Deiokes reigned from 700 to 647 B. C. and was succeeded by Phraortes (646-625), but of the latter no mention is made in the inscriptions thus far discovered. His successor Cyaxares (624–585), after breaking the Scythian power, formed an alliance with the Babylonians, who were endeavouring to regain their long lost domination over Assyria. In league with Nabopolassar, King of Babylon, he captured and destroyed Ninive (606 B. C.) and conquered all the northern portion of Mesopotamia. Enriched by the spoils of the great Assyrian capital, Cyaxares pushed his conquering armies westward, and soon the dominion of the Medes extended from the confines of Elam to the river Halys in Asia Minor. Astyages (584–550 B. C.), the son and successor of Cyaxares, failed to maintain the friendly relations with Babylon, and when Nabonidus succeeded to the throne of the latter kingdom, the Medes and Babylonians were at war.

In the meantime a great internal movement was preparing the way for a change in the destinies of the empire. It was due to the rising influence of another branch of the Aryan race, and in history it is generally known as the transition from the Median to the Persian rule. At this distance both terms are rather vague and indefinite, but there is no doubt as to the advent of a new dynasty, of which by far the most conspicuous ruler is Cyrus, who first appears as King of Anshan, and who is later mentioned as King of Persia. Doubtless in the earlier part of his reign he was but a vassal king dependent on the Median monarch, but in 549 B. C. he vanquished Astyages and made himself master of the vast empire then comprising the kingdoms of Anshan, Persia, and Media. He is known to Oriental history as a great and brilliant conqueror, and his fame in this respect is confirmed by the more or less fantastic legends associated with his name by the Greek and Roman writers. His power soon became a menace to all western Asia, and in order to withstand it a coalition was formed into which entered Nabonidus, King of Babylonia, Amasis, King of Egypt, and Crœsus, King of Lydia. But even this formidable alliance was unable to check the progress of Cyrus who, after having reduced to subjection the whole of the Median empire, led his forces into Asia Minor. Crœsus was defeated and taken prisoner in 546, and within a year the entire peninsula of Asia Minor was divided into satrapies, and annexed to the new Persian empire. The west being fully subdued, Cyrus led his victorious armies against Babylonia. Belshazzar, the son of the still reigning Nabonidus, was sent as general in chief to defend the country, but he was defeated at Opis. After this disaster the invading forces met with little or no resistance, and Cyrus entered Babylon, where he was received as a deliverer, in 539 B. C. The following year he issued the famous decree permitting the Hebrew captives to return to Palestine and rebuild the temple (I Esd., i). It is interesting to note in this connexion that he is often alluded to in Isaias (xl–xlviii, *passim*), where according to the obvious literal meaning he is spoken of as the Lord's anointed. With the accession of the Achæmenian dynasty the history of Media becomes absorbed into that of Persia (q. v.), which will be treated in a separate article.

BEURLIER in VIGOUROUX, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, s. v. *Médie;* ROGERS in *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*, s. v. *Medo-Persia;* JACKSON, *Persia Past and Present* (New York, 1906); SAYCE in HASTINGS, *A Dictionary of the Bible*, s. v. *Medes.*

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

Mediator (CHRIST AS MEDIATOR).—The subject will be treated under the following heads: (1) Definition of the word mediator; (2) Christ the Mediator; (3) Christ's qualifications; (4) Performance; (5) Results.

(1) MEDIATOR DEFINED.—A mediator is one who brings estranged parties to an amicable agreement. In New-Testament theology the term invariably implies that the estranged beings are God and man, and it is appropriated to Christ, the One Mediator. When special friends of God—angels, saints, holy men—plead our cause before God, they mediate "with Christ"; but their mediation is only secondary and is better called intercession (q. v.). Moses, however, is the proper mediator of the Old Testament (Gal., iii, 19–20).

(2) CHRIST THE MEDIATOR.—St. Paul writes to Timothy (I Tim., ii, 3–6) . . . "God our Saviour, Who will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus: Who gave himself a redemption for all, a testimony in due times." The object of the mediatorship is here pointed out as the salvation of mankind, and the imparting of truth about God. The mediator is named: Christ Jesus; His qualification for the office is implied in His being described as man, and the performance of it is ascribed to His redeeming sacrifice and His testifying to the truth. All this originates in the Divine Will of "God our Saviour, Who will have all men to be saved". Christ's mediatorship, therefore, occupies the central position in the economy of salvation: all human souls are both for time and eternity dependent on Christ Jesus for their whole supernatural life. "Who [God the Father] hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love, In whom we have redemption through his blood, the remission of sins; Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature . . . all things were created by him and in him. And he is before all, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church, who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he may hold the primacy: Because in him, it hath well pleased *the Father*, that all fulness should dwell; And through him to reconcile all things unto himself, making peace through the blood of his cross, both as to the things that are on earth, and the things that are in heaven". (Col., i, 13–20).

(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—The perfection of a mediator is measured by his influence with the parties he has to reconcile, and this power flows from his connexion with both: the highest possible perfection would be reached if the mediator were substantially one with both parties. A mother, for instance, is the best mediator between her husband and her son. But the matrimonial union of "two in one flesh", and the

union of mother and child are inferior in perfection to the hypostatic union of the Son of God with human nature. Husband, mother, son, are three persons; Jesus Christ, God and man, is only one person, identical with God, identical with man. Moreover, the hypostatic union makes Him the Head of mankind, and, therefore, its natural representative. By His human origin Christ is a member of the human family, a partaker of our flesh and blood (Heb., ii, 11–15); by reason of His Divine Personality, He is "the image and likeness of God" to a degree unapproached by either man or angel. The Incarnation establishing between the First-born and His brethren a real kinship or affinity, Christ becomes the Head of the human family, and the human family acquires a claim to participate in the supernatural privileges of their Head, "Because we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." (Eph., v, 30.) Such was the expressed will of God: "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent his Son, made of a woman . . . that we might receive the adoption of sons." (Gal., iv, 4–5; also Rom., viii, 29.) The man Christ Jesus, therefore, who was designed by God to mediate between Him and mankind, and whose mediatorship was not accidental and delegated, but inherent in His very being, was endowed with all the attributes required in a perfect mediator.

Christ's function as mediator necessarily proceeds from His human nature as *principium quo operandi;* yet it obtains its mediating efficacy from the Divine nature, i. e. from the dignity of the acting person. Its first object, as commonly stated, is the remission of sin and the granting of grace, whereby the friendship between God and man is restored. This object is attained by the worship of infinite value which is offered to God by and through Christ. Christ, however, is mediator on the side of God as well as on the side of man: He reveals to man Divine truth and Divine commands; He distributes the Divine gifts of grace and rules the world. St. Paul sums up this two-sided mediation in the words: ". . . consider the apostle and high priest of our confession, Jesus" (Heb., iii, 1); Jesus is the Apostle sent by God to us, the high priest leading us on to God.

(4) PERFORMANCE.—How do we benefit by Christ's mediation? Christ is more than an enlightening teacher and a bright example of holiness; He destroys sin and restores grace. Our salvation is not due exclusively to the Mediator's intercession for us in His glorified state in heaven; Christ administers in heaven the fruits of His work on earth (Heb., vii, 25). Scripture compels us to regard the work of the Mediator as an efficient cause of our salvation: His merits and satisfaction, as being those of our representative, have obtained for us salvation from God. The oldest expression of the dogma in the Church formularies is in the Nicene Creed: "crucified also for us". "Vicarious satisfaction", a term now in vogue, is not found expressly in the Church formularies, and is not an adequate expression of Christ's mediation. For His mediation partly replaces, partly completes, partly renders possible and efficacious the saving work of man himself; on the other hand, it is a condition of, and it merits, the saving work of God. It begins with obtaining the goodwill of God towards man, with appeasing the offended God by interceding for man. This intercession, however, differs from a mere asking in this, that Christ's work has merited what is asked for: salvation is its rightful equivalent. Further: to effect man's salvation from sin, the Saviour had to take upon Himself the sins of mankind and make satisfaction for them to God. But though His atonement gives God more honour than sin gives dishonour, it is but a step towards the most essential part of Christ's saving work—the friendship of God which it merits for man. Taken together, the expiation of sin and the meriting of Divine friendship are the end of a real sacrifice, i. e. of "an action performed in order to give God the honour due to Him alone, and so to gain the Divine favour" (St. Thomas, III, Q. xlviii, a. 3). Peculiar to Christ's sacrifice are the infinite holiness of the Sacrificer and the infinite value of the Victim, which give the sacrifice an infinite value as expiation and as merit. Moreover, it consists of suffering voluntarily accepted. The sinner deserves death, having forfeited the end for which he was created; and hence Christ accepted death as the chief feature of His atoning sacrifice.

(5) RESULTS.—Christ's saving work did not at once blot out every individual sin and transform every sinner into a saint; it only procured the means thereto. Personal sanctification is effected by special acts, partly Divine, partly human; it is secured by loving God and man as the Saviour did. *Christianus alter Christus:* every Christian is another Christ, a son of God, an heir to the eternal Kingdom. Finally, in the fulness of time all things that are in heaven and on earth shall be re-established, restored, in God through Christ (Eph., i, 9–10). The meaning of this promise is that the whole of creation, bound up together and perfected in Christ as its Head, shall be led back in the most perfect manner to God, from whom sin had partly led it away. Christ is the Crown, the Centre, and the Fountain of a new and higher order of things: "for all are yours; And you are Christ's; and Christ is God's." (I Cor., iii, 22–23).

Consult any treatise on the Incarnation, e. g. WILHELM AND SCANNELL, *Manual of Cath. Theol.*, II (London, 1908), bk. V; HUMPHREY, *The One Mediator* (London). J. WILHELM.

Medices (DE MEDICIS), HIERONYMUS, illustrious as a scholastic of acumen and penetration, b. at Camerino in Umbria, 1569, whence the surname de Medicis a Camerino. He was clothed with the Dominican habit at Ancona. He first distinguished himself as professor of philosophy and theology in various houses of the Province of Lombardy, whence he was advanced to a professorship in the more important theological school at Bologna. He was approved by the general chapter of his Order held at Paris, 1611, and raised to the mastership and doctorate. He was then performing the duties of general censor for the tribunal of the Inquisition established at Mantua, for which reason he is said eventually to have secured the transfer of his affiliation to the convent of that place (1618). His laborious and fruitful career closed in 1622. It had been marked by a studious application to the doctrines of St. Thomas. Just as the Paris chapter was acknowledging his intellectual ability, he completed the first part of the invaluable "Summæ theologiæ S. Thomæ Aquinatis doctoris angelici formalis explicatio". In this work he puts into syllogistic form the whole Summa. Aiming primarily at the enlightenment of beginners, he contributes notably to the instruction of others more advanced. The first part was not published until the first section of the second part was ready (Venice), 1614. Three years later followed the second section, but it was not until 1622 that the third part appeared at Salo, instead of Venice. The supplement had preceded the third part by a year (Venice, 1621); it was not published at Mantua in 1623. Other more correct editions have followed even as late as (Vici) 1858–1862. It is to Jacobus Quétif that credit is due for having improved the original in accuracy. He reproduced the work in five tomes, folio (Paris), in 1657. The chief advantage to be derived from the arrangement of St. Thomas in syllogistic form is a quickness of grasp with an easiness of assimilation not otherwise obtainable. In the Vici edition certain additions have been made which, although raising the value of the work as a manual, are outside the scope of the original. They serve as appendices to each question and, under the caption "Utilitas pro Ecclesia S. Dei", furnish the student with practical applications of the original matter in view of dogmas subsequently developed or contemporary heresy.

QUÉTIF-ECHARD, *Scriptores O. P.* (Paris, 1721), II, 425 b; HURTER, NOMENCLATOR (Innsbruck, 1892), I, 257 b.; MORGOTT in *Kirchenlexikon* (Freiburg im Br., 1893), treats more fully of the new features of the VICI ed. of the "*Explicatio.*"

THOMAS Á K. REILLY.

Medici, HOUSE OF, a Florentine family, the members of which, having acquired great wealth as bankers, rose in a few generations to be first the unofficial rulers of the republic of Florence and afterwards the recognized sovereigns of Tuscany.

COSIMO THE ELDER, b. 1389, d. 1 Aug., 1464, the founder of their power and so-called "Padre della Patria", was the son of Giovanni di Averardo de' Medici, the richest banker in Italy. He obtained the virtual lordship of Florence in 1434 by the overthrow and expulsion of the leaders of the oligarchical faction of the Albizzi. While maintaining republican forms and institutions, he held the government by banishing his opponents and concentrating the chief magistracies in the hands of his own adherents. His foreign policy, which became traditional with the Medici throughout the fifteenth century until the French invasion of 1494, aimed at establishing a balance of power between the five chief states of the Italian peninsula, by allying Florence with Milan and maintaining friendly relations with Naples, to counterpoise the similar understanding existing between Rome and Venice. He was a munificent and discerning patron of art and letters, a thorough humanist, and through Marsilio Ficino, the founder of the famous Neo-Platonic academy. Sincerely devoted to religion in his latter days, he was closely associated with St. Antoninus and with the Dominican friars of San Marco, his favourite foundation. His son and successor, Piero il Gottoso, the husband of Lucrezia Tornabuoni, a man of magnanimous character but whose activities were crippled by illness, contented himself with following in his footsteps.

COSIMO DE' MEDICI
Pontormo, Uffizi Gallery, Florence

On Piero's death in 1469, his sons LORENZO, b. 1449, d. 8 April, 1492, and GIULIANO, b. 1453, d. 26 April, 1478, succeeded to his power. The latter, a genial youth with no particular aptitude for politics, was murdered in the Pazzi conspiracy of 1478, leaving an illegitimate son Giulio, who afterwards became Pope Clement VII. Among those executed for their share in the conspiracy was the Archbishop of Pisa. A war with Pope Sixtus IV and King Ferrante of Naples followed, in which Florence was hard pressed, until Lorenzo, as Machiavelli says, "exposed his own life to restore peace to his country", by going in person to the Neapolitan sovereign to obtain favourable terms, in 1480. Henceforth until his death Lorenzo was undisputed master of Florence and her dominions, and, while continuing and developing the foreign and domestic policy of his grandfather, he greatly extended the Medicean influence throughout Italy. His skilful diplomacy was directed to maintaining the peace of the peninsula, and keeping the five chief states united in the face of the growing danger of an invasion from beyond the Alps. Guicciardini writes of him that it would not have been possible for Florence to have had a better or a more pleasant tyrant, and certainly the world has seen no more splendid a patron of artists and scholars. The poets, Pulci and Poliziano, the philosopher and mystic, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, and a whole galaxy of great artists, such as Botticelli and Ghirlandaio, shed glory over his reign.

Posterity has agreed to call Lorenzo "the Magnificent", but this is, in part, a misunderstanding of the Italian title "magnifico", which was given to all the members of his family, and, indeed, during the fifteenth century, applied to most persons of importance in Italy to whom the higher title of "Excellence" did not pertain. Lorenzo sums up the finest culture of the early Renaissance in his own person. Unlike many of the humanists of his epoch, he thoroughly appreciated the great Italian classics of the two preceding centuries; in his youth he wrote a famous epistle on the subject to Federigo of Aragon, which accompanied a collection of early Italian lyrics. His own poems in the vernacular rank very high in the literature of the fifteenth century. They are remarkably varied in style and subject, ranging from Petrarcan canzoni and sonnets, with a prose commentary in imitation of the "Vita Nuova", to the semiparody of Dante entitled "I Beoni". His *canzoni a ballo*, the popular dancing songs of the Florentines, have the true lyrical note. Especially admirable are his compositions in *ottava rima:* the "Caccia col Falcone", with its keen feeling for nature; the "Ambra", a mythological fable of the Florentine country-side; and the "Nencia da Barberino", an idyllic picture of rustic loves. His "Altercazione", six cantos in *terza rima*, discusses the nature of true felicity, and closes in an impressive prayer to God, somewhat Platonic in tone. To purely religious poetry belong his "Laude", and a miracle-play, the "Rappresentazione di san Giovanni e san Paolo", with a curiously modern appreciation of the Emperor Julian. In striking contrast to these are his carnival-songs, *canti carnascialeschi*, so immoral as to lend colour to the accusation that he strove to undermine the morality of the Florentines in order the more easily to enslave them.

At the close of his life, Lorenzo was brought into con-

BRUNELLESCHI AND GHIBERTI PRESENTING COSIMO DE' MEDICI WITH THE MODEL OF THE CHURCH OF S. LORENZO

G. VASARI, PALAZZO VECCHIO, FLORENCE

LAURENTIAN LIBRARY, FLORENCE

MICHELANGELO

flict with Savonarola, but the legend of the latter refusing him absolution on his deathbed unless he restored liberty to Florence is now generally rejected by historians. By his wife, Clarice Orsini, Lorenzo had three sons: Piero, Giuliano, and Giovanni, of whom the third rose to the papacy as Leo X. Although a man of immoral life, his relations with his family show him under a favourable aspect, and, in a letter from one of the ladies of the Mantuan court, a charming account is given of how, on his way to the congress of Cremona in 1483, Lorenzo visited the Gonzaga children and sat among them in their nursery.

Piero di Lorenzo, Lorenzo's eldest son, b. 1471, d. 1503, a licentious youth with none of his father's ability, proved a most incompetent ruler, and, on the French invasion of 1494, he was expelled from Florence by the people, led by the patriotic Piero Capponi. After several fruitless attempts to recover his position, he was drowned at the battle of the Garigliano while



Lorenzo de' Medici
Vasari, Uffizi Gallery, Florence

serving in the French army. On the restoration of the Medici in 1512, his son Lorenzo was made ruler of Florence. With him, in 1519, the legitimate male descent of Cosimo the Elder came to an end. By his wife, Madeleine de la Tour d'Auvergne, he was the father of Caterina de' Medici, afterwards Queen of France.

The Medici were again expelled from Florence, and the republic once more established, in 1527. But in 1530, after the famous siege, the city was compelled to surrender to the imperial forces, and Charles V made Alessandro de' Medici, an illegitimate son of the younger Lorenzo, hereditary head of the Florentine government. All republican forms and offices were swept away, and Alessandro ruled as duke until, in 1537, he was assassinated by his kinsman, Lorenzo di Pierfrancesco de' Medici, who fled to Venice without attempting either to assert his own claims to the succession or to restore the republican régime.

Cosimo de' Medici, usually known as Cosimo I, b. 1519, d. 1574, was the descendant of a brother of Cosimo the Elder and representative of the younger Medicean line. He was the son of Giovanni delle Bande Nere, the great soldier, and Maria Salviati. On the murder of Alessandro, he came into Florence, and was formally recognized as head of the government both by the citizens and by the emperor. At the outset, with the aid of imperial troops, he crushed the last efforts of the republicans, who were led by Baccio Valori and Filippo Strozzi. Various constitutional checks were at first put upon him, but these he soon discarded, and openly used the title of Duke of Florence. Although ruthless and implacable, he proved himself the ablest Italian ruler of the sixteenth century, and gave a permanent form to the government of Florence, finally developing the shapeless remains of the fallen republic into a modern monarchical state. He thoroughly reorganized the laws and administration, created a small but efficient fleet to defend the shores of Tuscany, and raised a national army out of the old Florentine militia. He married a Spanish wife, the noble and virtuous Eleonora da Toledo, and in foreign affairs leaned to a large extent upon Spain, by which power, however, he was prevented from accepting the crown of Corsica. His great desire of absorbing the neighbouring republics of Lucca and Siena into his dominions was fulfilled only in the case of the latter state; he conquered Siena in 1555, and in 1557 received it as a fief from the King of Spain.

Tradition has invested Cosimo's name with a series of horrible domestic crimes and tragedies, all of which have been completely disproved by recent research. After the death of Eleonora da Toledo in 1562, he appears to have abandoned himself to vice. A few years later he married his mistress, Cammilla Martelli. In 1570 he was crowned in Rome by Pius V as Grand Duke of Tuscany, thereby taking place among the sovereigns of Europe. The title was confirmed to his son and successor, Francis I, in 1575, by the Emperor Maximilian II. Cosimo's descendants reigned as Grand Dukes of Tuscany in an unbroken line until 1737, when, on the death of Gian Gastone de' Medici, their dominions passed to the House of Austria.

Capponi, *Storia della Repubblica di Firenze* (Florence, 1888); Pellegrini, *La Repubblica Fiorentina a tempo di Cosimo il vecchio* (Pisa, 1899); Ewart, *Cosimo de' Medici* (London, 1899); Roscoe, *The Life of Lorenzo de' Medici* (London, 1795, etc.); Reumont, *Lorenzo de' Medici il Magnifico* (Leipzig, 1874); *Opere di Lorenzo de' Medici detto il Magnifico* (4 vols., Florence, 1825); Carducci, *Poesie di Lorenzo de' Medici* (Florence, 1859); Rossi, *Il Quattrocento* (Milan, 1900); Villari, *La Storia di Girolamo Savonarola* (Florence, 1887); Galluzzi, *Storia del Granducato di Toscana sotto il governo della Casa Medici* (Florence, 1781, etc.); *Storia Fiorentina di Benedetto Varchi*, ed. Milanesi (Florence, 1857); Armstrong, *Lorenzo de' Medici* (London and New York, 1897); Saltini, *Tragedie Medicee domestiche* (Florence, 1898); Ferrai, *Lorenzino de' Medici* (Milan, 1891); Gauthiez, *L'Italie du xvi^e Siècle* (Paris, 1901); Young, *The Medici* (London, 1909); Gardner, *The Story of Florence* (London and New York, new ed., 1910).

Edmund G. Gardner.

Medici, Maria de', Queen of France; b. at Florence, 26 April, 1573; d. at Cologne, 3 July, 1642. She was a daughter of the Grand Duke Francis I of Tuscany and the Archduchess Joan of Austria, and married Henry IV of France, 5 October, 1600. In March, 1610, Henry IV, who was preparing to lead an expedition into Germany, against the Spaniards and the Imperialists, appointed Maria de' Medici regent, with a council of fifteen; yielding to her insistence, he also caused her to be crowned queen on 13 May, 1610. Two hours after the assassination of Henry IV (14 May, 1610), the Duc d'Epernon went to the Parliament and had Maria de' Medici declared regent, the little Louis XIII being not yet nine years of age. The policy of Henry IV, who, had he lived, would have striven more and more to secure alliances with Protestant powers, was replaced by a Catholic policy, aiming at a Spanish alliance. The first act in this direction was the betrothal of Louis XIII to the Infanta Anna (afterwards known as Anne of Austria), and of Elizabeth of France to the Infant Philip (1612). There was agitation among the princes and the Protestants. The States-General, convoked by the queen regent in 1614, as a

concession to the princes, was the last attempt under the old monarchy to associate representatives of the nation in the national government, and the attempt succeeded ill. Finally, defying the susceptibilities of Condé and the Protestants, Louis XIII married the Infanta Anna on 28 November, 1615, and the revolt of the princes, following on the arrest of Condé (1 Sept., 1616), was the cause of the queen regent's summoning Richelieu (q. v.), Bishop of Luçon, to her council, as minister of war. Public opinion was aroused by the influence which Maria allowed her lady-in-waiting, Leonora Galigaï, and Leonora's Florentine husband, Concini, Maréchal d'Ancre, to obtain over her; Concini was assassinated, 24 April, 1617, and thenceforward the influence of Albert de Luynes, a favourite of the young king, predominated. Maria de' Medici had to leave Paris, 2 May, 1617, and it was through the intervention of Richelieu that she was allowed to establish her household at Blois.

The regency of Maria de' Medici is interesting from the point of view of religious history because of the Gallican agitation which marked it. After the condemnation by the Parliament of Paris of Bellarmine's treatise on the temporal power of the pope (1610), Edmond Richer, syndic of the faculty of theology, developed, in his "Libellus de Ecclesiastica et Politica Potestate", the theory that the government of the Church should be aristocratical, not monarchical. Maria de' Medici decidedly opposed Richer, and, when he had been condemned by an assembly of bishops held at Sens under the presidency of Cardinal du Perron, she had him deposed, and a new syndic elected (1612). When Harlay had resigned the presidency of the Parliament, she refused to appoint in his place de Thou, a Gallican, and appointed instead Nicolas de Verdun, an Ultramontane. In the States-General of 1614, the Third Estate, through its spokesman, Miron, made a declaration of Gallican principles, and tried, with the support of the Protestant Condé, to introduce into its *cahier* an article on the power of kings, which aimed at the Ultramontanes; Maria de' Medici ended the business by ordering this article to be taken out of the *cahier*, and forbidding any further discussion of the question. Another interesting event of this regency was the Assembly of Saumur (1611), in which the Protestants, anxious to preserve and develop the political privileges given them by the Edict of Nantes, set about organizing all over France a vast network of provincial assemblies to watch over the interests of Protestantism, and *assemblées de cercles*, combining several provinces, which would be able to impose their will on the State. It was thus that, through the initiative of Henri de Rohan, Sully's son-in-law, there began to form within the French State a sort of separate Protestant party, to which Richelieu was to put an end.

After 1617, Maria de' Medici lived, with many vicissitudes, a life full of intrigue, which she sometimes carried to conspiracy. Escaping from Blois, 22 Feb., 1619, she made her way into Angoulême and obtained from Luynes the government of Anjou, which became a rallying-point for malcontents. The troops who supported her met those of the king at Les Ponts de Cé and were beaten (August, 1620). On the death of Luynes (15 December, 1621), she regained some of her influence; she caused Richelieu to be admitted to the council (1624), and was even entrusted with the regency during the war in Italy. But as Richelieu's hostility to Spain became more marked, she sought his dismissal. Allying herself with Gaston d'Orléans, she once—"the Day of the Dupes", 12 November, 1630—thought herself successful in making Louis dismiss the cardinal. She was mistaken. Banished to Compiègne in February, 1631, she vainly endeavoured to obtain admission to the stronghold of La Capelle, whence she might have dictated terms to the king. At last she went into exile, to wait for the triumph of Gaston d'Orléans: but Gaston was beaten, and Maria de' Medici never more set foot in France. From 1631 to 1638 she spent her time in the Low Countries, sending across the French frontier manifestos which no one read. After that, taking refuge in England (1638–41) with her son-in-law Charles I, she was as a Catholic an object of suspicion to the Protestants of that country. Last of all, she betook herself to Germany, where she died, a helpless onlooker at the triumph of that foreign policy of Richelieu which was the exact opposite of what she had followed during her regency. The haughty queen, whose luxury and splendour had been blazoned in Rubens's immense canvases, possessed but a moderate fortune at the time of her death.

MARIA DE' MEDICI
Pourbus, The Prado, Madrid

ZELLER, *La minorité de Louis XIII: Marie de Médicis et Sully* (Paris, 1892); IDEM, *La minorité de Louis XIII: Marie de Médicis et Villeroy* (Paris, 1897); IDEM, *Louis XIII, Marie de Médicis chef du conseil* (Paris, 1898); IDEM, *Louis XIII, Marie de Médicis, Richelieu ministre* (Paris, 1899); HANOTAUX, *Hist. du card. Richelieu*, I, II (Paris, 1893, 1896); PICOT, *Hist. des Etats Généraux*, IV (2nd ed., Paris, 1888); PERRENS, *L'Eglise et l'Etat en France sous le règne de Henri IV et la régence de Marie de Médicis* (2 vols., Paris, 1873); BATIFFOL, *La vie intime d'une reine de France au XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1906); HAYEM, *Le Maréchal d'Ancre et Leonora Galigaï* (Paris, 1910); PARDOE, *Life of Mary de Medicis* (London, 1852); LORD, *The Regency of Marie de Medicis* (London, 1904).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Medicine, HISTORY OF.—The history of medical science, considered as a part of the general history of civilization, should logically begin in Mesopotamia, where tradition and philological investigation have placed the cradle of the human race. But, in a condensed article such as this, there are important reasons which dictate the choice of another starting point. Modern medical science rests upon a Greek foundation, and whatever other civilized peoples may have accomplished in this field lies outside our inquiry. It is certain that the Greeks brought much with them from their original home, and also that they learned a great deal from their intercourse with other civilized countries, especially Egypt and India; but the Greek mind assimilated knowledge in such a fashion that its origin can rarely be recognized.

MYTHICAL, HOMERIC, AND PRE-HIPPOCRATIC TIMES.—Greek medical science, like that of all civilized peo-

ples, shows in the beginning a purely theurgical character. Apollo is regarded as the founder of medical science, and, in post-Homeric times, his son Æsculapius (in Homer, a Thessalian prince) is represented as the deity whose office it is to bring about man's restoration to health by means of healing oracles. His oldest place of worship was at Tricca in Thessaly. The temples of Æsculapius, of which those at Epidaurus and Cos are the best known, were situated in a healthy neighbourhood. The sick pilgrims went thither, that, after a long preparation of prayer, fasting and ablutions, they might, through the mediation of the priests, receive in their dreams the healing oracles. This kind of medical science already shows a rational basis, for the priests interpreted the dreams and prescribed a suitable treatment, in most cases purely dietetic. Important records of sicknesses were made and left as votive-tablets in the temples. Side by side with the priestly caste, and perhaps out of it, there arose the order of temple physicians, who, as supposed descendants of the god Æsculapius, were known as the *Asclepiadæ*, and formed a kind of guild or corporation. This separation of offices must have occurred at an early time, for even in Homer we find lay physicians mentioned, especially "the sons of Æsculapius", Machaon and Podalirius. In the vegetable drugs of Egyptian origin mentioned in Homer we recognize the early influence of the country of the Pharaohs upon Greek medical science. The schools of the philosophers likewise exerted no small influence upon its development, medical problems being studied by Pythagoras of Samos, Alcmæon of Crotona, Parmenides of Elea, Heraclitus of Ephesus (sixth century B. C.), Empedocles of Agrigentum, and Anaxagoras of Clazomenæ (fifth century B. C.). The earliest medical schools were at Cyrene in Northern Africa, Crotona, Cnidus, and Cos. From Cnidus came Euryphon and also Ctesias the geographer, who was at first physician in the army of Cyrus and, after the battle of Cunaxa (401 B. C.), to Artaxerxes Memnon. Of greater interest is the medical school adjoining the shrine of Æsculapius at Cos, for from it arose the man who first placed medicine upon a scientific basis, and whose name is even to-day well known to all physicians, Hippocrates.

Hippocrates and the so-called Corpus Hippocraticum.—Tradition knows seven physicians named Hippocrates, of whom the second is regarded as the most famous. Of his life we know but little. He was born at Cos in 460 or 459 B. C., and died at Larissa about 379. How great his fame was during his lifetime is shown by the fact that Plato compares him with the artists Polycletus and Phidias. Later he was called "the Great" or "the Divine". The historical kernel is probably as follows: a famous physician of this name from Cos flourished in the days of Pericles, and subsequently many things, which his ancestors or his descendants or his school accomplished, were attributed to him as the hero of medical science. The same was true of his writings. What is now known under the title of "Hippocratis Opera" represents the work, not of an individual, but of several persons of different periods and of different schools. It has thus become customary to designate the writings ascribed to Hippocrates by the general title of the "Hippocratic Collection" (Corpus Hippocraticum), and to divide them according to their origin into the works of the schools of Cnidus and of Cos, and those of the Sophists. How difficult it is, however, to determine their genuineness is shown by the fact that even in the third century before Christ the Alexandrian librarians, who for the first time collected the anonymous scrolls scattered through Hellas, could not reach a definite conclusion. For the development of medical science it is of little consequence who composed the works of the school of Cos, for they are all more or less permeated by the spirit of one great master. The secret of his immortality rests on the fact that he pointed out the means whereby medicine became a science. His first rule was the observation of individual patients, individualizing in contradistinction to the schematizing of the school of Cnidus. By the observation of all the perceptible symptoms in a patient, a number of principles were gradually derived from experience, and these, uniformly arranged, led by induction to a knowledge of the nature of the disease, its course, and its treatment. This is the origin of the famous "Aphorismi", short rules which contain at times principles derived from experience, and at times conclusions drawn from the same source. They form the most valuable part of the Collection. The school of Cos and its adherents, the Hippocratics, looked upon medical science from a purely practical standpoint; they regarded it as the art of healing the sick, and therefore laid most stress on prognosis and treatment by aiding the powers of nature through dietetic means, while the whole school of Cnidus prided itself upon its scientific diagnosis and, in harmony with the East, adopted a varied medicinal treatment. The method which the school of Cos established more than 2000 years ago has proved to be the only correct one, and thus Hippocratic medical science celebrated its renascence in the eighteenth century with Boerhaave at Leyden and subsequently with Gerhard van Swieten at Vienna. In his endeavour to attain the truth the earnest investigator often reaches an impassable barrier. There is nothing more tempting than to seek an outlet by means of reflection and deduction. Such a delusive course may easily become fatal to the physicist; but a medical system, erected upon the results of speculative investigation, carries the germ of death within itself.

The Dogmatic School.—In their endeavour to complete the doctrine of their great master the successors of the Hippocratics fell victims to the snares of speculation. In spite of this, we owe to this so-called "dogmatic school" some fruitful investigation. Diocles Carystius advanced the knowledge of anatomy, and tried to fathom the causal connexion between symptom and disease, in which endeavours he was imitated by Praxagoras of Cos, who established the diagnostic importance of the pulse.

Unfortunately, there already began with Aristotle (384–22 B. C.) that tendency—later rendered so fatal through Galen's teaching—to regard organic structure and function not in accordance with facts but from the teleological standpoint.

The Alexandrian Period.—The desire to give to medicine a scientific basis found rich nourishment in the ancient civilized soil of Egypt under the Ptolemies. Herophilus of Chalcedon (about 300 B. C.) and Erasistratus of Iulis (about 330–240 B. C.) are mentioned in this connexion. As anatomists, they were the first systematic investigators, and, following Hippocrates, they tried to complete clinical experience by exact methods. This tendency was opposed by the empirics, whose services lay solely in the field of drugs and toxicology. Erasistratus as well as Philinus, the empiric, attacked the doctrine of humors (humoral pathology), which developed out of the Hippocratic tendency. The former alone was a serious opponent, since, as an anatomist, he looked for the seat of the disease in the solid parts, rather than in the four fundamental humors (blood, mucus, black and yellow gall) and their different mixtures.

The Methodizers.—One of the opponents of humoral pathology was Asclepiades of Prusa in Bithynia (b. about 124 B. C.). He tried to utilize in medicine the atomistic theory of Epicurus and Heracleides of Pontus. He taught that health and disease depend upon the motion of the atoms in the fine capillaries or pores, which, endowed with sensation, pass through the entire body. With Themison as their leader, the followers of Asclepiades simplified his doctrine by supposing disease to be only a contraction or relaxation,

and later only a mixed condition (partly contracted, partly relaxed) of the pores. This simple and convenient explanation of all diseases without regard to anatomy and physiology, taken in conjunction with its allied system of physical dietetic therapeutics, explains why this doctrine enjoyed so long a life, and why the works of the methodist, Cœlius Aurelianus of Sicca in Numidia (beginning of fifth century A. D.), were diligently studied down to the seventh century.

Galen.—Departure from the Hippocratic observation of nature led physicians to form numerous mutually opposing sects. A man of great industry and comprehensive knowledge, Galen of Pergamum (about A. D. 130–201), tried to rescue medical science from this labyrinth. He chose the path of eclecticism, on which he built his (as he thought) infallible system. Whatever sense-perception and clincal observation left obscure, he tried to explain in a speculative manner. That this system of teaching could hold medicine in bondage until modern times shows the genius of the master, who understood how to cover up the gaps by brilliancy of style. Galen took the entire anatomical knowledge of his time, and out of it produced a work the substance of which was for centuries regarded as inviolable. His anatomy was to a large extent based upon the dissection of mammals, especially of monkeys, and, like his physiology, was under teleological influence. His presentation of things lacks dispassionateness. Instead of explaining the functions of the organs on the basis of their structure, Galen chose the reverse method. His anatomy and physiology were the most vulnerable part of his system, and an earnest re-examination of these fields must necessarily have shaken his entire scheme of teaching. Galen expressed the greatest respect for Hippocrates, published his most important works with explanatory notes, but never entered into the spirit of the school of Cos, although he adopted many of its doctrines. Galen is the culminating point and end of ancient Greek medical science. In his vanity he thought he had completed all investigation, and that his successors had only to accept without effort what he had discovered. As will be shown in the following paragraph, his advice was, unfortunately for science, followed literally.

Pedanius Dioscurides from Anazarbe, who lived in the time of Nero and Vespasian, may be mentioned here as the most important pharmaceutical writer of ancient times. He simplified greatly the pharmacopœia, which had then assumed unwieldy dimensions, and freed it from ridiculous, superstitious remedies. Our modern pharmacology is based on his work, Τὰ τῶν ὑλικῶν βιβλία.

Cornelius Celsus (about 25–30 B. C.—45–50 A. D.) is the only Roman who worked with distinction in the medical field; but it is doubtful whether he was a physician. His work, "De re medica libri viii", which is written in classical Latin, and for which he used seventy-two works lost to posterity, gives a survey of medical science from Hippocrates to imperial times. Very famous is his description of the operation of lithotomy. Celsus was altogether forgotten until the fifteenth century, when Pope Nicholas V (1447–55) is said to have discovered a manuscript of his works.

Byzantine Period.—In Byzantine times medicine shows but little originality, and is of small importance in the history of medical development. The works handed down to us are all compilations, but as they frequently contain excerpts from lost works, they are of some historical value. The notable writers of this period are: Oreibasios (325–403), physician in ordinary to Julian the Apostate; and Aëtius of Amida, a Christian physician under Justinian (527–66). A little more originality than these men exhibited was shown by Alexander of Tralles (525–605), and Paulus Ægineta of the first half of the seventh century, of whose seven books, the sixth, dealing with surgery, was greatly valued in Arabian medicine. Paulus lived at Alexandria, and was one of the last to come from its once famous school, which became extinct after the capture of the city by Omar in 640. At the end of the thirteenth century Nicolaus Myrepsus, living at the court in Nicæa, made a collection of prescriptions which was extensively used. In the time of Emperor Andronicus III (1328–42) lived a highly gifted physician, Joannes Actuarius, and the mention of his writings closes the account of this period.

Arabian Medicine.—Arabian medical science forms an important chapter in the history of the development of medicine, not because it was especially productive, but because it preserved Greek medical science with that of its most important representative, Galen. It was, however, strongly influenced by oriental elements of later times. The adherents of the heretic Nestorius, who in 431 settled in Edessa, were the teachers of the Arabs. After their expulsion these Nestorians settled in Dschondisapor in 489, and there founded a medical school. After the conquest of Persia by the Arabs in 650, Greek culture was held in great esteem, and learned Nestorian, Jewish, and even Indian physicians worked diligently as translators of Greek writings. In Arabian Spain conditions similarly developed from the seventh century. Among important physicians in the first period of Greek-Arabian medicine—the period of dependence and of translations—come first the Nestorian family Bachtischua of Syria, which flourished until the eleventh century; Abu Zakerijja Jahja ben Maseweih (d. 875), known as Joannes Damascenus; Mesuë the Elder, a Christian, who was a director of the hospital at Bagdad, did independent work, and supervised the translation of Greek authors; Abu Jusuf Jacub ben Ishak ben el-Subbah el-Kindi (Alkindus, 813–73), who wrote a work about compound drugs; and the Nestorian Abu Zeid Honeïn ben Ishak ben Soliman ben Ejjub el 'Ibadi (Joannitius, 809–about 873), a teacher in Bagdad who translated Hippocrates and Dioscurides, and whose work "Isagoge in artem parvam Galeni", early translated into Latin, was much read in the Middle Ages. Wide activity and independent observation—based, however, wholly upon the doctrine of Galen—were shown by Abu Bekr Muhammed ben Zakarijja er-Razi (Rhazes, about 850–923), whose chief work, however, "El-Hawi fi'l Tib" (Continens) is a rather unsystematic compilation. In the Middle Ages his "Ketaab altib Almansuri" (Liber medicinalis Almansoris) was well known and had many commentators. The most valuable of the thirty-six productions of Rhazes which have come down to us is "De variolis et morbillis", a book based upon personal experience. We ought also to mention the dietetic writer Abu Jakub Ishak ben Soleiman el-Israïli (Isaac Judæus, 830–about 932), an Egyptian Jew; the Persian, Ali ben el-Abbas Ala ed-Din el-Madschhusi (Ali Abbas, d. 994), author of "El-Maliki" (Regalis dispositio, Pantegnum). Abu Dshafer Ahmed ben Ibrahim ben Abu Châlid Ibn el-Dshezzar (d. 1009) wrote about the causes of the plague in Egypt. A work on pharmaceutics was written by the physician in ordinary to the Spanish Caliph Hisham II (976–1013), Abu Daut Soleiman ben Hassan Ibn Dsholdschholl.

Of the surgical authors, Abu'l-Kasim Chalaf ben Abbâs el-Zahrewi of el-Zahra near Cordova (Abulkasem, about 912–1013) alone deserves mention, and he depends absolutely on Paulus Ægineta. While he received scant attention at home, since surgery was little cultivated by the Arabs, his work, written in a clear and perspicuous style, became known in the West through the Latin translation by Gerardus of Cremona (1187), and was extensively used even in later days. Arabian medicine reached its culmination with the Persian Abu Ali el-Hosein ben Abdallah Ibn Sina(Avicenna, 980–1037), who based his system entirely upon the teaching of Galen and tried in various ways to supplement the latter. His chief work,

"El-Kanûn" (Canon Medicinæ), written in a brilliant style and treating all branches of medical science, soon supplanted in the West the works of the Greeks and, until the time of the Humanists, served as the most important textbook for physicians; but in Arabian Spain his fame was small. One of his chief rivals was Abu-Merwan Abd el-Malik ben Abul-Ala Zohr ben Abd el-Malik Ibn Zohr (Avenzoar, 1113–62) from the neighbourhood of Seville. His friend, the philosopher and physician Abul-Welîd Muhammed ben Ahmed Ibn Roshd el-Maliki (Averroës, 1126–98), of Cordova, is regarded as the complement of Avicenna. His book was also popular in the West and bears the title "Kitâb el-Kolijjat" (Colliget). With the decline of Arabian rule began the decay of medicine. In the Orient this decline began after the fall of Bagdad in 1256, and in Spain after the capture of Cordova in 1236, the decay becoming complete after the loss of Granada in 1492. The predominance of Arabian medicine, which lasted scarcely three centuries, seriously delayed the development of our science. A brief survey of this period shows that the Arabs bent in slavish reverence before the works of Aristotle and Galen without examining them critically. No other Greek physician obtained such a hold on the Arabs as Galen, whose system, perfect in form, pleased them just as that of Aristotle pleased them in philosophy. Nowhere did dialectics play a greater part in medicine than among the Arabs and their later followers in the West. Independent investigation in the fields of exact science, anatomy, and physiology was forbidden by the laws of the Koran. Symptomatology (semiotics) at the bedside, especially prognosis based on the pulse and the state of the urine, were developed by them with an equally exaggerated and fruitless subtlety. Much, and perhaps the only credit due to them is in the field of pharmaceutics. We are indebted to them for a whole series of simple and compound drugs of oriental and Indian origin, previously unknown, and also for the polypharmacy of later times. Until the discovery of America the Venetian drug-trade was controlled by Arabian dealers.



William Harvey
(1578–1657)

Christianity's Share in the Development of Medical Science.—As long as the cruel persecution of the Church lasted throughout the Roman Empire, it was impossible for Christians to take direct part in the development of medical science. But provision had been made for medical aid within the community, because the priest, like the rabbi of small Jewish communities in the late Middle Ages, was also a physician. This is clear from the story of the two brothers, Sts. Cosmas and Damian, who studied medicine in Syria and were martyred under Diocletian. The exercise of practical charity under the direction of deacons of the churches gave rise to systematic nursing and hospitals. In recent times it has, indeed, been alleged that the existence of hospitals among the Buddhists, even in the third century before Christ, and their existence in ancient Mexico at the time of its discovery is demonstrable, and that hospitals had their origin in general philanthropy; but nobody denies that the nursing of the sick, especially during epidemics, had never before been so widespread, so well organized, so self-sacrificing as in the early Christian communities. Christianity tended the sick and devised and executed extensive schemes for the care of deserted children (foundlings, orphans), of the feeble and infirm, of those out of work, and of pilgrims. The era of persecution ended, we find large alms-houses and hospitals like that of St. Basilius in Cæsarea (370), those of the Roman Lady Fabiola in Rome and Ostia (400), that of St. Samson adjoining the church of St. Sofia in Constantinople in the sixth century, the foundling asylum of Archbishop Datheus of Milan in 787, and many others. In 1198 Pope Innocent III rebuilt the pilgrims' shelter, which had been founded in 726 by a British king, but had been repeatedly destroyed by fire. He turned it into a refuge for travellers and a hospital, and entrusted it to the Brothers of the Holy Ghost established by Guy de Montpellier. Mention must also be made here of the religious orders of knights and the houses for lepers of later times. The great hospitals of the Arabs in Dschondisapor and Bagdad were built after Christian models. The celebrated ecclesiastical writer Tertullian (born A. D. 160) possessed a wide knowledge of medicine, which, following the custom of his time, he calls a "sister of philosophy". Clement of Alexandria, about the middle of the century, lays down valuable hygienic laws in his "Pædagogus". Lactantius in the fourth century speaks in his work "De Opificio Dei" about the structure of the human body. One of the most learned priests of his time, St. Isidore of Seville (d. 636), treats of medicine in the fourth book of his "Origines S. Etymologiæ". St. Benedict of Nursia (480) made it a duty for the brothers of his order to study the sciences, and among them medicine, as aids to the exercise of hospitality. Cassiodorus gave his monks direct instructions in the study of medicine. Bertharius, Abbot of Monte Cassino in the ninth century, was famous as a physician. Walafrid Strabo (d. 849), Abbot of Reichenau, the oldest medical writer on German soil, describes in a poem (Hortulus) the value of native medicinal plants, and also the method of teaching medicine in monasteries. We must mention, furthermore, the "Physica", a description of drugs from the three kingdoms of nature, written by St. Hildegarde (1099–1179), abbess of a monastery near Bingen-on-the-Rhine. The curative properties of minerals are described by Marbodus of Angers, Bishop of Rennes (d. 1123), in his "Lapidarius".

How diligently medicine was studied in the monasteries is shown by the numerous manuscripts (many still unedited) in the old cathedral libraries, and by those which were taken from the suppressed monasteries and are now to be found in the national libraries of various countries. Priests who possessed a knowledge of medicine served as physicians-in-ordinary to princes as late as the fifteenth century, although they were forbidden to practise surgery by the Fourth Synod of the Lateran (1213). Thus, Master Gerhard, parish-priest in Felling, who founded the Hospital of the Holy Ghost at Vienna (1211), was physician-in-ordinary to Duke Leopold VI of Austria, and Sigismund Albicus, who afterward became Archbishop of Prague (1411), held the same office at the court of King Wenzel of Bohemia (1391–1411). From this time, we constantly meet with priests possessing a knowledge of medicine and writing on medical subjects. The popes, the most important patrons of all the sciences, were friendly also to the development of medicine. That they ever at any time forbade the practice of anatomical investigation is a fable. Pope Boniface VIII in 1299–1300 forbade the practice then prevalent of boiling the corpses of noble persons who had died abroad, in order that their bones might be more conveniently transported to the distant ancestral tomb. This prohibitory rule had reference only to cases of death in Christian countries, while in the

Orient (e. g. during the Crusades) the usage seems to have been tacitly allowed to continue.

First Universities in the West.—Having voluntarily undertaken the education of the young in all branches of learning, the monasteries were aided in their endeavours by both Church and State. The foundation of state schools is the work of Charlemagne (768–814), whose activity, especially in the Germanic countries, was stimulated by the decree of the Synod of Aachen (789), that each monastery and each cathedral chapter should institute a school. According to the Capitulary of Charlemagne at Diedenhofen (Thionville) in 806, medicine was commonly taught in these schools. At the diocesan school in Reims, we find Gerbert d'Aurillac, later Pope Sylvester II (999–1003), long active as a teacher of medicine. Simultaneously with the rise of the cities there sprang up higher municipal schools, as for instance the *Burgerschule* at St. Stephan's in Vienna (about 1237). Out of the secular and religious schools, the curriculum of which institutions comprised the entire learning of the times, the first universities developed themselves, partly under imperial and partly under papal protection, according as they sprang from the lay and the cathedral or monastic schools.

School of Salerno.—This is regarded as the oldest medical school of the West. Salerno on the Tyrrhenian Sea, originally probably a Doric colony, was from the sixth to the eleventh century under the rule of the Lombards, and from 1075 to 1130 under that of the Normans. In 1130 it became a part of the Kingdom of Naples and Sicily. The origin of the school is obscure, but, contrary to former belief, it was not a religious foundation, though very many priests were engaged there as teachers of medicine. Women and even Jews were admitted to these studies. Salerno was destined to cultivate for a long time Greek medical science in undimmed purity, until the twelfth century saw the school fall a victim to the all-powerful Arab influence. One of its oldest physicians was Alpuhans, later (1058–85) Archbishop of Salerno. With him worked the Lombard Gariopontus (d. 1050), whose "Passionarius" is based upon Hippocrates, Galen, and Cælius Aurelianus. Contemporary with him was the female physician Trotula, who worked also in the literary field, and who is said to have been the wife of the physician Joannes Platearius. Perhaps the best known literary work of this school is the anonymous "Regimen sanitatis Salernitanum", a didactic poem consisting of 364 stanzas, which has been translated into all modern languages. It is said to have been dedicated to Prince Robert, son of William the Conqueror, upon his departure from Salerno in 1101. An important change in the intellectual tendency of the "Civitas Hippocratica", as this school called itself, was brought about by the physician Constantine of Carthage (Constantinus Africanus), a man learned in the Oriental languages and a teacher of medicine at Salerno, who died in 1087 a monk of Monte Cassino. While hitherto the best works of Greek antiquity had been known only in mediocre Latin translations, Constantine in the solitude of Monte Cassino began to translate from the Arabic Greek authors (e. g. the "Aphorisms" of Hippocrates and the "Ars parva" of Galen), as well as such Arabic writers as were accessible to him (Isaak, Ali Abbas). As he brought to the knowledge of his contemporaries first class Greek authors, but only secondary Arab writers, the study of the former became more profound, while on the other hand an interest was awakened in the hitherto unknown Arabic literature. His pupils were Bartholomæus, whose "Practica" was translated into German as early as the thirteenth century, and Johannes Afflacius (De febribus et urinis). To the twelfth century, when Arabian polypharmacy was introduced, belong Nicolaus Præpositus (about 1140), whose "Antidotarium", a collection of compounded pharmaceutical formulæ, became a model for later works of this kind, and Matthæus Platearius, who, towards the end of the century, wrote a commentary on the above-named "Antidotarium" (Glossæ) and a work about simple drugs (Circa instans). Similar productions appeared from the hand of an otherwise unknown *Magister Salernitanus*. Maurus, following Arabian sources, wrote on uroscopy. Here must be also mentioned Petrus Musandinus (De cibis et potibus febricitantium), the teacher of Pierre Giles of Corbeil (Ægidius Corboliensis), who later became a canon and the physician-in-ordinary to Philip Augustus of France (1180–1223), and who even at this day began to complain about the decay of the school.

Its first misfortune dates from the death of King Roger III (1193), when the army of King Henry VI captured the city. The establishment of the University of Naples by Frederick II in 1224, the preponderance of Arabian influence, and the rise of the Montpellier school, all exerted so unfavourable an influence that by the fourteenth century Salerno was well-nigh forgotten. Salerno is the oldest school having a curriculum prescribed by the state. In 1140 King Roger II ordered a state examination to test the proficiency of prospective physicians, and Frederick II in 1240 prescribed five years of study besides a year of practical experience. When we consider the proximity of Northern Africa, that the neighbouring Sicily had been under Saracenic rule from the ninth to the eleventh century, and that the Norman kings, and to a far greater degree Frederick II, gave powerful protection to Arabian art and science, it seems wonderful that this oasis of Græco-Roman culture endured so long. Down to the twelfth century this school was ruled by a purely Hippocratic spirit, especially in practical medicine, by its diagnosis and by the treatment of acute diseases dietetically. Arabian influence makes itself felt first of all in therapeutics, a fact which is easily explained by the proximity of Amalfi, where the Arabian drug-dealers used to land. Local conditions (resulting from the Crusades) explain how surgery, especially the treatment of wounds received in war, was diligently cultivated. In Rogerius we find a Salernitan surgeon armed with independent experience, but showing, nevertheless, reminiscences of Abulhasem. His "Practica Chirurgiæ" dates from the year 1180. Although Salerno finally succumbed to Arabian influences, this school did not hand down to us a knowledge of the best Arabian authors.

Spain as the Transmitter of Arabian Medicine.—Its focus was the city of Toledo, which was taken from the Moors in 1085 by Alfonso VI of Castile and Leon. Here Archbishop Raimund (1130–50) founded an institution for translations, in which Jewish scholars were the chief workers. Here lived Gerard of Cremona (1114–87, properly Carmona, near Seville), the translator of Rhazes and Avicenna. A later translator of Rhases (about 1279) was the Jew Faradsch ben Salem (Faragius), who was educated at Salerno.

The Scholastic Period.—When in the twelfth century all the Aristotelean works gradually became known, one of the results was the development of scholasticism, that logically arranged systematic treatment and explanation of rational truths based upon the Aristotelean speculative method. Even though this tendency led to the growth of many excrescences in medicine and confirmed the predominance of Galen's system, also largely based on speculation, it is wrong to hold Scholasticism responsible for the mistakes which its disciples made in consequence of their faulty apprehension of the system, because scholasticism, far from excluding the observation of nature, directly promotes it. The best proof of this is the fact that the most important scholastic of the thirteenth century, Albertus Magnus, was likewise the most important physicist of his time. He thus imitated his model, Aristotle, in both directions. The

famous scholastic Roger Bacon (1214–94), an English Franciscan, lays chief stress in his theory of cognition upon experience as far as the natural sciences are concerned, and this with even greater emphasis than Albertus Magnus.

Albertus Magnus (Albert Count of Bollstädt, 1193–1280) was a Dominican. For medical science his works about animals, plants, and minerals alone concern us. Formerly a work called "De secretis mulierum" was wrongly attributed to him. Albertus's most eminent service to medicine was in pointing out the way to an independent observation of nature. The following books were to a certain degree based upon the writings of Albertus: the encyclopedic works on natural history of the Franciscan Bartholomæus Anglicus (about 1260), of Thomas of Cantimpré (1204–80), canon of Cambrai, of Vincent of Beauvais (d. 1264), the "Book of Nature" by Kunrad von Megenberg (1307–74), canon of Ratisbon, and the natural history of Meinau composed towards the end of the thirteenth century at the Monastery of Meinau on the Lake of Constance. In the medical schools the influence of scholasticism made itself felt, but this influence was always favourable. The scholastic physician, the philosopher at the bedside, with his compendious works of needy contents, with his endless game of question and answer, must not, however, be misjudged; he preserved interest in the observation of nature and was, as is freely conceded, a skilful practitioner, although he laid excessive stress upon formalism, and medicine in his hands made no special progress.



Leopold Auenbrugger (1722–1809)

Bologna was the principal home of scholastic medicine, and, as early as the twelfth century, a medical school existed there. The most famous physician there was Thaddeus Alderotti (Th. Florentinus, 1215–95), who even at that time gave practical clinical instruction and enjoyed great fame as a physician. Among his pupils were the four Varignana, Dino and Tommaso di Garbo, and Pietro Torrigiano Rustichelli—later a Carthusian monk—all well-known expounders of the writings of Galen. Indirect disciples were Pietro de Tussignana (d. 1410), who first described the baths at Bormio, and Bavarius de Bavariis (d. about 1480), who was for a long time physician to Pope Nicholas V.

Bologna and the Study of Anatomy.—Bologna has gained incomparable glory from the fact that Mondino de Liucci (about 1275–1326), the reviver of anatomy, taught there. There, for the first time since the Alexandrian period (nearly 1500 years), he dissected a human corpse, and wrote a treatise on anatomy based upon personal observation—a work which, for nearly two and a half centuries, remained the official textbook of the universities. Although Mondino's work, which appeared in 1316, contains many defects and errors, it nevertheless marked an advance and incited men to further investigation.

Padua, the famous rival of Bologna, received a university in 1222 from Frederick II. Just as the University of Leipzig originated in consequence of the migration of students and professors from the University of Prague in 1409, so Padua came into existence through a secession from Bologna. Bologna was soon surpassed by the daughter institution, and, from the foundation of the University of Vienna in 1365 until the middle of the eighteenth century, Padua remained a shining model for the medical school of Bologna. The first teacher of repute was Pietro d'Abano (Petrus Aponensis, 1250—about 1320), known as the "great Lombard"—an honorary title received during his residence at the University of Paris. On account of his too liberalistic opinions and his derision of Christian teaching in his "Conciliator differentiarum", his chief medical work, he was accused of being a heretic. From this period also date the "Aggregator Brixiensis" of Guglielmo Corvi (1250–1326), a work in even greater demand in later times, and the "Consilia" of Gentile da Foligno (d. 1348), who, in 1341, performed the first anatomical dissection in Padua. The fame of the school of Padua was greatly advanced by the family of physicians, the Santa Sophia, which about 1292 emigrated from Constantinople, and whose most famous members were Marsilio (d. 1405) and Galeazzo (d. 1427). The latter, one of the first teachers in Vienna (about 1398–1407), and later professor at Padua, wrote in Vienna a pharmacopœia which indicates absolutely independent observation in the field of botany. His antithesis and contemporary was Giacomo dalla Torre of Forli (Jacobus Foroliviensis, d. 1413), professor at Padua, known for his commentary on the "Ars parva" of Galen. Giacomo de Dondi (1298–1359), author of the "Aggregator Paduanus de medicinis simplicibus", tried to disengage a salt from the thermal waters of Abano, near Padua. As anatomist and practitioner we must mention Bartholomæus de Montagnana (d. 1460), and the grandfather of the unfortunate Savonarola, Giovanni Michele Savonarola (1390–1462), author of the "Practica Major", who worked along the same lines.

Montpellier.—The earliest information about the medical school of this place dates from the twelfth century. Like Salerno, Montpellier developed great independence as far as the other schools were concerned, and laid the greatest stress upon practical medicine. With the decay of Salerno, Montpellier gained in importance. The chief representative of this school is the Spaniard, Arnold of Villanova (1235—about 1312). His greatest merit is that, inclining more towards the Hippocratic school, he did not follow unconditionally the teachings of Galen and Avicenna, but relied upon his own observation and experience, while employing in therapeutics a more dietetic treatment as opposed to Arabian tenets. To him we are indebted for the systematic use of alcohol in certain diseases. A very doubtful merit is his popularizing of alchemy, to the study of which he was very much devoted. Other Montpellier representatives of purely practical medicine are Bernard of Gordon (d. 1314; "Lilium medicinæ", 1305), a Scotchman educated in Salerno; Gerardus de Solo (about 1320; "Introductorium juvenum"); Johannes de Tornamira (end of the fourteenth century; "Clarificatorium juvenum"); and the Portuguese Valescus de Taranta ("Philonium pharmaceuticum et chirurgicum", 1418). The medical school of Paris, founded in 1180, remained far behind Montpellier in regard to the practice of medicine.

Surgery in the Age of Scholasticism.—Surgery exhibited during this period in many respects a more independent development than practical medicine, especially in Bologna. The founder of the school there was Hugo Borgognoni of Lucca (d. about 1258). A more important figure was his son Teodorico, chaplain, penitentiary, and physician-in-ordinary to Pope Innocent IV, later Bishop of Cervia. In his "Surgery", completed in 1266, he recommends the simplification of the treatment of wounds, fractures, and dislocations. Guilielmo Saliceto from Piacenza (Guil. Placentinus), first of Bologna, then at Verona, where he

completed his surgery in 1275, shows great individuality and a keen diagnostic eye. Similarly his pupil Lanfranchi strongly recommended the reunion of surgery and internal medicine. Lanfranchi, banished in 1290 from his native city, Milan, transplanted Italian surgery to Paris. There the surgeons, like the physicians of the faculty, had, since 1260, been formed into a corporation, the Collège de St. Cosme (since 1713 Académie de Chirurgie), to which Lanfranchi was admitted. His "Chirurgia magna" (Ars completa), finished in 1296, is full of casuistic notes and shows us the author as an equally careful and lucky operator. The first important French surgeon is Henri de Mondeville (1260–1320), originally a teacher of anatomy at Montpellier, whose treatise, although for the most part a compilation, does not lack originality and perspicuity. The culminating point in French surgery at this period is marked by the appearance of Guy de Chauliac (Chaulhac, d. about 1370). He completed his studies at Bologna, Montpellier, and Paris; later he entered the ecclesiastical state (canon of Reims, 1358), and was physician-in-ordinary to popes Clement VI, Innocent VI, and Urban V. From him we have a description of the terrible plague which he witnessed in 1348 at Avignon. His "Chirurgia magna" treated the subject with a completeness never previously attained, and gave its author during the following centuries the rank of a first-class authority. Among contemporary surgeons in other civilized countries we must mention John Ardern (d. about 1399), an Englishman, who studied at Montpellier and lived subsequently in London, famous for his skill in operating for anal fistulæ, and Jehan Yperman of the Netherlands (d. about 1329), who studied in Paris under Lanfranchi. Besides these surgeons who had a fixed abode, there were a number of itinerant practitioners who offered their services at fairs; as, specializing usually in certain operations (hernio- and lithotomy), they often possessed great skill, and their advice and assistance were sought by people of the upper classes.

Signs of Improvement: Humanism.—A short survey of the scholastic period gives us the following picture: On the appearance of Arabic literature in Latin translations, Hippocratic medicine was driven from its last stronghold, Salerno. Then came the rule of Arabism, of the system of Galen in Arabic form equipped with all sorts of sophistic subtleties. The works of Rhazes and Avicenna possessed the greatest authority. The latter's "Canon", written in clear language and covering the entire field of medicine, became the gospel of physicians. The literature of these times is rich in writings but very poor in thought; for people were content when the long-winded commentaries gave them a better understanding of the Arabs, whom they deemed infallible. A good many things were incomprehensible, first of all the names of diseases and drugs, which translators rendered incorrectly. A comparative investigation of the Greek authors was practically impossible, as both their works and a knowledge of the Greek language had disappeared from among the Romance nations. Thus it happened that special books had to be written from which were learned foreign words and their meanings. The "Synonyma Medicinæ" (Clavis sanationis) by the physician Simon of Genoa (Januensis, 1270–1303) and the "Pandectæ medicinæ" of Matthæus Sylvaticus (d. 1342), both of which were alphabetically arranged, were much in vogue. Woe to the physician who dared to doubt the authority of the Arabs! Only men of strong mind could successfully carry out such a dangerous undertaking. The influence of scholasticism in medicine was manifold. It encouraged the observation of nature at the bedside and logical thinking, but it also stimulated the love of disputation, wherein the main object was to force a possibly independent idea into the strait-jacket of the ruling system, and thus avoid all imputation of medical heresy. Signs of improvement are noticed first in anatomy (Mondino) and subsequently in surgery, which is based upon it.

The impulse to follow a new path came, however, from without, first of all from a study of the Greek language, and then directly through the famous poet Francesco Petrarca (1304–74), the zealous patron of humanistic studies and thus of the Renaissance. Petrarch's instructor in the Greek language was the monk Barlaam, who procured for his pupil, Leontius Pilatus, a position as public teacher of the language in Florence in 1350. In later times, especially after the fall of Constantinople in 1453, numerous Greek scholars came to Italy. With the spread of a knowledge of Greek and the enthusiasm for the Hellenic masterpieces in art and science, there arose also an interest in classical Latin and a diligent search for manuscripts of Græco-Roman antiquity, and efforts along these lines were, as is well known, energetically supported by the popes. The West now became acquainted with the works of the old Greek pre-Aristotelean philosophers and physicians in their original tongue, a fact which marks the beginning of the fall of the Arabian teaching. Petrarch fought as champion along the whole line of battle, especially against scholasticism and the medicine of that period. There is no doubt that his zeal was exaggerated in many respects. He blames the physicians of his time because they philosophize and do not cure. Medicine, he says, is a practical art and, therefore, may not be treated according to the same methods for the investigation of truth as philosophy. The greatest misfortune had been the appearance of Arabism with all its superstitions (astrology, alchemy, uroscopy). On the other hand, he speaks with great respect of surgery; the reason for this is patent, since he was a friend of the most important surgeon of his time, Guy de Chauliac. There is no doubt that there were then in Italy many excellent physicians who, like Petrarch, recognized the existence of a wrong tendency in medicine, but they were far too weak to break the fetters of Arabism. The road to improvement had already been pointed out by Mondino, the anatomist of Bologna, but a complete change of view did not occur until the sixteenth century.

The Black Death of the Fourteenth Century.—Associated with the name of Petrarch is the memory of the most terrible epidemic of historic times. The Black Death (bubonic plague with pulmonary infection), originating in Eastern Asia, passed through India to Asia Minor, Arabia, Egypt, Northern Africa, and directly to Europe by the Black Sea. In Europe the epidemic began in 1346, and spread first of all in the maritime cities of Italy (especially Genoa) and Sicily; in 1347 it appeared in Constantinople, Cyprus, Greece, Malta, Sardinia, and Corsica, and, towards the end of the year, at Marseilles; in 1348 in Spain, Southern France (Avignon), Paris, the Netherlands, Italy, Southern England and London, Schleswig-Holstein, and Norway, and, in December, in Dalmatia and Jutland; in 1349 in the Austrian Alpine countries, Vienna, and Poland; in 1350 in Russia, where in 1353 the last traces disappeared on the shores of the Black Sea. The entire period was preceded by peculiar natural phenomena, as floods, tidal waves, and abnormally damp weather. Petrarch, who witnessed the plague at Florence, declared that posterity would regard the description of all its horrors as fables. The loss of human life in Europe, the population of which is estimated to have been 100 millions, is said to have amounted to twenty-five millions. The disease usually began suddenly and death occurred within three days, and often after a few hours. Physicians were quite powerless in face of the enormous extent of the pestilence. Great self-sacrifice was shown by the clergy, especially by the Franciscans, who are said to have lost 100,000 (?) members through the epidemic.

Concerning this terrible period we have reports from the jurist of Piacenza, Gabriel de Mussis; from Cantacuzenus and Nicephorus about the epidemic in Constantinople; from Boccaccio and Petrarch (Florence), from the physician Dionysius Colle of Belluno (Italy), the Belgian Simon of Covino (Montpellier), Guy de Chauliac (Avignon), and also from some Spanish physicians. Less voluminous accounts are to be found in the chronicles of the different countries. Europe has since been repeatedly visited by the plague, which has, however, never been so violent nor extended so widely. The last great epidemics occurred in Central Europe in 1679 and 1713.

Humanism and Medical Science in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries.—The terrors of the Black Death, and the conviction which it brought of the powerlessness of current medicine, undoubtedly helped to effect a gradual change. The greatest influence, however, was exerted by the humanistic tendency which had found many adherents, especially among physicians. The desire after general cultivation in the natural sciences was substantially promoted by the great voyages of discovery made towards the end of the fifteenth century. It is worthy of mention that, at a time when the gifted Christopher Columbus was still ridiculed as a dreamer by the learned, the Florentine astronomer and physician, Toscanelli, and the house-physician of the Franciscan monastery of Santa Maria de Rabida, Garcia Fernandes, both heartily encouraged him and gave him material aid. The scientific endeavours for the reform of medicine are characterized by the activity of the translators, by the critical treatment and explanation of old authors, and by independent investigation especially in the field of botany. Concerning translations, those which had reference to the Hippocratic writings were of prime importance. Among the translators and commentators of these works we find Nicola Leoniceno of Vicenza (1428–1524), the Spaniard Franciscus Valesius (end of the sixteenth century), the Frenchman Jacques Houllier (Hollerius, 1498–1562), Johann Hagenbut of Saxony (Cornarus, 1500–58), the two Paris professors, Jean de Gorris (Gorræus, 1505–77), and Louis Duret (1527–86), and Anutius Foesius (1528–91), a physician of Metz. As investigators of Pliny there are Ermolao Barbaro (1454–93), later Patriarch of Aquileia, and Filippo Beroaldo (1453–1505). Students of other authors were Giovanni Manardo of Ferrara (1462–1536; Galen, Mesue), the Paduan professor Giovanni Battista de Monte (Montanus, 1498–1552; Galen, Rhazes, Avicenna), and the Englishmen Thomas Linacre (1461–1524), and John Kaye (1506–73), Wilhelm Copus, town physician of Basle (1471–1521), and Theodore Zwinger of Switzerland (1533–88), all students of Galen. As may be seen, the system of Galen still formed the central point of medical studies, but it must be regarded as an advance that people now read his works in the original or in accurate translations, not as before in their Arabic form, for in this way many changes and conflicting views introduced by the Arabs were detected. But the full beauty of the Hippocratic works could not be appreciated as long as Galen reigned supreme.

Edward Jenner
(1749–1823)

The first fruit of Humanism in medicine was primarily of a purely formal nature, the main stress being now laid upon philological subtleties and elegant diction. No longer content with prose, authors often recorded their thoughts in verse. Petrarch had blamed the physicians of his time because they knew how to construct syllogisms, but did not know how to cure; and now the place of the philosophizing practitioners was taken by the poet physicians. A more satisfactory sign of the times is the great number of medical botanists, whose works show more or less independent investigation, and always regard the needs of the physician at the bedside. Among these we must mention the town physician of Bern, Otto Brunfels (d. 1534), Leonard Fuchs (1501–66), professor at Ingolstadt, Hieronymus Tragus (Bock) of Heiderbach (1498–1554), and his pupil Jacobus Theodorus Tabernæmontanus (d. 1590). The most important, however, is the Zurich physician Conrad Gesner (1516–65; Tabulæ phytographicæ), who was the first to experiment with tobacco brought from America. Only Andrea Cesalpini, professor at the Sapienza in Rome, can be regarded as his equal. The interest taken in the study of natural science in Germany by Hapsburg emperors, Ferdinand I (1522–64) and Maximilian (1564–76), was of great advantage to it. The physician-in-ordinary to the Archduke Ferdinand of Tyrol, Petrus Andreas Mathiolus of Siena (1500–77), published a translation of Dioscurides with a commentary, a work which was most highly valued until recent times. The special favour of Maximilian II was enjoyed by Rembert Dodœns (Dodonæus) of Mechlin (1517–85), and by the founder of scientific botany, Charles de l'Ecluse (Clusius) of Antwerp (1525–1609). The latter was appointed professor in Leyden, and for a time lived in Vienna, where he found zealous followers in the physicians Johann Aicholtz (d. 1588) and Paul Fabricus (d. 1589).

Progress in Anatomy: Andreas Vesalius.—From the time of Mondino anatomy had been diligently cultivated at the universities, especially in Italy. In Bologna, Giovanni de Concoreggi (d. 1438) issued a work on anatomy. As commentators of Mondino we must mention Alessandro Achillini (1463–1512) and Jacopo Berengerio da Carpi (about 1470–1530). Anatomy made special progress because of the artists. Thus Raphael Sanzio (1488–1520) already makes use of the human skeleton when making his sketches, so as to give his figures the proper posture. We possess numerous anatomical descriptions and sketches by Leonardo da Vinci (1442–1519), which were intended partly for an anatomy planned by Marcantonio della Torre (Turrianus, 1473–1506), and partly for a work of his own. The great Michelangelo (1475–1564) left sketches of the muscles, and in 1495, in the monastery of Santo Spirito at Florence, made studies for a picture of the Crucified with cadavers as models.—As an indication of how much the popes endeavoured to advance the study of anatomy, we may recall that the priest Gabriel de Zerbis for a time taught anatomy in Rome (towards the end of the fifteenth century), that Paul III (1534–49) appointed the surgeon Alfonso Ferri to teach this subject at the Sapienza in 1535, that the physician-in-ordinary of Julius III (1550–55), Giambattista Cannani, crowned his anatomical studies by discovering the valves in the veins; that Paul IV (1555–9) called to Rome the famous Realdo Colombo, the teacher of Michelangelo, and that Colombo's sons dedicated their father's work, "De re anatomica", to Pope Pius IV (1559–1565). Foremost among the universities stood Padua, the stronghold of medical science, whence was to issue the light which disclosed the weaknesses of Galen's system. In Padua, where Bartolomeo Montagna (d. 1460) performed no less than fourteen dissections, there existed since 1446 an anatomical theatre which

in 1490 was rebuilt under Alessandro Benedetti (1460–1525). Of the anatomists who worked outside of Italy we may mention Guido Guidi (Vidus Vidius) of Florence (d. 1569), until 1531 professor at Paris; his successor François Jacques Dubois (Sylvius, d. 1551), and Günther von Andernach (1487–1574), professor at Louvain. The two latter were the teachers of the great reformer of anatomy, Andreas Vesalius (q. v.).

Vesalius (b. 1514), studied at Louvain, Montpellier, and Paris, and then became imperial field-surgeon. His eagerness to learn went so far that he stole corpses from the gallows to work on at night in his room. He soon became convinced of the weakness and falsity of the anatomy of Galen. His anatomical demonstrations on the cadaver, which he performed in several cities and which attracted attention, soon earned him a call to Padua where he had recently graduated and where, with some interruptions, he taught from 1539 to 1546. His chief work, "De corporis humani fabrica libri vii", which appeared at Basle in 1543, brought him great fame, but likewise aroused violent hostility, especially on the part of his former teacher, Sylvius. The supreme service of Vesalius is that he for the first time, with information derived from the direct study of the dead body, attacked with keen criticism the hitherto unassailable Galen, and thus brought about his overthrow, for soon after this serious weaknesses in other parts of Galen's medical science were also disclosed. Vesalius is the founder of scientific anatomy and of the technique of modern dissection. Unfortunately, he himself destroyed a part of his manuscripts on learning that his enemies intended to submit his work to ecclesiastical censure. While engaged on a pilgrimage, he received word in Jerusalem of his reappointment as professor in Padua, but he was shipwrecked in Zant and died there in great need on 15 October, 1565.

The authority of Galen was, however, still so deep-rooted among physicians that Vesalius found opponents even among his own more intimate pupils. Nevertheless, the path which he had pointed out was further explored and anatomy enriched by new discoveries. His immediate successors as teacher in Padua were, in 1546, Realdo Colombo (d. 1569), later professor in Rome, the discoverer of the lesser circulation of the blood (pulmonary circulation), d. 1569; from 1551 the versatile Gabriele Fallopio (1523–62), an admirer of Vesalius, who among other things described the organ of hearing; Girolamo Fabrizio of Acquapendente (Fabr. ab Aquapendente, 1537–1619), who worked in the field of embryogeny and studied carefully the valves in the veins, and finally Giulio Casserio (1561–1619), who published a series of anatomical charts. A similar undertaking was planned by Bartolommeo Eustacchi at the Sapienza in Rome, but he died before the completion of the work in 1574. Pope Clement XI (1700–21) caused his physician-in-ordinary, Giovanni Maria Lancisi, to print the rediscovered copper-plates and to supply them with an explanatory text. Adrian van den Spieghel of Brussels (Spigelius, 1578–1625) worked on the anatomy of the liver and of the nervous system. In comparison with the excellent productions of Italy, the anatomical activity of Germanic countries appears slight. It was considered sufficient at the universities, if a surgeon now and then dissected a corpse, while a physician explained the functions of the different organs. The only laudable exceptions were two physicians who rendered services both to anatomy and botany—Felix Platter (1536–1614), professor in Basle, and his successor, Kaspar Bauhinus (1560–1624), the discoverer of the valve in the *cæcum* named after him (Bauhin's valve).

The Opponents of Galen and the Arabs.—Violent attacks upon ancient traditions were not confined to the domain of medicine, but also found expression in the general upheaval caused by Humanists, by the discovery of new countries, by the opening up of new sources of knowledge, by the dissemination of education through the invention of printing, and by the schism of the Church brought about by Luther. Authority, both ecclesiastical and civil, had been considerably weakened. The investigations of Vesalius probably dealt the most serious blow to the teaching of Galen, but it was neither the first nor the only one; for even before Vesalius' critics had attacked the theories of Galen and the Arabs, although not quite so energetically as the anatomists attacked them. The chief representatives of these times down to the end of the sixteenth century can be classed respectively into anti-Galenists or anti-Arabists and positive Hippocratics. The climax of this revolution was reached on the appearance of Theophrastus Paracelsus and his adherents, although the Italian schools remained uninfluenced by this. The physician and philosopher, Geronimo Cardano of Milan (1501–76), attacked principally Galen's explanation of the origin of catarrhs of the brain, and also the validity of the therapeutical principle, *Contraria contrariis curantur*. Similar was the tendency shown by Bernardino Telesio of Piacenza (1508–88), Giovanni Argenterio of Piedmont (1513–72), and the chancellor of Montpellier, Laurent Joubert (1529–83), while Jean Fernel (1485–1558), made an attempt to modernize the system of Galen in accordance with the results of anatomical investigation.

A lively exchange of opinions was caused by the controversy on bleeding, which was begun by the Paris physician Pierre Brissot (1478–1522). Brissot assailed the Arabian doctrine that inflammatory diseases, especially pleurisy, should be treated by bleeding on the side opposite to the seat of inflammation, and favoured the Hippocratic doctrine of bleeding as near as possible to it. The controversy was decided in favour of the Hippocratics, who did not discard the doctrines of Galen as long as they agreed with Hippocratic views, but rejected the principles of Galen as modified by the Arabs. This is clearly shown by the importance attached to the state of the pulse and of the urine, upon which the Arabs laid much more stress than the Greeks. Of the great number of positive Hippocratics let us call attention to the above-mentioned de Monte, who introduced clinical instruction in Padua; to his successors Vellore Trincavella (1496–1568), Albertino Bottoni (d. about 1596), Marco degli Oddi (d. 1598, Giovanni Manardo (1462–1526), Prospero Alpino (1533–1617); to the Spaniards, Cristóbal de Vega (1510–about 1580), and Luis Mercado (1520–1606); to the Frenchman Guillaume Baillou (Ballonius, 1538–1616); to the Netherlanders, Peter Foreest (1522–97) and Jan van Heurne (1543–1601), who will be mentioned subsequently; Franz Emerich (1496–1560), the organizer of clinical instruction at Vienna; Johann Crato of Crafftheim (1519–85), and Johann Schenck von Grafenberg (1530–98). Epidemiological works were written by Antonio Brassavola (1500–55) on syphilis; Girolamo Fracastoro (1483–1553) on petechial fever and syphilis; Girolamo Donzellini (d. 1558), and Alessandro Massaria (1510–98) on plagues; Jan van den Kasteele (about 1529) on "the English sweat"; and the Viennese physician, Thomas Jordanus (1540–85), on purple or petechial fever.

Theophrastus Paracelsus. His Adherents and Opponents.—Theophrastus Bombast of Hohenheim (Paracelsus), the son of a physician, was born near Einsiedeln, Switzerland, in 1493. In 1506 he went to the University of Basle; from Trithemius he learned chemistry and metallurgy in the smelting houses at Schwaz (Tyrol), and he visited the principal universities of Italy and France. In 1526 he became town physician of Basle, and could as such give lectures. His first appearance is characteristic of him. He publicly burned the works of Avicenna and Galen and showed respect only to the "Aphorisms" of Hippocrates. He was the first to give lectures in the Ger-

man language. But, as early as 1528, he was compelled, on account of the hostility he evoked, to leave Basle secretly. After this he travelled through various countries working constantly at his numerous writings, until death overtook him at Salzburg in 1514. Paracelsus, like a blazing meteor, rose and disappeared; he shared the fate of those who have a violent desire to destroy the old without having any substitute to offer. Passing over his philosophic views, which were based upon neo-Platonism, we find practical medicine indebted to him in various ways, e. g. for the theory of the causes of disease (etiology), for the introduction of chemical therapeutics, and for his insistence on the usefulness of mineral waters and native vegetable drugs. He exaggerates indeed the value of experience. His classification and diagnosis of diseases are quite unscientific, anatomy and physiology being wholly neglected. He thought that for each disease there should exist a specific remedy, and that to discover this is the chief object of medical art. With him diagnosis hung upon the success of this or that remedy, and because of this he named the diseases according to their specific remedies. Directly repudiated by the Italian schools, Paracelsus found adherents mainly in Germany, among them being the Wittenberg professor Oswald Croll (about 1560–1609). He also found numerous friends among the travelling physicians and quacks. His teachings met with the most hostile reception from the Paris faculty. Although the further progress of anatomy and physiology indicated clearly to physicians the right path, we meet even in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with two men who start directly from Paracelsus: Samuel Friedrich Hahnemann (1755–1843), the originator of homœopathy, and Johann Gottfried Rademacher (1772–1850), advocate of empiricism.

Baron Jean-Nicholas de Corvisart (1755–1821)

Surgery in the Sixteenth Century: Ambroise Paré.—The first fruits of the progress in anatomy were enjoyed by surgery, especially since most Italian anatomists were practical surgeons. After the introduction of fire-arms in war, the treatment of gunshot wounds was especially studied. While surgery had always enjoyed a high rank in Italy and France, in Germany it was in the hands of barbers and surgeons, unconnected with the universities and poorly educated; hence it is readily understood why the best surgeons lived in the cities nearest the Romance countries, especially Strasburg. With the member of the Teutonic Order, Heinrich von Pfolspeundt ("Bündth-Ertzney", 1460), the most important representatives were the Strasburg surgeons, Hieronymus Brunschwig (d. about 1534), and Hans von Gersdorff ("Feldtbuch der Wundtartzney", 1517). Their equal was a somewhat younger man, Felix Würtz of Basle (1518–74). We are indebted to the French field-surgeon Ambroise Paré for a marked change in the treatment of gunshot wounds and arterial hemorrhage. He abandoned the Arabic method of work with a red-hot knife, declared that supposedly poisoned gunshot wounds were simple contused wounds, and proceeded to bandage them without using hot oil. He was the first to employ the ligature in the case of arterial hemorrhage. Next to him in importance stands Pierre Franco (about 1560), known as the perfecter of the operation of lithotomy and that for hernia. Gaspare Tagliacozzi of Bologna (1546–99) deserves credit for reintroducing and improving the ancient plastic operations. In the sixteenth century the Cæsarean operation (Sectio cæsarea, laparotomy) was performed on living persons.

Discovery of the Circulation of the Blood: William Harvey and his Time.—Galen's theory, according to which the left heart and the arteries contained air, the blood being generated in the liver, had long been regarded as improbable, but in spite of every effort no one had as yet discovered the truth about circulation. The solution of this problem, which brought about a complete fall of Galen's system and a revolution in physiology, came from the English physician William Harvey of Folkstone (1578–1657), a pupil of Fabricius ab Aquapendente. Harvey's discovery published in 1628, that the heart is the centre of the circulation of the blood and that all blood must return to the heart, at first received scant notice and was even directly opposed by Galen's adherents; but further investigation soon made truth victorious. Even as early as 1622, Gaspare Aselli (1581–1626) found the chyle vessels, but correct explanation was possible only after the discovery of the thoracic duct (*ductus thoracius*) and its opening into the circulation by Jean Pacquet (1622–74) and Johann van Horne (1621–70), and of the lymphatic vessels by Olaus Rudbeck (1630–1702) and Thomas Bartholinus (1616–80). A new field of investigation was opened by the invention of the microscope, by which Marcello Malpighi (1628–94) discovered the smaller blood-vessels and the blood corpuscles. From Harvey's time starts a series of important anatomists and physiologists, among them the Englishmen Thomas Wharton (1614–73; glands) and Thomas Willis (1621–75; brain); the Netherlanders Peter Paaw (1564–1617), his pupil Nikolas Pieterz Tulp (1593–1678), both teachers of anatomy at Leyden, and Antony van Leeuwenhoek (1632–1723) and Johann Swammerdam (1647–80), microscopists; Reinier de Graaf (1641–73; ovary); Nikolaus Steno of Copenhagen (1638–86), and the Germans, Moriz Hofman (1621–98) and George Wirsung, who investigated the pancreas.

Iatrophysicists and Iatrochemists.—The doctrine of the circulation is based to a large extent upon the laws of physics. Consequently among a number of physicians, influenced by the works of Alfonso Borelli (1608–78) on animal motion, there was a marked effort to explain all physiological processes according to the laws of physics (iatrophysicists). Opposed to them was a party, which, influenced by the progress in chemistry, sought to make use of it for explaining medical facts (iatrochemists). This tendency goes back to Paracelsus and his adherent Johann Baptist von Helmont (1578–1644). Helmont, who was an important chemist (the discoverer of carbonic acid), recognized the importance of anatomy, and deserves credit for his work in therapeutics, although his failure to appraise the needs of his time prevented his doctrine from influencing the development of medicine. Iatrophysics was cultivated mainly in Italy and England; iatrochemistry in the Netherlands and Germany. The chief adherent of iatrophysics in Italy was Giorgio Baglivi (d. 1707), professor at the Sapienza in Rome; in practical medicine, however, he held mainly to Hippocratic principles, while the Englishman, Archibald Pitcairn (1652–1713), tried to follow out iatrophysics to its utmost consequences.

Owing to the greater progress made in physics, iatrochemistry found fewer followers, and that it took root at all is the service of its chief representative Franz de le Boë Sylvius (1614–72), who in 1658 became professor of practical medicine at Leyden. At the school there, founded in 1575, Jan van Heurne had

already tried to establish a clinic after the Paduan model, but it was not till 1637 that his son Otto was able to carry out his scheme. The immediate successors of the latter, Albert Kyper (d. 1658), and Ewald Schrevelius (1576–1646), continued this institution in the Hippocratic spirit. Before Sylvius began to teach there, the Leyden clinic had already gained world-wide fame. One of the first adherents of Harvey, Sylvius, depending in part on Paracelsus and Helmont, sought to explain physiological processes by suggesting fermentation (molecular motion of matter) and "vital spirits" as moving forces. Through "effervescence" acid and alkaline juices are formed, and through their abnormal mixture hyperacidity and hyperalkalinity (i. e. sickness) originate. This simple doctrine, supported by the clinical activity of Sylvius, found numerous adherents especially in Germany; but it made just as many opponents among the iatrophysicists, who were able to refute in part these untenable hypotheses. The two theories are, however, not absolutely opposed to each other, for both physics and chemistry offer the means necessary for an explanation of physiological processes, and may form the basis for the construction of an exact medical science. At this time, however, physics and chemistry (especially the latter) were still too little developed for this purpose, and therefore the endeavour to create a system is much more apparent among the iatrochemists. Fortunately, the two parties found a common point of union in practical medicine, where the doctrines of the Hippocratic school were predominant.

Pioneers in Practical Medicine: Thomas Sydenham and Hermann Boerhave.—Both renounce all systems, and lay most stress upon the perfection of practical medicine. Thomas Sydenham (1624–89), physician at Westminster and known as the "English Hippocrates", laid down the principle that, just as in the natural sciences, so in medicine the inductive method should be authoritative. The main object of medicine, healing, would be possible only when the changes lying at the root of disease and the laws governing its course had been investigated. Then also would the proper remedies be found. Following the idea of Hippocrates, he seeks the cause of disease in the change of the fundamental humours (humoral pathology). The activity of the physician was mainly to assist "nature". A man of the same intellectual build as Sydenham was Hermann Boerhave (1668–1738), the most famous practitioner of his time, who in 1720 became clinical professor at Leyden. Being an iatrophysicist, he regards Hippocratism as able to live only if the results of investigation in anatomy, physiology, physics, and chemistry are properly utilized. He tries to explain most physiological processes as purely mechanical. In contradistinction to the two professors of Halle, Friedrich Hoffmann (1660–1742) and George Ernst Stahl (1660–1734), of whom the former supposed the ether (Leibniz's doctrine of monads) and the latter the "soul" to be the moving power, Boerhave did not care at all about any moving force that might possibly be present. With his death Leyden lost its importance as a nursery of medicine. His illustrious pupil and commentator, Gerhard van Swieten (1700–72), was called as teacher to Vienna in 1745, and there laid the foundation of the fame of the school whose most important representatives are Anton de Haen (1704–76) and his successor as teacher, Maximilian Stoll (1742–88). Under the eye of van Swieten and de Haen, but without recognition from them, a simple hospital physician, Leopold Auenbrugger (1722–1809), published his epoch-making discovery that, by striking or rapping on the chest (percussion), disease of the lungs and heart may be diagnosed from the various sounds elicited by such percussion. An important member of the Vienna school was Johann Peter Frank (1745–1821), director of the general hospital, who was celebrated as a practitioner and as the author of a work, unequalled until then ("System einer vollständigen medizinischen Polizey", 1779–1819).

Among important practitioners outside of the school of Leyden were: the papal physician-in-ordinary, Giovanni Maria Lancisi (1654–1720), who established a clinic in Rome after the model of Leyden; Giovanni Battista Borsieri (Burserius de Kanilfeld, 1725–85), professor at Pavia; James Keill (1673–1718); Richard Mead (1673–1754); John Freind (1675–1728, smallpox); John Pringle (1707–82) and John Huxham (1694–1768), investigators in epidemiology; John Fothergill (1712–80; diphtheria and intermittent fever). Albrecht von Haller developed an important school in Göttingen as van Swieten had done in Vienna. The first members of the Göttingen school were: Paul Gottlieb Werlhof (1699–1767; intermittent fever) and Johann Georg Zimmermann (1728–95).

Anatomy in the Eighteenth Century.—During this period normal and pathological anatomy were more cultivated than microscopy. The greater number of investigators that we have to consider won fame in the field of surgery. Starting from the school of Leyden the following anatomists deserve mention: Govert Bidloo (1649–1713) and Bernhard Sigmund Albinus (1697–1770; anatomical charts); in Amsterdam, Friedrich Ruysch (1638–1721), and Pieter Camper (1722–89), the inventor of craniometry and of the elastic truss for hernia; in Italy, Antonio Maria Valsalva (1666–1723; eye and ear) and Giovanni Domenico Santorini (1681–1737); in Paris, the Dane Jakob Benignus Winslöw (1669–1760; topographical anatomy); in England, James Douglas (1675–1742; peritoneum); Alexander Munroe (1732–1817; bursa mucosa), and William (1718–83) and John Hunter (1728–93) both known also as surgeons; finally in Germany, the anatomist, surgeon, and botanist, Lorenz Heister (1683–1758), Johann Friedrich Meckel (1724–74; nerves); Johann Gottfried Zinn (1727–59; eye); Johann Nathanael Lieberkühn (1711–65; intestine); Heinrich August Wrisberg (1739–1808; larynx), and Samuel Thomas Sömmering (1755–1830). Abnormal anatomical changes in organs had been recorded since the time of Vesalius, but these were for the most part merely incidental observations, and nobody had tried to trace systematically the connexion between them and the symptoms occurring in the living body. The best survey of the achievements of the earlier centuries is offered in Theophil Bonet's "Sepulchretum anatomicum" (1709). As the scientific founder of pathological anatomy we must mention Giovanni Battista Morgagni (1682–1771), professor at Padua, whose famous work, "De sedibus et causis morborum" (1761), usually contains, besides the results of post-mortem examinations, a corresponding history of the diseases. This field was cultivated in France especially by Joseph Lieutaud (1703–80) and Vicq d'Azyr (1748–94), and in Leyden by Eduard Sandifort (1742–1814). Germany had an important investigator in the days before Morgagni, viz., Johann Jakob Wepfer in Schaffhausen (1620–95). In Vienna, autopsies on those who died in the clinic were first regularly made by Anton de Haen. For a strictly systematic treatment of the whole field we are indebted to the London physician, Matthew Baillie (1761–1823), who published the first pictorial work on pathological anatomy.

Surgery in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.—The eminent surgeons of the seventeenth century are: Cesare Magati (1579–about 1648), professor in Ferrara and later a Capuchin monk, who simplified the treatment of wounds; Marc' Aurelio Severino (1580–1656; treatment of abscesses, resection of ribs); the already mentioned anatomist, Fabrizio ab Aquapendente (re-introduction of tracheotomy,

improvement of herniotomy); Antonio Ciucci (about 1650; re-introduction of lithotripsy); in France, Bartholomæus Saviard (1656–1702; digital compression of arteries), Jacques Beaulieu (1651–1714), a travelling surgeon and later a hermit (Frère Jacques), who improved the method of lateral lithotomy, and helped people for a "God-bless-you"; in Amsterdam, Abraham Cyprianus (about 1695; lithotomy). The most important German surgeon is Wilhelm Fabry of Hilden (Fabricius Hildanus, 1560–1634; simplified treatment of wounds, amputation); next to him Johann Schultes (Schultetus, 1595–1646), author of "Arma mentarium chirurgicum", and Matthias Gottfried Purmann (1648–1721; field surgery). Of English surgeons Richard Wiseman, (about 1652; amputation, compression of aneurisms), John Woodall (about 1613), and Lowdham (about 1679) are the most eminent.

In the eighteenth century surgery was essentially stimulated by the numerous wars; in France also through the establishment of an academy in 1731 by Georges Maréschal (1658–1736) and François Gigot de la Peyronie (1678–1747). Of Frenchmen we must also name Jean Louis Petit (1674–1750), the inventor of the screw tourniquet, Henri François le Dran (1685–1770; lithotomy, lacerations of scalp), Pierre Joseph Boucher (1715–93; amputation); Toyssaint Bordenave (1728–82; amputation), Antoine Louis (1723–92; operation for hare-lip, bronchotomy, simplification of instruments), Pierre Joseph Desault (1744–95, founder of the Paris surgical clinic, ligature of vessels, treatment of aneurism, dislocations, fractures), François Chopart (1743–95, methods of amputation), and finally the monk and lithotomist Frère Côme (Jean de St. Cosme, Baseilhac, 1703–81), the inventor of the lithotome-caché. The founder of modern English surgery is William Cheselden (1688–1752; lateral lithotomy, artificial pupil). Samuel Sharp (about 1700–78) wrote a text-book; William Bromfield (1712–92), invented an artery-retractor and the double gorgeret; and Percival Pott (1713–88) established the doctrine of arthrocace (malum potti). The most eminent and versatile surgeon is the already-mentioned John Hunter (treatment of aneurisms, theory of inflammation, gunshot wounds, syphilis). Surgery was on a much lower plane in the Germanic countries. For the better training of the Prussian military surgeons and on the proposal of Surgeon-General Ernst Konrad Holtzendorff (1688–1751), there was founded in Berlin a *Collegium medico-chirurgicum* in 1714; later in 1726 the Charité school, and in 1795 the Pepinière academy. Surgery made great progress through Johann Zacharias Platner (1694–1747) at Leipzig; Johann Ulrich Bilguer (1720–96) and Christian Ludwig Mursinna (1744–1833) at Berlin; Karl Kasper Siebold (1736–1807) at Würzburg, and especially through August Gottlob Richter (1742–1812) at Göttingen (surgical library). A school for military surgeons was founded at Vienna in 1775 at the suggestion of Anton Störck (1731–1803), ten years after which was established the Josephinum academy, under the direction of the army Surgeon-in-chief Johann Alexander von Brambilla (1728–1800).

Baron Guillaume Dupuytren (1777–1835)

Study of Physiology: Albrecht von Haller and His Time.—The great discoveries in the field of gross and minute (microscopic) anatomy naturally impelled men to investigate also the vital functions, but the results of the efforts of both iatrophysicists and iatrochemists were far from satisfactory, since scientific aid was sadly lacking. Physiology for the first time received systematic treatment at the hands of the versatile scholar, Albrecht von Haller of Bern (1708–77), professor in Göttingen from 1737 to 1753 (Elementa physiologiæ, 1757–66). Haller, a pupil of Albinus and Boerhave, was the first to recognize the importance of experiments on animals. We are indebted to him for the best description of the vascular system and for studies in hæmodynamics, in which field, however, the English clergyman, Stephen Hales (d. 1761), had already broken the soil. He correctly recognized the mechanism of respiration without being able to investigate its physiological importance (exchange of gases), since Joseph Priestley did not discover oxygen until 1774. He disproved the view that there was air between the lungs and the pleura by a simple experiment on animals. Haller became best known through the discovery of irritability and sensibility. When external stimuli are applied to tissues, especially muscles, the latter react either by contracting and moving (irritability), or by experiencing a sensation or sense of pain (sensibility), or at times by both. Sensibility disappears when the corresponding nerve is cut, while irritability persists independent of the nerves and even continues some time after death. This theory met with great opposition, especially among the practical physicians (Anton de Haen), who did not, however, take the trouble to repeat the experiments on animals. Even though Haller knew neither the central cause of the two phenomena, nor the correct structure of the tissues, it nevertheless stands to his eternal credit that he was the first to point out the facts and open up new roads for physiology. Haller's investigation was generally welcomed, especially in Italy by Abbate Lazzaro Spallanzani (1729–99), the first scientific opponent of spontaneous generation. His experiments along the lines of artificial fertilization of frogs' eggs, and concerning digestion are famous. Felice Fontana (1730–1805), repeating the experiments concerning irritability, reached the same results as Haller. William Hewson (1729–74) studied the qualities of the blood (coagulation). The most important German physiologist after Haller is Kasper Friedrich Wolff (1735–94), known for his investigations in the field of evolution and for pointing out the fact that both animals and plants are composed of the same elements, which he called little "bubbles" or "globules". Joseph Priestley's discovery of "dephlogisticated air" (1774), as oxygen was then called, was of the highest importance in the development of the theory of respiration, of the process of tissue-decomposition, of formation of the blood, and of metabolic phenomena.

Medical Systems in the Eighteenth Century.—The three great discoveries in the second half of the century (oxygen, galvanism, and irritability), contrary to what one might expect, led scientists astray, and gave rise to systems whose foundations were of a purely hypothetical nature. Especially interesting are the neuro-pathological theories, connected to some extent with irritability. William Cullen (1712–90), accepting irritability as his starting-point, supposes a "tonus" or fluid inherent in the nerves (Newton's ether), whose stronger or weaker motions produce either a spasm or atony. In addition "weakness" of the brain and "vital power" played a great part in his explanation of diseases. Cullen's pupil, John Brown (about 1735–88), modified this doctrine by explaining that all living creatures possess excitability, located in

the nerves and muscles, which are excited to activity by external and internal influences (*stimuli*). Diseases occur according to increase or dimunition of the stimuli and excitability, strong stimuli causing increased excitability (*sthenia*) and weak stimuli diminished excitability (*asthenia*). Death is caused either by an increase of excitability with a lack of stimuli, or by exhaustion of excitability from too strong stimuli. Brown's theory was little noticed in England and France, but in Germany it was highly lauded. Christoph Girtanner (1760–1800) and Joseph Frank (1771–1842) spread its fame. Out of this Brunonianism Johann Andreas Röschlaub (1768–1835) developed the so-called theory of excitability which was so energetically opposed by Alexander von Humboldt and Christian Wilhelm Hufeland (1762–1836). Giovanni Rasori (1762–1837), building also on Brown's theory, developed his contra-stimulistic system, namely that there are influences which directly diminish excitement (contra-stimuli) or remove existing stimuli (indirect contra-stimuli); he, therefore, distinguishes two groups of diseases—diathesis of the stimulus and that of the contra-stimulus.

Another group of systematizers, the Vitalists, basing their views upon Stahl's doctrine of the soul (Animism) and Haller's irritability, consider vital energy to be the foundation of all organic processes. The chief representatives of Vitalism, a system developed especially in France and later predominant in Germany, are: Theophile Bordeu (1722–76), Paul Joseph Barthez (1734–1806), Philippe Pinel (1755–1826), Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752–1840), and Johann Christian Reil (1759–1813). But, while these physicians adhered to Hippocratism in practice and (e. g. Reil) were eminently active in developing anatomy and physiology, the same may not be said of the three Germans, Mesmer, Hahnemann, and Rademacher, who were the last followers of Paracelsus. The doctrine of animal magnetism (Mesmerism), established by Friedrich Anton Mesmer (1734–1815), is connected with Vitalism in so far as Mesmer presupposes a magnetic power to exist in the body, and accordingly tries, at first by means of magnets and later by touching and stroking the body, to effect an interchange of forces, a transfusion or cure. Mesmer through his manipulations very likely induced real hypnotic sleep in many cases. His doctrine, however, which at first met with a sharp rebuff and was subsequently characterized in many circles as a fraud, was degraded by his immediate followers to somnambulism and clairvoyance, and in later times it became altogether discredited from having fallen into the hands of quacks. Nevertheless, mesmerism forms a basis for hypnotism, which in 1841 was established by James Braid.

Homœopathy, founded by Samuel Friedrich Christian Hahnemann, seems to have the promise of a long lease of life. Hahnemann regards disease as a disturbance of vital energy. The latter in itself has no power to heal, for a cure can take place only when a similar severer disease simultaneously occurs. The best way to produce such a disease is to give highly diluted drugs which are capable of producing a similar set of symptoms. The rest of this "drug-disease" is destroyed by the vital energy, which is possible only when the doses are small. As chief principle, therefore, Hahnemann sets up the doctrine that like cures like. Since he denies the possibility of investigating the nature of disease, and completely disregards pathological anatomy, it is necessary to know all simple drugs which produce a set of symptoms similar to those of the existing disease. With his pupils Hahnemann undertook the task of testing the effects of all simple drugs, but the result of this gigantic piece of work could not be absolutely objective, since it is based upon the purely subjective feeling of the experimentalists. Never before had a physician built a system upon so many purely arbitrary hypotheses as Hahnemann. Paracelsus also had declared war upon the old medicine, and had attributed little value to anatomical and physiological investigation, which, however, was still in its initial period of development; but, with his reverence for Hippocrates, he nevertheless ranks higher than Hahnemann, who is the representative of empiricism and the despiser of all the positive successes which medicine had previously attained. Hahnemann's more sensible pupils did not follow their master blindly, but regarded his method as that which under the most favourable circumstances it may be, viz., a purely therapeutical method that does not disregard clinical science. To this rational standpoint, together with eclecticism, homœopathy owes its long life and wide dissemination. One service of physicians of this school is that they simplified prescriptions, and appreciatively studied obsolete, but nevertheless valuable vegetable drugs. Hahnemann's pupil, Lux, extended homœopathy to isotherapy, which in modern times celebrated its renascence in organotherapy. Widely removed from scientific progress was the "empirical medical doctrine" of Johann Gottfried Rademacher (1772–1850), which is to-day completely discredited. Starting from the doctrine of nostrums of Paracelsus, he names the diseases according to the effective drug (e. g. nux-vomica strychina, liver disease), and classifies diseases as universal and organic in accordance with universal and organic drugs. His therapeutics was a purely empirical one, uninfluenced by pathology or clinical diagnosis.

Some Special Branches of Medicine at the end of the Eighteenth Century.—*Obstetrics.*—Down to the sixteenth century obstetrics was almost exclusively in the hands of midwives, who were trained for it as for a trade. Only in rare cases was a surgeon called in. All the achievements of ancient times seemed forgotten, and it was only after anatomical studies had been resumed and surgery had made some progress that things began to improve. The most important accounts of the condition of ancient operative obstetrics are found in the Hippocratic writings (position of the child, version or turning, dismemberment of the fœtus, parturition chair for facilitating delivery), and in later times in the works of Soranus of Ephesus (second century A. D.; protection of the perinæum), Galen, Celsus, Aëtius, and in those of the female physician Trotula of Salerno. The oldest book on midwifery in the Middle Ages (Rosengarten) was written by Eucharius Röslin (d. 1526), who, in addition to numerous drugs assisting delivery, mentions "version". Version was put into practice again by Ambroise Paré. In the sixteenth century attempts were made to perform the Cæsarean operation on the living (Jakob Nufer, a Swiss, c. 1500); in ancient times it was done only after the death of the mother. The first work about this operation was published by the Paris surgeon, François Rousset (1581). In the domain of practical obstetrics, Giulio Casare Aranzio (1530–89) was the first to point out those malformations of the pelvis which exactly indicated the necessity for the Cæsarean section. Much was done to extend the study of this branch of medicine by the works of Jacques Guillemeau (1560–about 1609), Scipione Mercurio (1595, German translation by Gottfried Welsch, 1653), François Mauriceau (1637–1709), investigators on eclampsia, and Philippe Peu (1694), Pierre Dionis, and Guillaume Manquest de la Motte (1655–1737), pelycologists. The splendid development of obstetrics in France explains why male assistance was more and more sought there, especially after Jules Clement had been called in 1673 to the court of Louis XIV. The most important accoucheur in the Netherlands was Hendrik van Deventer (1651–1724; axis of the pelvis, placenta prævia, asphyxia neonatorum). In Germany Siegemundin, the most

famous German midwife, published in 1690 a textbook based upon wide experience (Chur-Brandenburgische Hoff-Wehe-Mutter).

In the first half of the seventeenth century Hugh Chamberlen invented the obstetrical forceps, selling it to Dutch physicians about 1688. Jean Palfyn of Ghent (1650–1730) constructed independently a similar instrument (Main de Palfyn), which he submitted to the Paris Academy about 1723. After various improvements by Lorenz Heister, Dussé, and Grégoire, the forceps passed into general practice. The most important accoucheurs of the eighteenth century were: in France, André Levret (1703–1780; inclination of the pelvis, forceps, combined examination), François Louis Joseph Solayrés de Renhac (1737–72; mechanism of delivery), Jean Louis Baudelocque (1746–1810; pelvimetry), opponent of artificial premature delivery and symphyseotomy; in England, Fielding Ould (1710–89; mechanism of delivery, perforation), William Smellie (1697–1763; mechanism of delivery, use of forceps, pelvimetry), William Hunter (1718–93), opponent of the forceps and the Cæsarean operation, Thomas Denman (1733–1815), the first to recommend artificial premature delivery, and William Osborn (1732–1808), opponent of symphyseotomy and of the Cæsarean section. The well-founded doubts which in preaseptic times many accoucheurs entertained concerning the Cæsarean operation, led to so-called symphyseotomy (Jean René Siegualt, 1768), which by widening the pelvis would permit delivery of the fœtus. This operation, which from the very outset met with vigorous opposition in England, is now forgotten. The introduction of scientific obstetrics in Germanic countries was comparatively late. Special schools for midwives were instituted, in 1728 at Strasburg (Johann Jakob Fried, 1689–1769), in 1751 at Berlin (Johann Friedrich Meckel, 1724–74) and Göttingen (Johann Georg Röderer, d. 1763), and in 1754 at Vienna (Johann Nep. Crantz, 1756; Valentin von Lebmacher, 1797; Raphael Steidele, 1816). While the Parisian midwives belonged to the Collège de S. Côme as early as 1560 and received a methodical training, those in Germany could receive only private instruction. Examination by physicians is mentioned at Ratisbon since 1555 and at Vienna since 1642.

Baron Karl von Rokitansky (1804–1878)

Ophthalmology gained importance much later than obstetrics. In addition to inflammation of the eye and operations on the eyelid, the Hippocratic writings mention amblyopia, nyctalopia, and glaucoma. Celsus describes an operation for cataract (scleroticonyxis). Galen gives us the beginnings of physiological optics. The slight ophthalmological knowledge of the Greeks was borrowed by the Arabs, but their lack of anatomical knowledge prevented all progress. No improvement set in until after the rise of anatomy under Vesalius. Formerly, this branch had been almost completely in the hands of travelling physicians (cataract operators), but henceforth surgeons with a fixed abode (e. g. Ambroise Paré, Jacques Guillemeau) began to turn their attention to it. In Germany Georg Bartisch (about 1535–1606), "Court eye specialist" at Dresden, wrote the first monograph, a work very highly valued even in later days. Among other things he mentions spectacles for curing squint, eye-glasses and, among operations, is the first to describe extirpation of the pupil. The invention of convex spectacles is by some attributed to the Dominican Alexander da Spina (d. 1313), by others to Salvino degli Armati of Florence (d. 1317). Concave glasses did not appear until the sixteenth century.

The foundations for further progress in ophthalmology were laid by the anatomists and physicists of the seventeenth century. In the first group let us mention the works of Friedrich Ruysch (choroid), van Leeuwenhoek (lens), Heinrich Meibom (1678–1740; glands of the eye-lids), and Stenon (lachrymal apparatus). Investigations of physicists were of great importance, especially those of the two astronomers, Johann Keppler (1571–1630) and the Jesuit Christoph Scheiner (1575–1659), concerning accommodation, refraction of light, and the retinal image; René Descartes (1596–1650; comparison of the eye with the camera obscura, accommodation); Edmund Marriott (d. 1684; blind spot, choroid); Isaac Newton (1642–1727; dispersion of light and origin of colours). In the eighteenth century, besides anatomy and physiology, the practical side of ophthalmology was also cultivated. Among anatomists were Winslow, Petit, Zinn, Demours (cornea and sclerotic); Buzzi and Sömmering (retina); La Hire, J. H. Hoin, Camper, and Reil (lens). The theory of the sensibility of the retina to light, established by Haller, was further developed by Porterfield and Thomas Young (1773–1829). The latter also described astigmatism and colour-blindness, and discovered that accommodation depended upon a change in the shape of the lens. Boerhave was the first to give clinical lectures on ophthalmology. From him we have the exact definition of myopia and presbyopia. Gray cataract (*cataracta*) was first located in the lens by François Quarré and Remi Lasnier, a view which was corroborated by the anatomist, Werner Rolfink (1599–1673). François Pourfour du Petit (1644–1741), Lorenz Heister, and others also worked on cataract. Jacques Daviel (1696–1762) performed the first operation for extraction of a cataract in 1745. Of other practitioners we must mention: Brisseau (theory of glaucoma), William Cheselden (1668–1752; artificial pupil), Baron Wenzel the elder (1780; iridectomy), Charles de St. Yves (ablatio retinæ, asthenopia, staphyloma, strabismus), John Taylor (1708–60; operation to correct oblique vision, ceratoconus), Dominique Anel (cathederism of the lachrymal fistula, 1713), G. E. Stahl, Boerhave, Jonathan Wathen, Lorenz Heister, Johann Zacharias Platner (1691–1747), and August Gottlob Richter (studies on the lachrymal fistula).

Pharmaceutics, Mineral Waters, Cold Water Cures.—Pharmacy had remained the most backward of all the branches of medicine, for it was longest under the influence of the Arabs. A large part of the drugs came from the Orient to Venice and Flemish harbours. Besides simple drugs there were also a great many compound remedies. But, in the latter class, there was great confusion resulting from the many adulterations, and from the fact that not only did individual authors give different compositions for the same remedy, but also under the same name an entirely different preparation was understood by different authors. The most famous panacea, which dated from Roman imperial times and was used as late as the eighteenth century, was theriac, a mixture consisting of numerous ingredients, among them being the flesh of vipers. This composition originally came from the Orient, but was made later at Venice, Augsburg, and Vienna. To get some order into the treasury of drugs and to enable apothecaries to compound their remedies, the college of physicians in Florence

published a pharmacopœia (Riceptario) in 1498. The oldest work of this kind in Germany was written by Valerius Cordus, a Nuremberg physician (Dispensatorium, 1546); then followed the Dispensatorium of Adolph Occo in 1564, written at the request of the city of Augsburg, the Dispensatorium of Cologne in 1565, and finally in 1572 a similar work in Vienna, which, however, was not printed. Not until 1618 did Vienna receive a dispensatorium prepared from that of Augsburg, which had become a model for all Germany.

The Oriental trade in drugs was greatly facilitated by the discovery of the sea route to the East Indies. Uninfluenced by exotic remedies of scholastic medicine, popular medicine offered poor people, in addition to repulsive and superstitious remedies, a series of valuable remedies derived from native plants and minerals. A long-known and popular remedy for syphilis was mercury, introduced into scientific therapeutics by Paracelsus. To his adherents we are indebted for the use of preparations of antimony and arsenic, a popular remedy for skin diseases since ancient times. The first-mentioned preparations gave rise to a violent struggle on the part of the Paris faculty, which opposed every form of progress. Guaiac wood, regarded as a specific remedy for syphilis, was brought from America in the sixteenth century. The most important drugs introduced in the seventeenth century were ipecacuanha and Peruvian bark. The latter, coming from Peru, became known in Europe between 1630 and 1640. No remedy has had such a beneficial effect, but none has met with such opposition on the part of many physicians as this, because its effect (reduction of fever without subsequent intestinal evacuation) was a direct contradiction of Galenic doctrine. Peruvian bark was introduced generally into therapeutics only after a long struggle, principally because important men like Sydenham advocated it. The latter as well as the Leyden school under Boerhave discontinued to a large extent the old Arab drugs, preferring in general simple remedies with a corresponding dietetic treatment. Besides the improvement in lead preparations by Thomas Goulard (1750; *aqua Goulardi*), we may mention the pharmacological investigations of cornium, aconite, stramonium, etc., by Anton Störck (1731–1803), in Vienna. Hahnemann's services in investigating native medicinal plants have been previously mentioned.

The impulse to study mineral springs was in modern times given by Paracelsus. The majority of the modern European watering places of world-wide fame were already known to the Romans, but their curative properties were too little valued during the Middle Ages. Petrus de Tussignana wrote, about 1336, concerning the famous thermæ of Bormio; Giacomo de Dondi in 1340 about Abano; the Vienna physician, Wolfgang Windberger (Anemorinus), in 1511, about the sulphur springs at Baden near Vienna; Paracelsus about Pfäfers, St. Moritz in the Engadine, Teplitz. Karlsbad in Bohemia was much frequented towards the close of the sixteenth century, as were Vichy and Plombières. Helmont, who was the first to prove the existence of carbonic acid and of fixed alkalies, wrote about Spa. Highly meritorious also was the work in this field of Johann Phillip Seip (Pyrmont) and of Friedrich Hoffmann, who wrote about Spa, Selters, Schwalbach, and Karlsbad, and taught the preparation of Seidlitz salt (*Bittersalz*), artificial Karlsbad, and of artificial mineral waters.

Cold-water cures were introduced in ancient Rome for the first time by Asclepiades, but they were soon forgotten. In sporadic cases cold water was employed therapeutically in later times, e. g. by Rhazes for smallpox, by Edward Baynard in 1555 against the plague, by John Floyer (1649–1734) for mania, and by several others. Cold water was not used systematically until the eighteenth century. The brothers Johann Sigismund and Johann Gottfried, and their father Sigismund Hahn (1662–1742), who in 1737 made extensive experiments during an epidemic of petechial fever in Breslau, may be regarded as the founders of the cold water cure. The work of John Sigismund (Unterricht von der Kraft und Wirkung des kalten Wassers) is the best known, and laid the foundation of modern hydrotherapeutics. Towards the end of the eighteenth century Johann Dietrich Brandis obtained good results in the treatment of febrile diseases by means of tepid lotions. The subsequent development of hydrotherapeutics was largely influenced by the results obtained by William Wright (1736–1819), and James Currie (1756–1805) in the epidemics of petechial fever in the years 1787–92.

Vaccination. Edward Jenner.—Even in the oldest times people seem to have possessed an efficient preservative against one of the most destructive epidemics, smallpox (*variola*). From remote antiquity the Brahmins of Hindustan are said to have transferred the smallpox poison (secretion of the pustules) to healthy persons by incising the skin with the object of protecting them against further infection by causing a local illness. In China people stopped up their noses with the incrustations of smallpox. A peculiar transfer with a needle (inoculation) was in use among the Circassians and Georgians. This so-called Greek method became generally known in Constantinople towards the end of the seventeenth century, and was introduced into England by Lady Wortley Montague, wife of the English ambassador, who had had her own son successfully vaccinated in 1717. Despite the loud approval of the court and aristocracy, inoculation met with violent resistance from the physicians and clergy. Carelessness, quackery, and its ill-repute caused the method to be forgotten, until in 1746 Bishop Isaac Maddox of Worcester, by popular teaching and the establishment of institutions for inoculation, once more proclaimed its value. Among physicians who favoured inoculation were Richard Mead (1673–1754), Robert and Daniel Sutton (1760, 1767), Thomas Dinsdale (1767), Théodore Tronchin (1709–1781), and Haller. In Austria it was introduced by van Swieten, at whose suggestion Maria Theresa, in 1768, called to Vienna the famous naturalist Jan Ingen-Housz (1730–99), in spite of the opposition of the clinical professor de Haen. In the meantime another opponent of inoculation appeared. In countries devoted to cattle-raising it was observed that those who came in contact with cows suffering from smallpox frequently fell sick and had pustules on their fingers, but such persons were immune against the human smallpox. This incited the physician Edward Jenner (1749–1823) to further experimentation, which he continued for twenty years. On 14 May, 1796, he performed his first inoculation with the lymph of cowpox (vaccination), an experiment of world-wide importance. Jenner's discovery was everywhere received with enthusiastic approval. The first vaccinations on the continent were performed at Vienna by Jean de Caro in 1799, and by his contemporaries Alois Careno (d. 1811) and Paschalis Joseph von Ferro (d. 1809); in Germany, by Georg Friedrich Ballhorn (1772–1805) and Christian Friedrich Stromeyer (1761–1824); in France, by Rochefoucauld-Liancourt. Protective inoculation with vaccine has been introduced into almost every civilized state in the course of the nineteenth century, partly from free choice and partly by laws enforcing compulsory vaccination.

Medicine in the Nineteenth Century.—The powerful political position of France in the first thirty years of the nineteenth century finds medicine in an especially high state of development in that country. After this period followed the golden period of the Vienna school and, in a wider sense, of German medicine. The development of modern medicine is the work of all civilized nations; yet all will regard Rudolf Virchow unqualifiedly as the chief worker. Not

to encroach upon the domain of the special articles, let us summarize in a few brief words the most important achievements of recent times: in anatomy, theory of tissues—Bichat; in pathological anatomy and pathology cellular, pathology—Virchow; in physiology—Johannes Müller; in practical medicine, auscultation—Laënnec, Skoda; in surgery, treatment of wounds—Joseph Lister; narcosis—Jackson, Simpson; obstetrics, cause of puerperal fever—Semmelweiss; in ophthalmology—Albrecht von Gräfe and (speculum oculi) Helmholtz; in bacteriology and serotherapy—Pasteur, Koch, and Behring. The subject of skin diseases was most ingeniously elaborated by Ferdinand Hebra.

General Anatomy.—A splendid basis for the further development of modern medicine was laid by Marie François Xavier Bichat (1771–1802), through his investigation of the vital qualities of tissues. What Haller had tried to do for the muscles, Bichat attempted to accomplish for all the tissues of the body. Bichat was the first to promulgate the idea that each tissue might by itself become diseased, and that the symptoms of diseased organs depend upon tissue changes. Gilbert Breschet (1784–1845) worked on the lympathic vessels and the history of development, and Isidore Geoffrey Saint-Hilaire (1772–1884) on comparative anatomy. Of Italian and English anatomists are to be mentioned: Paolo Mascagni (1752–1815; lymphatic vessels, comparative anatomy), Antonio Scarpa (1747–1832; structure of the bones, organs of sense); the brothers John and Charles Ball, the latter (1774–1842) known also as a physiologist (brain, nerves); and Robert Knox (1793–1862; comparative anatomy). Germany performed the greatest services in perfecting anatomy and allied branches. The first to be named in this connexion is Theodor Schwann (1810–82), the discoverer of the cell as the fundamental element of the body of plants and animals. Johann Ev. Purkynje (1787–1869) worked along the same lines, and Rudolph Albert Kölliker (b. 1817; pensioned 1901) followed close in their wake. Work in comparative anatomy was done by Johann Friedrich Blumenbach (1752–1840), Ignaz Blumenbach (1752–1850), Ignaz Döllinger (1770–1841), Karl Asmund Rudolphi (1771–1832), and Johann Friedrich Meckel (1781–1833). Friedrich Gustav Jakob Henle (1809–85), and Wilhelm Menke (1834–96) were prominent teachers of general anatomy and histology; Friedrich Tiedemann (1781–1861) was an eminent brain anatomist, while Nikolaus Rüdinger (1832–96; injection of carbolic for the preservation of corpses in the dissecting room), Friedrich Sigmund Merkel (b. 1845; topographical anatomy), and Wilhelm His (b. 1831; history of development), must also be mentioned.

Joseph Hyrtl
(1811–1894)

Following the reform of studies under van Swieten in 1749, anatomy was cultivated in Vienna more than ever before. The more important men were Lorenz Gasser (professor 1757–65; trigeminus), Joseph Barth (technique of injection), George Prochaska (1749–1820; muscle and nerves), Franz Joseph Gall (1758–1828), the well-known phrenologist and founder of the theory of cerebral localization, and Joseph Berres (1796–1844; microscopic anatomy). The founder of the modern anatomical school of Vienna was the highly gifted Joseph Hyrtl (1811–94; technique of injection and corrosion, organ of hearing, comparative and topographical anatomy), known as a pre-eminent teacher, investigator, and a man of noble character. Karl Langer (1819–87; mechanism of the joints), Karl Toldt (b. 1840; histology, anthropometry), and Karl Wedl (1815–91; normal and pathological histology) are others of this School. The professors at present teaching this subject in the Austrian universities still belong chiefly to the school of Hyrtl-Langer. In North America anatomy was cultivated especially in Philadelphia, where, besides the school founded in 1764, there existed from 1820 to 1875 a private institution established by John Balentine O'Brien Lawrence (d. 1823), "The Philadelphia School of Anatomy". In 1775 Japan became acquainted for the first time with the anatomical knowledge of Europe through a translation of a work by the German Johann Adam Kulmus which had appeared in 1725. A diligent study of anatomy and of medicine in general began when the University of Tokio was established in 1871.

Pathological Anatomy was placed upon a new basis by Bichat's theory of the tissues, and it was later greatly advanced by physiology, physiological chemistry, and by improved means of investigation (compound achromatic objective lens of the microscope). The increased attention, which clinical physicians bestowed on this subject, exercised no small influence on its progress. Among these must be especially mentioned Laënnec, who defined tuberculosis and studied the pathological anatomy of lung diseases, especially of phthisis. Numerous though the able investigators were who performed meritorious services in perfecting this branch, the development of modern pathological anatomy will forever be intimately connected with the names of the pioneers, Rokitansky and Virchow. The first pathological prosectorship at Vienna was held by Alois Rudolph Vetter from 1796 to 1803, well known as the author of the first German work on pathological anatomy. In 1832, after the death of Joseph Wagner, Karl Rokitansky (1804–78; later Freiherr von) became prosector and professor. He was educated in the views of Johann Friedrich Meckel (1781–1833), Johann Georg Christian Freidrich Martin Lolstein (1777–1835), but particularly of Gabriel Andral of Paris (1797–1876), a leading representative of humoral pathology. Rokitansky's training was thus based upon the French school, but he subsequently brought about a still closer connexion between anatomical and physical diagnostics. His endeavour to become acquainted with the entire course of development of pathological changes was greatly assisted by the valuable material for dissecting which the metropolis afforded. His excellence is seen in his descriptions of pathological changes; he replaced the previous symptomatic pictures of disease by creating an anatomical pathology and anatomical types of disease. He was not so successful in establishing his doctrine of crasis based upon humoral pathology, and just here Virchow's fruitful activity begins.

Rudolf Virchow (1821–1902), professor in Berlin and a pupil of Johannes Müller and Johann Lucas Schönlein, early became acquainted with the cellular doctrine of Schwann. Virchow is the creator of cellular pathology, which to-day is universally recognized, a pathology based strictly upon natural science which definitively extinguished Hippocratic speculative humoral pathology. According to Virchow, there is life in the smallest units of the body, in the cells which increase by fission (*omnis cellula e cellula*). He applied his doctrine to the various tissues, and showed their behaviour under normal and abnormal condi-

tions of life. Diseases thus represent a reaction of the sum of the cells which form the body against harmful influences, the causes of diseases. Virchow's chief work "Die Cellularpathologie" appeared in 1858. Greater attention was now paid not alone to pathological anatomy, but to its sister sciences, pathological chemistry, experimental pathology, and bacteriology. The chief representatives of experimental pathology were: in France, Claude Bernard (1813–78), Charles Edouard Brown-Séquard (1818–95), and Etienne Jules Marey (b. 1830); in Germany, Ludwig Traube (1818–76), Rudolph Virchow, and Julius Cohnheim (1839–84); in Vienna, Salomon Striker (d. 1898) and Philip Knoll (1841–1900). Experiments on animals are extensively made to-day in this field of investigation.

Bacteriology, Theory of Immunity, Serotherapy, Disinfection.—The first to suspect that living beings invade the organism and exist in the blood and pus was the learned Jesuit Athanasius Kircher (1671), although there is no doubt that the "little worms" observed by him were really blood-corpuscles. With the help of his improved microscope Leeuwenhoek discovered a number of bacteria. The idea that infectious diseases were caused by a living contagion invading the body from without was first expressed in 1762 by the Vienna physician Markus Antonius Plenciz (d. 1786). Otto Friedrich Müller, in 1786, was the first to doubt that the microscopical living beings, then comprised under the name of *infusoria*, really belonged to the animal kingdom. In 1838, Christian Gottfried Ehrenberg gave a description of the finer structure of the "infusoria", but it was Ferdinand Cohn, who in 1854 first ascertained with certainty that bacteria belonged to the vegetable kingdom. From the studies that were now made concerning the vital qualities of these infinitesimal living beings of the vegetable kingdom, Louis Pasteur (1822–95) definitely settled the controversy about spontaneous generation (*generatio æquivoca*), and proved the materialistic view to be without foundation. What Plenciz had only suspected was now clearly formulated by Henle, who defined the conditions under which bacteria are to be regarded as direct causes of disease. The untiring activity of Robert Koch (d. 1910) from about 1878 succeeded in bringing bacteriology to such a state of development that it could be made of service to practical medicine. Apart from ascertaining the bacterial origin of cholera and tuberculosis, Koch's greatest achievements are the improvement of the microscope (Abbé, Zeis), the method of colouration and pure cultures.

Jenner's success with the lymph of cowpox, a weakened poison as a protection against a full poison, as well as the old experience that those who had once recovered from an infectious disease usually became immune from new infection, led savants to look for the cause of the phenomena. In 1880 Pasteur, on the basis of his experiments concerning chicken cholera, looked for the cause in the exhaustion of the nutritive material necessary for the bacteria in the body (theory of exhaustion), while Chauveau believed in a residue of metabolic products which prevented a new settlement of bacteria or new infection (retention theory). The investigation of Metschnikoff, and in 1889 of Buchner, advanced the idea that blood-serum possesses a certain hostility to bacteria. In 1890 Von Behring proved that the blood-serum of animals which has been made immune against diphtheria, if injected into another animal, would make the latter also immune against diphtheria. That element in the serum hostile to bacteria he called antitoxin. The introduction of antitoxin into the therapeutics of diphtheria in 1892 was so far the greatest practical success of bacteriology. Efforts were naturally made to secure by similar methods protection against other infectious diseases, efforts only partly crowned with success (tetanus, plague, cholera, snake poison). Following Jenner's method of producing immunity by means of living, weakened causes of infection, Pasteur (1885) found a protection against lyssa, while Haffkine made experiments in 1895 to combat cholera with killed germs, and in 1897 similar experiments with the plague. From 1891 dates Koch's experimentation with extracts of bacteria against tuberculosis. By means of preparations of pure bacteria-cultures, made according to Koch's method, it became possible to devise exact methods for destroying bacteria. In the field of the modern theory of disinfection, Koch also worked as a pioneer, not only in precisely defining the difference between prevention of development and the killing of bacteria, but also by subjecting physical and chemical disinfectants to new tests. The modern steam sterilizers are based upon the discovery of Koch that steam under the ordinary pressure of the atmosphere is sufficient to kill even resistant lasting forms. He pointed out the ineffectiveness of alcohol, glycerine, and other substances upon the spores of anthrax, and the diminished effect of carbolic acid in an oily or alcoholic solution. Von Behring's experiments showed a diminution of power of some disinfectants in the presence of albumen, concerning which Krönig and Paul made a special study.

Physiology is indebted for its perfection to the progress of minute anatomy (doctrine of tissues) to the improved means of investigation (microscope, chemical and physical apparatus), but especially to the fact that experiments on animals (vivisection) were once more extensively made. The principal physiologists of the past century were in France and Germany. François Magendie (1783–1855), opposing Bichat (vitalism), maintained that there is no uniform vital energy, and that the vital qualities of the different organs are to be explained upon a physical and chemical basis and by means of experiments. His investigations in hæmodynamics and the functions of the nervous system (roots of the spinal column), in which he supplemented the work of Charles Bell (Law of Bell-Magendie) are very important. Marie Jean Pierre Flourens (1794–1867) is known by his studies in disturbances of co-ordination, nutrition of the bones, and localization of the centre of respiration in the medulla oblongata, and François Achille Longet (1811–71) by his work on the functions of the anterior and posterior columns of the spinal cord, the innervation of the larynx, the nerves of the brain, and the law of the contraction of the muscles. The most famous French physiologist, a pioneer in the field of physiological chemistry, is Claude Bernard (glycogenic function of the liver, the consumption of glycogen through work of the muscles, the discovery of vascular nerves, the chemistry of the bile and the urine, theory of diabetes mellitus, assimiliation of sugar, atrophy of the pancreas, the power of the pancreatic juice to digest albumen, and the theory of animal heat). The physiology of the circulation was elaborated by Etienne Jules Marey (b. 1830; blood pressure, mechanism of the heart, and the invention of the sphygmograph). The relation of muscles and nerves to electricity was studied by Guillaume Benjamin Duchenne (1806–75), while Charles Edouard Brown-Séquard (1818–94), the founder of modern organo-therapeutics, investigated the reflex irritability of the spinal cord, the blood, respiration, and animal heat. In Great Britain were Marshall Hall (1780–1857; theory of reflex action), William Bowman (1816–92; structure of the striated muscles, and theory of the secretion of urine), Alfred Henry Garrod (1846–79; sphygmography, physics of the nerves), Augustus Volney Waller (1816–70; diapedesis of the red corpuscles of the blood, studies on nerve-fibres and ganglia, Waller's degeneration) and William Prout (1785–1869; discovery of free hydrochloric acid in the gastric juice).

The Bohemian Johann Evangelist Purkynje (1787–

1869) founded at Breslau the first German physiological institute. His most important studies were concerned with the physiology of the organs of sense, especially of sight, the physiology of the muscles and nerves, the ciliary movement of the epithelium of the mucous membrane, the structure of the nerve-fibre (axis-cylinder) and of the ganglia, the glands secreting gastric juice, the sympathetic nervous system, and the history of development (discovery of the germinal spot). Fundamental work in physiological physics was done by the brothers Weber, Ernest Heinrich (1795–1878), and Eduard Friedrich Wilhelm (1806–71), both physicians, and the physicist Wilhelm Eduard (1804–91); mechanism of the human organs of walking (Wilhelm and Eduard), experiments in irritability by means of induction currents, and the irritation of the pneumogastric and sympathetic nerves and its influence upon the heart (Ernst and Eduard). Physiological chemistry is represented by Friedrich Tiedemann and Leopold Gemlin (1788–1853; digestion, absorption and assimilation, the importance of the lymphatic system for absorption), Friedrich Wöhler (1800–82; artificial preparation of urea), and Karl Bogislav Reichert (1811–83; crystallization of blood pigment). We must also mention the nerve physiologist Rudolf Wagner (1805–64), discoverer of the tactile corpuscles. The greatest credit for developing modern physiology is due to the school of the versatile Johannes Müller (1801–58). Müller's importance, comparable to that of Albrecht von Haller, is due on the one hand to the results of his own investigations (studies on the physiology of the organs of sense, the sympathetic nervous system, the theory of reflex action, the production of voice in the larynx, and the description of the cartilage-nucleus), and on the other hand to his activity in all branches of physiology and in his grasp of the entire field of physiological knowledge. The most important investigators of the century in the domain of histology, physiological chemistry, and physics, were pupils of Müller. Besides the above-mentioned investigators, Schwann, Kölliker, and Virchow, attention may be called to Robert Remak (1815–65; description of the marrowless nerve fibres, of the course of the fibres in the brain and the spinal cord) and Heinrich Friedrich Bidder (1810–94; sympathetic nerve system, nerves of the heart, metabolism).

Jean-Martin Charcot (1825–1893)

The doctrine of metabolism was advanced by the famous chemist, Justus Freiherr von Liebig (1803–73; excretion of nitrogen in the form of urea, importance of uric acid, albumen as a source of muscular strength), Theodor Ludwig Wilhelm Bischoff (1807–32; urea) and Karl von Voit (b. 1831; metabolism of nitrogen and organic albumen). The latter, together with Max von Pettenkofer (1818–1901), made numerous experiments in the change of gases in man during rest and work. Georg Meissner (b. 1829; origin of the constituents of urine, muscle sugar), Schwann (discoverer of pepsin), Karl Gotthelf Lehmann (1812–65; pepton). The chemistry of the blood was investigated by Ernst Felix Josef Hoppe-Seyler (1825–95; blood pigment, blood gases, chemistry of cell and tissue), Julius Robert Meyer (1814–78; mechanism of heat), Hermann Ludwig Ferdinand von Helmholtz (1821–94; physiological optics), and Emil du Bois-Reymond (1818–96; animal electrical phenomena, physics of the muscles and nerves). Just as versatile as Johannes Müller were Karl Friedrich Wilhelm Ludwig (1816–95; physiology of the circulation and excretions, theory of the functions of the kidneys, endosmosis, discovery of the nerves of secretion) and Ernst Wilhelm Ritter von Brücke (1819–92; studies of the ciliary muscle as a muscle of accommodation, theory of colours, physiology of the voice, structure of the muscle-fibres, biliary capillaries, digestion, absorption). Karl von Vierordt (1818–83) is associated with the chemistry of respiration and the counting of the blood corpuscles; Adolf Fick (1829–1901) with physiology of the muscles and nerves; Moritz Schiff (1823–96) with the nervous system, discovery of the harmful results of the extirpation of the thyroid gland, function of the base of the brain and the cerebellum; Rudolf Heidenhain (1834–97) with the physiology of the glands; Alexander Rollett (b. 1834) with the glands of the stomach, blood; Eduard Friedrich Wilhelm Pflüger (b. 1829) with the gases of the blood, processes of oxidation in the body; Ewald Hering (b. 1834) with the theory of self-regulation of the act of breathing, sensitiveness of retina to colours, and Theodor Wilhelm Engelman (b. 1834), with electrophysiology, motion of the ciliary epithelium, physiology of the heart and of the organs of sense. The localization of the brain was investigated especially by Gustav Fritsch (b. 1838), Eduard Hitzig (b. 1838), Leopold Goltz (1835–1902), and Sigmund Exner (b. 1846). Of eminent physiologists outside of Germany we may mention the Dutchmen Franz Cornelis Donders (1818–89; physiological optics, determination of refraction) and Jakob Moleschott (1822–93; metabolism and doctrine of foods).

Owing to the progress of the theoretical auxiliary sciences, practical medicine reached a high state of development, especially in diagnosis, but also to a certain extent in therapeutics. A general revolution was effected by the establishment of physical diagnosis. Auenbrugger's epoch-making discovery, percussion (1761), passed over in silence by van Swieten and de Haen, the leading spirits of the Vienna school, and mentioned only in timid fashion by Maximilian Stoll, might have been altogether forgotten, if Jean Nicolas Corvisart de Marest (1755–1821), after an objective examination, had not translated Auenbrugger's "Inventum novum" into French, and published it in 1808 with a commentary. René Theophile Hyacinthe Laënnec (1781–1826) enriched the physical method of examination by the invention of auscultation (noting the different tones and noises in the chest by placing the ear against it). His pupil Pierre Adolphe Piorry (1794–1879) perfected percussion (definition of the borders and outlines of the organs, invention of the plessimeter, improvement of the stethoscope). Laënnec's invention attracted attention but slowly. His chief opponent was François Joseph Victor Broussais (1772–1838), but in England John Forbes (1787–1861) and William Stokes (1804–78), and in Germany, Christian Friedrich Nasse (1778–1851), Peter Krukenberg (1787–1865), Johann Lukas Schönlein (1793–1864), and others assumed a friendly attitude. Auscultation and percussion came into general use in the Germanic countries much later than in England and France, but they were then brought to great perfection by the Vienna physician Joseph Skoda (1805–81), who in 1839 treated physical diagnosis scientifically and fundamentally (auscultation and percussion). The new methods made possible the exact clinical diagnosis of diseases of the heart and the lungs to a degree never previously imagined. Besides Laënnec and Skoda must be mentioned among the great number of in-

vestigators: Jean Baptiste Bouillaud (1796–1881) and James Johnson (1777–1845), who investigated affections of the heart and rheumatism of the joints. August François Chomel (1788–1855; pericarditis and rheumatism), James Hope (1801–41; valvular insufficiency), Hermann Lebert (1813–78), Johann Oppolzer (1808–91), Felix Niemeyer (1820–71), Ludwig Traube (1818–76), Heinrich von Bamberger (1822–88), and Adalbert Duchek (1824–82).

Among therapeutical aids the introduction of digitalis purpurea by Traube deserves special mention. M. J. Oertel (d. 1897), tried to cure certain affections (fatty degeneration of the heart, obesity) by means of dietetic mechanical treatment (*Terrainkur*); and the brothers August and Theodor Schott established the so-called Nauheim method (carbonic acid baths and gymnastics). Great credit in connexion with the diagnosis of lung disease is due to M. Anton Wintrich (1812–82; pleuritis), Karl August Wunderlich (1815–78; range of temperature in pneumonia), Leon Jean Baptiste Cruveilhier (1791–1875; pneumonia in children), Theodor Jürgensen (infectious nature of pneumonia), Robert Bree (1807; bronchial asthma), Biermer (1870), Leyden (1875; crystals of asthma), and Curschmann (1883; spirals). The subject of pulmonary tuberculosis was profoundly treated by Gaspard Laurent Bayle (1774–1816; 1810 discovery of miliary tuberculosis, tuberculosis a general disease); Virchow defined the anatomic character of tuberculosis; Villemin in 1865–8 proved its contagiousness, and his experiments were re-examined and confirmed among others by Lebert (1866) Klebs (1868), Baumgarten (1880), Teppeiner (1877), and Weichselbaum (1882). With the discovery of the tubercle bacillus by R. Koch in 1882, the path to the suppression of tuberculosis was indicated. Cornet in 1888 showed the danger of the sputum, which resulted in prohibition of spitting and the placing of cuspidors with disinfecting solutions. In 1890 Koch appeared with his remedy tuberculin, which he improved in 1897 and 1901. In 1902 Behring began his experiments on cows to secure immunity. Of late the treatment of tuberculosis is chiefly dietetic. Diagnosis and therapeutics of the diseases of the larynx were greatly advanced by the invention of the laryngoscope in 1860 (Ludwig Türck 1810–68, Vienna; and Johann Nepomuk Czermak, 1828–73). The taking of temperature, which was diligently cultivated by de Haen and later by James Currie (1733–1819), was systematically done for the first time by Friedrich Wilhelm Felix von Bärensprung (1822–64), Traube, and Wunderlich. In the treatment of metabolic diseases we must mention the noteworthy zeal of Friedrich Theodor von Frerichs (1819–85).

Diagnosis and therapeutics of diseases of the stomach were advanced by the introduction of the stomach pump invented by the English surgeon Bush in 1822, an instrument recommended and used since 1869 by Adolf Kussmaul (d. 1902), in enlargement of the stomach, and for the examination of the stomach with a speculum. Faradization was employed by Karl Friedrich Canstatt in 1846, Duchenne, and later by Kussmaul (1877), the stomach catheter was used for diagnostic purposes by Wilhelm Leube in 1871. The subject of typhlitis and perityphlitis was investigated among others by Puchelt (1829), Burne, Smith, Bamberger, and Oppolzer; diseases of the kidneys by Richard Bright (1827), Pierre François Oliver Rayer (1793–1867), Johnson (1852), Julius Vogel (1814–80), and Hermann Senator (1896); diseases of the bladder by Josef Grünfeld (1872), Trouvé (1878), Max Nitze (1879; endoscopy), Rovsing (1890, 1898), Krogius (1890, 1894), Guyon, Leube, and Robert Ultzmann (inflammation of the bladder, formation of stone). The development of modern diagnosis and the therapeutics of nervous diseases are connected with the names of eminent physiologists and clinical physicians. Of the latter we may mention Moriz Heinrich Romberg (1795–1873), Wilhelm Griesinger (1817–68), Duchenne, and the universal Jean Martin Charcot (d. 1893). Faradization (1831), as a therapeutical means especially against lameness, was introduced by Duchenne in 1847. Among special studies of individual diseases were: on tabes dorsalis by Romberg, Duchenne, Armand Trousseau (1801–66), Nikolaus Friedreich (d. 1882), Leyden (d. 1910), Karl Friedrich Westphal (b. 1833), Charcot, and Alfred Fournier, who in 1876 pointed out the connexion between tabes and lues; on myelitis by Brown-Séquard, Oppolzer, Friedreich, Westphal, Charcot. A peculiar complex of symptoms was described for the first time by Robert James Graves (d. 1853), later (1840) by Karl von Basedow (Basedow's Disease). The picture of neurasthenia was given for the first time in detail in 1869 by Georg Beard; Weir-Mitchell together with Playfair proposed for it the so-called fattening cure.

As to progress in psychiatry, there is now a more humane conception of the care for the insane compared with that obtaining in former times. This movement originated principally in England (Thomas Arnold, d. 1816; William Perfect, b. 1740; Alexander Crichton, 1763–1856), and France (Philippe Pinel, 1755–1826; Jean Etienne Dominique Esquirol, 1772–1840), and found in Italy in Vincenzo Chiarugi (d. 1822) and in Germany in Johann Christian Reil (1759–1813), zealous supporters. With this movement came a general and profounder study of the subject stimulated by the results of pathological anatomy, more judicious therapeutics conscious of its aim, proper physical occupation of the insane, and the discontinuance of the isolation system. Special attention is paid to the etiology and therapeutics of diseases occurring most frequently, cretinism, hysteria, progressive paralysis, as well as to psychosis of intoxication, alcoholism, morphinism, etc. Hydrotherapeutics, which is especially effective in the case of neurosis and psychosis, was much cultivated by Anton Fröhlich (1760–1846) and the two laymen, Eucharius Ferdinand Oertel and the Silesian, Vincenz Priessnitz (1790–1851). It was treated scientifically by Wilhelm Winternitz, who wisely reduced within due bounds a great deal of the harshness in the laymen's hydrotherapy.

Modern Dermatology begins with the endeavours of Johann Jakob Plenk (1738–1807) at Vienna to establish a classification of skin diseases on a basis of external clinical appearance. Work of a similar nature was done by Anne Charles Lorry (1777), Robert Willan (1798), Thomas Bateman (1815), all of whom introduced simplifications into Plenk's system, Laurent Beilt (1781–1840), and Camille Melchior Gibert (1797–1866). Jean Louis Alibert (1766–1837) made a classification according to pathological principles, while Pierre François Oliver Rayer used anatomy and physiology as a basis. The pathological-anatomical method, introduced by Julius Rosenbaum (1807–74), was established by Ferdinand Hebra in Vienna (1816–80). Its chief merits consist in creating a classification of twelve groups, valid in its substantial form even to-day, in a definition of the general course of the disease, and in simplifying therapeutics. His chief special studies are concerned with itch, lepra, and eczema. With him we must mention Friedrich Wilhelm Felix von Bärensprung (1822–64; eczema marginatum, erythrasma caused by fungus, and herpes zoster) and his successor, Georg Lewin (1820–96; scleroderma). Pierre Antoine Ernest Nazin (1807–78) worked along the same lines as Hebra (parasitical and constitutional skin-diseases, erythema induratum). Hebra's most important pupils are Heinrich Auspitz (1835–86; venous stagnation, soap therapeutics), Moriz Kaposi (1837–1902; pigment sarcoma, sarcoid swellings), and Ernst Ludwig Schwimmer (1837–98; neuropathic dermatosis). For a number

of valuable special investigations we are indebted to Tilbury Fox (1836–79; impetigo contagiosa, dermatitis herpetiformis), and on lepra to D. C. Daniellssen (1815–94) and Karl Wilhelm Boeck (1808–75). In recent times we notice an endeavour to define more closely the course of the disease, a movement started by Paul Gerson Unna in Hamburg (b. 1850; histodermatology, histotherapy, bacteriology of acne, eczema, impetigo, and favus).

Ophthalmology, as an independent branch, was established in Germany first at Vienna and Göttingen. In Vienna the anatomist Josef Barth (1755–1818) gave ophthalmological lectures as early as 1774, but two of his pupils, Johann Adam Schmidt (1759–1809; studies on iritis xerophthalmus and the lachrymal organs) and Georg Josef Beer (1763–1821; method of extraction of cataract, staphyloma, pannus), were the first to receive special professorships, the former in 1795 at the military academy and the latter at the university. Of Beer's school may be mentioned among others Konrad Johann Martin Langenbeck (1776–1851; ceratonyxis, formation of the pupil, amaurosis, entropium), Karl Friedrich von Gräfe (1787–1840; teleangiectasis in the eye), Friedrich Jäger (1784–1871; upper cutting of the cornea in the operation for cataract), Johann Nepomuk Fischer (1787–1847; pyæmic inflammation of the eye), and finally the most eminent English ophthalmologist of his time, William Mackenzie (1791–1868; choroiditis, accommodation, asthenopy, scotoma). A contemporary of Beer was Carl Himly of Göttingen (1772–1837; introduction of mydriatics). Among his pupils were Friedrich August von Ammon (1799–1861; iritis) and Christian Georg Theodor Ruete (1810–67), who deserves credit chiefly for the introduction into practice of the speculum oculi. In Italy the progress of ophthalmology begins with Antonio Scarpa (1747–1832; staphyloma of the cornea). We must also mention Paolo Assalini (1759–1840; extraction of cataract, artificial pupil, Egyptian inflammation of the eye, 1811), Giovanni Battista Quadri, the first professor in Naples (1815), and likewise the professors of the clinics established at Padua and Pavia in 1819, Anton von Rosas (1719–1855), a pupil of Beer, and Franz Flarer, (trichiasis, iritis, 1841). In England, besides Mackenzie, John Cunningham Saunders (1773–1810) of the German school, John Vetch (Egyptian inflammation of the eye, 1807), George James Guthrie (artificial pupil, extraction of cataract, 1818), and William Lawrence (1785–1867), author of a textbook, deserve mention. In North America are George Frick of the Viennese school, author of a textbook (Baltimore, 1823), and Isaac Hays of Philadelphia. More than anywhere else was German influence felt in France, and here we must mention in the first place the pupils of Jäger: Viktor Stöber (1803–71), professor at Strasburg, and Julius Sichel of Paris (1802–58; choroiditis, glaucoma, cataract, staphyloma). Besides these we have Carron du Villards, a pupil of Scarpa and author of a textbook (1838), and Desmarres.

Helmholtz, Arlt, and Gräfe are regarded as the founders of modern ophthalmology. Hermann Ludwig Ferdinand von Helmholtz (1821–94) opened an entirely new field for diagnosis by inventing the speculum oculi in 1851. Just as important is his theory of accommodation and sensation of colours. Ferdinand von Arlt of Vienna (1812–87), an eminent operator (trichiasis symblepharon) and teacher, founder of ophthalmopathology, recognized the true cause of myopia (elongation of the eye-ball) and introduced a chart of letters, later improved by Snellen. Albrecht von Gräfe (1828–70) of Berlin, a pupil of Arlt but in many respects outshining his master, is known principally through his work on the connexion between brain and blindness, on glaucoma, iridectomy, and linear extraction of the lens. Besides the above-mentioned Donders we must call attention to Alexander Pagenstecher (1827–79; operation for cataract), Eduard Jäger von Jaxthal (1818–84; letter chart), Karl Stellwag von Carion (1823–1904; defects of accommodation, innervation of the iris), Julius Jacobson (1828–89; diphtheritis conjunctivæ), Otto Becker (1828–90; pathological topography of the eye, lens), Josef Ritter von Hasner (1819–92; forensic injury of the eye), Ludwig Mauthner (1840–94; optical defects of the eye, glaucoma), Albrecht Nagel (1833–95; strychnia in the case of amblyopia), Rudolf Berlin (1833–97; word-blindness), Richard Forster (1825–1902; perimeter, glaucoma, general diseases and maladies of the eye), William Bowman (1816–92; diseases of the lachrymal sac), George Critchett (1817–82; iridodesis), Cornelius Agnew, New York (1830–88; strabismus, paracentesis of the cornea, canthoplastics), the Russian Alexander Ivanoff (1836–80; inflammation of the retina and the optic nerves, glass eye), and Victor Felix Szokalski (1811–91; textbook). The introduction of local anæsthesis by means of cocaine in 1884 by Rudolf Koller of Vienna, greatly facilitated operation on the eye.

Obstetrics.—One of the most eminent obstetricians was Lukas Johann Boër of Vienna (1751–1835), who upon the request of the emperor studied in Paris and London from 1785 to 1788. He represented the so-called "waiting method", using instruments as rarely as possible, taught rational dietetics during pregnancy and confinement, and was the first to employ electricity for reviving asphyxiated children. Work of a similar nature was done by his contemporary, Wilhelm Josef Schmitt (1760–1824; forceps operation in the longitudinal position, methods of examination, mechanism of parturition). In contradistinction to Boër, Friedrich Benjamin Osiander (1759–1822) represented the most extreme operative tendencies, while Adam Elias von Siebold (1775–1828) took a middle course. Mechanism of parturition and pelycology was treated by Ferdinand Franz August von Ritgen (1787–1867) and Franz Karl von Nägele (1778–1851); physiology of pregnancy by Franz Kiwisch von Rotterau (1814–52) and Johann Christian Gottfried von Jörg (1779–1856). The founder of the modern theory of labour pains is Justus Heinrich Wigand (1769–1817). A new period of development begins in 1847 with James Young Simpson (1811–70), the inventor of the English forceps and cranioclast; he was the first to employ narcosis (first with ether and in the same year also with chloroform) for women in labour, but at present this is done only in case of operations. Of far greater importance is the simultaneous discovery of the cause of puerperal fever (pyæmia) by Ignaz Philipp Semmelweiss of Vienna (1818–65). He introduced the practice of disinfecting hands and instruments with a solution of chloride of lime, and thereby reduced the mortality of lying-in women from 9·92 to 1·27 per cent. This most important discovery that external infection causes puerperal fever was utilized in general practice only at a late period. Propositions similar to those of Semmelweiss had been made as early as 1843 by Oliver Wendell Holmes of Boston, but they were not known in Europe. Important advances in modern times are marked by descriptions of the narrow pelvis by Gustav Adolph Michælis (1798–1848) and Karl Konrad Theodor Litzmann in 1851, and of the oblique oval pelvis by Litzmann in 1853; artificial premature birth in the case of such a pelvis by Spiegelberg in 1870; the manual removal of the placenta in 1853, and prophylaxis against blemorrhœa of the newly born by Credé in 1884; axial traction forceps by Chassagny in 1861; combined turning by Braxton Hicks in 1860–3; the mechanism of delivery by Leishman and Hodge in 1864; placenta prævia by Hofmeier in 1888; pregnancy of the oviduct by Veit in 1884; extra-uterine pregnancy by Werth in 1887; asphyxia of the newborn by Schwartz in 1858 and by Schultze in 1864.

The classical Cæsarean operation, as previously performed, consisted in opening but leaving in the uterus, whereupon death usually resulted from sepsis. Porro of Pavia in 1875 performed it, therefore, with the subsequent removal of the uterus and ovaries, and thus obtained much more favourable results. With the perfection of antiseptic, or rather aseptic, treatment in modern times, the classical Cæsarean operation is being again performed. The total removal of the ovaries (ovariotomy) on account of their degeneration was performed for the first time in 1809 by Ephraim MacDowell at Danville, Kentucky, the technique of the operation being perfected by Hutchinson in 1859, Spencer Wells and Marion Sims in 1873, Freund in 1878, and Czerny in 1879. Total extirpation of the uterus is performed especially in the case of cancer.

Surgery.—Of all the branches of medicine, surgery made the greatest progress, first in France and England, later also in Germany. Side by side with the renowned surgeon-in-chief, of the Napoleonic armies, Jean Dominique Larry (1766–1842), we have, as the most versatile, Guillaume Dupuytren (1777–1835); next to him Philibert Joseph Roux (1780–1854; resections), Jacques Lisfranc (1790–1847; exarticulations), Alfred Armand Louise Marie Velpeau (1795–1868; treatment of hernia by injection of iodine), Jacques Mathurin Delpech (1777–1832; studies about phagedænas, gangræna nosocomialis, tenotomy of the tendo Achillis), Jean Zuléma Amussat (1796–1856; lithotripsy), Auguste Vidal (1803–56; varicocele), Joseph François Malgaigne (1806–65; fractures and dislocations), Auguste Nélaton (1807–73; lithotomy), Edouard Chassaignac (1805–79; écrasement linéaire, drainage), and Charles Gabriel Pravaz (1791–1853; orthopædia, subcutaneous injection). Of English surgeons we must mention the brothers Bell, John (collateral circulation after ligation) and Charles (operative surgery); John Abernethy (1763–1831; ligation); James Syme (1799–1870; exarticulation of the hip joint); the famous surgeon, Astley Patson Cooper (1768–1841; textbook), and William Lawrence (1785–1867). In America we may note the chief surgeon of the War of Independence, John Collins Warren (1753–1815), Philipp Syng Physick (1768–1837; new formations), Willard Parker (1800–84; cystotomy), and Frank Hastings Hamilton (1813–86; fractures and dislocations). Passing to the German surgeons let us mention first of all Vincenz von Kern of Vienna (1760–1829; open treatment of wounds), his successor, Joseph von Wattman (1789–1866; lithotomy), and Franz Schuh (1805–65; new formations, hernia); in Germany Louis Strohmayer (1804–76; myotomy, tenotomy, resections), Johann Friedrich Dieffenbach (1794–1847; plastic operations), and Albert Theodor Middeldorpf (1824–68; galvanocautery).

A new epoch of progress begins in 1846 with the introduction of narcosis. The discoverer of the narcotic effect of ether is the American physician and chemist, Charles Jackson (1805–80), who, together with William Morton, made experiments upon his own person. The first narcosis was undertaken in 1846 by Warren, and in the same year in London by Robert Liston. Simpson first employed ether in an obstetric operation in 1847, but soon afterwards introduced into practice chloroform. In modern times a mixture of ether and chloroform is generally used. Besides general narcosis we must also mention local anæsthesis (evaporation of ether, injection of cocaine, bromœthyl). Of still greater importance than narcosis was the treatment of wounds with carbolic acid by the Englishman Joseph Lister in 1867 (antiseptic treatment of wounds). In the course of time carbolic acid was replaced by other antiseptics, as salicylic acid, iodoform etc., until finally the antiseptic method had to yield to the aseptic method (careful protection of the field of operation against infecting germs). A third achievement of modern times is operating with an artificial absence of blood (operations on the extremities), mentioned for the first time by Friedrich Esmarch in 1873. Narcosis and antiseptics now make possible a series of daring operations, before impossible, with essentially better chances of success. In the recent development of German surgery Bernhard von Langenbeck (1810–87), known especially as a military surgeon, holds a leading position. Of his school we have among others Adolf von Bardeleben (1819–95), author of a textbook, Karl Thiersch, (1822–95; transplantation), Johann Nepomuk von Nussbaum (1829–90; transplantation of bones, extension of nerves), Theodor von Billroth (1829–94; extirpation of the larynx and struma, resection of the pylorus) and Richard von Volkmann (1830–89; surgery of the joints). A very important means of locating foreign bodies (e. g. projectiles), in the human body, and for the examination of fractures is the Röntgen rays discovered by William Karl Röntgen in 1895 (Röntgen photography).

General bibliographical works: *Index medicus* (Boston, 1879–1909); *Index Catalogue of the Library of the Surgeon General's Office, U. S. A.* (Washington, 1800–); Canstadt, *Jahresber. über die Fortschritte der gesammten Medizin* (Berlin, 1842–). Biographical: Gurlt-Hirsch, *Biogr. Lex. der hervorragenden Ärzte aller Zeiten u. Völker* (6. vols, Vienna, 1884–8); Pagel, *Biogr. Lex. hervorragender Ärzte des 19. Jahrh.* (Berlin and Vienna, 1901). Historical: Sprengel, *Versuch einer pragmatischen Gesch. der Arzneikunde* (5 vols., Halle, 1821–8), a fundamental work, but written from a partisan and Protestant point of view; Haeser, *Lehrbuch der Gesch. der Medizin u. der epidemischen Krankheiten* (3 vols., Jena, 1875–82); Puschmann, *Gesch. des medizin. Unterrichtes* (Leipzig, 1889); *Die Medizin in Wien während der letzten 100 Jahre* (Vienna, 1884); Neuburger-Pagel, *Handbuch der Gesch. der Medizin* (Jena, 1902–5), with rich international literature on all special subjects.

Leopold Senfelder.

Medicine, Pastoral. See Pastoral Medicine.

Medicine and Canon Law.—In the early centuries the practice of medicine by clerics, whether secular or regular, was not treated with disapproval by the Church, nor was it at all uncommon for them to devote a considerable part of their time to the medical avocation. Abuses, however, arose, and in the twelfth century ecclesiastical canons were framed which became more and more adverse to clerics practising the art of medicine. The "Corpus Juris Canonici" contains a decree prohibiting secular clerics and regulars from attending public lectures at the universities in medicine and law (cap. Nam magnopere, 3, Ne clerici aut monachi). The reason adduced is, lest through such sciences, spiritual men be again plunged into worldly cares. They were not hereby forbidden to make private studies in medicine or to teach it publicly. The Council of Tours (1163), in issuing a similar prohibition, had especially in view monks who left their cloisters under pretext of attending university lectures, and in this were imitated by secular priests, who thus violated their obligation of residence. This law was extended by Honorius III to all clerics having ecclesiastical dignities. It is not binding, consequently, on the lower clergy, or on those clerics who pursue the sciences only as private studies. The penalty imposed for violation was excommunication *ipso facto*.

As to the practice of medicine by clerics, the Fourth Council of the Lateran (1215) forbade its employment when cutting or burning was involved. In the decree (c. Sententiam 9, Ne cler. vel mon.), it is said: "Let no subdeacon, deacon or priest exercise any art of medicine which involves cutting or burning". This was especially prohibited to regulars (cap. tua nos, 19, De Homicid.), and they are also forbidden to exercise the science of medicine in any form (c. Ad aures, 7, de æt. et qual.). This general prohibition is extended to all clerics, inasmuch as the art of medicine is of its nature secular and, moreover, involves the danger of incurring an irregularity (c. 9, X, V, 12). Canonists, however, generally hold that in case of necessity and where danger to life is not involved, clerics can practise

medicine through pity and charity towards the poor, in default of ordinary practitioners. The Sacred Congregations have on several occasions granted permission to priests to make and distribute medical confections, and allowed priests who had formerly been physicians to practice the art, but with the clause "gratis and through love of God towards all and on account of the absence of other physicians". A clause is likewise sometimes added that they may accept recompense if spontaneously offered, but never from the poor. In cases where a cleric had formerly been a physician, he may not practise medicine except through necessity, without obtaining a papal indult, which is generally not granted except for an impelling cause (Bened. XIV, "De Syn. Diœc.", l. 13, c. 10). This has been frequently insisted on in decrees of the Sacred Congregation of the Council. The regulations of some dioceses (e. g. Brixen, 1857) explicitly mention that homœopathy likewise falls under the prohibition of exercising the medical art. Priests are reminded that it is preferable to study theology and become expert physicians of souls rather than to cure bodies, which is a secular profession. The main reason why clerics should not practice medicine arises from the danger of incurring the irregularity which is caused by accidental homicide or mutilation. Even accidental homicide induces irregularity if the perpetrator be at fault. The decretals give certain rules to determine whether such action is culpable. Thus, if a person in the performance of a licit act does not employ proper diligence and as a consequence the death or mutilation of the patient ensues, he becomes irregular if he could have foreseen the gravity of his act and if his want of diligence was gravely culpable. Again, if a person performs an illicit act from which the death of another follows, he becomes irregular even though he employed all diligence in averting a fatal result, provided there was a natural connection between the illicit act and the danger of death, so that the act was both illicit and imputable. It is to be noted that, according to this first rule, all physicians and surgeons contract irregularity for possible future sacred orders if any of their patients die through want of proper diligence or of due study of the art of medicine on the part of the physician. Hence, Benedict XIV (De Syn. Diœc., l. 13, c. 10) declares that in general when physicians wish to enter the clerical state, a dispensation should be obtained *ad cautelam*, as they can never certainly know that they have always used all the means prescribed by medical science in behalf of those patients who died under their treatment. According to the second decretal rule, all are irregular who practise medicine or surgery rashly, through want of proper knowledge and experience, if they thus cause the death of another. Particularly as regards clerics, this irregularity is declared to be incurred by regulars who have received tonsure and by seculars in sacred orders who practise medicine in a forbidden manner, with burning and cutting, and thereby bring about a fatal result. Irregularity is also contracted by mutilation, which consists in the severing of any principal member of the body, that is, one having a distinct and peculiar function. Even those who mutilate themselves, even if it be done through indiscreet zeal, incur canonical irregularity. As regards physicians and surgeons who are not clerics, they incur no irregularity for counselling or performing mutilation, because the canonical "defect of mildness" (see IRREGULARITY) does not apply to them. Should they afterwards wish to receive sacred orders, they should be dispensed *ad cautelam*.

The ecclesiastical canons contain many and various prescriptions concerning lay physicians, which are enumerated at length by Ferraris (op. cit. infra). Thus physicians are warned that they must endeavour to persuade their patients to make sacramental confession of their sins (cap. Cum Infirmitas, 13, de pœnit.). St. Pius V decreed that no physician should receive the doctorate unless he took oath not to visit a sick person longer than three days without calling a confessor, unless there was some reasonable excuse. If he violated this oath, he fell under excommunication. Canonists and moralists (among them St. Alphonsus Liguori), however, declare that this is not binding in places where it never became an established usage. They also teach that even where it had been received, it applied only to cases of mortal sickness, or where there was danger that it might become mortal, and that it sufficed for the physician to give this warning by means of a third party. The canons also declare that when a physician is paid by the public community, he is bound to treat ecclesiastics gratis, though the bishop may allow them to make voluntary contributions. Likewise, the precept of charity binds medical practitioners to give their services to the poor free of charge. Physicians who prescribe remedies involving infractions of the Decalogue, are themselves guilty of grave sin. This is also the case if they experiment on a sick person with unknown medicines, unless all hope has been given up and there is at least a possibility of doing them good. Physicians are to be reminded that they have no dispensing power concerning the fast and abstinence prescribed by the Church. They may however give their prudent judgment as to whether a sick person, owing to grave danger or inconvenience to his health, is obliged by the ecclesiastical precept. They are warned that, if they declare unnecessarily that a person is not obliged to fast, they themselves commit grave sin. They also sin mortally if they attempt, without being forced by necessity, to cure a serious illness, when they are aware that through their own culpable ignorance or inexperience, they may be the cause of grave harm to the patient. Physicians who are assigned to the care of convents of nuns should be not less than fifty years of age, and younger practitioners are not to be employed unless those of the prescribed age are not obtainable. When they have the ordinary care of nuns, they are to have general license to enter the cloister, even at night in cases of great urgency. They are not, however, to be alone with the patient. Physicians who are not ordinary require special faculties to enter the cloister.

Regulars living in missionary countries have the privilege, especially by the Bull of Clement XII, "Cum Sicut", of practising medicine. To make use of this privilege, however, they must be skilled in the art of medicine and prescribe their remedies gratuitously. They must also abstain from cutting and burning (*citra sectionem et adustionem*). It is required, however, that regular missionaries abstain from medical practice where there is a sufficient number of proper physicians. Regulars who according to their institute have care of hospitals may not exercise the art of medicine outside of their own institutions. Indults for clerics to engage in medical practice are not ordinarily conceded until the bishop's testimony concerning the medical skill of the applicant and the want of lay practitioners has been considered. The religious superior of the regular in question must also add his testimonial concerning the moral qualities of the candidate. An indult to practice surgery is much more difficult to obtain than one for practising medicine, and it is granted only when there is no other local surgeon.

AICHNER, *Compendium Juris Ecclesiastici* (Brixen, 1895); FERRARIS, *Bibliotheca Canonica* (Rome, 1889), s. v. *Clericus* and *Medicus*.

WILLIAM H. W. FANNING.

Medina, BARTHOLOMEW, Dominican theologian, b. at Medina, 1527; d. at Salamanca, 1581. With Dominico Soto, Melchior Canus, and Dominico Bañez he studied theology at the University of Salamanca under the celebrated professor Francis Vittoria. His life was devoted almost entirely to teaching theology at Sala-

manca, first in the chair of Durandus, afterwards as principal professor. He was appointed to the "cathedra primaria" after a successful concursus, in public, against the learned Augustinian, John of Guevara. Although he was well versed in Greek and Hebrew, he loved theology more, and all his writings preserved are theological, being principally commentaries on the Summa of St. Thomas. He is usually called the Father of Probabilism. Writers are divided as to his teaching on this important question of moral theology. Some hold that he did not introduce, but merely formulated, Probabilism when he wrote: "It seems to me that if an opinion is probable, it may be followed, even though the opposite opinion be more probable" (I–II, q. xix, a. 6). Others say he proposed that principle in the abstract (speculative), restricting it in practice so that there was no departure from rules of conduct formerly followed. Others still, e. g. Echard, followed by Billuart, maintain that the system proposed by Medina differed greatly from Probabilism as it has been explained by its later defenders, and they cite its definition: "that opinion is probable which is held by wise men and is supported by first-class arguments". Hurter (Nomencl.) writes: "He seems to have led the way to Probabilism". Echard admits, with Vincent Baron, O. P., that Medina opened the way for a flood of probabilistic theories, and closes with the declaration: St. Thomas is our Master, others only in so far as they follow his teaching. Probabiliorists are unwilling to admit that Medina is against them; probabilists are loath to admit that he proposed a new doctrine, or do not wish to give to him all the credit of introducing a new system for forming the conscience in doubtful cases. The following is a list of his most important works: "Commentaria in primam secundæ" (Salamanca, 1577); "Commentaria in tertiam partem, a Q. 1 ad 60" (Salamanca, 1584); "Breve instruction de comme se ha administrar el sacramento de la penitencia" (Salamanca, 1580).

QUÉTIF-ECHARD, *SS. Ord. Præd.*, II, 256; BOISDRON, *Théories et systèmes des probabilités en théologie morale* (Fribourg, 1894), 6.

D. J. KENNEDY.

Medina, JUAN DE, theologian; b. 1490; d. 1547; he occupied the first rank among the theologians of the sixteenth century. He was born at Medina de Pomar in the Province of Burgos, and not at Alcalá as some writers state. Very little has been written about his life though he is repeatedly quoted and praised by several theologians of his time. He entered the College of St. Ildefonsus at Alcalá, 20 May, 1516, took doctor's degrees in philosophy and theology, and soon after was made canon and master of theology at the university. He was selected as primary professor of theology in the College of St. Ildefonsus in succession to Michael Carasco, whom Cardinal Ximenes wished to be made perpetual Rector of the College: "Ximenes perpetuum rectorem esse voluerit". From about 1526 and for the space of twenty years, Medina filled his position with the greatest distinction. Alvarez Gomez says that Medina had a wonderful power of presenting the most intricate questions in a simple and clear style so that his pupils had no difficulty in understanding him—"nihil esset tam perplexum aut obscurum quod vel tardissimus non assequeretur". His love of study impaired his health and he died at the age of fifty-seven years. Medina's works are principally on moral theology and ethics. Some of his opinions were not in accordance with the doctrine propounded at the Council of Trent. The "Diccionario Enciclop. Hispano-Americano" says that his treatise "de Pœnitientia" was put on the Index published in 1707; the edition of the Index printed in 1711 does not give Medina's work, nor does any of the subsequent editions. The Council of Trent declares that at the hour of death there is no "reservatio" and that all priests can absolve "in articulo mortis". Medina says "that absolution given by an excommunicated priest is invalid"; and again, "at a time of necessity (articulo necessitatis) any priest, not suspended or excommunicated, can absolve any person". His opinions on the "materia" for sacramental absolution, and on the "Copia confessariorum" seem opposed to the teaching of the council on these points. Alvarez Gomez and Andrea Schott state that Medina was buried in the church of St. Ildefonsus. The first lines of the epitaph on his tomb are:

Complutense decus jacet hic, attende viator,
Ter tumulum lustra, ter pia thura crema
Hoc moriente silet vox, qua non clarior unquam
Compluti fulsit, nec fuit illa.

Many editions of Medina's works were printed in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. His brother John de Medina brought out the theological books at Alcalá in 1544 and sqq.; Salamanca, 1555; Ingoldstadt, 1581; Brescia, 1590–1606; Cologne, 1607 etc.

Opera Joannis de Medina; DE CASTRA, *De potest. legis* (Lyons, 1556); GOMEZ, *De rebus gestis Card. Ximenes* (Alcalá, 1569); SCHOTT, *Hispaniæ Bibliotheca* (Frankfort, 1608); NICOLAS, *Ant. Bibliotheca Hisp.* (Rome, 1672).

GREGORY CLEARY.

Medina, MIGUEL DE, theologian, b. at Belalcázar, Spain, 1489; d. at Toledo, 1 May, 1578. He entered the Franciscan order in the convent of S. Maria de Angelis at Hornachuelos, in the Sierra Morena. After his profession he went to the college of SS. Peter and Paul at Alcalá. He received the doctor's degree from the city of Toledo; and in 1550 he was unanimously elected to the chair of Holy Scripture in the University of Alcalá. In 1560 Philip II sent him to the Council of Trent; on his return he became superior of St. John's of the Kings at Toledo. In 1553 the "Commentaries" of John Ferus were published in Rome after a strict examination. Dominicus a Soto published at Salamanca a work censuring Ferus's commentaries, selecting sixty-seven passages as deserving censure, and dedicated them to Valdés, Archbishop of Seville. Medina took up the defence of Ferus, which was published at Alcalá (1567, 1578), and Mainz (1572). This literary controversy—for no doubts were entertained of the orthodoxy of Medina—agitated the Spanish people. A process was instituted against Medina in the tribunal of the Inquisition at Toledo. He was cast into prison, where for more than five years he was subjected to great suffering and privations. His temporal afflictions and the rigour of his life brought on a severe illness, and the inquisitor-general gave orders that Medina was to be conveyed to the Convent of St. John's of the Kings, where everything possible was to be done to preserve his life. Before the Blessed Sacrament, he made his profession of faith, calling God to witness that he never believed anything or taught anything opposed to the doctrines of the Church "the pillar and the ground of truth". His last words were: "In te Domine speravi, non confundar in æternum."

Soon after his death, the supreme tribunal of the Inquisition issued a decree declaring that the accusations brought against Medina were without foundation. His principal works are: "Christianæ parænesis sive de recta in Deum fide libri septem" (Venice, 1564); "Disputationes de indulgentiis adversus nostri temporis hæreticos ad PP. s. Concilii Trident." (Venice, 1564); "De sacrorum hominum continentia libri V" (Venice, 1569), written against those who advocated the necessity of permitting the German priests to follow the example of the Greeks in this matter; "De igne purgatorio" (Venice, 1569); "De la verdadera y cristiana humilidad" (Toledo, 1559).

Annales ord., Min., XIX, XXI; WADDING-SBARALEA, *Scriptores Ord. Min.*; JUAN FRANC. DE S. ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca Univ. Franciscana* (Madrid, 1732); DE CASTRO; SCHOTT, *Hispaniæ Bibliotheca* (Frankfort, 1608); NICOLÁS ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca Hisp.* (Rome, 1672); *Diccion. enciclop. Hispano-Amer.* (Barcelona, 1893).

GREGORY CLEARY.

Meditation. See PRAYER.

Medrano, Francisco, Spanish lyric poet, b. in Seville, not to be confounded with Sebastián Francisco de Medrano who was also a poet and lived at about the same time. The dates of his birth and death are unknown, but he lived during the latter part of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries. Little is known of his life except that he visited Rome. His works were published at Palermo (1617) as an appendix to the imitation of Ovid's "De Remedio Amoris" by Pedro Venegas, a poet of Seville. According to the Spanish critic Adolfo de Castro, Medrano is the best of the Spanish imitators of Horace, comparing favourably in that respect with Fray Luis de León. Endowed with literary taste, he writes in good Spanish, and his style is free from the gongorism of his time. Among the odes of Medrano, his "La profecía del Tajo" is very similar to one of Fray Luis de León of the same title. Although both are based upon Horace's ode to Mark Antony in which he would separate him and Cleopatra, there is a great difference between them. León's ode departs from the original of Horace, while Medrano's is an imitation of the latter so close as to amount almost to a translation. The poems of Medrano are reprinted in "La Biblioteca de Autores Españoles".

Biblioteca de Autores Españoles, Vols. XXXII, XXXV, and XLII (Madrid, 1848–86).

Ventura Fuentes.

Medulić, Andreas, Croatian painter and engraver, called by Italian authors Medola, Medula, Schiavone, Schiaon, etc., b. at Sibenik, Dalmatia, 1522; d. at Venice, 1582. The son of poor parents, Andreas was accustomed, while still a boy, to study closely the pictures and woodwork on the walls of the churches and public buildings of his native town, and, on his return home, to sketch on paper all that he had seen. So tireless was his devotion to his drawing that his father took him to Venice, and there entrusted him to his godfather, Rocco, a painter of very little merit. Under Rocco Medulić, first as apprentice and then as salaried assistant, compelled to work from early morning till evening to procure bare nourishment and clothing, strove to perfect himself in his art. He began by studying and copying the works of the then renowned painter, Francesco Mazzuola (known as Parmigiano), and the paintings of Titian. From these celebrated painters Medulić learned that grace and delicate lightness of touch, that animation of colour, which constitute the pre-eminent characteristics of his own pictures. While still young in years, chance procured for him the acquaintance of Pietro Aretino, commonly known as "the Divine" and the "scourge of princes" (Flagellum principum), from whom Medulić received always a most friendly reception and much valuable instruction. About this time Medulić began to copy the engravings of Parmigiano, the first to execute pictures on copper with nitric acid. J. Paolo Lomazzo, contemporary painter and writer, states that Parmigiano was Medulić's instructor in this branch. Medulić, however, was no mere imitator; the individual character of his painting gave rise to a special school in Venice, the "Scuola di Schiavone".

Tintoretto was not ashamed to work with the needy youth, to assist him, and even to study his beautiful style of colouring, recommending in writing all painters to study colour from Medulić's pictures, adding that "every painter is blameworthy, who does not possess at least one picture of Medulić's in his studio." Among those who occasionally purchased his pictures and greatly prized them, was Titian himself who when commissioned by the Venetian Government to choose the best painters in Venice to decorate with mural paintings the public library of St. Mark, included Medulić's name with those of Tintoretto, Paul Veronese, Battista Zelotti, Giuseppe Salviati, and Battista Franco. Medulić retained throughout life great veneration for Titian and is indeed proclaimed by many authors (Filibeau, Rahmdor, Nagler) his most celebrated imitator. For the Ruzzini family in Venice, Medulić painted the "Baptism of Jesus", but the subdued colouring cannot bear comparison with his other artistic achievements. For the Pellegrini he painted: "Jesus at Emmaus with Luke and Cleophas", for colour one of the greatest masterpieces of the Venetian school; "Pilate Washing his Hands", an equally typical example of Medulić's style; "Madonna with Child in the Desert, with St. Joseph and St. John the Baptist". For the Gussoni he painted "St. Cecilia Playing the Organ" (half length), with two attendant angels, and "Madonna Presenting her Son to Holy Simeon". In the house of the Priuli in the Via San Salvadore, Medulić painted in fresco some scenes from the life of St. John; for the Foscarini the "Descent of the Holy Ghost". A great number of works, now scattered throughout the world, were painted for the churches of Venice and other cities and for individual collectors. On 22 May, 1563, the judges appointed from among the celebrated painters of Venice to decide the process of the brothers Zuccati were Titian, Jacob of Pistoia, Andreas Medulić, Paul Veronese, and Tintoretto. Medulić also worked with nitric acid on copper, and, according to some authorities, was the first to engrave with a dry needle. His etchings are highly praised for their special elegance, beauty, and vigour; among his best works of this class may be mentioned, "Moses Saved by Pharaoh's Daughter", "Abduction of the Trojan Helen", "Sts. Peter and Paul", "Curing of the Lame Man" (after Raphael). Medulić died in poverty, leaving scarcely sufficient to pay for his interment in the church of St. Luke at Venice. The following works must be placed in the same rank as the pictures of Titian himself: "The Last Supper" in the Borghese Palace, Rome; "Madonna and Child, with Sts. Francis and Jerome" in the Royal Academy of Arts, Venice; "Jesus Bound Between a Malefactor and Two Soldiers" at Paris; "Pilate Washing his Hands" in the Royal Academy, Venice.

Caodry, *Description of the Pictures at the Earl of Pembroke's House at Wilton* (London, 1751); Pilkington, *The Gentleman's and Connoisseur's Dictionary of Painters* (London, 1798); Forel, *Etchings after Drawings and Engravings by Parmegianino and Meldolla* (London, 1822); Basan, *Dictionnaire des graveurs anciens et modernes* (Paris, 1767); Brulliot, *Dictionnaire de Monogrammes*, etc. (Munich, 1832); Hirsching, *Nachrichten von sehenswürdigen Gemälden und Kupferstichsammlungen in Deutschland* (Erlangen, 1786); Nagler, *Neues allgemeines Künstlerlexikon* (Munich, 1835–52); Kukuljević, *Andreas Medulić Schiavone* (Zagreb, 1863); Pezzoli, *Elogio di Andrea Schiavone* (Venice, 1840).

Anthony-Lawrence Gancević.

Meehan, Charles Patrick, Irish historical writer and translator, b. in Dublin, 12 July, 1812; d. there 14 March, 1890. His parents, natives of Ballymahon, Co. Longford, where his ancestors for thirteen centuries were custodians of the Shrine of St. Molaise, now one of the most famous relics in the Royal Irish Academy, Dublin, sent him to the Irish College, Rome, to study for the priesthood. Ordained priest in 1834, he returned to Ireland, then in enjoyment of five years of Catholic Emancipation. His first mission was the rural parish of Rathdrum in Wicklow, from which he was soon transferred to the metropolitan parish of Sts. Michael and John, where he remained until his death. While working zealously in the ministry, he was untiring in historical research. From materials gathered while in Wicklow, he compiled a "History of the O'Tooles, Lords Powerscourt", published without his name and long out of print. His other works, with date of publication are: "History of the Confederation of Kilkenny" (1846); "The Geraldines, their Rise, Increase and Ruin" (1847); translation of Manzoni's "La Monaca di Monza" (1848), out of print; "Portrait of a Christian Bishop, Life and Death of the Most Rev. Francis Kirwan, Bishop of Killala, trans-

lated from the Latin of Archdeacon John Lynch" (1848); "Lives of the most eminent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects, of the Order of St. Dominic, translated from the Italian of Vincenzo Marchese" (1852), out of print; "Fate and Fortunes of the Earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell" (1868); "Rise and Fall of the Irish Franciscan Monasteries and Memoirs of the Irish Hierarchy in the Seventeenth Century" (1870). These works, all published in Dublin, have earned renown, and, except those marked out of print, have gone through numerous revised editions. Father Meehan wrote "Tales for the Young", and translated others which he named "Flowers from Foreign Fields". He edited Davis's "Essays" (1883), Mangan's "Essays and Poems" (1884), and Madden's "Literary Remains of the United Irishmen" (1887). He also wrote some graceful verse, which is to be found in various anthologies.

SILLARD in *Catholic World* (Sept., 1890).

PETER A. SILLARD.

Meerschaert, THEOPHILE. See OKLAHOMA.

Megara, a titular see, suffragan to Corinth, in Achaia. The city, which was built on an arid strip of land between two rocks, had two ports, on the Saronic Gulf and the Gulf of Corinth respectively. In the eighth and seventh centuries B. C., Megara became the metropolis of flourishing colonies, the chief of which were Megara Hyblæa, and Selinus, in Sicily, Selymbria, Chalcedon, Astakos, Byzantium, and the Pontic Heraclea. The exclusion of Megara from the Attic market by Pericles, in 432, was one cause of the Peloponnesian War. The Megarian territory, already very poor, was then ravaged year after year, and in 427 Nicias even established a permanent post on the island of Minoa over against Nisæa. Shortly before this Megara had become the birthplace of the Sophist, Eucleides, a disciple of Socrates, who, about the year 400 B. C., founded the philosophic school of Megara, chiefly famous for the cultivation of dialectic. It subsequently shared the political vicissitudes of the other Greek cities. About the end of the fifth century after Christ, under the Emperor Anastasius I, its fortifications were restored. The names of some early Greek bishops of Megara are given in Le Quien, "Oriens Christianus", II, 205. In the "Notitia episcopatuum" of Leo the Wise (c. 900), the earliest authority of the kind for this region, the name of Megara does not appear. Numerous Latin bishops in the Middle Ages are mentioned in Eubel, "Hierarchia catholica medii ævi", I, 348; II, 208. Megara is now a town of 6500 inhabitants, the capital of a deme of the same name. On Easter Sunday the women there perform an antique dance which people come from Athens to see. Not a vestige remains of the temples which Pausanias described. Efforts are made to locate the acropoles of Minoa and Nisæa on various little eminences along the coast.

REINGANUM, *Das alte Megaris* (Berlin, 1825); LEAKE, *Northern Greece*, II, 388; SMITH, *Dict. Greek and Roman Geog.*, II, 310–17.

S. VAILHÉ.

Megarians.—The Megarian School is one of the imperfectly Socratic Schools, so called because they developed in a one-sided way the doctrines of Socrates. The Megarians, of whom the chief representatives were Euclid, the founder of the school, and Stilpo, flourished at Athens, during the first half of the fourth century B. C. Borrowing from the Eleatics, especially from Parmenides, the doctrine that there is no change or multiplicity in the world, they combined this principle with the Socratic teaching that knowledge by means of concepts is the only true knowledge. It follows from this that the only reality is the unchangeable essential nature, that the world of our sense experience is an illusion, and that there is nothing possible except what actually exists. The affirmation of the existence of "bodiless forms", which seems to have been the Megarian designation for the unchangeable essential natures of things, is the school's most important contribution to speculative thought. Its analogy with the Platonic doctrine of ideas is evident. In the practical portion of their teaching the Megarians emphasized the supremacy of the notion of goodness. Knowledge, Socrates taught, is the only virtue; it is identical with moral excellence. The highest object of knowledge is the highest good. But, as the Eleatics taught, the highest object of knowledge is the highest reality, being. Therefore, the Megarians conclude, the highest good and the highest reality are one and the same. Whatever Parmenides predicated of being, namely oneness, immutability, etc., may be predicated of the good also. The good is insight, reason, God; it alone exists. In order to defend these tenets, which to the popular mind seemed not only untrue but absurd, the Megarians developed to a high degree the art of disputation. This art (the eristic method, or method of strife, as it was called in contradistinction to the heuristic method, or method of finding, advocated by Socrates), was introduced into philosophy by the Eleatic, Zeno, surnamed the Dialectican. It was adopted in the Megarian School, and carried by the followers of Euclid to a point where it ceased to serve any useful or even serious purpose. To Euclid himself we owe the use of the method of argumentation known as the *reductio ad absurdum*, which consists in attacking, not the premises, but the conclusion, of the opponent's argument and showing the absurd consequences which follow if his contention is admitted. This method, however, was germinally contained in Zeno's procedure by which, in a series of specious fallacies he had striven to show that motion, change, and multiplicity are illusions.

PLATO, *Dialogues*, especially *Sophistes*, 242 B; SCHLEIERMACHER, *Platon's Werke*, II (Berlin, 1804–10), 2; PRANTL, *Gesch. der Logik im Abendlande*, I (Leipzig, 1855, sqq.), 33; ZELLER, *Socrates and the Socratic Schools*, tr. REICHEL (London, 1885), 250 sqq.; TURNER, *Hist. of Philos.* (Boston, 1903), 85 sqq.

WILLIAM TURNER.

Mège, ANTOINE-JOSEPH, a Maurist Benedictine, b. in 1625 at Clermont; d. 15 April, 1691, at the monastery of St.-Germain-des-Prés near Paris. On 17 March, 1643, he became a Benedictine at the monastery of Vendôme. In 1659 he taught theology at the Abbey of St. Denis and afterwards devoted himself to preaching. In 1681 he was made prior of the monastery at Rethel in Champagne. Towards the end of his life he withdrew to St.-Germain-des-Prés, where he divided his time between prayer and study. His most important literary production is "Commentaire sur la règle de S. Benoît" and a MS. history of the congregation of St. Maur from 1610 till 1653 (Paris, 1687). This commentary is an attack upon the rigoristic interpretation of the rule by Abbot Rancé of La Trappe, and was forbidden in 1689 by a chapter of the Maurist superiors at the instance of Bossuet. His other works are a translation of St. Ambrose's treatise "On Virginity" (Paris, 1655), "La Morale chrétienne" (Paris, 1661), a few ascetical writings and translations.

TASSIN, *Histoire littéraire de la congrégation de St.-Maur* (Brussels, 1770), s. v.; LE CERF, *Bibliothèque historique et critique des auteurs de la congrégation de St. Maur* (La Haye, 1726), 346–355; DE LAMA, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la congrégation de Saint-Maur* (Munich and Paris, 1882), 59–60.

MICHAEL OTT.

Megiddo. See MAGEDDO.

Mehrerau, formerly a Benedictine, now a Cistercian Abbey, is situated on Lake Constance, west of Bregenz, in the district of Vorarlberg, Austria. The original monastery was founded by St. Columbanus who, driven from Luxeuil, settled about 611 at this spot and built a monastery after the model of Luxeuil. A convent for women soon arose near the monastery for men. Little has been preserved of the early history of either foundation up to 1079. In this year the monastery was reformed by the monk Gottfried,

sent by Abbot William of Hirsau, and the Benedictine rule was introduced. It is probable that when the reform was effected the convent for women was suppressed. In 1097–98 the abbey was rebuilt by Count Ulrich of Bregenz, its secular administrator and protector. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the abbey acquired much landed property; up to the middle of the sixteenth century it had the right of patronage for sixty-five parishes. In the era of the Reformation the abbey was a strong support of the old Faith in Vorarlberg. In particular Ulrich Mötz, afterwards abbot, exerted much influence in Bregenzerwald (a mountainous district of northern Vorarlberg) by preaching with great energy against the spread of religious innovations while he was provost of Lingenau (1515–33). During the Thirty Years War the abbey suffered from the devastation wrought by the Swedes, from the quartering upon it of soldiers, and from forced contributions; it was also robbed of nearly all its revenues. Nevertheless, it often offered a free refuge to religious expelled from Germany and Switzerland. At a later date it was once more in a very flourishing condition; in 1738 the church was completely rebuilt, and in 1774–81 the monastic buildings were also entirely reconstructed. The existence of Mehrerau was threatened, as was that of other religious foundations, by the attacks upon monasteries in the reign of the Emperor Joseph II. However, Abbot Benedict was able to obtain the withdrawal of the decree of suppression, although it had already been signed. The Peace of Presburg (1805) gave Vorarlberg, and with it the abbey, to Bavaria, which in April, 1806, took an inventory of the abbey. In reply to the last attempt to save the abbey, namely the offer to turn it into a training-school for male teachers, the State declared in August, 1806, that on 1 September the monastic organization would be dissolved and the monks would have to leave the abbey. The valuable library was scattered, part of it was burnt. The forest and agricultural lands belonging to the monastery were taken by the State; in February, 1807, the church was closed, and the other buildings were sold at auction. In 1808–09 the church was taken down and the material used to build the harbour of Landau. When the district came again under the rule of Austria, the monastic buildings were used for various purposes. In 1853 they were bought from the last owner, along with some pieces of land connected with them, by the abbot of the Cistercian Abbey of Wettingen in Switzerland (see WETTINGEN). This monastery had been forcibly suppressed by the Canton of Aargau in 1841, and for thirteen years the abbot had been seeking a new home; on 18 October, 1854, the Cistercian Abbey of Wettingen-Mehrerau was formally opened. In the same year a monastery school was started. In 1859 a new Romanesque church was built; its greatest ornament is the monument to Cardinal Hergenröther (d. 1890), who is buried there. About the middle of the last century, during the fifties and sixties, the buildings were gradually enlarged. In 1910 besides the abbot (from 1902 Eugene Notz) the abbey had 32 priests; including those that had been connected with the abbey but were at that date engaged in work outside, 64 priests; in addition there were 5 clerics, 30 lay brothers, and 4 novices. The monastery has a house of studies, and a college, in which some 200 pupils are taught by the monks of the abbey. The periodical "Cisterciensерchronik", edited by Father Gregor Müller, has been issued since 1889.

BERGMANN, *Nekrologium Augiæ majoris Brigantinæ Ord. S. Benedicti* (Vienna, 1853); BRUNNER, *Ein Benediktinerbuch* (Würzburg, 1880), 10–18; IDEM, *Ein Cistercienserbuch* (Würzburg, 1881), 453–97, gives an account of Wettingen-Mehrerau; *Cisterciensерchronik* (1904), 289–313; LINDNER, *Album Augiæ Brigantinæ* (1904); *Schematismus von Brixen* (1910).

JOSEPH LINS.

Meignan, GUILLAUME-RENÉ, Cardinal Archbishop of Tours, French apologist and Scriptural exegete, b. at Chauvigné, France, 12 April, 1817; d. at Tours, 20 January, 1896. Having ascertained his vocation to the priesthood, on the completion of his academic studies at the Angers *lycée* and at Château-Gontier, he studied philosophy in the seminary of Le Mans, where he received the subdiaconate in 1839. From this institution he passed to the Collège de Tessé, which belonged to the Diocese of Le Mans, where, while teaching in one of the middle grades, he continued his own ecclesiastical studies. All through his career he seems to have been blessed with the friendship and sympathetic counsel of the most eminent men among the Catholics of his time and country. The Abbé Bercy, an Orientalist of some distinction, whose notice he attracted at Le Mans and later at Tessé, advised him to make Scriptural exegesis his special study. Mgr Bouvier ordained him priest (14 June, 1840) and sent him to Paris for a further course in philosophy under Victor Cousin. Meignan made the acquaintance of Ozanam, Montalembert, and others like them, who urged him to prepare for the special controversial needs of the day by continuing his studies in Germany. Following this advice, he became the pupil at Munich of such teachers as Görres (q. v.), Döllinger, and Windschmann; and when his earlier attraction for Scriptural studies was thoroughly reawakened under the stimulus of the then fresh Tübingen discussions, he repaired to Berlin where he attended the lectures of Neander, Hengstenberg, and Schelling. In, or soon after May, 1843, Meignan returned to Paris to be numbered among the clergy of the archdiocese, but was soon (1845) obliged to visit Rome for the good of his health, which had become impaired. He seemed to recover immediately, and was able to prosecute his sacred studies so successfully that he won a Doctorate of Theology at the Sapienza (March, 1846). Here again he was helped by the friendly interest and advice of many eminent men, of Perrone and Gerbet, as well as by the teaching of Passaglia, Patrizzi, and Theiner. Between this period and 1861, when he became professor of Sacred Scripture at the Sorbonne, he filled various academical positions in the Archdiocese of Paris, of which Mgr Darboy made him vicar-general in 1863. In 1864 he was elevated to the Bishopric of Châlons, in 1882 transferred to the See of Arras, and in 1884 to the Archbishopric of Tours.

By the logic of circumstances he was one of the chief antagonists of Ernest Renan. In his work he aimed to enlighten the lay mind on current topics of controversy and, while giving a knowledge of the assured results of criticism, to supply his readers with the Christian point of view. His aggressive and triumphant career as an apologist began as early as 1856 with the publication of "Les prophéties messianiques. Le Pentateuque" (Paris). In 1860 appeared "M. Renan et le Cantique des Cantiques" (Paris); in 1863 "M. Renan réfuté par les rationalistes allemands" (Paris) and "Les Évangiles et la critique au XIXe siècle" (Paris); in 1886 "De l'irréligion systématique, ses influences actuelles" (Paris); in 1890 "Salomon, son règne, ses écrits" (Paris); in 1892 "Les prophètes d'Israël et le Messie, depuis Daniel jusqu'à Jean-Baptiste" (Paris). He wrote many other works on kindred topics. His treatment of Messianic prophecy extends far beyond mere verbal exegesis, and includes a critical examination of historical events and conditions. Like other great Catholic controversialists of his time, he had to suffer adverse criticism; these criticisms were finally answered by the action of Leo XIII, who raised him to the cardinalate, 15 Dec., 1892.

BOISSONNOT, *Le cardinal Meignan* (Paris, 1899).

E. MACPHERSON.

Meilleur, JEAN-BAPTISTE, a French Canadian physician and educator, b. at St. Laurent, P. Q., 9 May, 1796; d. 7 Dec., 1878. He studied the classics at the

Sulpician college of Montreal, philosophy at Middlebury, N. H., and medicine at Castletown, Vt. He was one of the founders of the flourishing college of L'Assomption, P. Q. In 1834 he edited "L'Echo du pays" and was returned the same year to the Lower Canadian Parliament. He was the first superintendent of education for that province, an office which he held from 1842 to 1855. He assumed the arduous task of enforcing the educational law framed by the Act of Union of the two Canadas (1841), a law which, owing to prejudice and to undue political influence, was highly unpopular. Meilleur thoroughly organized the Department of Education, and witnessed, before retiring from office, the remarkable progress achieved by education, both primary and classical, thanks, in a great measure, to the generous and devoted co-operation of the clergy. Besides contributing to different periodicals, articles on education, agriculture, botany, and geology, and on medicine to the "Journal de médecine", he wrote textbooks on French and English grammar and correspondence, and on chemistry. His chief work is "Mémorial de l'Education" (1860), a history of education in Canada. He died the very day on which he was publicly to receive the insignia of Officer of Public Instruction of France.

MORGAN, *Bibliotheca canadensis* (Ottawa, 1867); CHAUVEAU, *L'Instruction publique au Canada* (Quebec, 1876); *Le Courrier du Canada* (Quebec, 1878).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Meinrad, SAINT. See EINSIEDELN, ABBEY OF.

Meinwerk, BLESSED, tenth Bishop of Paderborn, d. 1036. Meinwerk (Meginwerk) was born of the noble family of the Immedinger and related to the royal house of Saxony. His father was Imad (Immeth), Count of Teisterbant and Radichen, and his mother's name was Adela (Adala, Athela). In early youth he was dedicated by his parents to serve God in the priesthood. He began his secular and ecclesiastical studies at the church of St. Stephen in Halberstadt and finished them at the cathedral school of Hildesheim, where he had as schoolmate St. Bernward of Hildesheim and probably the later Emperor Henry II. After his ordination he became a canon at Halberstadt, then chaplain at the Court of Otto III. Henry II, who greatly esteemed him, named him Bishop of Paderborn, for the express purpose of raising the financial condition of the impoverished church. He was consecrated at Goslar, 13 March, 1009, by Archbishop Willigis of Mainz. For twenty-seven years he laboured with restless energy and zeal, and deserves the title of second founder of the diocese. His cathedral and a large portion of Paderborn had been destroyed by a conflagration in 1000; he rebuilt the cathedral on a much grander scale and consecrated it on 15 Sept., 1015. He employed Greek workmen to build the chapel of St. Bartholomew, which was considered a work of art. In 1031 he founded the Abbey of Abdinghof, for which he obtained thirteen Benedictine monks from the Abbey of Cluny. Between the years 1033–36, he established the collegiate church for canons-regular at Bussdorf. He built an episcopal palace and new walls for the city. He divided his diocese into parishes, caused the erection of many churches and chapels, held frequent visitations, insisted on a clerical life among his priests, observance of rules in the monasteries, and was much interested, not only in the spiritual welfare of his subjects, but also in their temporal well-being, for which he introduced improved methods in agriculture, etc. According to his biography his own education was not of a high grade, but he did much for the spread of knowledge; he called in noted teachers of mathematics, astronomy, and of other sciences and put his cathedral school into a flourishing condition, which it retained for many years after his death, many prominent men receiving their education in it, among others, Altmann of Passau, Anno of Cologne, Frederic of Münster, and others. To defray the expenses of his buildings and charitable works, he made use of church festivals, social gatherings, and other occasions to call upon the generosity of kings and princes, of the rich and noble, of the clergy and of the laity, frequently importuned the emperor himself, relying upon his friendship and often appealing to his own labours for the state; but he also very liberally used his personal means for the benefit of the Church. Towards his subjects Meinwerk was frequently harsh, but kind at heart, and, if any serious offence had been given, he would conciliate the party by presents. Twice he made a journey to Rome, the first time in 1014, to assist at the coronation of Henry II, then, in 1026, as companion of Otto III. On this trip he received from Wolfgang, Patriarch of Aquileia, the body of St. Felix for Abdinghof. Similarly he obtained for his diocese, entirely or in part, the relics of Sts. Valerian, Minias, Philip, Juvenal, and of the great martyr-bishop Blasius. His body was buried, according to his wish, in the crypt of the church of Abdinghof. Abbot Conrad von Allenhause raised the relics and 25 April, 1376, placed them in a beautiful monument in the sanctuary. This has been considered equal to a canonization, but his feast is not in the Proprium of Paderborn of 1884, nor does the schema of the diocese for 1909 show any church, chapel, or altar dedicated to his name. On the secularization of Abdinghof, 1803, the remains were brought to the church of Bussdorf. The "Vita" (Mon. Germ. SS., XI, 104), written anonymously by a monk of Abdinghof, soon after 1150, is a history, not a legend, though somewhat ornamented by legendary additions. (Giesebrecht, "Deutsche Kaiserzeit", II, 578.)

Acta SS., June, I, 500; STADLER, *Heiligenlex.*; WATTENBACH, *Deutsche Geschichtsquellen*, II, 27, 30; EBELING, *Die deutschen Bischöfe*, II (Leipzig, 1858), 346.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Meissen, a former see of north-east Germany. The present city of Meissen, situated in the Kingdom of Saxony on both banks of the Elbe, owes its origin to a castle built by King Henry I about 928 to protect German colonists among the Wends. To insure the success of the Christian missions, Otto I suggested at the Roman Synod of 962 the creation of an archiepiscopal see at Magdeburg. To this proposal John XII consented, and, shortly before the execution of the plan in 968, it was decided at the Synod of Ravenna (967) to create three other sees—namely Meissen, Mersburg, and Zeitz—as suffragans of Magdeburg. The year in which the Diocese of Meissen was established is not known, the oldest extant records being forgeries; however, the record of endowment by Otto I in 971 is genuine. The first bishop, Burchard (d. 969), established a foundation (*monasterium*) which in the course of the eleventh century developed a chapter of canons. In 1346 the diocese stretched from the Erzgebirge in the south to the mouth of the Neisse and to the Queis, on the east to the Oder, on the north to the middle course of the Spree. It embraced the five provostries of Meissen, Riesa, Wurzen, Grossenhain, and Bautzen, the four archdeaneries of Nisani (Meissen), Chemnitz, Zschillen (Wechselburg), and Niederlausitz, and the two deaneries of Meissen and Bautzen. Poorly endowed in the beginning, it appears to have acquired later large estates under Otto III and Henry II.

The chief task of the bishops of the new see was the conversion of the Wends, to which Bishops Volkold (d. 992) and Eido (d. 1015) devoted themselves with great zeal; but the work of evangelization was slow, and was yet incomplete when the investiture conflict threatened to arrest it effectively. St. Benno (1066–1106), bishop at the time when these troubles were most serious, was appointed by Henry IV and appears to have been in complete accord with the emperor until 1076; in that year, however, although he had taken no part in the Saxon revolt, he was imprisoned by Henry for nine months. Escaping, he joined

the Saxon princes, espoused the cause of Gregory VII, and in 1085 took part in the Gregorian Synod of Quedlinburg, for which he was deprived of his office by the emperor, a more imperially disposed bishop being appointed in his place. On the death of Gregory, Benno made peace with Henry, and, being reappointed to his former see in 1086, devoted himself entirely to missionary work among the Slavs. Among his successors, Herwig (d. 1119) sided with the pope, Godebold with the emperor. In the thirteenth century the pagan Wends were finally converted to Christianity, chiefly through the efforts of the great Cistercian monasteries, the most important of which were Dobrilugk and Neuzelle. Among the convents of nuns Heiligenkreuz at Meissen, Mariental near Zittau, Marienstern on the White Elster, and Mühlberg deserve mention. Among the later bishops, who were after the thirteenth century princes of the empire, the most notable are Wittigo I (1266–93) and John I of Eisenberg (1340–71). The former began the magnificent Gothic cathedral, in which are buried nine princes of the House of Wettin; the latter, as notary and intimate friend of the Margrave of Meissen, afterwards the Emperor Charles IV, protected the interests of his church and increased the revenues of the diocese. During the latter's administration, in 1344, Prague was made an archiepiscopal see.

In 1365 Urban V appointed the Archbishop of Prague *legatus natus*, or perpetual representative of the Holy See, for the Dioceses of Meissen, Bamberg, and Regensburg (Ratisbon); the opposition of Magdeburg made it impossible to exercise in Meissen the privileges of this office, and Meissen remained, though under protest, subject to the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Magdeburg. John's successor, John II of Jenstein (1376–9), who resigned Meissen on his election to the See of Prague, Nicholas I (1379–92), John III (1393–8), and Thimo of Colditz (1399–1410) were appointed directly from Rome, which set aside the elective rights of the cathedral chapter. Thimo, a Bohemian by birth, neglected the diocese and ruined it financially. Margrave William I of Saxony prevailed on Boniface IX in 1405 to free Meissen from the authority of the metropolitan and to place it directly under the Holy See. The illustrious Bishop Rudolf von der Planitz (1411–27), through wise regulations and personal sacrifices, brought order out of chaos. The Hussite wars caused great damage to the diocese, then ruled over by John IV Hofmann (1427–51); under the government of the able brothers Caspar (1451–63) and Dietrich of Schönberg (1461–76), it soon recovered, and on Dietrich's death there was a fund of 8800 gold florins in the episcopal treasury. John V of Weissenbach (1476–87) through his mania for building and his travels soon spent this money, and left a heavy burden of debt on the diocese. John VI of Salhausen (1488–1518) further impoverished the diocese through his obstinate attempt to obtain full sovereignty over his see, which brought him into constant conflict with Duke George of Saxony; his spiritual administration was also open to censure. John VII of Schleinitz (1518–37) was a resolute opponent of Luther, whose revolt began in the neighbouring Wittenberg, and, conjointly with George of Saxony, endeavoured to crush the innovations. The canonization of Benno (1523), urged by him, was intended to offset the progress of the Lutheran teaching. John VIII of Maltitz (1537–49) and Nicholas II of Carlowitz (1549–55) were unable to withstand the ever-spreading Reformation, which, after the death of Duke George (1539), triumphed in Saxony and gained ground even among the canons of the cathedral, so that the diocese was on the verge of dissolution. The last bishop, John of Haugwitz (1555–81), placed his resignation in the hands of the cathedral chapter, in virtue of an agreement with Elector Augustus of Saxony, went over to Protestantism, married, and retired to the castle of Ruhetal near Mögeln. The electors of Saxony took over the administration of the temporalities of the diocese which in 1666 were finally adjudged to them. The canons turned Protestant, and such monasteries as still existed were secularized, their revenues and buildings being devoted principally to educational works. (For the present Prefecture Apostolic of Lausitz-Meissen see SAXONY.)

Urkundbuch des Hochstifts Meissen, ed. GERSDORF (3 vols., Leipzig, 1864–67), in the *Codex Diplomaticus Saxoniæ Regiæ;* MACHATSCHEK, *Gesch. der Bischöfe des Hochstifts Meissen* (Dresden, 1884); VON BRUN (VON KAUFFUNGEN), *Das Domkapitel von M. im Mittelalter* (Meissen, 1902); *Mitteil. des Vereins für Gesch. der Stadt M.* (8 vols., Meissen, 1882–1910); *Neues Archiv für sächsische Gesch.* (Dresden, 1880—).

JOSEPH LINS.

Meissonier, ERNEST, French painter, b. at Lyons 21 February, 1815; d. at Paris, 31 January, 1891. If the Lyonnese genius in painting is found in such artists as Chenavard, Flandrin, Puvis de Chavannes, and in such landscape painters as Ravier, Meissonier does not belong to this family. At an early age his parents took him to Paris where they set up chemical works in the Marais. A family friend introduced him to the much frequented studio of Léon Cogniet (1794–1880). His first efforts date from 1831. These are portraits, generally busts, of the bourgeois of the neighbourhood (there is one at the Louvre), life-size, and somewhat commonplace in execution. At the *Salon* of 1834 there appeared a more significant picture, the "Visit to the Burgomaster's", three middle-class Hollanders in eighteenth-century costume, seated at a table and smoking. Herein the painter for the first time attempted those small *genre* subjects in costumes of the past whose pleasing picturesqueness was to contribute so much to his fame. But fame was to be delayed; for ten years Meissonier had to earn his living by illustration; and so he made vignettes for a number of works, to-day much sought after as "romantic editions", "Paul et Virginie", Lamartine's "Chûte d'un Ange" (1839), "Le Vicaire de Wakefield", and "Les Français peints par eux-mêmes" (1840–42). By degrees, however, the young artist attracted attention. Between the "classicists", or partisans of Ingres and the "romanticists" ardent followers of Delacroix, he found favour with a public rather indifferent to the quarrels of the schools and very willing to become acquainted with a style of art which did not require so much thought. In fact Meissonier seems to have quite ignored these great movements. A contemporary of many artistic controversies, e. g., the renovation of art by the school of Barbizon and the wonderful naturalistic revolution inaugurated by Paul Huet, Corot, and Rousseau, he seems a stranger to all these interests and passions.

There was on the other hand a small *genre* school, to-day somewhat forgotten, that of Eugène Isabey, Eugène Lami, Célestin Nanteuil, and the brothers Johannot, which was occupied with representing small scenes of manners in the quaint every-day costume of the Middle Ages or the Renaissance. They were pleasing extemporizers, skillful and brilliant story-tellers who put on canvas, often with spirit, the historic bric-a-brac popularized by Walter Scott. To this important school Meissonier attached himself. But he did so in a very original manner, bringing with him individual methods, aims, and talents, which marked him out among his contemporaries. He was obviously inspired by the Dutch, and he set himself to paint with the same composure, conscientiousness, and perfection as Terborch, Miéris, or Gérard Dow. It was a stroke of genius to choose as models these men who are among the best masters of painting, and this at a time when Romanticism had begun to overload its canvases with violence and excesses. Besides, these artists had been for a long time greatly esteemed by collectors, and by suggesting relationship with them Meissonier increased his chances of success with am-

ateurs. Moreover no other manner suited so well the special faculties of Meissonier, his extraordinary gift of observation and his almost absolute lack of imagination. But he was clever enough to restore *genre* painting and to blend imitation with invention; thus, for Dutch subjects he substituted those of the Regency or of the sixteenth century. Above all he excelled in microscopic canvases, wherein the wonderful reproduction of the minutest details is a perpetual source of astonishment. In painting, the "finished" product is always sure to appeal to the philistine, and when found together with smallness, and when to the pleasure of accuracy is joined that of a feat of skill, admiration knows no bounds. No more is needed to explain the incredible success of Meissonier.

In 1842 began that series of small thumb-nail pictures, the reputation of which so long outshone that of his larger works. First came "The Young Man playing the Bass-viol", then the "Painter in his studio"(1843), the "Guard-room", the "Readers", the "Smokers", the "Bravi" (1847), the "Reading at the House of Diderot", the "Bowling-party", "La Rixe" or "The Quarrel" (1855). This year, which marked the first Universal Exhibition, marked also the apogee of Meissonier's triumphs. He was already the favourite painter of his time; he now became the most illustrious. He was compared with the classic artists and the masters of *genre;* this was an exaggeration, and to-day we find much to criticize in him. His art dealt only with what had been already observed. It is regrettable that he did not make better use of his own gifts of observation; that he did not take his subjects directly from life, as did Daumier, instead of treating scenes of mere curiosity; that he did not create something "new" instead of giving us a modernized antique and giving his pictures the false appearance of a *tableau de musée.* This criticism is perhaps unjust; sixteenth-century scenes have nothing better to show than "La Rixe" and "The Bravi"; and neither Stendhal nor Mérimée is reproached for his Renaissance style of novels. Nevertheless it is true that despite superficial resemblances Meissonier is far inferior to the Dutch masters. To compare him with Terborch is to pay him too great an honour. His sharp facetted drawing, engraved with painful precision (cf. Fromentin, "Les Maîtres d'autrefois", 1876, 228), his barren, dry painting, swarming with trifles, without aim or restraint, his indefinite analysis of a host of insignificant objects, all grouped in the compass of an amazingly small space, go to make up a series of quaint harsh works, unattractive and useless, like those pieces of embroidery which distress us when we realize the immense waste of labour they give proof of. What is wanting in these pictures is that which constitutes the value of art, emotion and life.

In 1859 Meissonier was charged to paint the "Battle of Solferino" (Louvre). This was the beginning of a new series of works, which date from the Second Empire, and in which the artist undertook to celebrate the glories of the First Empire. Renouncing his small interiors and subjects of fantasy he attempted historical and open air subjects, movements of crowds and armies, and set himself the task of painting the great scenes of the imperial *épopée.* In 1864 he submitted his "1814" (Louvre); in 1867 his "Desaix to the Army of the Rhine"; next came "1805", "1807" (Metropolitan Museum, New York), and a large number of other military pictures. This style, which answered the public demand after the events of 1870, brought the artist increased popularity. For his "1814" Chauchard paid a million of francs. It is true that in these new subjects the artist displayed the same scrupulous conscientiousness of which he had given proof in his earlier manner. He painted from nature, even to the very sods of earth. To convey the impression of a broken road, he selected a corner of his garden, had it trampled by men and horses, had trucks and carts drawn over it, and sprinkled the whole with flour to imitate melting snow. To paint Napoleon, he made use of the grey cloak and the very hat the emperor wore. But in spite of it all he falls short of the lithographs of Raffet with their prodigious mystery and their breath of the heroic.

MEISSONIER IN 1881
By himself

What will last of these curious pictures is the fabulous amount of studies and sketches accumulated by the painter in preparation for his pictures. One is filled with respect before the mass of observations; there are drawings, studies of soldiers, of equipments, of horses, which are priceless documents. It is remarkable that nothing is more rare than an ensemble study, there is never more than a detail, a gesture, a movement, a muscle, caught and reproduced with unheard-of precision and strength, as by the surest and most infallible instruments. There is no other example—even if we count Menzel himself—of a similar power of analysis applied to the realm of facts. To unravel a detail from the confusion of nature Meissonier was without an equal. He had an eye constructed like the lens of a magnifying glass, or like the eye of a primitive man capable of registering thousands of sensations which our civilized retina no longer perceives. For example, he was successful in catching the movement of a running horse, which no one has been able to do since the caveman, and later the cinematograph confirmed the marvellous truth of his observations. Only everything remained for him in a fragmentary state. His was the eye of a myopic, the eye of a fly, cut like a crystal into millions of facets, the most astounding instrument known for decomposing everything into its elements, for seeing distinctly into the world of the infinitesimal, but this prodigious power of decomposition left him incapable of putting anything together again.

It is not astonishing that his "1807" cost him fourteen years of labour; he was no longer able to weld together his scraps, his extracts from nature. He scrutinized, rummaged, ransacked to infinity, and found himself powerless to give life to anything. He spoke truly when he wished to do nothing but design and when he dreamed of a picture which should be no more than a collection of sketches, of fragments and disconnected events, like the "Pensées" of Pascal, yet giving at the same time the shock and the sensation of life. The difference was, however, that the "Pensées" were to become a book. Meissonier, overwhelmed by his materials, never succeeded in producing a great work, and not even in giving the impression that he

had clearly conceived one. So this man loaded with honours, wealth and glory, was perpetually unhappy and discontented. His pride and his suspicious sensitiveness were proverbial. This sickly self-love was the chief cause of the division among the French artists in 1889 when to the traditional Salon Meissonier opposed the Salon of the "Champ-de-Mars" or of the Société Nationale. This unreasonable schism had regrettable consequences and introduced into the school the anarchical system which for twenty years has gone on developing.

Such was this eminent and most unfinished of artists, assuredly little deserving of the mark of honour paid him by erecting his statue in the Garden of the Louvre, but still less deserving of the unjust criticisms he has since had to bear in expiation of his great glory. He was in reality the victim no less than the product of a valuable faculty carried to hypertrophia and monstrosity. He may perhaps be more equitably judged by the less known portions of his work, in which his faculties for analysis and observation found their true use, as in the small portraits such as that of "The Younger Dumas" (Louvre), those of "Stanford" or "Vanderbilt", or again his small studies from nature as in his "Views of Venice" at the Louvre, and especially his peerless collection of drawings at the Luxembourg. If these are not a great work, or their author a great artist, they are at least the materials, the remains or the fragments thereof. On 13 October, 1838, he married Jenny Steinheil, who died in June, 1888; in August, 1890, he married Mlle Bezançon; he died 31 January, 1891, and after a Requiem Mass at the Madeleine, 3 February, 1891, he was buried at Poissy where a monument was erected to him in 1894.

GRÉARD, *Meissonier* (1897); GAUTIER, *Les Beaux-Arts en Europe*, II (1856); *Salons* (not collected in vols.); PLANCHE, *Salons* (1855); CHESNEAU, *Les nations rivales dans l'art* (1868); MICHEL, *Notes sur l'art moderne* (1896); BRETON, *Nos peintres du siècle;* ALEXANDRE, *La Peinture militaire en France;* MUTHER, *Ein Jahrhundert französischer Malerei* (1901).

LOUIS GILLET.

Melanchthon, PHILIPP, collaborator and friend of Luther, b. at Bretten (in Unterpfalz, now Baden), 16 February, 1497; d. at Wittenberg, 19 April, 1560.

(1) HIS REARING AND EDUCATION.—Melanchthon was of respectable and well-to-do parentage. His father, Georg Schwarzerd (Schwarzert) was a celebrated armourer, while his pious and intelligent mother was the daughter of Reuter, the burgomaster of Bretten. He received his first instruction at home from a private tutor, and in 1507 he went to Pforzheim, where he lived with his grandmother Elizabeth, sister of the great humanist, Johann Reuchlin. Here the Rector, Georg Simler, made him acquainted with the Greek and Latin poets, and with the philosophy of Aristotle. But of greater influence still was his intercourse with Reuchlin, his grand-uncle, who gave a strong impetus to his studies. It was Reuchlin also who persuaded him to translate his name Schwarzerd into the Greek Melanchthon, (written Melanthon after 1531). In 1509 Melanchthon, not yet 13 years of age, entered the University of Heidelberg. This institution had already passed its humanistic prime under Dalberg and Agricola (see HUMANISM). It is true that Pallas Spangel, Melanchthon's eminent teacher, was also familiar with humanists and humanism, but he was none the less an able scholastic and adherent of Thomism. Melanchthon studied rhetoric under Peter Günther, and astronomy under Conrad Helvetius, a pupil of Cæsarius. Meanwhile he continued eagerly his private studies, the reading of ancient poets and historians as well as of the neo-Latins, grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics. He obtained the baccalaureate in 1511, but his application for the master's degree in 1512 was rejected because of his youth. He therefore went to Tübingen, where the scientific spirit was in full vigour, and he became there a pupil of the celebrated Latinist Heinrich Bebel, and, for a second time, of Georg Simler, who was then teaching humanities in Tübingen, and was later professor of jurisprudence. He studied astronomy and astrology under Johann Stöffler. With Franciscus Stadianus he planned an edition of the genuine Greek text of Aristotle, but nothing ever came of this. His thirst for knowledge led him into jurisprudence, mathematics, and even medicine.

In 1514 he won the master's degree as first among eleven candidates, and was made an instructor in the university. His subjects were Vergil and Terence; later he was assigned the lectureship on eloquence and expounded Cicero and Livy. He also became (1514) press-corrector in the printing office of Thomas Anshelm, pursued his private studies, and at last turned to theology. For the antiquated scholastic methods of this science as taught at Tübingen, and for Dr. Jacob Lemp, who, as Melanchthon said, had attempted to picture Transubstantiation on the blackboard, he had, later on, only words of derision. He studied patristics on his own account and took up the New Testament in the original text, but did not at this time reach any definite theological point of view; in this branch of knowledge, as he himself afterwards repeatedly declared, his intellectual father was Luther. He naturally took Reuchlin's part in the latter's controversy with the Cologne professors (see HUMANISM), and wrote in 1514 a preface to the "Epistolæ clarorum virorum"; but he did not come prominently to the fore. His own earliest publications were an edition of Terence (1516), and a Greek grammar (1518). In 1518 he was offered, on Reuchlin's recommendation, a professorship of Greek at Wittenberg. "I know of no one among the Germans who is superior to him," wrote Reuchlin to the Elector of Saxony, "save only Erasmus Roterodamus, and he is a Dutchman." The first impression made by the simple, bashful and frail-looking youth was not favourable. But his opening address: "De corrigendis adolescentiæ studiis" (29 Aug., 1518), elicited enthusiastic applause. He extolled the return to the authentic sources of genuine science as a signal merit of the new humanistic and scientific spirit, and he promised to apply this method to the study of theology.

(2) MELANCHTHON AND THE GERMAN REFORMATION.—Luther was a strong believer in making humanism serve the cause of the "Gospel", and it was not long before the still plastic Melanchthon fell under the sway of Luther's powerful personality. He accompanied the latter to his Leipzig disputation in 1519; though he did not participate in the discussion itself, he seconded with his knowledge Luther's preparatory labours. After the disputation he composed, with the co-operation of Œcolampadius, a report which was the occasion of an attack upon him by Eck to whom he replied with his "Defensio Phil. Melanchthonis contra Joh. Eckium professorem". He was now persuaded by Luther to take up theological lectures, and became in 1519 a Bachelor of Theology, then a professor of the same science. For 42 years he laboured at Wittenberg in the very front rank of university professors. His theological courses were followed by 500 or 600, later by as many as 1500 students, whereas his philological lectures were often but poorly attended. Yet he persistently refused the title of Doctor of Divinity, and never accepted ordination; nor was he ever known to preach. His desire was to remain a humanist, and to the end of his life he continued his work on the classics, along with his exegetical studies. And yet he became the father of evangelical theology. He composed the first treatise on "evangelical" doctrine (Loci communes rerum theologicarum, 1521). It deals principally with practical religious questions, sin and grace, law and gospel, justification and regeneration. This work ran through more than 100 editions before his death. He was a friend and supporter of Luther the Reformer, and de-

fended him, e. g. against the Italian Dominican, Thomas Radinus of Piacenza, and the Sorbonne in Paris (1521).

But he was not qualified to play the part of a leader amid the turmoil of a troublous period. The life which he was fitted for was the quiet existence of the scholar. He was always of a retiring and timid disposition, temperate, prudent and peace-loving, with a pious turn of mind and a deeply religious training. He never completely lost his attachment for the Catholic Church and for many of her ceremonies. His limitations first became apparent when, during Luther's stay on the Wartburg, 1521, he found himself in Wittenberg confronted with the task of maintaining order against the Zwickau fanatics, with their wild notions as to the establishment of Christ's Kingdom upon earth, communism, and so forth. What Luther accomplished in a few days on his return had proved impossible to Melanchthon. On the other hand he showed his ability as an organizer when he undertook the reorganization of Church affairs in Saxony which then appeared to be in a very bad state. For the visitations ordered by the Elector, Melanchthon drew up the "Instructions for Visitors of the parochial clergy" (printed, 1528), which work is remarkable for its practical sense and simplicity. Here also appears the difference between Luther and Melanchthon, for Melanchthon warns pastors against reviling pope or bishop; whereas Luther remarks: "You must denounce vehemently the Papacy and its followers, for it is already doomed by God even as the devil and his kingdom." Melanchthon, it is true, preached the doctrine that faith alone justifies and that "God will forgive sins for the sake of Christ, and without works on our part"; but he added: "We must nevertheless do good works, which God has commanded." Later also he invariably sought to preserve peace as long as might be possible, and no one took so much to heart as he the break between the churches.

PHILIPP MELANCHTHON
Lucas Cranach, Royal Gallery, Dresden

While Luther, in the Smalkaldic Articles (1537), described the pope as Antichrist and other theologians subscribed to this declaration, Melanchthon wrote: "My idea of the pope is this, that if he would give due recognition to the Gospel, his supremacy over the bishops, which he enjoys by human consent (not by Divine ordinance) should also be acknowledged by us for the sake of peace and of the unity of those Christians who are now, and in the future may be, subject to him." He had to make a diplomatic plea for the Reformation at the Reichstag in Speyer (1529). He hoped that it would be recognized without difficulty by the emperor and the Catholic party, but instead of this, a resolution was adopted to carry out vigorously the Edict of Worms (1521) which prohibited all innovations. The evangelical element, "a small handful," protested against this (whence the name, "Protestants"), and Melanchthon felt grave concern over this "terrible state of things". At a religious conference with the Zwinglians in Marburg (autumn of 1529), he joined hands with Luther in opposing a union with Zwingli. The latter's views on the Eucharist seemed to him an "impious doctrine". Melanchthon composed for the Reichstag of Augsburg (1530) the Augsburg Confession (confessio Augustana) in which he aimed to prove that the Protestants, in spite of the innovations, still belonged to the Catholic Church and had a right to remain within her fold. To this end he alleged in defence of Protestant doctrine the Scriptures and statements of recognized Catholic authorities. The innovations in question were represented as merely a reformation of abuses which had crept into the Church. The tenor of the Confession in general and its wording in particular, were the work of Melanchthon. Luther saw its outline and gave it his approval. It received numerous additions and changes at Augsburg, and its final form was determined by common agreement of theologians from all the evangelical bodies.

Melanchthon's desire for peace appears even in this basic document of Protestantism, and he has often been reproached with lack of vigour in his opposition to the Catholic Church. Luther himself explained (only, it is true, after the hopes of obtaining for the Confession the ear of the emperor and of Catholics proved vain), that he had no intention of showing "servile submission", and that he regretted the omission of an attack on Purgatory, the veneration of the Saints and the Papacy. The formal merits of the Confession, its simple, clear, calm, and terse statement of doctrine won the unanimous praise of the Evangelical party. His "masterful clearness and vigorous doctrine" were also admired in the "Apology" for the Augsburg Confession, which is more decided in tone because written at a later date (when Melanchthon himself had determined "to throw aside moderation") and directed against the Catholic "Confutatio". On the other hand, Melanchthon was sharply criticized for his personal conduct in the Reichstag, for his apprehension and concern, his failure to take a firm and dignified attitude against the Catholic party. He himself once declared, in justification of his course: "I know that the people decry our moderation; but it does not become us to heed the clamour of the multitude. We must labour for peace and for the future. It will prove a great blessing for us all if unity be restored in Germany." He feared the overthrow of all order. Hence he made decided concessions to the Catholics at the subsequent conferences and debates on religion. He seems to have been lured by some dream of an Evangelical-Catholic Church. He thought it possible to remain within the Catholic Church, even with the new theology. But he was never a Cryptocatholic, as has been laid to his charge, and while evincing in every other way a spirit of conciliation, he held fast to the "purified doctrine", and repeatedly qualified as blasphemy the lending of a hand, even in the cause of peace, to any suppression of the truth.

The story that when his mother asked which was the better of the two religions, he replied that the modified one was the more plausible, while the old one was the surer, is nothing but a ridiculous invention. His attempt to bring about a reconciliation between the two brought him, instead of thanks, only mortification and abuse. From the age of 30 to that of 50, Melanchthon was at the height of his career as spokesman and advocate of the Reformation, which, as had formerly been the case in Hesse and Prussia, was in-

troduced under his guidance into Würtemberg, Brandenburg, and Saxony. He never absented himself from a convention of theologians or statesmen, but found himself differing from Luther on many points, for as time went on Melanchthon emancipated himself more and more from Luther's teaching. More eventful still and more painful was the last portion of his life, following the death of Luther (1546). He rejected the Augsburg Interim (1548) which was to regulate Church affairs until they should be definitively settled by the Council, on the ground that it did not harmonize with Evangelical principles. On the other hand he was prevailed upon to take part in a conference for a modified interim, the so-called Leipzig Interim, and he addressed on this occasion a letter (28 April, 1548) to Minister Carlowitz, of Saxony, which once more provoked bitter criticism. He lamented therein the thraldom in which he had been held by the violence of Luther, and again showed himself favourable to the Catholic system of church organization and was even ready to accept Catholic practices, though he desired to hold fast to the "evangelical" doctrines.

A result of this was the Adiaphora controversy, in which Melanchthon declared Catholic practices adiaphorous (indifferent things, neither good nor bad), hence permissible provided that the proper doctrine were maintained and its import made clear to the people. Matthias Flacius Illyricus and other zealots objected that these practices had heretofore been the centres of impiety and superstition, and Melanchthon was attacked and reviled by Flacius, Amsdorf, and the other "Gnesiolutherans", as a renegade and a heretic. The Lutheran theologians met at Weimar in 1556, and declared their adhesion to Luther's teaching as to good works and the Last Supper. Melanchthon participated in the religious discussion which took place at Worms, in 1557, between Catholic and Protestant theologians. His Lutheran opponents' behaviour toward him here proved grossly insulting. The last ten years of his life (1550–60) were almost completely taken up with theological wrangles (adiaphoristic, osiandric, stankaristic, majoristic, Calvinistic and cryptocalvinistic) and with attempts to compose these various differences. He continued in spite of all to labour for his Church and for her peace. But one readily understands why, a few days before he died, he gave as a reason for not fearing death: "thou shalt be freed from the theologians' fury (*a rabie theologorum*)". His last wish was that the Churches might become reunited in Christ. He died praying, quietly and peacefully, without apparent struggle.

(3) Melanchthon as a Theologian.—Melanchthon considered it his mission to bring together the religious thoughts of the Reformation, to co-ordinate them and give them a clear and intelligible form. He did not feel himself called upon to seek out their original premises or to speculate on their logical results. His theology bears the substantial impress of his humanistic thought, for he saw in ancient philosophy a precursor of Christianity and sought to reconcile it with Christian Revelation. Even in dogma he took up whatever adapted itself most easily to the general trend of humanistic religious thought, and his dogmatic departures from Luther were a softening of doctrine. His theological system is contained in the "Loci Communes", as revised by him; in substance it was brought to completion by the edition of 1535. As late as 1521 he had upheld the harsh tenets of fatalism with regard to all events and of determinism with regard to the human will. He subsequently gave "Synergism" his support, as against the deterministic tendency of the Reformation. That God is not the cause of sin, and that man is responsible for his acts, must be firmly maintained. Man's salvation can only be wrought out with the co-operation of his own will, although there can be no question of merit on his part. Likewise he emphasized the necessity of good works from the practical, ethical standpoint. He went so far as to say, in the Loci of 1535, that good works are necessary for eternal life, inasmuch as they must necessarily follow reconciliation with God. This was again attenuated later on: what is necessary, he said, is a new spiritual life or sense of duty, i. e. a righteous conscience.

As years went by he even abandoned Luther's doctrine as to the Last Supper, and looked on Christ's spiritual communication of Himself to the faithful and their internal union with Him as the essential feature of the Sacrament; i. e. he inclined towards Calvin's theory. In 1560 his teachings were introduced into all the churches of Saxony, through the "Corpus Philippicum" (a collection of Melanchthonian doctrinal writings). But there came a change fourteen years after his death. The Philippists or Crypto-Calvinists were thrown into prison and sent into exile. They subsequently identified themselves more and more with Calvinism, even on the question of predestination. Lutheranism, narrow and harsh, won the day with its Formula of Concord (1580). So strong indeed was this opposition that the saying ran: better a Catholic than a Calvinist. From that time on until well into the eighteenth century, Melanchthon's memory was assailed and reviled, even in Wittenberg. It is said that Leonard Hutter, the leading theologian there at the beginning of the seventeenth century, was so enraged by an appeal to Melanchthon as an authority, made in the course of a public disputation, that he had the latter's portrait torn down from the wall and trampled under foot before the eyes of all. It was not until the period of the Enlightenment that Melanchthon was again appreciated and recognized as the real founder of a German-Evangelical theology. Indeed, he carried his labours into all the other theological fields, in some of which he worked as a pioneer, while in all he toiled at least as a contributor. He promoted the study of the Scriptures not only by his own active work thereon from first to last, but also by his teachings, and by his exhortations to the clergy. Like Luther, he laid particular stress on the necessity of a thorough philological training, as well as of a knowledge of history and archæology, for the proper interpretation of the Bible. He assisted Luther constantly in his German translation of the Bible, and also, it is said, in the production of the Latin translation which appeared at Wittenberg, in 1529. In exegesis he stood out vigorously for one sense, and that the literal, (*sensus literalis*), as against the "four senses" of the scholastics. Beyond this, he held, there was nothing to be sought in the words of the Bible save the dogmatic and practical application and development. His commentaries on the Old Testament are not as important as those which he wrote on the New. The most noteworthy are those on the Epistles to the Romans and the Colossians, which have been published repeatedly. These are largely given to the discussion of facts and of dogmatic and polemical matters, and they have exerted considerable influence on the history of Protestant doctrines. The impulse also which he gave to the study of theology by historical methods, was felt for a long time. In his handling of the Chronicle of Cario he treated of the history of the Church jointly with that of the state, and thereby set an example which found many imitators. He was also the first to attempt a history of dogma, and led the way in Christian biography. In homiletics he was early recognized as the originator of a more methodical form of pulpit oratory, as contrasted with the "heroic" sermons of Luther. He did not himself appear as a preacher, but was content with expounding selections from the Gospel on Sundays and Feast days, in his house or in a lecture-hall, using for this purpose the Latin tongue for the benefit of the Hungarian students who did not understand the German

sermons preached in church. This was the origin of his "Postillen" (homilies). Finally, he was the author of the first Protestant treatise on the method of theological study.

(4) Melanchthon as Professor and Pedagogue. —Melanchthon was the embodiment of the entire intellectual culture of his time. His learning covered all the branches of knowledge as it then existed, and what is more remarkable, he possessed the gift of imparting his knowledge always in the simplest, clearest and most practical form. On this account the numerous manuals and guides to the Latin and Greek grammars, to dialectics, rhetoric, ethics, physics, politics, and history, which he produced in addition to his many editions of, and commentaries on, classical authors, were quickly adopted, and were retained for more than a century. The exposition shows the utmost care; the style is natural and clear. In his academic teaching also, he disdained all rhetorical devices. His power lay not in brilliant oratory, but in clearness and in the choice of the most appropriate expression (*proprietas sermonis*). He did not look upon learning and literature as ends in themselves, but as means for inculcating morality and religion. The union of knowledge with the spirit of religion, of humanism with the "Gospel", was ever the keynote of his public activity, and through him it became for centuries the educational ideal of "Evangelical" Germany, even, in a certain sense, of Germany as a whole. It is not easy therefore to overrate Melanchthon's importance in this field. By this many-sided practical activity and his work as an organizer he became the founder of higher education in "Evangelical" Germany; the elementary school lay outside his sphere. Numerous Latin schools and universities owed to him their establishment or reorganization; and in numberless cases he was written to for advice, or was called on to recommend competent instructors, to settle controversies, or to give his opinion on the advantage or necessity of courses of study. His ideas on teaching in the three-class Latin schools are more fully set forth in the "Unterricht der Visitatoren" (1528) already referred to, and the "Wittenberger Kirchen-und Schulordnung" (1533). Their novelty lies partly in the selection of subjects, but chiefly in the method. Latin naturally holds the place of honour.

Melanchthon put an end to grammatical torture and the "Doctrinale" of Alexander de Villa Dei; grammar exercises were appended to the texts. He himself had a Latin school, the Schola Privata, in his own house for ten years, in which he prepared a few boys for the university. In 1526, he founded a second grade of the more advanced school, the Obere Schule, in Nuremberg near St. Ægidien. He looked on this as a connecting link between the Latin school and the university. It comprised dialectics and rhetoric, readings from the poets, mathematics, and Greek. This type of school, however, did not meet with any great success. The reorganization of universities, as advocated by Melanchthon, affected chiefly the arts and theological courses. The faculty of Arts became wholly humanistic. Logic, till then dominant in education, gave way to the languages, and Greek and Hebrew assumed more prominence. As sources of philology the classic authors replaced the writers of the Middle Ages. For the scholastic study of the liberal arts a more simple and practical course in dialectics and rhetoric was substituted. Likewise in theology, Scriptural interpretation was brought to the fore. Dogmatic principles were developed by exegesis; to these then were gradually added special lectures on dogma. The essential fact was a decided return to original sources. This transformation was wrought not only in the University of Wittenberg, but also in that of Tübingen, where Melanchthon himself took part in the work of reform, in those of Frankfort, Leipzig, Rostock, and Heidelberg, where in 1557 he took part in the deliberations concerning the university statutes. Wherever he could not appear in person he sent his advice in writing, while his disciples, for whom he obtained professorships, taught in accordance with his ideals and his method. The new universities of Marburg (1527), Königsberg (1544), and Jena (1548), which were founded under the Reformation, also found in Melanchthon a guide and a counsellor. Hence his title, "Præceptor Germaniæ".

Works of Melanchthon, edited by Bretschneider and Bindseil in *Corpus Reformatorum*, I–XXVIII (Leipzig, 1834–60); Schmidt, *Philipp Melanchthon* (Elberfeld, 1861); Hartfelder, *Melanchthon als Præceptor Germaniæ* (Berlin, 1889); Ellinger, *Ph. Melanchthon* (Berlin, 1902); Möller, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, 3rd ed., III, ed. Kawerau (Tübingen, 1907); Krüger, *Philipp Melanchthon* (Halle, 1906); Janssen, *History of the German People* (London, 1908–09), passim.

Klemens Löffler.

Melania, Saint (the Younger), b. at Rome, about 383; d. in Jerusalem, 31 December, 439. She was a member of the famous family of Valerii. Her parents were Publicola and Albina, her paternal grandmother of the same name is known as Melania, Senior. Little is known of the saint's childhood, but after the time of her marriage, which occurred in her thirteenth year, we have more definite information. Through obedience to her parents she married one of her relatives, Pinianus a patrician. During her married life of seven years she had two children who died young. After their death Melania's inclination toward a celibate life reasserting itself, she secured her husband's consent and entered upon the path of evangelic perfection, parting little by little with all her wealth. Pinianus, who now assumed a brotherly position toward her, was her companion in all her efforts toward sanctity. Because of the Visigothic invasions of Italy, she left Rome in 408, and for two years lived near Messina in Sicily. Here, their life of a monastic character was shared by some former slaves. In 410 she went to Africa where she and Pinianus lived with her mother for seven years, during which time she grew well acquainted with St. Augustine and his friend Alypius. She devoted herself to works of charity and piety, especially, in her zeal for souls, to the foundation of a nunnery of which she became superior, and of a cloister of which Pinianus took charge. In 417, Melania, her mother, and Pinianus went to Palestine by way of Alexandria. For a year they lived in a hospice for pilgrims in Jerusalem, where she met St. Jerome. She again made generous donations, upon the receipt of money from the sale of her estates in Spain. About this time she travelled in Egypt, where she visited the principal places of monastic and eremetical life, and upon her return to Jerusalem she lived for twelve years, in a hermitage near the Mount of Olives. Before the death of her mother (431), a new series of monastic foundations had begun. She started with a convent for women on the Mount of Olives, of which she assumed the maintenance while refusing to be made its superior. After her husband's death she built a cloister for men, then a chapel, and later, a more pretentious church. During this last period (Nov., 436), she went to Constantinople where she aided in the conversion of her pagan uncle, Volusian, ambassador at the Court of Theodosius II, and in the conflict with Nestorianism. An interesting episode in her later life is the journey of the Empress Eudocia, wife of Theodosius, to Jerusalem in 438. Soon after the empress's return Melania died.

The Greek Church began to venerate her shortly after her death, but she was almost unknown in the Western Church for many years. She has received greater attention since the publication of her life by Cardinal Rampolla (Rome, 1905). In 1908, Pius X granted her office to the congregation of clergy at Somascha. This may be considered as the beginning of a zealous ecclesiastical cult, to which the saint's

life and works have entitled her. Melania's life has been shrouded in obscurity nearly up to the present time; many people having wholly or partially confounded her with her grandmother Antonia Melania. The accurate knowledge of her life we owe to the discovery of two MSS.; the first, in Latin, was found by Cardinal Rampolla in the Escorial in 1884, the second, a Greek biography, is in the Barberini library. Cardinal Rampolla published both these important discoveries at the Vatican printing-office. A new biography (1908) by Georges Goyau is worthy of mention.

Analecta Sanctæ Sedis (1908); *Ecclesiastical Review* (July, 1908); GOYAU, *Sainte Mélanie* in the collection *Les Saints* (Paris, 1908).

CHARLES SCHLITZ.

Melbourne, ARCHDIOCESE OF (MELBURNEN.), in the State of Victoria, Southeastern Australia. Its history is closely interwoven with the rise and progress of the State of Victoria. When the first Catholic Bishop of Melbourne was consecrated in 1848, the present metropolis, from which the see takes its name, was known as the Port Philip Settlement, and was part of the ecclesiastical province of Sydney. Dr. Polding, the newly consecrated bishop of that see, placed the Rev. Patrick Bonaventure Geoghegan in charge of Port Philip in 1839; and the first Mass was celebrated in Melbourne on Pentecost Sunday, 15 May, of that year. The entire population of Port Philip in 1841 was 11,738, and the Catholics numbered 2411.

(1) MOST REV. JAMES ALYPIUS GOOLD, the first bishop, an Irishman, journeyed overland from Sydney after his consecration, arriving in Melbourne, 4 October, 1848. In April, 1850, he laid the foundation of St. Patrick's cathedral, and this event was followed in a few months by a declaration from the imperial authorities which changed the Settlement of Port Philip into the independent Colony of Victoria. The discovery of the goldfields of Ballarat, Bendigo, and Castlemaine at this period was responsible for a large increase in the population. Ireland found in Victoria a refuge and a home for many of her exiled children. The Catholic population, in 1851 only 18,000, had by 1857 grown to 88,000.

During the next decade and a half large centres of population had sprung up in places so remote from Melbourne that it was utterly impossible for Bishop Goold to attend to the wants of his widely scattered flock. When at Rome in 1874 he placed his difficulties before the Holy See, and had the northern and western portions of Victoria cut off from Melbourne and formed into the dioceses of Sandhurst and Ballarat, and received the pallium as first Archbishop of Melbourne and Metropolitan of Victoria. The strain in getting through ecclesiastical work in the pioneer days of Australia demanded a physical strength and a mental firmness of no ordinary capacity. The work accomplished by Archbishop Goold from 1848 to 1886 proves him a man of wonderful endurance and great organizing ability. He made five voyages to Rome, and introduced several religious orders devoted to education and works of charity, the Jesuit Fathers, the Christian Brothers, Sisters of Mercy, Good Shepherd Nuns, Presentation Order, Faithful Companions of Jesus, and Little Sisters of the Poor. The most important action of Dr. Goold and most far-reaching in its consequences, was the determined and consistent fight he made against the state system of purely secular education. The zeal he displayed in the erection of Catholic schools, and the sacrifice he demanded of his people in maintaining them, show how fully convinced he was that religious instruction can never be separated from genuine education. When the denominational system in 1872 gave way to a system from which the name of God was banished, the bishop proclaimed that no matter what the cost, or what the sacrifice involved, the Catholic children of Victoria should be provided with a Catholic education. When Archbishop Goold died, 11 June, 1886, there were 11,661 children receiving Catholic education without costing a penny to the state, while their parents were contributing their share as taxpayers to the state system.

(2) MOST REV. THOMAS JOSEPH CARR, on the solid foundation laid by his predecessor, the first Bishop of Melbourne, has raised a stately and imposing edifice. The present archbishop was transferred from the ancient see of Galway, and arrived in Melbourne on the first anniversary of Dr. Goold's death, 11 June, 1887. Three years after his arrival he undertook the great task of completing St. Patrick's cathedral. For over forty years the building of this magnificent temple absorbed every thought of the first Vicar-General, the Right Rev. John Fitzpatrick, D.D. Yet a sum of one hundred thousand pounds was required to carry out the original design, exclusive of the towers which are still unfinished. On the death of Dr. Fitzpatrick in 1889, the archbishop enlisted the practical sympathy and hearty co-operation of the clergy and laity of the archdiocese in this large undertaking. On 31 October, 1897, the cathedral was consecrated, entirely free from debt. The total cost from the day the foundation stone was laid in April, 1850, to the day of dedication was two hundred and thirty thousand pounds. No modern cathedral in Ireland approaches the Melbourne fane, and even the two ancient cathedrals, Christ's Church, and St. Patrick's, Dublin, fall far short in seating accommodation and massive beauty. The episcopal silver jubilee of the archbishop was celebrated 26 August, 1907, with unbounded enthusiasm, when over 10,000 found standing or sitting room within the walls of the cathedral. The clergy and laity took occasion of this celebration to mark their appreciation of Archbishop Carr's great services to the Church in Australia during the twenty years of his rule. Because of his deeply rooted objection to a personal testimonial, a debt of eight thousand pounds was cleared off the cathedral hall and a thousand pounds over-subscribed handed him for educational purposes. In connexion with that event a review was made, and official statistics compiled, of the growth and progress of the Church during that period. The number of clergy had increased from 66 to 142, 30 new churches had been built, old churches had been replaced by substantial and stately edifices, and the existing ones improved in ornamentation and equipment, and the number of parishes had risen from 26 to 56. The total cost in the erection of churches, schools, presbyteries, halls, educational and charitable institutions amounted to the enormous sum (considering the population) of £1,272,874.

The development of Catholic education and the increase in the number of schools not only kept pace with the general growth, but led the van of progress. The archbishop adhered religiously to the principle of his predecessor in his endeavour to provide as far as possible, Catholic education for every Catholic child. To make effectual and permanent provision in the department of education, new teaching orders were introduced. In addition to those already fighting the educational battle the archbishop, within a few years, had the Marist Brothers, the Sisters of Charity, the Sacred Heart Sisters, the Sisters of Loretto, the Sisters of St. Joseph, and the Sisters of the Good Samaritan. £500,679 was expended during these twenty years on school buildings and residences for religious engaged in Catholic education. In 1887 the number of pupils attending the Catholic schools of the archdiocese was 11,661 as compared with 25,369 at the close of 1908. This building and maintaining of a separate school system means a double tax on the Catholic community; as rate payers they contribute their share of State education, and as Catholics they pay for their own; and count the cost as nothing compared with the eternal interests at stake. When the purely secular system of

education was introduced into Victoria in 1872, some anti-Catholics leagued together, and declared that the new system would "rend the Catholic Church asunder". The opposite has been the result. The very sufferings and disabilities associated with the maintenance of their own schools have united solidly the Catholic body; while the absence of religion from the State schools has "rent asunder" Protestantism in producing a generation of non-believers. No review of the Archdiocese of Melbourne would be complete without reference to the growth of Catholic literature, particularly during recent years. To stem the tide of irreligious reading, splendid efforts have been made in Melbourne to provide Catholic homes with Catholic literature. When the archbishop came to Melbourne (1887) there was only one Catholic paper, the "Advocate" in Victoria. Since then a monthly magazine, the "Austral Light," under his direction (1892), a penny weekly paper, the "Tribune" (1900), and the Australian Catholic Truth Society (1904), have come into existence, and are doing great apostolic work in the diffusion of Catholic truth. The Catholics of the archdiocese are almost entirely Irish or of Irish origin. The priesthood was exclusively Irish till recent years, when vocations among the native born are rapidly on the increase. The religious, teaching in the schools or conducting the charitable institutions, were in the early days Irish, but are now largely Australian.

SUMMARY OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF MELBOURNE.—Districts, 57; Churches, 168; Secular Clergy, 113; Regular Clergy, 38; Religious Brothers, 54; Nuns, 851; Superior Schools, for Boys, 8; for Girls, 28; number of pupils, 3443; Parochial Primary Schools, 107; number of pupils, 21,926; Total number of pupils in Parochial and High Schools, 25,369; Orphanages, 4; Industrial Schools, for Boys, 1, for Girls, 1; Reformatory School for Girls, 1; Magdalen Asylums for Penitent Women, 2; Home for Neglected Children, 1; Home for the Poor, 1; Home for Women and Girls out of employment, 1; Foundling Hospital, 1; Receiving Home in connexion with Foundling Hospital, 1; Catholic population of the archdiocese according to Government census returns of 1901, 145,333.

PATRICK PHELAN.

Melchers, PAUL, Cardinal, Archbishop of Cologne, b. 6 Jan., 1813, at Münster, Westphalia; d. 14 Dec., 1895, at Rome. He studied law at Bonn (1830–33), and after a few years practice at Münster, took up theology at Munich under Klee, Görres, Windischmann and Döllinger. Ordained in 1841, he was assigned to duty in the village of Haltren. In 1844 he became vice-rector of the diocesan seminary, rector (1851), canon of the cathedral (1852), vicar-general (1854). Pius IX appointed him Bishop of Osnabrück (1857) and Archbishop of Cologne (1866). Here he laboured zealously and, moreover, inaugurated (1867) at Fulda, those annual reunions of the German bishops which have since produced such excellent results. Though he had always accepted and taught the doctrine of papal infallibility, he regarded its formal definition as untimely, a conviction which he, with thirteen other bishops, expressed in a letter to the pope, 4 Sept., 1869. At the same time, however, the bishops, in a pastoral letter which they signed without exception, warned the faithful against reports unfavourable to the future (Vatican) Council and exhorted them to await calmly its decisions. In the Council itself Archbishop Melchers took a prominent part. At the session of 13 July, 1870, he voted negatively on the question of papal infallibility; but he refused to sign an address in which fifty-five other members of the minority notified the pope of their immediate departure and reiterated their *non placet*. He left Rome before the fourth solemn session, giving as his reason the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war, and declaring his readiness to abide by the decisions of the Council. On his return to Cologne he proclaimed in an eloquent address (24 July) the dogma defined 18 July. As a means of ensuring obedience to the Council, the bishops assembled by him at Fulda, published (1 Sept.) a joint letter which produced a deep and salutary impression, and for which Pius IX expressed (20 Oct.) his gratitude to Archbishop Melchers. To eliminate the opposition at Bonn, the archbishop (20 Sept. and 8 Oct.) called on Professors Dieringer, Reusch, Langen and Knoodt to sign a declaration accepting the Vatican decrees and pledging conformity thereto in their teaching. Dieringer alone complied; the others were suspended and eventually (12 March, 1872) excommunicated.

The encroachments and repressive measures of the Kulturkampf (q. v.) were firmly resisted by Archbishop Melchers. In June, 1873, he excommunicated two priests who had joined the Old Catholics; for this and for other administrative acts he was fined and imprisoned six months (12 March—9 Oct., 1874). On 2 Dec., 1875, the president of the Rhine Province demanded his resignation on pain of deposition; he refused, but learning that preparations were being made to deport him to Küstrin, he escaped (13 Dec.) to Maestricht and took refuge with the Franciscans. From their monastery he administered his diocese during ten years. Knowing, however, the temper of the German government and fearing that his absence from his see would prove injurious to religion, he on different occasions informed Leo XIII of his willingness to resign for the general good. The pope at last reluctantly consented, but called him to Rome and created him cardinal (27 July, 1885). In 1892 during a serious illness, he was received into the Society of Jesus and lived as a Jesuit until his death three years later. He was laid to rest in the cathedral of Cologne amid obsequies that attested the people's admiration and love. St. Paul's church in the same city, completed in 1908, fittingly commemorates Melcher's heroic struggle for the liberty of the Church.

His principal publications are: "Erinnerungen an die Feier des 50 jährigen Bischofsjubiläums des h. Vaters Pius IX" (Cologne, 1876); "Eine Unterweisung über das Gebet" (Cologne, 1876); "Eine Unterweisung über das heilige Messopfer" (Cologne, 1879); "Das Sendschreiben des heiligen Vaters Papst Leo XIII über den Socialismus" (Cologne, 1880); "Die katholische Lehre von der Kirche" (Cologne, 1881); "Das eine Nothwendige" (Cologne, 1882); "De canonica dicœcesium visitatione" (Rome, 1892).

LUDWIGS, *Kardinal Erzbishof Dr. Paulus Melchers und die St. Pauluskirche in Köln* (Cologne, 1909); GRANDERATH–KIRCH, *Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils I. II. III.* (Freiburg, (1903–1906); GRANDERATH, *Acta et Decreta S. S. conciliorum recentiorum*, tom. VII (Freiburg, 1890).

J. FORGET.

Melchiades. See MILTIADES, SAINT, POPE.

Melchisedech [Gr. Μελχισεδέκ, Heb. מלכי־צדק, "King of righteousness" (Gesenius)] was King of Salem (Gen. xiv, 18–20) who, on Abraham's return with the booty taken from the four kings, "bringing forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the most high God, blessed him", and received from him "the tithes of all" (v. 20). Josephus, with many others, identifies Salem with Jerusalem, and adds that Melchisedech "supplied Abram's army in a hospitable manner, and gave them provisions in abundance . . . and when Abram gave him the tenth part of his prey, he accepted of the gift" (Ant., I, x, 2). Cheyne says "it is a plausible conjecture that he is a purely fictitious personage" (Ency. Bib., s. v.), which "plausible conjecture" Kaufmann, however, rightly condemns (Jew. Ency., s. v.). The Rabbins identified Melchisedech with Sem, son of Noe, rather for polemic than historic reasons, since they wished to set themselves against what is said of him as a type of Christ "without father, without mother, without genealogy" (Heb., vii, 3).

In the Epistle to the Hebrews the typical character of Melchisedech and its Messianic import are fully explained. Christ is "a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech" (Heb., vii, 6; Ps., cix, 4); "a high priest forever", etc. (Heb., vi, 20), על-דברתי, i. e. order or manner (Gesenius), not after the manner of Aaron. The Apostle develops his teaching in Heb., vii: Melchisedech was a type by reason (a) of his twofold dignity as priest and king, (b) by reason of his name, "king of justice", (c) by reason of the city over which he ruled, "King of Salem, that is, king of peace" (v. 2), and also (d) because he "without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but likened unto the Son of God, continueth a priest forever" (v. 3). The silence of Scripture about the facts of Melchisedech's birth and death was a part of the divine plan to make him prefigure more strikingly the mysteries of Christ's generation, the eternity of His priesthood. Abraham, patriarch and father of nations, paid tithes to Melchisedech and received his blessing. This was all the more remarkable since the priest-king was a stranger, to whom he was not bound to pay tithes, as were the children of Israel to the priests of the Aaronic line. Abraham, therefore, and Levi "in the loins of his father" (Heb. vii, 9), by acknowledging his superiority as a type of Christ (for personally he was not greater than Abraham), thereby confessed the excellence of Christ's priesthood. Neither can it be fairly objected that Christ was in the loins of Abraham as Levi was, and paid tithes to Melchisedech; for, though descended from Abraham, he had no human father, but was conceived of the Holy Ghost. In the history of Melchisedech St. Paul says nothing about the bread and wine which the "priest of the most High" offered, and on account of which his name is placed in the Canon of the Mass. The scope of the Apostle accounts for this; for he wishes to show that the priesthood of Christ was in dignity and duration superior to that of Aaron, and therefore, since it is not what Melchisedech offered, but rather the other circumstances of his priesthood which belonged to the theme, they alone are mentioned.

McEvilly, *An Expos. of the Eps. of St. Paul* (Heb., vii); Priconio, *Triplex Expositio* (Heb., vii); Hoonacker, *Le Sacerdoce Lévitique* (1899), 281–287; Hastings, *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.; Rabbinic references in *Jew. Ency.*, s. v.; St. Thomas, III, Q. xxii, a. 6; Hommel, *The Ancient Heb. Tradition* (tr. from the Ger., 1897), 146.

John J. Tierney.

Melchisedechians, a branch of the Monarchians, founded by Theodotus the banker. (See Monarchians.) Another quite distinct sect or party is refuted by Marcus Eremita, who seems to have been a disciple of St. John Chrysostom. His book *Εἰς τὸν Μελχισεδέκ*, or according to Photius "Against the Melchisedekites" (P. G., lxv, 1117), speaks of these new teachers as making Melchisedech an incarnation of the Logos. They were anathematized by the bishops, but would not cease to preach. They seem to have been otherwise orthodox. St. Jerome (Ep. 73) refutes an anonymous work which identified Melchisedech with the Holy Ghost. About A. D. 600, Timotheus, Presbyter of Constantinople, in his book "*De receptione Hæreticorum*" (Cotelier, "Monumenta eccles. Græca", III, 392; P. G., LXXXVI, 34), adds at the end of his list of heretics who need rebaptism the Melchisedechians, "now called Athingani" (Intangibles). They live in Phrygia, and are neither Hebrews nor Gentiles. They keep the Sabbath, but are not circumcised. They will not touch any man. If food is offered to them, they ask for it to be placed on the ground; then they come and take it. They give to others with the same precautions. Nothing more is known of this curious sect.

For the Monarchian Melchisedechians the ancient authorities are Pseudo-Tertullian, *Præscript.*, liii; Philastrius, *Hær.*, lii; Epiphanius, *Hær.*, lv; Augustine, *Hær.*, xxxiv; Prædestinatus, *Hær.*, xxxiv; Theodoret, *Hær. Fab.*, II, vi. Also see Kunze, *Marcus Eremita* (Leipzig, 1896); Idem in *Realencycl.*, s. v. (See Monarchians.)

John Chapman.

Melchites (Melkites). I. Origin and Name.—Melchites are the people in Syria, Palestine, and Egypt who remained faithful to the Council of Chalcedon (451) when the greater part turned Monophysite. The original meaning of the name therefore is an opposition to Monophysism. The Nestorians had their communities in eastern Syria till the Emperor Zeno (474–491) closed their school at Edessa in 489, and drove them over the frontier into Persia. The people of western Syria, Palestine, and Egypt were either Melchites who accepted Chalcedon, or Monophysites (called also Jacobites in Syria and Palestine, Copts in Egypt) who rejected it, till the Monothelete heresy in the seventh century further complicated the situation. But Melchite remained the name for those who were faithful to the great Church, Catholic and Orthodox, till the Schism of Photius (867) and Cerularius (1054) again divided them. From that time there have been two kinds of Melchites in these countries, the Catholic Melchites who kept the communion of Rome, and schismatical ("Orthodox") Melchites who followed Constantinople and the great mass of eastern Christians into schism. Although the name has been and still is occasionally used for both these groups, it is now commonly applied only to the Catholic Uniates. For the sake of clearness it is better to keep to this use; the name "Orthodox" is sufficient for the others, whereas among the many groups of Catholics, Latin and Uniate, of various rites, we need a special name for this group. It would be, indeed, still more convenient if we could call all Uniates of the Byzantine rite Melchites. But such a use of the word has never obtained. One could not with any propriety call Ruthenians, the Uniates of southern Italy or Rumania, Melchites. One must therefore keep the name for those of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, all of whom speak Arabic.

We define a Melchite then as any Christian of these lands in communion with Rome, Constantinople, and the great Church of the Empire before the Photian schism, or as a Christian of the Byzantine Rite in communion with Rome since. As the word implied opposition to the Monophysites originally, so it now marks the distinction between these people and all schismatics on the one hand, between them and Latins or Uniates of other rites (Maronites, Armenians, Syrians, etc.) on the other. The name is easily explained philologically. It is a Semitic (presumably Syriac) root with a Greek ending, meaning *imperialist*. *Melk* is Syriac for king (Heb. *melek*, Arab. *malik*). The word is used in all the Semitic languages for the Roman Emperor, like the Greek *βασιλεύς*. By adding the Greek ending *–ίτης* we have the form *μελκίτης*, equal to *βασιλικός*. It should be noted that the third radical of the Semitic root is *kaf:* there is no guttural. Therefore the correct form of the word is *Melkite*, rather than the usual form Melchite. The pure Syriac word is *malkoyo* (Arab. *malakiyyu;* vulgar, *milkiyyu*).

II. History before the Schism.—The decrees of the Fourth General Council (Chalcedon, 451) were unpopular in Syria and still more in Egypt. Monophysism began as an exaggeration of the teaching of St. Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444), the Egyptian national hero, against Nestorius. In the Council of Chalcedon the Egyptians and their friends in Syria saw a betrayal of Cyril, a concession to Nestorianism. Still more did national, anti-imperial feeling cause opposition to it. The Emperor Marcian (450–457) made the Faith of Chalcedon the law of the empire. Laws passed on 27 February and again on 13 March, 452, enforced the decrees of the council and threatened heavy penalties against dissenters. From that time Dyophysism was the religion of the court, identified with loyalty to the emperor. In spite of the compromising concessions of later emperors, the Faith of Chalcedon was always looked upon as the religion of the state, demanded and enforced on all subjects of Cæsar. So the long-smoul-

dering disloyalty of these two provinces broke out in the form of rebellion against Chalcedon. For centuries (till the Arab conquest) Monophysism was the symbol of national Egyptian and Syrian patriotism. The root of the matter was always political. The people of Egypt and Syria, keeping their own languages and their consciousness of being separate races, had never been really amalgamated with the Empire, originally Latin, now fast becoming Greek. They had no chance of political independence, their hatred of Rome found a vent in this theological question. The cry of the faith of Cyril, "one nature in Christ," no betrayal of Ephesus, meant really no submission to the foreign tyrant on the Bosphorus. So the great majority of the population in these lands turned Monophysite, rose in continual rebellion against the creed of the Empire, committed savage atrocities against the Chalcedonian bishops and officials, and in return were fiercely persecuted.

The beginning of these troubles in Egypt was the deposition of the Monophysite Patriarch Dioscur, and the election by the government party of Proterius as his successor, immediately after the council. The people, especially the lower classes and the great crowd of Egyptian monks, refused to acknowledge Proterius, and began to make tumults and riots that 2000 soldiers sent from Constantinople could hardly put down. When Dioscur died in 454 a certain Timothy, called the Cat or Weasel (*αἴλουρος*), was ordained by the Monophysites as his successor. In 457 Proterius was murdered; Timothy drove out the Chalcedonian clergy and so began the organized Coptic (Monophysite) Church of Egypt. In Syria and Palestine there was the same opposition to the council and the government. The people and monks drove out the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, Martyrius, and set up one Peter the Dyer (*γναφεύς, fullo*), a Monophysite, as his successor. Juvenal of Jerusalem, once a friend of Dioscur, gave up his heresy at Chalcedon. When he came back to his new patriarchate he found the whole country in rebellion against him. He too was driven out and a Monophysite monk Theodosius was set up in his place. So began the Monophysite national churches of these provinces. Their opposition to the court and rebellion lasted two centuries, till the Arab conquest (Syria, 637; Egypt, 641). During this time the government, realizing the danger of the disaffection of the frontier provinces, alternated fierce persecution of the heretics with vain attempts to conciliate them by compromises (Zeno's Henotikon in 482, the Acacian Schism, 484–519, etc.). It should be realized that Egypt was much more consistently Monophysite than Syria or Palestine. Egypt was much closer knit as one land than the other provinces, and so stood more uniformly on the side of the national party. (For all this see MONOPHYSISM.)

Meanwhile against the nationalist party stood the minority on the side of the government and the council. These are the Melchites. Why they were so-called is obvious: they were the loyal Imperialists, the emperor's party. The name occurs first in a pure Greek form as *βασιλικός*. Evagrius says of Timothy Sakophakiolos (the Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria set up by the government when Timothy the Cat was driven out in 460) that "some called him the Imperialist (*ὃν οἱ μὲν ἐκάλουν βασιλικόν*)" (H. E., II, 11). These Melchites were naturally for the most part the government officials, in Egypt almost entirely so, while in Syria and Palestine a certain part of the native population was Melchite too. Small in numbers, they were until the Arab conquest strong through the support of the government and the army. The contrast between Monophysites and Melchites (Nationalists and Imperialists) was expressed in their language. The Monophysites spoke the national language of the country (Coptic in Egypt, Syriac in Syria and Palestine), Melchites for the most part were foreigners sent out from Constantinople who spoke Greek. For a long time the history of these countries is that of a continual feud between Melchites and Monophysites; sometimes the government is strong, the heretics are persecuted, the patriarchate is occupied by a Melchite; then again the people get the upper hand, drive out the Melchite bishops, set up Monophysites in their place and murder the Greeks. By the time of the Arab conquest the two Churches exist as rivals with rival lines of bishops. But the Monophysites are much the larger party, especially in Egypt, and form the national religion of the country. The difference by now expresses itself to a great extent in liturgical language. Both parties used the same liturgies (St. Mark in Egypt, St. James in Syria and Palestine), but while the Monophysites made a point of using the national language in church (Coptic and Syriac), the Melchites generally used Greek. It seems, however, that this was less the case than has been thought; the Melchites, too, used the vulgar tongue to a considerable extent (Charon, "Le Rite byzantin", 26–29).

When the Arabs came in the seventh century, the Monophysites, true to their anti-imperial policy, rather helped than hindered the invaders. But they gained little by their treason; both churches received the usual terms granted to Christians; they became two sects of Rayas under the Moslem Khalifa, both were equally persecuted during the repeated outbursts of Moslem fanaticism, of which the reign of Al-Hākim in Egypt (996–1021) is the best known instance. In the tenth century part of Syria was conquered back by the empire (Antioch reconquered in 968–969, lost again to the Seljuk Turks in 1078–1081). This caused for a time a revival of the Melchites and an increase of enthusiasm for Constantinople and everything Greek among them. Under the Moslems the characteristic notes of both churches became, if possible, stronger. The Monophysites (Copts and Jacobites) sank into isolated local sects. On the other hand, the Melchite minorities clung all the more to their union with the great church that reigned free and dominant in the empire. This expressed itself chiefly in loyalty to Constantinople. Rome and the West were far off; the immediate object of their devotion was the emperor's court and the emperor's patriarch. The Melchite patriarchs under Moslem rule became insignificant people, while the power of the Patriarch of Constantinople grew steadily. So, looking always to the capital for guidance, they gradually accepted the position of being his dependents, almost suffragans. When the Bishop of Constantinople assumed the title of "Œcumenical Patriarch" it was not his Melchite brothers who protested. This attitude explains their share in his schism. The quarrels between Photius and Pope Nicholas I, between Michael Cerularius and Leo IX were not their affair; they hardly understood what was happening. But naturally, almost inevitably, when the schism broke out, in spite of some protests [Peter III of Antioch (1053–1076?) protested vehemently against Cerularius's schism; see Fortescue, "Orthodox Eastern Church", 189-192], the Melchites followed their leader, and when orders came from Constantinople to strike the pope's name from their diptychs they quietly obeyed.

III. FROM THE SCHISM TO THE BEGINNING OF THE UNION.—So all the Melchites in Syria, Palestine, and Egypt broke with Rome and went into schism at the command of Constantinople. Here, too, they justified their name of Imperialist. From this time to almost our own day there is little to chronicle of their history. They existed as a "nation" (*millet*) under the Khalifa; when the Turks took Constantinople (1453) they made the patriarch of that city head of this "nation" (*Rum millet*, i. e., the Orthodox Church) for civil affairs. Other bishops, or even patriarchs, could only approach the government through him. This further increased his authority and influence over all the Orthodox in

the Turkish Empire. During the dark ages that follow, the Œcumenical Patriarch continually strove (and generally managed) to assert ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the Melchites (Orth. Eastern Ch., 240, 285–289, 310, etc.). Meanwhile the three patriarchs (of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem), finding little to do among their diminished flocks, for long periods came to live at Constantinople, idle ornaments of the Phanar. The lists of these patriarchs will be found in Le Quien (loc. cit. below). Gradually all the people of Egypt, Syria, and Palestine since the Arab conquest forgot their original languages and spoke only Arabic, as they do still. This further affected their liturgies. Little by little Arabic began to be used in church. Since the seventeenth century at the latest, the native Orthodox of these countries use Arabic for all services, though the great number of Greeks among them keep their own language.

But already a much more important change in the liturgy of the Melchites had taken place. We have seen that the most characteristic note of these communities was their dependence on Constantinople. That was the difference between them and their old rivals the Monophysites, long after the quarrel about the nature of Christ had practically been forgotten. The Monophysites, isolated from the rest of Christendom, kept the old rites of Alexandria and Antioch-Jerusalem pure. They still use these rites in the old languages (Coptic and Syriac). The Melchites on the other hand submitted to Byzantine influence in their liturgies. The Byzantine litanies (*Synaptai*), the service of the Ptoskomide and other elements were introduced into the Greek Alexandrine Rite before the twelfth or thirteenth centuries; so also in Syria and Palestine the Melchites admitted a number of Byzantine elements into their services (Charon, op. cit., 9–25).

Then in the thirteenth century came the final change. The Melchites gave up their old rites altogether and adopted that of Constantinople. Theodore IV (Balsamon) of Antioch (1185–1214?) marks the date of this change. The crusaders held Antioch in his time, so he retired to Constantinople and lived there under the shadow of the Œcumenical Patriarch. While he was there he adopted the Byzantine Rite. In 1203 Mark II of Alexandria (1195–c. 1210) wrote to Theodore asking various questions about the liturgy. Theodore in his answer insists on the use of Constantinople as the only right one for all the Orthodox, and Mark undertook to adopt it (P. G., CXXXVIII, 953 sq.). When Theodosius IV of Antioch (1269–1276) was able to set up his throne again in his own city he imposed the Byzantine Rite on all his clergy. At Jerusalem the old liturgy disappeared at about the same time (Charon, op. cit., 11–12, 21, 23).

We have then for the liturgies of the Melchites these periods: first the old national rites in Greek, but also in the languages of the country, especially in Syria and Palestine, gradually Byzantinized till the thirteenth century. Then the Byzantine Rite alone in Greek in Egypt, in Greek and Syriac in Syria and Palestine, with gradually increasing use of Arabic to the sixteenth or seventeenth century. Lastly the same rite in Arabic only by the natives, in Greek by the foreign (Greek) patriarchs and bishops.

The last development we notice is the steady increase of this foreign (Greek) element in all the higher places of the clergy. As the Phanar at Constantinople grew more and more powerful over the Melchites, so did it more and more, in ruthless defiance of the feeling of the people, send them Greek patriarchs, metropolitans, and archimandrites from its own body. For centuries the lower married clergy and simple monks have been natives, speaking Arabic and using Arabic in the liturgy, while all the prelates have been Greeks, who often do not even know the language of the country. At last, in our own time, the native Orthodox have rebelled against this state of things. At Antioch they have now succeeded in the recognition of their native Patriarch, Gregory IV (Hadad) after a schism with Constantinople. The troubles caused by the same movement at Jerusalem are still fresh in everyone's mind. It is certain that as soon as the present Greek patriarchs of Jerusalem (Damianos V) and Alexandria (Photios) die, there will be a determined effort to appoint natives as their successors. But these quarrels affect the modern Orthodox of these lands who do not come within the limit of this article, inasmuch as they are no longer Melchites.

IV. Uniates.—We have said that in modern times since the foundation of Uniate Byzantine churches in Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, only these Uniates should be called Melchites. Why the old name is now reserved for them it is impossible to say. It is, however, a fact that it is so. One still occasionally in a western book finds all Christians of the Byzantine Rite in these countries called Melchites, with a further distinction between Catholic and Orthodox Melchites; but the present writer's experience is that this is never the case among themselves. The man in union with the great Eastern Church in those parts never now calls himself or allows himself to be called a Melchite. He is simply "Orthodox" in Greek or any Western language, *Rūmī* in Arabic. Everyone there understands by Melchite a Uniate. It is true that even for them the word is not very commonly used. They are more likely to speak of themselves as *rūmī kāthūlīkī* or in French *Grecs catholiques;* but the name Melchite, if used at all, always means to Eastern people these Uniates. It is convenient for us too to have a definite name for them less entirely wrong than "Greek Catholic"—for they are Greeks in no sense at all. A question that has often been raised is whether there is any continuity of these Byzantine Uniates since before the great schism, whether there are any communities that have never lost communion with Rome. There are such communities certainly in the south of Italy, Sicily, and Corsica. In the case of the Melchite lands there are none. It is true that there have been approaches to reunion continually since the eleventh century, individual bishops have made their submission at various times, the short-lived unions of Lyons (1274) and Florence (1439) included the Orthodox of these countries too. But there is no continuous line; when the union of Florence was broken all the Byzantine Christians in the East fell away. The present Melchite Church dates from the eighteenth century.

Already in the seventeenth century tentative efforts at reunion were made by some of the Orthodox bishops of Syria. A certain Euthymius, Metropolitan of Tyre and Sidon, then the Antiochene Patriarchs Athanasius IV (1700–1728) and the famous Cyril of Berrhœa (d. 1724, the rival of Cyril Lukaris of Constantinople, who for a time was rival Patriarch of Antioch) approached the Holy See and hoped to receive the pallium. But the professions of faith which they submitted were considered insufficient at Rome. The latinizing tendency in Syria was so well known that in 1722 a synod was held at Constantinople which drew up and sent to the Antiochene bishops a warning letter with a list of Latin heresies (in Assemani, "Bibl. Orient.", III, 639). However, in 1724 Seraphim Tanas, who had studied at the Roman Propaganda, was elected Patriarch of Antioch by the latinizing party. He at once made his submission to Rome and sent a Catholic profession of faith. He took the name Cyril (Cyril VI, 1724–1759); with him begins the line of Melchite patriarchs in the new sense (Uniates). In 1728 the schismatics elected Sylvester, a Greek monk from Athos. He was recognized by the Phanar and the other Orthodox churches; through him the Orthodox line continues. Cyril VI suffered considerable persecution from the Orthodox, and for a time had to flee to the Lebanon. He received the pallium from Benedict XIV in 1744. In 1760, wearied by the con-

tinual struggle against the Orthodox majority, he resigned his office. Ignatius Jauhar was appointed by Cyril to succeed him, but the appointment was rejected at Rome and Clement XIII appointed Maximus Hakim, Metropolitan of Baalbek, as patriarch (Maximus II, 1760–1761). Athanasius Dahan of Beirut succeeded by regular election and confirmation after Maximus's death and became Theodosius VI (1761–1788). But in 1764 Ignatius Jauhar succeeded in being re-elected patriarch. The pope excommunicated him, and persuaded the Turkish authorities to drive him out. In 1773 Clement XIV united the few scattered Melchites of Alexandria and Jerusalem to the jurisdiction of the Melchite patriarch of Antioch. When Theodosius VI died, Ignatius Jauhar was again elected, this time lawfully, and took the name Athanasius V (1788–1794).

Then followed Cyril VII (Siage, 1794–1796), Agapius III (Matar, formerly Metropolitan of Tyre and Sidon, patriarch 1796–1812). During his time there was a movement of Josephinism and Jansenism in the sense of the synod of Pistoia (1786) among the Melchites, led by Germanus Adam, Metropolitan of Baalbek. This movement for a time invaded nearly all the Melchite Church. In 1806 they held a synod at Qarqafe which approved many of the Pistoian decrees. The acts of the synod were published without authority from Rome in Arabic in 1810; in 1835 they were censured at Rome. Pius VII had already condemned a catechism and other works written by Germanus of Baalbek. Among his errors was the Orthodox theory that consecration is not effected by the words of institution in the liturgy. Eventually the patriarch (Agapius) and the other Melchite bishops were persuaded to renounce these ideas. In 1812 another synod established a seminary at 'Ain-Traz for the Melchite "nation". The next patriarchs were Ignatius IV (Sarruf, Feb.–Nov., 1812, murdered), Athanasius VI (Matar, 1813), Macarius IV (Tawil, 1813–1815), Ignatius V (Qattan, 1816–1833). He was followed by the famous Maximus III (Mazlum, 1833–1855). His former name was Michael. He had been infected with the ideas of Germanus of Baalbek, and had been elected Metropolitan of Aleppo, but his election had not been confirmed at Rome. Then he renounced these ideas and became titular Metropolitan of Myra, and procurator of his patriarch at Rome. During this time he founded the Melchite church at Marseilles (St. Nicholas), and took steps at the courts of Vienna and Paris to protect the Melchites from their Orthodox rivals.

Hitherto the Turkish government had not recognized the Uniates as a separate *millet;* so all their communications with the State, the *berat* given to their bishops and so on, had to be made through the Orthodox. They were still officially, in the eyes of the law, members of the *rum millet,* that is of the Orthodox community under the Patriarch of Constantinople. This naturally gave the Orthodox endless opportunities of annoying them, which were not lost. In 1831 Mazlum went back to Syria, in 1833 after the death of Ignatius V he was elected patriarch, and was confirmed at Rome after many difficulties in 1836. His reign was full of disputes. In 1835 he held a national synod at 'Ain-Traz, which laid down twenty-five canons for the regulation of the affairs of the Melchite Church; the synod was approved at Rome and is published in the Collectio Lacensis (II, 579–592). During his reign at last the Melchites obtained recognition as a separate *millet* from the Porte. Maximus III obtained from Rome for himself and his successors the additional titles of Alexandria and Jerusalem, which sees his predecessors had administered since Theodosius VI. In 1849 he held a synod at Jerusalem in which he renewed many of the errors of Germanus Adam. Thus he got into new difficulties with Rome as well as with his own people. But these difficulties were gradually composed and the old patriarch died in peace in 1855. He is the most famous of the line of Melchite patriarchs. He was succeeded by Clement I (Bahus, 1856–1864), Gregory II (Yussef, 1865–1897), Peter IV (Jeraïjiri, 1897–1902), and Cyril VIII (Jeha, the reigning patriarch, who was elected 27 June, 1903, confirmed at once by telegram from Rome, enthroned in the patriarchal church at Damascus, 8 August, 1903).

V. Constitution of the Melchite Church.—The head of the Melchite Church, under the supreme authority of the pope, is the patriarch. His title is "Patriarch of Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and all the East". "Antioch and all the East" is the old title used by all patriarchs of Antioch. It is less arrogant than it sounds; the "East" means the original Roman Prefecture of the East (*Præfectura Orientis*) which corresponded exactly to the patriarchate before the rise of Constantinople (Fortescue, "Orth. Eastern Church", 21). Alexandria and Jerusalem were added to the title under Maximus III. It should be noted that these come after Antioch, although normally Alexandria has precedence over it. This is because the patriarch is fundamentally of Antioch only; he traces his succession through Cyril VI to the old line of Antioch. He is in some sort only the administrator of Alexandria and Jerusalem until the number of Melchites in Egypt and Palestine shall justify the erection of separate patriarchates for them. Meanwhile he rules equally over his nation in the three provinces. There is also a grander title used in Polychronia and for specially solemn occasions in which he is acclaimed as "Father of Fathers, Shepherd of Shepherds, High Priest of High Priests and Thirteenth Apostle".

The patriarch is elected by the bishops, and is nearly always chosen from their number. The election is submitted to the Congregation for Eastern Rites joined to Propaganda; if it is canonical the patriarch-elect sends a profession of faith and a petition for confirmation and for the pallium to the pope. He must also take an oath of obedience to the pope. If the election is invalid, nomination devolves on the pope. The patriarch may not resign without the pope's consent. He must make his visit *ad limina,* personally or by deputy, every ten years. The patriarch has ordinary jurisdiction over all his church. He confirms the election of and consecrates all bishops; he can translate or depose them, according to the canons. He founds parishes and (with consent of Rome) dioceses, and has considerable rights of the nature of dispensation from fasting and so on. The patriarch resides at the house next to the patriarchal church at Damascus (near the Eastern Gate). He has also residences at Alexandria and Jerusalem, where he spends at least some weeks each year; he is often at the seminary at 'Ain-Traz, not far from Beirut, in the Lebanon.

The bishops are chosen according to the bull "Reversurus", 12 July, 1867. All the other bishops in synod with the patriarch choose three names, of which the pope selects one. All bishops must be celibate, but they are by no means necessarily monks. Priests who are not monks may keep wives married before ordination, but as in all uniate churches celibacy is very common, and the married clergy are looked upon rather askance. There are seminaries at 'Ain-Traz, Jerusalem (the College of St. Ann under Cardinal Lavigerie's White Fathers), Beirut, etc. Many students go to the Jesuits at Beirut, the Greek College at Rome, or St. Sulpice at Paris. The monks follow the Rule of St. Basil. They are divided into two great congregations, that of St. John the Baptist at Shuweir in the Lebanon and that of St. Saviour, near Sidon. Both have numerous daughter-houses. The Shuweirites have a further distinction, i. e. between those of Aleppo and the Baladites. There are also convents of Basilian nuns.

Practically all Melchites are natives of the country,

Arabs in tongue. Their rite is that of Constantinople, almost always celebrated in Arabic with a few versicles and exclamations (*πρόσχωμεν· σοφία ὀρθοί*, etc.) in Greek. But on certain solemn occasions the liturgy is celebrated entirely in Greek.

The sees of the patriarchate are: the patriarchate itself, to which is joined Damascus, administered by a vicar; then two metropolitan dioceses, Tyre and Aleppo; two archdioceses, Bosra with Hauran, and Horus with Hama; seven bishoprics, Sidon, Beirut (with Jebail), Tripolis, Acre, Furzul (with Zahle), and the Beqaa, Paneas, and Baalbek. The patriarchates of Jerusalem and Alexandria are administered for the patriarch by vicars. The total number of Melchites is estimated at 130,000 (Silbernagl) or 114,080 (Werner).

For the origin and history see any history of the Monophysite heresy. NEALE, *History of the Holy Eastern Church* (London, 1847–1850), IV and V: *The Patriarchate of Alexandria*—supplementary volume: *The Patriarchate of Antioch*, ed. WILLIAMS (London, 1873); CHARON, *Histoire des Patriarcats Melkites* (Rome, in course of publication), a most valuable work; RABBATH, *Documents inédits pour servir à l'histoire du Christianisme en Orient* (3 vols., Paris, 1907); LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christianus* (Paris, 1740), II, 385–512 (Alexandrine Patriarchs), 699–730 (Antioch), III, 137–527 (Jerusalem).

For the present constitution: SILBERNAGL, *Verfassung u. gegenwärtiger Bestand sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients* (Ratisbon, 1904), 334–341; WERNER, *Orbis Terrarum Catholicus* (Freiburg, 1890), 151–155; *Echos d'Orient* (Paris, since 1897), articles by CHARON and others; KÖHLER, *Die Katholischen Kirchen des Morgenlandes* (Darmstadt, 1896), 124–128; CHARON, *Le Rite byzantin dans les Patriarcats Melkites (extrait des Chrysostomika)* (Rome, 1908); REBOURS, *Traité de Psaltique, Théorie et Pratique du Chant dans l'Eglise Grecque* (Paris, 1906).

A. FORTESCUE.

Melchizedeck. See MELCHISEDECH.

Meléndez Valdés, JUAN, Spanish poet and politician, b. at Ribera del Fresno (Badajoz) 11 March, 1754; d. in exile at Montpellier, France, 24 May, 1817. He studied law at Salamanca and while there, began his poetical career. In 1780, with his "Batilo", he won a prize offered by the Spanish Academy for the best eclogue on the pleasures of life in the country. In 1781 he went to Madrid where he made the acquaintance of the minister and author, Jovellanos, whose favour he enjoyed, and who had him appointed to a chair in the University of Salamanca. In 1784 Meléndez was one of over fifty competitors for a prize offered by the city of Madrid for the best dramatic composition. His comedy, "Las bodas de Camacho el rico" founded on the famous story of Cervantes, was awarded the prize and presented, but, as a stage production, it was not successful. This failure gave his detractors opportunity for much unfavourable criticism. Meléndez answered by publishing in 1785 the first volume of his poems which met with such success that it quickly ran through several editions and firmly established his literary reputation. He now entered upon a political career which was to prove his ruin. Through the favour of his friend Jovellanos, he obtained the posts successively of judge of the court of Saragossa in 1789, judicial chancellor at Valladolid in 1791, and fiscal of the supreme court in Madrid in 1797. On the fall of Jovellanos, Meléndez was ordered to leave Madrid, and after brief stays in Medina del Campo and Zamora, he finally established his residence at Salamanca. After the revolution of 1808, Meléndez accepted from the government of Joseph Bonaparte the post of councillor of state, and late that of minister of public instruction. This lack of patriotism naturally involved him in trouble with his countrymen, so that when the Spaniards returned to power in 1813, he was compelled to flee to France. Here he passed four years amid misery and misfortune, and died at Montpellier poor and neglected in his sixty-fourth year.

Though Meléndez cannot be considered a great poet, he was not lacking in talent. His poems are characterized by delicacy of expression and grace, rather than by vigour and great flights of fancy. He shows to best advantage in his eclogues and romances, which are distinguished for their easy flow and facility. In spite of the fact that he is but little read to-day, he undeniably exercised some influence in the literary restoration during the reign of Charles III, and has sometimes been called by admiring Spaniards "Restaurador del Parnaso" (Restorer of Parnassus). Besides the works already mentioned, Meléndez wrote a lyric poem on the creation, an epic entitled "La Caida de Luzbel", an ode to Winter, and a translation of the Æneid. Complete editions of the poems of Meléndez, with a life of the author by Quintana, were published in Madrid in 1820 (4 volumes), and in Barcelona in 1838. "La Biblioteca de Autores Españoles" (LXIII) reproduces the poems.

QUINTANA, *Notice sur la vie de Méléndez Valdés* (prefixed to the edition of the poet's works published at Madrid, 1820); *Poésias inéditas* in *Revue hispanique* (Paris, 1894–97).

VENTURA FUENTES.

Meletian Schism. See MELETIUS OF ANTIOCH; MELETIUS OF LYCOPOLIS.

Meletius of Antioch, Bishop, b. in Melitene, Lesser Armenia; d. at Antioch, 381. Before occupying the see of Antioch he had been Bishop of Sebaste, capital of Armenia Prima. Socrates supposes a transfer from Sebaste to Berœa and thence to Antioch; his elevation to Sebaste may date from the year 358 or 359. His sojourn in that city was short and not free from vexations owing to popular attachment to his predecessor Eustathius. Asia Minor and Syria were troubled at the time by theological disputes of an Arian, or semi-Arian character. Under Eustathius (324–330) Antioch had been one of the centres of Nicene orthodoxy. This great man was set aside, and his first successors, Paulinus and Eulalius held the see but a short time (330–332). Others followed, most of them unequal to their task, and the Church of Antioch was rent in twain by schism. The Eustathians remained an ardent and ungovernable minority in the orthodox camp, but details of this division escape us until the election of Leontius (344–358). His sympathy for the Arian heresy was open, and his disciple Ætius preached pure Arianism which did not hinder his being ordained deacon. This was too much for the patience of the orthodox under the leadership of Flavius and Diodorus. Ætius had to be removed. On the death of Leontius, Eudoxius of Germanicia, one of the most influential Arians, speedily repaired to Antioch, and by intrigue secured his appointment to the vacant see. He held it only a short time, was banished to Armenia, and in 359 the Council of Seleucia appointed a successor named Annanius, who was scarcely installed when he was exiled. Eudoxius was restored to favour in 360, and made Bishop of Constantinople, whereby the Antiochene episcopal succession was re-opened. From all sides bishops assembled for the election. The Acacians were the dominant party. Nevertheless the choice seems to have been a compromise. Meletius, who had resigned his see of Sebaste and who was a personal friend of Acacius, was elected. The choice was generally satisfactory, for Meletius had made promises to both parties so that orthodox and Arians thought him to be on their side.

Meletius doubtless believed that truth lay in delicate distinctions, but his formula was so indefinite that even to-day, it is difficult to seize it with precision. He was neither a thorough Nicene nor a decided Arian. Meanwhile he passed alternately for an Anomean, an Homoiousian, an Homoian, or a Neo-Nicene, seeking always to remain outside any inflexible classification. It is possible that he was yet uncertain and that he expected from the contemporary theological ferment some new and ingenious doctrinal combination, satisfactory to himself, but above all non-committal. Fortune had favoured him thus far; he was absent from Antioch when elected, and had not been even sounded concerning his doctrinal leanings. Men were weary of

interminable discussion, and the kindly, gentle temper of Meletius seemed to promise the much-desired peace. He was no Athanasius, nor did unheroic Antioch wish for a man of that stamp. The qualities of Meletius were genuine; a simple life, pure morals, sincere piety and affable manners. He had no transcendent merit, unless the even harmonious balance of his Christian virtues might appear transcendent. The new bishop held the affection of the large and turbulent population he governed, and was esteemed by such men as St. John Chrysostom, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Basil, and even his adversary St. Epiphanius. St. Gregory Nazianzen tells us that he was a very pious man, simple and without guile, full of godliness; peace shone on his countenance, and those who saw him trusted and respected him. He was what he was called, and his Greek name revealed it, for there was honey in his disposition as well as his name. On his arrival at Antioch he was greeted by an immense concourse of Christians and Jews; every one wondered for which faction he would proclaim himself, and already the report was spread abroad, that he was simply a partisan of the Nicene Creed. Meletius took his own time. He began by reforming certain notorious abuses and instructing his people, in which latter work he might have aroused enmity had he not avoided all questions in dispute. Emperor Constans, a militant Arian, called a conference calculated to force from Meletius his inmost thought. The emperor invited several bishops then at Antioch to speak upon the chief text in the Arian controversy. "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way" (Prov., viii, 22).

In the beginning Meletius was somewhat long and tedious, but exhibited a great Scriptural knowledge. He cautiously declared that Scripture does not contradict itself, that all language is adequate when it is a question of explaining the nature of God's only begotten Son. One does not get beyond an approximation which permits us to understand to a certain extent, and which brings us gently and progressively from visible things to hidden ones. Now, to believe in Christ is to believe that the Son is like unto the Father, His image, Who is in everything, creator of all; and not an imperfect but an adequate image, even as the effect corresponds to the cause. The generation of the only begotten Son, anterior to all time, carries with it the concepts of subsistence, stability, and exclusivism. Meletius then turned to moral considerations, but he had satisfied his hearers, chiefly by refraining from technical language and vain discussion. The orthodoxy of the bishop was fully established, and his profession of faith was a severe blow for the Arian party. St. Basil wrote the hesitating St. Epiphanius that "Meletius was the first to speak freely in favour of the truth and to fight the good fight in the reign of Constans". As Meletius ended his discourse his audience asked him for a summary of his teaching. He extended three fingers towards the people, then closed two and said, "Three Persons are conceived in the mind but it as though we addressed one only". This gesture remained famous and became a rallying sign. The Arians were not slow to avenge themselves. On vague pretexts the emperor banished Meletius to his native Armenia. He had occupied his see less than a month.

This exile was the immediate cause of a long and deplorable schism between the Catholics of Antioch, henceforth divided into Meletians and Eustathians. The churches remaining in the hands of the Arians, Paulinus governed the Eustathians, while Flavius and Diodorus were the chiefs of the Meletian flock. In every family one child bore the name of Meletius, whose portrait was engraved on rings, reliefs, cups, and the walls of apartments. Meletius went into exile in the early part of the year 361. A few months later Emperor Constans died suddenly, and one of the first measures of his successor Julian was to revoke his predecessor's decrees of banishment. Meletius quite probably returned at once to Antioch, but his position was a difficult one in presence of the Eustathians. The Council of Alexandria (362) tried to re-establish harmony and put an end to the schism, but failed. Both parties were steadfast in their claims, while the vehemence and injudiciousness of the orthodox mediator increased the dissension, and ruined all prospects of peace. Though the election of Meletius was beyond contestation, the hot-headed Lucifer Cagliari yielded to the solicitations of the opposing faction, and instead of temporizing and awaiting Meletius's approaching return from exile, assisted by two confessors he hastily consecrated as Bishop of Antioch the Eustathian leader, Paulinus. This unwise measure was a great calamity, for it definitively established the schism. Meletius and his adherents were not responsible, and it is a peculiar injustice of history that this division should be known as the Meletian schism when the Eustathians or Paulinians were alone answerable for it. Meletius's return soon followed, also the arrival of Eusebius of Vercelli, but he could accomplish nothing under the circumstances. The persecution of Emperor Julian, whose chief residence was Antioch, brought new vexations. Both factions of the orthodox party were equally harassed and tormented, and both bore bravely their trials.

An unexpected incident made the Meletians prominent. An anti-Christian writing of Julian was answered by the aforesaid Meletian Diodorus, whom the emperor had coarsely reviled. "For many years", said the imperial apologist of Hellenism, "his chest has been sunken, his limbs withered, his cheeks flabby, his countenance livid". So intent was Julian upon describing the morbid symptoms of Diodorus that he seemed to forget Bishop Meletius. The latter doubtless had no desire to draw attention and persecution upon himself, aware that his flock was more likely to lose than to gain by it. He and two of his *chorepiscopi*, we are told, accompanied to the place of martyrdom two officers, Bonosus and Maximilian. Meletius also is said to have sent a convert from Antioch to Jerusalem. This, and a mention of the flight of all Antiochene ecclesiastics, led to the arbitrary supposition that the second banishment of Meletius came during Julian's reign. Be that as it may, the sudden end of the persecuting emperor and Jovian's accession must have greatly shortened the exile of Meletius. Jovian met Meletius at Antioch and showed him great respect. Just then St. Athanasius came to Antioch by order of the emperor, and expressed to Meletius his wish of entering into communion with him. Meletius, ill-advised, delayed answering him, and St. Athanasius went away leaving with Paulinus, whom he had not yet recognized as bishop, the declaration that he admitted him to his communion. Such blundering resulted in sad consequences for the Meletian cause. The moderation constantly shown by Athanasius, who thoroughly believed in Meletius's orthodoxy, was not found in his successor, Peter of Alexandria, who did not conceal his belief that Meletius was an heretic. For a long time the position of Meletius was contested by the very ones who, it seemed, should have established it more firmly. A council of 26 bishops at Antioch presided over by Meletius was of more consequence, but a pamphlet ascribed to Paulinus again raised doubts as to the orthodoxy of Meletius. Moreover, new and unsuspected difficulties soon arose.

Jovian's death made Arianism again triumphant and a violent persecution broke out under Emperor Valens. At the same time the quiet but persistent rivalry between Alexandria and Antioch helped the cause of Meletius. However illustrious an Egyptian patriarch might be, the Christian episcopate of Syria and Asia Minor was too national or racial, too self-centred, to seek or accept his leadership. Athanasius,

indeed, remained an authoritative power in the East, but only a bishop of Antioch could unite all those who were now ready to frankly accept the Nicene Creed. In this way the rôle of Meletius became daily more prominent. While in his own city a minority contested his right to the see and questioned his orthodoxy, his influence was spreading in the East, and from various parts of the empire bishops accepted his leadership. Chalcedon, Ancyra, Melitene, Pergama, Cæsarea of Cappadocia, Bostra, parts of Syria and Palestine, looked to him for direction, and this movement grew rapidly. In 363 Meletius could count on 26 bishops, in 379 more than 150 rallied around him. Theological unity was at least restored in Syria and Asia Minor. Meletius and his disciples, however, had not been spared by the Arians. While Paulinus and his party were seemingly neglected by them, Meletius was again exiled (May, 365) to Armenia. His followers expelled from the churches, sought meeting places for worship wherever they could. This new exile, owing to a lull in the persecution, was of short duration, and probably in 367 Meletius took up again the government of his see. It was then that John, the future Chrysostom, entered the ranks of the clergy. The lull was soon over. In 371 persecution raged anew in Antioch, where Valens resided almost to the time of his death. At this time St. Basil occupied the see of Cæsarea (370) and was a strong supporter of Meletius. With rare insight Basil thoroughly understood the situation, which made impossible the restoration of religious peace in the East. It was clear that the antagonism between Athanasius and Meletius protracted endlessly the conflict. Meletius, the only legitimate Bishop of Antioch, was the only acceptable one for the East; unfortunately he was going into exile for the third time. In these circumstances Basil began negotiations with Meletius and Athanasius for the pacification of the East.

Aside from the inherent difficulties of the situation, the slowness of communication was an added hindrance. Not only did Basil's representative have to travel from Cæsarea to Armenia, and from Armenia to Alexandria, he also had to go to Rome to obtain the sanction of Pope Damasus and the acquiescence of the West. Notwithstanding the blunder committed at Antioch in 363, the generous spirit of Athanasius gave hope of success, his sudden death, however (May, 373), caused all efforts to be abandoned. Even at Rome and in the West, Basil and Meletius were to meet with disappointment. While they wrought persistently to restore peace, a new Antiochene community, declaring itself connected with Rome and Athanasius, increased the number of dissidents, aggravated the rivalry, and renewed the disputes. There were now three Antiochene churches that formally adopted the Nicene Creed. The generous scheme of Basil for appeasement and union had ended unfortunately, and to make matters worse, Evagrius, the chief promoter of the attempted reconciliation, once more joined the party of Paulinus. This important conversion won over to the intruders St. Jerome and Pope Damasus; the very next year, and without any declaration concerning the schism, the pope showed a decided preference for Paulinus, recognized him as bishop, greeted him as brother, and considered him papal legate in the East. Great was the consternation of Meletius and his community, which in the absence of the natural leader was still governed by Flavius and Dodorus, encouraged by the presence of the monk Aphrates and the support of St. Basil. Though disheartened, the latter did not entirely give up hope of bringing the West, especially the pope, to a fuller understanding of the situation of the Antiochene Church. But the West did not grasp the complex interests and personal issues, nor appreciate the violence of the persecution against which the orthodox parties were struggling. In order to enlighten these well-intentioned men, closer relations were needed and deputies of more heroic character; but the difficulties were great and the "statu quo" remained.

After many disheartening failures, there was finally a glimpse of hope. Two legates sent to Rome, Dorotheus and Sanctissimus, returned in the spring of 377, bringing with them cordial declarations which St. Basil instantly proceeded to publish everywhere. These declarations pronounced anathemas against Arius and the heresy of Apollinaris then spreading at Antioch, condemnations all the more timely, as theological excitement was then at its highest in Antioch, and was gradually reaching Palestine. St. Jerome entered into the conflict, perhaps without having a thorough knowledge of the situation. Rejecting Meletius, Vitalian, and Paulinus, he made a direct appeal to Pope Damasus in a letter still famous, but which the pope did not answer. Discontented, Jerome returned to Antioch, let himself be ordained presbyter by Paulinus, and became the echo of Paulinist imputations against Meletius and his following. In 378 Dorotheus and Sanctissimus returned from Rome, bearers of a formal condemnation of the errors pointed out by the Orientals; this decree definitively united the two halves of the Christian world. It seemed as though St. Basil was but waiting for this object of all his efforts, for he died 1 Jan., 379. The cause he had served so well seemed won, and Emperor Valens's death five months earlier warranted a hopeful outlook. One of the first measures of the new emperor, Gratian, was the restoration of peace in the Church and the recall of the banished bishops. Meletius therefore was reinstated (end of 378), and his flock probably met for worship in the "Palaia" or old church. It was a heavy task for the aged bishop to re-establish the shattered fortunes of the orthodox party. The most urgent step was the ordination of bishops for the sees which had become vacant during the persecution. In 379 Meletius held a council of 150 bishops in order to assure the triumph of orthodoxy in the East, and published a profession of faith which was to meet the approval of the Council of Constantinople (382). The end of the schism was near at hand. Since the two factions which divided the Antiochene Church were orthodox there remained but to unite them actually, a difficult move, but easy when the death of either bishop made it possible for the survivor to exercise full authority without hurting pride or discipline. This solution Meletius recognized as early as 381, but his friendly and peace-making proposals were rejected by Paulinus who refused to come to any agreement or settlement. Meanwhile, a great council of Eastern bishops was convoked at Constantinople to appoint a bishop for the imperial city and to settle other ecclesiastical affairs.

In the absence of the Bishop of Alexandria, the presidency rightfully fell to the Bishop of Antioch, whom the Emperor Theodosius received with marked deference, nor was the imperial favour unprofitable to Meletius in his quality of president of the assembly. It began by electing Gregory of Nazianzus Bishop of Constantinople, and to the great satisfaction of the orthodox it was Meletius who enthroned him. The Council immediately proceeded to confirm the Nicene faith, but during this important session Meletius died almost suddenly. Feeling his end was near, he spent his remaining days re-emphasizing his eagerness for unity and peace. The death of one whose firmness and gentleness had kindled great expectations caused universal sorrow. The obsequies, at which Emperor Theodosius was present, took place in the church of the Apostles. The funeral panegyrics were touching and magnificent. His death blasted many hopes and justified grave forebodings. The body was transferred from Constantinople to Antioch, where, after a second and solemn funeral service, the body of the aged bishop was laid beside his predecessor St. Babylas. But his name was to live after him, and long remained for the

Eastern faithful a rallying sign and a synonym of orthodoxy.

ALLARD, *Julien l'Apostat* (Paris, 1903); HEFELE, *Histoire des conciles*, ed. LECLERCQ, II, 1; LOOFS in *Realencyk. für prot. Theol. und Kirche*, s. v.; CAVALLERA, *Le schisme d'Antioche au IV et V siècle* (Paris, 1905). H. LECLERCQ.

Meletius of Lycopolis, Bishop of Lycopolis in Egypt, gave his name to a schism of short duration. There is uncertainty as to the dates of his birth, his death, and his episcopate. It is known, however, that he was bishop of the above-mentioned city as early as 303, since in a council held about 306 at Alexandria by Peter, archbishop of that city, Meletius was deposed for several reasons, among others for sacrificing to idols. Meagre references by St. Athanasius were our only source of information until important documents were discovered in the eighteenth century by Scipio Maffei at Verona in a manuscript dealing with the Meletian schism in Egypt. The three documents preserved in Latin are undoubtedly authentic. There is first, a letter of protest by four Egyptian bishops, Hesychius, Pachomius, Theodore, and Phileas, dating at the latest from 307, from the very beginning of the schism of Meletius, and before the excommunication of the latter who was termed by the bishops, *dilectus comminister in Domino* (beloved fellow minister in the Lord). "We have heard", said the bishops, "grievous reports regarding Meletius who is accused of troubling the divine law and ecclesiastical rules. Quite recently, a number of witnesses having confirmed the reports, we feel compelled to write this letter. Meletius is undoubtedly aware of the very ancient law which forbids a bishop to ordain outside his own diocese. Nevertheless, without regard for this law, and without consideration for the great bishop and father, Peter of Alexandria, and the incarcerated bishops, he has created general confusion. To vindicate himself he will perhaps declare that he was compelled to act thus, as the congregations were without pastors. Such a defence however, is worthless, as a number of visitors (*circumeuntes*) had been appointed. Were they neglectful of their duties, their case should have been presented before the incarcerated bishops. If the latter had been martyred, he could have appealed to Peter of Alexandria, and thus have obtained the authority to ordain". Second, an anonymous note added to the foregoing letter and worded thus: "Meletius having received the letter and read it, paid no attention to the protest and presented himself neither before the incarcerated bishops, nor Peter of Alexandria. After all these bishops, priests, and deacons had died in their dungeons at Alexandria, he immediately repaired to that city. Among other intriguers there were two, a certain Isidore and one Arius, seemingly honourable, both of them desirous of being admitted to the priesthood. Aware of the ambition of Meletius and what he sought, they hastened to him, and gave him the names of the vistors (*circumeuntes*) appointed by Peter. Meletius excommunicated them and ordained two others, one of them detained in prison, the other in the mines." On learning this, Peter wrote to his Alexandrian flock. Here comes the third document, in which occurs the phrase interpreted as follows: "Having heard", said Peter, "that Meletius, without considering the letter of the blessed bishops and martyrs, has intruded himself into my diocese, and deprived my deputies of their power, and consecrated others, I advise you to avoid all communion with him until I can bring him before me face to face in the presence of prudent men, and investigate this affair".

The conduct of Meletius was all the more reprehensible in as much as his insubordination was that of one in very high office. St. Epiphanius and Theodoret tell us that Meletius stood next in rank to Peter of Alexandria, of whom he was jealous and whom he was basely endeavouring to supplant at the moment, when Peter was forced to flee from persecution and live in hiding. It was not only against Peter, but also against his immediate successors, Achillas and Alexander, that Meletius maintained his false position. This we know from St. Athanasius, an authoritative witness. Comparing the information given us by St. Athanasius with that furnished by the documents above, the date of the beginning of the Meletian schism may be determined with fair accuracy. It was evidently during the episcopate of Peter, who occupied the See of Alexandria from 300 to 311. Now St. Athanasius in his "Epistola ad episcopos" states positively that "the Meletians were declared schismatics over fifty-five years ago". Unfortunately the date of this letter is contested; the choice lies between 356 or 361. However, St. Athanasius adds: "The Arians were declared heretical thirty-six years ago", i. e. at the Council of Nicæa (325). Apparently, therefore, Athanasius was writing in 361. If now we deduct fifty-five years, we have the year 306 for the condemnation of the Meletian schism; and as the persecution of Diocletian raged bitterly between 303 and 305, the beginnings of the schism seem to belong to the year 304, or 305. St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus gives a circumstantial account (Haer. lxviii) in contradiction with the foregoing narrative. According to him, the schism arose from a disagreement between Meletius and Peter regarding the reception of certain of the faithful, particularly of ecclesiastics, who had abjured the Faith during the persecution. This account, preferred by some historians to the statement of St. Athanasius, is no longer credible since the discovery of the aforesaid documents by Maffei at Verona. How, then, explain the origin of the account given by Epiphanius? It seems to us it arose in this manner: after Peter's death Meletius was arrested and sent to the mines; on his way he stopped at Eleutheropolis, and there founded a church of his sect; Eleutheropolis being the native town of Epiphanius, the latter naturally came in contact with Meletians in his early days. They would of course represent in a most favourable light the origin of their sect; and thus their partial and misleading narrative was afterwards inserted by Epiphanius in his great work on heresies. Finally, the references to the Meletian schism by Sozomen and Theodoret quite accord with the original documents discovered at Verona, and more or less with what St. Athanasius has upon the same subject. As to St. Augustine, he merely mentions the schism in passing and very likely follows St. Epiphanius.

The suppression of the Meletian schism was one of the three important matters that came before the Council of Nicæa. Its decree has been preserved in the synodical epistle addressed to the Egyptian bishops. Meletius, it was decided, should remain in his own city of Lycopolis, but without exercising authority or the power of ordaining; moreover he was forbidden to go into the environs of the town or to enter another diocese for the purpose of ordaining its subjects. He retained his episcopal title, but the ecclesiastics ordained by him were to receive again the imposition of hands, the ordinations performed by Meletius being therefore regarded as invalid. Throughout the diocese where they were found, those ordained by him were always to yield precedence to those ordained by Alexander, nor were they to do anything without the consent of Bishop Alexander. In the event of the death of a non-Meletian bishop or ecclesiastic, the vacant preferment might be given to a Meletian, provided he were worthy and the popular election were ratified by Alexander. As to Meletius himself, episcopal rights and prerogatives were taken from him owing to his incorrigible habit of everywhere exciting confusion. These mild measures, however, were in vain; the Meletians joined the Arians and did more harm than ever, being among the worst enemies of St. Athanasius. Referring to this attempt at reunion the latter said: "Would to God it had never happened."

About 325 the Meletians counted in Egypt twenty-nine bishops, Meletius included, and in Alexandria itself, four priests, three deacons, and one army chaplain. Conformably to the Nicene decree, Meletius lived first at Lycopolis in the Thebaid, but after Bishop Alexander's death he took a personal part in the negotiations which united his party to the Arians. The date of his death is not known. He nominated his friend, John, as his successor. Theodoret mentions very superstitious Meletian monks who practised Jewish ablutions. The Meletians died out after the middle of the fifth century.

CEILLIER, *Histoire Générale des auteurs ecclésiastiques*, III (Paris, 1732), 678–81, II (1765), 615–16; HEFELE, *Meletius* in *Kirchenlex.*, ed. KAULEN, VIII (1893), 1221 sq.; ACHELIS, *Meletius von Lykopolis* in *Realencyclopädie*, ed. HAUCK, XII (1903), 558–62; HEFELE, *Histoire des Conciles*, ed. LECLERCQ, I (1907), 211–12, 488–503.

H. LECLERCQ.

Melfi and Rapolla, DIOCESE OF (MELPHIENSIS ET RAPOLLENSIS), in the province of Potenza, in Basilicata, southern Italy. Melfi is situated on a pleasant hill, on the slopes of Mt. Volture. The origin of the city is not well known; but the town became famous in 1043, when it was chosen capital of the new military state created in southern Italy by the twelve Norman counts, founders of the Kingdom of Naples. Nicholas II made it a diocese immediately dependent on the Holy See; its first bishop was Baldwin. Its beautiful cathedral, a work of Bishop Roger, son of Robert Guiscard (1155), was destroyed by the earthquake of 1851. Among its other bishops, mention should be made of Fra Alessandro da San Elpidio, a former general of the Augustinians (1328), and a learned theologian. In 1528, Clement VII, in view of the scarcity of its revenues, united the Diocese of Rapolla to that of Melfi, "æque principaliter". Rapolla is a city founded by the Lombards, on the banks of the Olivento River. The Normans took it from the Greeks in 1042, and fortified it with works still to be seen. The town, which has a beautiful cathedral, was an episcopal see, suffragan of Siponto, in the time of Gregory VII. Other bishops were Cardinal Giovanni Vincenzo Acquaviva (1537), who gave a noble organ to the cathedral, and Lazzro Caraffini (1622), founder of the seminary. Several councils were held at Melfi: one in 1048; another 1059, under Nicholas II, important on account of the prohibition of the marriage of priests, the deposition of the Bishop of Trani, promoter of the schism of Cerularius, and the investiture of Robert Guiscard of the Duchy of Apulia and Calabria; the council of 1067; the one of 1089, against simony and the concubinage of priests, and for the freedom of the Church; lastly, the council of 1100. The united sees have 14 parishes, with 40,000 inhabitants, 66 priests, 5 religious houses of women, and 1 school for boys and 1 for girls.

CAPPELLETTI: *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XXI (Venice, 1857).

U. BENIGNI.

Meli, GIOVANNI, Sicilian poet, b. at Palermo, 4 March, 1740; d. 20 Dec., 1815. He was the son of a goldsmith of Spanish origin, and received his first education from the Jesuits. He afterwards studied natural science and medicine, and practised as a physician in the hamlet of Cinisi and later at Palermo itself, where for nineteen years he held the chair of chemistry at the university. Towards the end of his life he took minor orders. In childhood he had been led to poetry by reading Ariosto, and in poetical composition found relief from domestic unhappiness. His poems are written in the Sicilian dialect, and as a vernacular poet of this kind he has no rival in Italian literature. His longer works, "La Fata Galanti", "Don Chisciotti e Sanciu Panza", "L'origini di lu Munnu", are fantastic poems in *ottava rima* in imitation of Berni. The "Buccolica", eclogues and idylls of the four seasons of the year, is full of Sicilian colour, and has won him the title of "the modern Theocritus". Meli was a staunch supporter of the Bourbon regime, and among his lyrics "Anacreontiche" and "Odi", is an ode in honour of Nelson, which however, he is said to have suppressed after the latter's execution of the Neapolitan patriots. His last work, the "Favuli morali", is a collection of Esopian fables in verse with an underlying allegorical or satirical meaning.

Opere di GIOVANNI MELI (Palermo, 1857); *La Buccolica, la Lirica, le Satire, e l'Elegie di* GIOVANNI MELI *ridotte dal siciliano in italiano da* AGOSTINO GALLO (Palermo, 1858); NAVANTARI, *Studio critico su Giovanni Meli* (Palermo, 1904).

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

Melia, PIUS, Italian theologian, b. at Rome, 12 Jan., 1800; d. in London, June, 1883. He entered the Society of Jesus on 14 Aug., 1815, taught literature at Reggio, and afterwards was engaged in preaching. He left the Society in 1853. He wrote two books: "Alcune ragioni del P. Pio Melia della C. di G." (Lucca, 1847), a defence of the Society of Jesus, and "Alcune affirmazioni del Sig. Antonio Rosmini-Serbati" (Pisa, s. d.), an attack upon Rosmini (q. v.). In his "Life of Rosmini", Father Lockhart merely declares that the latter work was written by certain Italian Jesuits; Father de Backer, in his "Dictionnaire des Antonymes", attributed it to Passaglia, but his "Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus", re-edited by Sommervogel, follows Beorchia, who attributes it to Melia. Melia, who attacked especially Rosmini's doctrine on original sin, was answered by Rosmini (Milan, 1841) and Pagani (Milan, 1842); then began a bitter controversy which had to be ended by a direct command of Pius IX.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la C. de J.*, V (Brussels and Paris, 1894); LOCKHART, *Life of Rosmini* (London, 1886).

WM. T. TALLON.

Melissus of Samos, a Greek philosopher, of the Eleatic School, b. at Samos about 470 B. C. It is probable that he was a disciple of Parmenides, and that he is identical with the Melissus who, according to Plutarch (Pericles, 26), commanded the Samian fleet which defeated the Athenians off the coast of Samos in 442. He wrote a work which is variously entitled *περὶ τοῦ ὄντος, περὶ φύσεως*, etc., and of which only a few fragments have come down to us. In attempting to combine the doctrines of Parmenides with those of the earliest philosophers of Greece (see IONIAN SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY), Melissus, though he fell into many contradictions, forestalled, in a sense, Aristotle's more successful effort to define the infinite and the incorporeal. Like Parmenides, he depreciated sense-knowledge, and held that change, motion, and multiplicity are illusions. At the same time, he was influenced by the Ionians, especially by Heraclitus, to attach value to the question of origins. He definitely predicates infinity of being, and asserts that reality "has no body". By the infinite he understands "that which has neither beginning nor end", and in his conception of "that which has no body", he does not, as Aristotle points out (Metaph. I, 5, 986 b.) attain a correct understanding of the immaterial. The physical doctrines ascribed to Melissus by Philoponus, Stobœus, Epiphanius, and others do not seem to have been held by him. There is, however, a possibility that, as Diogenes Laërtius informs us, Melissus avoided all mention of the gods because we can know nothing about them. Like Plato, Aristotle, and some of the other Greek philosophers, he probably thought it wisest to take refuge in a profession of ignorance regarding the gods, so as to avoid the imputation of hostility to the popular mythology.

FAIRBANKS, *First Philosophers of Greece* (New York, 1898), 120 sq., gives fragments of Melissus's work, with translations of references to him in Aristotle, Epiphanius, etc.; PABST, *De Melissi fragmentis* (Bonn, 1880); KERN, *Zur Würdigung des Melissus* (Stettin, 1880); ZELLER, *Pre-Socratic Philosophy*, tr. ALLEYNE, I (Lond., 1881), 627 sq.; TANNERY, *Pour l'histoire de la science hellène* (Paris, 1887), 262 sq.; TURNER, *History of Philosophy* (Boston, 1903), 51 sq.

WILLIAM TURNER.

Melitene, residence of an Armenian Catholic see, also a titulary archbishopric. According to Pliny (Nat. Hist. VI, 3), the city was founded by Queen Semiramis at a little distance from the Euphrates; the earliest mention of it is found in Tacitus (Annal., XV, 26). A Roman camp was there under Nero, and Trajan made it the principal stronghold of this frontier. Its name is probably derived from the river Melas which empties into the Euphrates. Under Marcus Aurelius the *Legio XII fulminata* was stationed there (Eusebius, H. E. V, v, 4); to this legion belonged the forty martyrs of Sebaste. Ptolemy (V, vi, 21) and Strabo (XII i, 2, 4; see also XI, xii, 2; XI, xiv, 2) make it one of the ten provinces of Cappadocia. Justinian fortified it and filled it with magnificent monuments (Procopius, De Ædificiis, III, 4), which have all disappeared. In 577 the Romans gained a great victory over the Persians in the vicinity of Melitene; two years before the city had been burned by the Shah Chosroes. Towards the middle of the seventh century Melitene again became Byzantine; it was afterwards taken by the Arabs and later recaptured by Emperor Constantine Copronymus in 751. The latter transported the Christian population to Thrace, dispersed the Mussulmans of the province, destroyed the city and razed the walls. In 760 Caliph Al-Manzur took possession of it and restored to it something of its former importance. In the tenth century the Byzantines re-established their domination and in 965 the Emperor Nicephorus Phocas successfully undertook to colonize the region. The Greek Government had faithfully promised not to molest the Monophysites, whether Armenian or Syrian; but it did not keep its promise. In the eleventh century the city counted no less than fifty-six churches, and was able to furnish 60,000 armed men from among its own citizens and its environs, an index of its great prosperity. The number of suffragan sees increased at this time and was suddenly changed from three to nine (Gelzer, "Ungedruckte . . . Texte der Notitiæ episcopatuum", 579). The Monophysites had at that time seven sees in the vicinity of Melitene (Barhebræus, H. E. II, 460). The city fell afterwards into the power of the Seljuk Turks of Iconium; then of the Mongols in 1235; of the Osmanlis in 1396; of Timur in 1401; then of different Turkish princes. Finally, at the beginning of the sixteenth century it was annexed to the Ottoman Empire, of which it is still a part.

Christianity seems to have reached Melitene very early. The Roman soldier, St. Polyeuctus, immortalized by Corneille, was martyred there in 254 or 259. Another third century martyr is known, St. Eudoxius, whose relics were found in 966, as indicated by an inscription carved on the door of a church. St. Meletius, the celebrated Bishop of Antioch, was a native of Melitene, as was also Saint Euthymius, to whom was chiefly due the organization of monastic life in Palestine during the fifth century. A council against the Arians was held there in 363. Le Quien (Oriens Christianus, I, 439–46) gives a long list of its Greek bishops, the last of whom belongs to the year 1193. Among them are St. Acacius, who died about 438; and Saint Domitian, first cousin to the Emperor Maurice, who played a most important rôle in the religious and political life of the second half of the sixth century. For its Jacobite bishops see Le Quien (II, 1451–58) and "Revue de l'Orient chrétien" (VI, 201). To-day the city of Malatia forms a sanjak of the vilayet of Mamouret-ul-Aziz; it numbers about 30,000 inhabitants of whom 16,000 are Turks; 4500 Kurds; 6500 Kizil Bach (a Mussulman sect); and about 3000 Armenians. Among the last mentioned are 800 Catholics. The Capuchins have established there a mission with a church built in 1884 and an orphan asylum. The city, which was disturbed by an earthquake in 1893, was still more sorely troubled by the massacres of 1895, during which 500 houses were burned and 1000 Christians massacred. About five miles from Malatia is the village of Eski-Malatia on the site of the ancient Melitene; a part of the walls is still preserved. The whole region is like an immense fruit garden in a delightful climate and a well-watered land. The Catholic Armenian diocese numbers 5100 souls, 9 priests, 10 churches and chapels, 7 stations, 9 primary schools, and an establishment of Armenian Sisters of the Immaculate Conception. The schismatic Armenian diocese is under the Catholicos of Sis. There is also established there a Protestant mission.

Texier, *L'Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1862), 587–590; Cuinet, *La Turquie d'Asie*, II, 369–375; Piolet, *Les missions catholiques Françaises au XIX^e siècle*, I (Paris, 285–287); *Missiones catholicæ* (Rome, 1907), 757.

S. Vailhé.

Melito, Saint, Bishop of Sardis, prominent ecclesiastical writer in the latter half of the second century. Few details of his life are known. A letter of Polycrates of Ephesus to Pope Victor about 194 (Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl.", V, xxiv) states that "Melito the eunuch [this is interpreted "the virgin" by Rufinus in his translation of Eusebius], whose whole walk was in the Holy Spirit", was interred at Sardis, and had been one of the great authorities in the Church of Asia who held the Quartodeciman theory. His name is cited also in the "Labyrinth" of Hippolytus as one of the second-century writers who taught the duality of natures in Jesus. St. Jerome, speaking of the canon of Melito, quotes Tertullian's statement that he was esteemed a prophet by many of the faithful.

Of Melito's numerous works almost all have perished; fortunately, Eusebius has preserved the names of the majority and given a few extracts (Hist. Eccl., IV, xiii, xxvi). They are (1) "An Apology for the Christian Faith", appealing to Marcus Aurelius to examine into the accusations against the Christians and to end the persecution (written apparently about 172, or before 177). This is a different work from the Syriac apology attributed to Melito, published in Syriac and English by Cureton from a British Museum MS. The latter, a vigorous confutation of idolatry and polytheism addressed to Antoninus Cæsar, seems from internal evidence to be of Syrian origin, though some authorities have identified it with Melito's Περὶ ἀληθείας. (2) Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα, on Easter, written probably in 167–8. A fragment cited by Eusebius refers to a dispute that had broken out in Laodicea regarding Easter, but does not mention the precise matter in controversy. (3) Ἐκλογαί, six books of extracts from the Law and the Prophets concerning Christ and the Faith, the passage cited by Eusebius contains a canon of the Old Testament. (4) Ἡ κλείς, for a long time considered to be preserved in the "Melitonis clavis sanctæ scripturæ", which is now known to be an original Latin compilation of the Middle Ages. (5) Περὶ ἐνσωμάτου θεοῦ, on the corporeity of God, of which some Syriac fragments have been preserved. It is referred to by Origen (In Gen., i, 26), as showing Melito to have been an Anthropomorphite, the Syriac fragments, however, prove that the author held the opposite doctrine.

Fourteen additional works are cited by Eusebius. Anastasius Sinaita in his Ὁδηγός (P. G., LXXXIX) quotes from two other writings: Εἰς τὸ πάθος (on the Passion), and Περὶ σαρκώσεως Χριστοῦ (on the Incarnation), a work in three books, probably written against the Marcionites. Routh (see below) has published four scholia in Greek from a Catena on the Sacrifice of Isaac as typifying the Sacrifice of the Cross, probably taken from a corrupt version of the Ἐκλογαί. Four Syriac fragments from works on the Body and Soul, the Cross, and Faith, are apparently compositions of Melito, though often referred to Alexander of Alexandria. Many spurious writings have been attributed to Melito in addition to the "Melitonis clavis sanctæ scripturæ" already mentioned—e. g., a "Let-

ter to Eutrepius", "Catena in Apocalypsin", a manifest forgery compiled after A. D. 1200; "De passione S. Joannis Evangelistæ" (probably not earlier than the seventh century), "De transitu Beatæ Mariæ Virginis" (see APOCRYPHA in I, 607). Melito's feast is observed on 1 April.

BARDENHEWER, *Patrology*, tr. SHAHAN (St. Louis, 1908), 62–3, contains a bibliography of the printed fragments; SALMON in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v.; HEFELE, *Hist. of the Christ. Councils*, tr. CLARK, I (Edinburgh, 1894), 310–12; CURETON, *Spicilegium Syriacum* (London, 1855); ROUTH, *Reliquiæ Sacræ*, I (Oxford, 1834), 110; PITRA, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, II (Paris, 1854), xxxvii, lxv; TILLEMONT, *Mémoires*, II (Paris, 1694), 407, 663; *Acta SS.*, April, I, 10–12; *Melito of Sardis and his Remains* in KITTO, *Journal of Sacred Lit.* (1855–6), XV, 121; XVI, 434; XVII, 121.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

Melk (MOLCK, MELLICUM), ABBEY AND CONGREGATION OF.—Situated on an isolated rock commanding the Danube, Melk has been a noted place since the days of the Romans. A Slav settlement, Magalicha, replaced the Roman fort, and in its turn was destroyed by a Magyar invasion about 955, when it received the name Eisenburg. The Magyars, however, were driven out by Luitpold the Illustrious, first Margrave of Austria, who here fixed his capital and founded a church for secular canons. These having become lax, were replaced by twelve monks of Subiaco, whom Luitpold II brought from Lambach with Sijibold as their abbot in 1089. Melk was much favoured by St. Luitpold III, and the new foundation rapidly grew and flourished, its corn tithes being so abundant that the folk-name for Melk was "at the full bushel". It became a place of pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Coloman, and was famed for its great relic of the Holy Cross. By the fifteenth century monastic observance at Melk had become relaxed, but in 1418, at the request of Albert V, Archduke of Austria, Martin V sent the Ven. Nicholas of Magen with five other monks of Subiaco from the Council of Constance to begin a reform of the monasteries of Lower Austria. The Abbot of Melk, John of Flemming, voluntarily resigned, and Nicholas, elected in his stead, soon so reformed the observance in accordance with the constitutions of Subiaco that the abbey became a model for other houses in Austria. Several monasteries followed its example, among them Obenburg, Salzburg, Mariazell, the Scottish abbey at Vienna, Kremsmunster, Ratisbon, and Tegernsee. All these houses followed the same observance and styled themselves the Congregation of Melk. They in no way depended, however, on Melk, nor had they any general superior, soliciting visitors when needful from the pope. The Abbey of Melk continued in its first fervour of reform, and several attempts were made from 1460 onwards to effect a more formal union. In 1470 seventeen abbots of various neighbouring dioceses met at Erfurt and decided to establish in their monasteries the common observance and ceremonial of Melk. Nothing more definite occurred until Gaspar, Abbot of Melk, in 1618 invited the abbots of Austria to meet at Melk and form a congregation. The negotiations continued until 1623, when the Abbots of Melk, Kremsmunster, Garsten, the Scots' Abbey of Vienna, Altenburg, Göttweich and Mariazell signed the constitutions agreed upon for the new congregation. These were confirmed by Urban VIII in 1625. In addition the congregation included the houses of Lambach, Monsee, Leittenstaden and Kleinck. It was governed by a superior general, elected every two years, who acted as visitor of all the monasteries of the congregation. Each province also had its own visitor. In 1630 there was an attempt to form a united congregation of all the monasteries of the empire, but the Swedish invasion frustrated this project, though many of the German monasteries thenceforth observed the constitutions of Melk. In the fourteenth century Melk, by permission of Duke Frederic I, had been fortified, and was thus able to resist successive sieges by Matthias Corvinus, by the revolted peasantry, by the Protestant States of Austria and by the Turks, though on each occasion the property of the abbey suffered. Great losses, too, were sustained at the hands of Napoleon's troops. In 1889 the Abbey of Melk was included by Leo XIII in the Austrian Congregation of the Immaculate Conception. In 1905 the congregation numbered 85, of whom 75 were priests. The present abbot, Joseph Charles (b. 1824, appointed 1875), exercises jurisdiction over 29 parishes, with 45,145 souls.

Annales Mellicenses, ed. WATTENBACH, in PERTZ, *Mon. Germ. Hist. Script.*, IX (Hanover, 1851), 480–535; BERLIÈRE, *La réforme de Melk au XV^e Siècle* in *Revue Bénédictine*, XII (1895), 204–13, 289–309; HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der Katholischen Kirche*, I (Paderborn, 1907), 286–95,344; HÉLYOT, *Dictionnaire des . . . ordres religeux*, II (Paris, 1863), 1033–39; KATSCHTHALER, *Melk* (Vienna, 1905); KEIBLINGER, *Geschichte des Benediktinerstifts Melk* (Vienna, 1851–69); KROPF, *Bibliotheca Mellicensis* (Vienna, 1747); MABILLON, *Annales O. S. B.*, V (Lucca, 1740), 248–9; PEZ, *Ephemerides rerum in Monasterio Mellicensi . . . gestarum . . .* 1741–46, ed. STAUFER in *Studien O. S. B.*, VIII–X (1886–9); SCHRAMB, *Chronicon Mellicense* (Vienna, 1702); WOLFSGRÜBER AND HÜBL, *Abteien unde Klöster in Œsterreich* (Vienna, n. d.).

LESLIE A. ST. L. TOKE.

Melleray (MELLEARIUM), situated in Brittany (Loire-Inférieure), Diocese of Nantes, in the vicinity of Chateaubriand, was founded about the year 1134. Foulques, Abbot of Pontron, in Anjou, founded from Loroux (a daughter of Cîteaux), sent monks for the foundation of a monastery in Brittany. They were delighted with the solitude of a place near Old Melleray, shown them by Rivallon, pastor of Auverné, which Alain de Moisdon, proprietor of the place, donated to them. Guitern, the first abbot, erected the original monastery in 1145, but the church was not completed until 1183, under Geffroy, the fourth abbot. Melleray, a small monastery built for about twelve religious, remained regular until during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when relaxation prevailed as a result of the acquisition of great wealth and the introduction of the system of commendatory abbots. Etienne de Brezé (1544) was the first commendatory abbot, and from his time both spiritual and temporal welfare declined, until toward the end of the seventeenth century when, through the efforts of Dom Jouard, vicar-general of the order, the rule of St. Bernard was re-introduced, and the monastic buildings restored. In 1791 it was suppressed, and the few religious were dispersed. This, however, was not the end of Melleray. The Trappists, expelled from France, took refuge at Val Sainte, Switzerland; from there, urged by their rapid increase, and for fear of the spread of the revolution, Dom Augustine de Lestrange established them in various parts of the world. Through the generosity of Sir Thomas Weld, a wealthy English Catholic, the father of Cardinal Weld, they settled (1795) at Lulworth, Dorsetshire, England. Their monastery was soon created an abbey, and Dom Antoine was elected the first abbot (1813). In 1817, with changed conditions and the restoration of the Bourbons, the monks of Lulworth returned to Melleray. The restored abbey flourished, increasing from fifty-seven to one hundred and ninety-two members in twelve years. During the Revolution of 1830 they were again persecuted, especially those of foreign birth, of whom they had a great number. To make homes for these they founded Mount Melleray (1833) in Ireland and Mount Saint Bernard (1835) in England. Dom Antoine (d. 1839) was succeeded first by Dom Maxime, then by a second Dom Antoine, and finally by Dom Eugène Vachette, the present abbot. Under Dom Antoine II several monasteries were established, among them Gethsemani, in the United States. Dom Eugène, elected in 1875, was for many years the vicar-general of the Congregation of La Grande Trappe, and was instrumental in effecting the reunion of the three congregations into one order (1892). Since then he has

been vicar to the Most Reverend General of the Reformed Cistercians. Recently he has established an annex to his monastery in Woodbarton, Diocese of Plymouth, England.

MELLERAY, MOUNT.—Situated on the slopes of the Knockmealdown Mountains, near Cappoquin, Diocese of Waterford, Ireland, was founded in 1833. Father Vincent Ryan was chosen leader of the religious sent by Dom Antoine, Abbot of Melleray, for this foundation. After many efforts to locate his community he accepted the offer of Sir Richard Keane, of Cappoquin, to rent a tract of barren mountain waste, some five hundred acres, subsequently increased to seven hundred. In the work of reclaiming the soil, they were assisted by the country folk; entire parishes, led by their pastors, came, each in turn, to give free a full day's work. In 1833 the corner-stone was laid by Sir Richard Keane, in the presence of the bishop and a large concourse of clergy and people. In 1835 the monastery was created an abbey, and Father Vincent, unanimously elected, received the abbatial blessing from Dr. Abraham, bishop of the diocese, this being the first abbatial blessing in Ireland since the Reformation. Abbot Vincent vigorously undertook the work of completing the abbey, but died 9 Dec., 1845. Under the short rule of his successor, Dom M. Joseph Ryan, but little was accomplished, as he resigned after only two years. To Dom Bruno Fitzpatrick, who succeeded as abbot in September, 1848, it remained to consolidate and perfect the work so well begun. He also founded, in 1849, the monastery of New Melleray, near Dubuque, Iowa, U. S. A., and, in 1878, Mount Saint Joseph, Roscrea, Co. Tipperary, Ireland. But the most conspicuous of Abbot Bruno's works was the founding of the Ecclesiastical Seminary of Mount Melleray. Originating in a small school formed by Abbot Vincent in 1843, it was developed by Abbot Bruno and his successors, until it attained its present rank. Abbot Bruno died 4 Dec., 1893, and was succeeded by Dom Carthage Delaney, who was blessed 15 Jan., 1894, and presided over Mount Melleray for thirteen years; his successor, Dom Maurus Phelan, solemnly blessed by Dr. Sheahan, Bishop of Waterford, 15 Aug., 1908, is the present abbot. The community numbers thirty-eight choir religious (of whom twenty-nine are priests) and twenty-nine lay brothers.

MELLERAY, NEW.—Mount Melleray having become crowded, it was decided to attempt a new foundation. While plans were being discussed, Bishop Lorans, of Dubuque, Iowa, visited the abbey (1849). He expressed a strong desire to have a colony of Trappists in his diocese, and offered a tract of land about twelve miles from Dubuque. Abbot Bruno immediately sent two of his religious to inspect the land, and receiving a favourable report, he accepted the offer. Later in the same year he laid the foundation of New Melleray Abbey, appointing, as its first superior, Father James O'Gorman (later consecrated first Bishop of Omaha, Nebraska). Father Clement Smyth, the third superior, was also elected bishop, being placed in charge of the Diocese of Dubuque. In 1859 the monastery was made an abbey, and Father Ephraim McDonald elected its first abbot. The second abbot, still in office, is Dom Alberic Dunlea, whose community now numbers thirty-six members.

MANRIQUE, *Annales Cistercienses* (Lyons, 1642); JANAUSCHEK, *Originum Cistercienium* (Vienna, 1877); HAURÉAU, *Gallia Christiana*, XIV (1856); MORICE, *Preuves de l'Histoire de Bretagne;* FELIX, *Notice sur l'Abbaye de Melleray* (Nantes, 1884); DE CORSON, *L'Abbaye de Melleray avant la Révolution* (St. Brieuc, 1895); *Vie du R. P. D. Antoine* (Paris, 1840); GAILLARDIN, *Les Trappistes de l'ordre de Citeaux au XIX^e s.* (2 vols., Paris., 1845); RICHER, *Voyage par un Trappiste de 7 Fons* (Paris, 1870); *Grandmaison y Bruno* (Paris, 1852); *Archives of Mount Melleray;* RYAN, *Hist. of the Foundation and First Six Years of Mt. Melleray Abbey;* HENNESSEY, *Mellifont Abbey, Its Ruins and Associations* (Dublin, 1897); HAVTRY (1640), *Triumphalia Chronologica Monast. S. Crucis*, ed. MURPHY (Dublin, 1891); ROBERT, *Concise Hist. of the Cistercian Order* (London, 1852).

EDMOND M. OBRECHT.

Mellifont, ABBEY OF, three miles from Drogheda, Co. Louth, Diocese of Armagh, was the first Cistercian monastery established in Ireland. In the year 1140, St. Malachy, *en route* for Rome, visited St. Bernard at Clairvaux, and was so edified that he resolved to establish a similar monastery in his own diocese of Armagh. He therefore left several of his companions at Clairvaux, to make their novitiate under the direction of St. Bernard. In 1142 they returned to found Mellifont under Christian O'Conarchy, who had been Archdeacon of Down, and who became the first abbot. A French monk, Father Robert, an able architect, directed the construction of the monastic buildings according to the plans of the Abbey of Clairvaux. The consecration of the church in 1157 was the occasion of great religious celebrations. So numerous were the postulants that six important monasteries were founded during the first ten years: Bective (1146); Boyle (1148); Monasternenagh (1148); Baltinglas (1148); Schrule (1150); Newry (1153). In 1150 the venerable Abbot Christian was appointed Bishop of Lismore, and Pope Eugene III, who had been his fellow-novice at Clairvaux, named him legate for Ireland. Soon after his death (1186) his name was inscribed in the calendar of the saints, and he has long been venerated as one of the most powerful protectors of his country. His brother Malchus, equally illustrious for his science and sanctity, succeeded him. For sixty years Mellifont rejoiced in great prosperity, and when the English invaded Ireland there were already twenty-five great Cistercian abbeys. During the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the rivalries between the English and Irish exerted a baneful influence, peace gave way to discord, and in more than one case the general chapter, and even the sovereign pontiff, were forced to intervene. Not until the fifteenth century did Mellifont regain its ancient prestige, which was maintained until its suppression by Henry VIII on 23 July, 1539, when one hundred and fifty monks were compelled to leave with Richard Contour, the last Abbot of Mellifont. The king seized the treasures of the abbey, and the annals were either lost or destroyed, and with them the names of many remarkable men. Several religious continued to live in the environs, which explains why, in 1623, the title of Abbot of Mellifont was granted, by Apostolic Brief, to Patrick Barnewall, and again in 1648 to John Devreux when the title disappears. In 1566 the abbey, with its dependencies, was given to Edward Moore, chief of the family Drogheda, and passed, in 1727, to Balfour of Townley Hall, during whose term of ownership all fell to the speedy decay and desolate ruin of the present day.

HENNESSEY, *Mellifont Abbey, Its Ruins and Associations* (Dublin, 1897); HAVTRY (1640), *Triumphalia Chronologica Monasterii Sanctæ Crucis*, ed. MURPHY (Dublin, 1891); *De Cisʻercium Hibernorum Viris Illustribus* (Dublin, 1895); JONGELINUS, *Notitiæ Abbatiarum O. Cist.* (Cologne, 1840); JANAUSCHEK, *Originum Cisterciensium* (Vienna, 1877); MANRIQUE, *Annales Cistercienses* (Lyons, 1642); DUGDALE, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, VI, part 2 (London, 1830); ARCHDALL, *Monasticum Hibernicum* (London, 1786).

EDMOND M. OBRECHT.

Mellitus, SAINT, Bishop of London and third Archbishop of Canterbury, d. 24 April, 624. He was the leader of the second band of missionaries whom St. Gregory sent from Rome to join St. Augustine at Canterbury in 601. Venerable Bede (Hist. Eccl., II, vii) describes him as of noble birth, and as he is styled abbot by the pope (Epp. Gregorii, xi, 54, 59), it is thought he may have been Abbot of the Monastery of St. Andrew on the Cœlian Hill, to which both St. Gregory and St. Augustine belonged. Several commendatory epistles of the pope recommending Mellitus and his companions to various Gallic bishops have been preserved (Epp., xi, 54–62). With the band he sent also "all things needed for divine worship and the Church's service, viz. sacred vessels and altar cloths, vestments for priests and clerics, and also relics of the

Typogravure Goupil of Paris (France).

ANGEL PLAYING A VIOLIN

FRESCO BY MELOZZO DA FORLÍ, SACRISTY OF ST. PETER'S, ROME

holy apostles and martyrs, with many books" (Bede, "Hist. Eccl.", I, 29).

The consecration of Mellitus as bishop by Augustine took place soon after his arrival in England, and his first missionary efforts were among the East Saxons. Their king was Sabert, nephew to Ethelbert, King of Kent, and by his support Mellitus was able to establish his see in London, the East Saxon capital, and build there the church of St. Paul. On the death of Sabert his sons, who had refused Christianity, gave permission to their people to worship idols once more. Moreover, on seeing Mellitus celebrating Mass one day, the young princes demanded that he should give them also the white bread which he had been wont to give their father. When the saint answered them that this was impossible until they had received Christian baptism, he was banished from the kingdom. Mellitus went to Kent, where similar difficulties had ensued upon the death of Ethelbert, and thence retired to Gaul about the year 616.

After an absence of about a year, Mellitus was recalled to Kent by Laurentius, Augustine's successor in the See of Canterbury. Matters had improved in that kingdom owing to the conversion of the new king Eadbald, but Mellitus was never able to regain possession of his own See of London. In 619 Laurentius died, and Mellitus was chosen archbishop in his stead. He appears never to have received the pallium, though he retained the see for five years—a fact which may account for his not consecrating any bishops. During this time he suffered constantly from ill-health. He consecrated a church to the Blessed Mother of God in the monastery of SS. Peter and Paul at Canterbury, and legend attributes to him the foundation of the Abbey of St. Peter at Westminster, but this is almost certainly incorrect. Among the many miracles recorded of him is the quelling of a great fire at Canterbury which threatened to destroy the entire city. The saint, although too ill to move, had himself carried to the spot where the fire was raging and, in answer to his prayer, a strong wind arose which bore the flames southwards away from the city. Mellitus was buried in the monastery of SS. Peter and Paul, afterwards St. Augustine's, Canterbury. Some relics of the saint were preserved in London in 1298. The most reliable account of his life is that given by Bede in "Hist. Eccl.", I, 29, 30; II, 3–7. Elmham in his "Historia Monasterii S. Augustini Cantuar.", edited by Hardwick, gives many additional details, but the authenticity of these is more than questionable. His feast is observed on April 24.

BEDE, *Hist. Eccl.*, I, xxix, xxx; II, iii-vii, in *P. L.*, XCV; *Acta SS.*, April, III, 280; BARONIUS, *Ann. Eccl.* (Rome, 1599), ad an. 624; CAPGRAVE, *Nova legenda Angliæ* (London, 1516), 228; HADDON AND STUBBS, *Councils and Eccl. Documents relating to Great Britain*, III (Oxford, 1871), 62–71; HARDY, *Descriptive catalogue of MSS. relating to the history of Great Britain and Ireland*, I (*Rolls Series*, London, 1862), i, 219–220; MABILLON, *Acta Sanctorum Bened.* (Paris, 1669), II, 90–94; STANTON, *Menology of England and Wales* (London, 1887), 178; CHALLONER, *Britannia Sancta*, I (London, 1745), 255–258.

G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

Melo, DIOCESE OF, in Uruguay. It was decided in 1897 to erect two sees suffragan to Montevideo, one of which was to be Melo, but, owing to political causes, no appointments have been made as yet. However, negotiations for a renewal of diplomatic relations between the Republic and the Holy See are now in progress, and as the recognition of the new dioceses by the State is a condition of their resumption, this probably will be shortly accorded. The Diocese of Melo is to embrace the north-eastern part of Uruguay and so will include, in part or in whole, the Departments of Cerro Largo, Riviera, Tacuarembó, and Treinta y Tres. This region has an area of about 19,600 square miles; the population, practically all Catholic, barely numbers 145,000 (1906). The district is very fertile, but there is little agriculture, most of the inhabitants, a large and the most important element of whom are Brazilians, being engaged in cattle breeding. The town of Melo, founded in 1796, is the capital of Cerro Largo and contains about 7000 persons. It is situated near the Tacumari River about 315 miles north of Montevideo. It has a fine church and also a pretty chapel of our Lady of Mt. Carmel. Artigas (2500 inhabitants) lies 60 miles north of Melo, on the Brazilian frontier. San Fructuoso, the capital of Tacuarembó, has about 3000 inhabitants. The other centres of population are little more than hamlets.

Handbook of Uruguay. Bur. of the Amer. Rep. (Washington, 1892); BRYSSEL, *La république orientale de l'Uruguay* (1889); Publications of the *Dirección de estadística general* (Montevideo); MULHALL, *Handbook of the River Plate Republics* (London, 1895).

A. A. MACERLEAN.

Melos, a titular see, suffragan of Naxos in the Cyclades. The name seems to have been derived from a Phœnician navigator, Μῆλος, though others ascribe it to its rounded or apple shape, Μῆλον. The island has had different names: Zephyria, Memblis, Mimallis, Siphis, Acyton, Byblis, etc. The Phœnicians seem to have been the first to colonize the island; then came the Dorians from Laconia in the twelfth century B. C. This Dorian colony lasted for seven hundred years, when the Athenians, jealous of their fidelity to the Spartans, took possession of the island in 416 B. C. All the men were massacred and replaced by five hundred Athenian colonists; the women and children were carried captive to Attica. Later on, when these children were grown, they returned to occupy the island. Melos then passed under the domination of the Macedonians, then under that of the Romans, and finally under that of the Byzantines, who retained possession of it until 1207, when Marco Sanudo annexed it to the Italian Duchy of Naxos. In 1537 it was taken by the corsair Barbarossa and joined to the Ottoman Empire. The island continued to prosper, serving as a market and even as a refuge to the corsairs of the West, especially the French; it was so until the eighteenth century, when it began to decline because of a volcano which arose in the vicinity. From 20,000 inhabitants the population decreased to about 2000; united to Greece in 1827 the island now contains 5000 souls. The chief town, called Plaka, possesses a very fine harbour; nearby are the ruins of ancient Melos, with a cemetery, two citadels, a temple of Dionysius, a necropolis, and a theatre. Near the theatre was found in 1820 the celebrated Venus of Melos, now at the Museum of the Louvre at Paris, the work of a sculptor of Antioch on the Meander, in the second century B. C. The earliest known Bishop of Melos, Eutychius, assisted at the Sixth Œcumenical Council in 681. Le Quien (Oriens Christianus, I, 945) mentions a number of Greek titulars, especially at the beginning of the sixteenth century, after the expulsion of the Venetians. The Greek diocese was a suffragan of Rhodes. A very long list of the Latin residential or titular bishops is found in Le Quien, op. cit., III, 1055–58, and in Eubel, "Hierarchia Catholica medii ævi", Munich, I, 355; II, 211. Melos had Latin bishops until 1700, in which year John Anthony de Camillis died. The see was then joined to that of Naxos until 1830, when the island was made a part of the Diocese of Santorin. The Bishop of Santorin now ministers to the few Catholics who live there.

SMITH, *Dict. Greek and Roman Geog.*, II (London, 1870), s. v.; LACROIX, *Iles de la Grèce* (Paris, 1858), 473–78.

S. VAILHÉ.

Melozzo da Forlì, an Italian painter of the Umbrian School, b. at Forlì, 1438; d. there 1494. Lanzi's suggestion that Melozzo studied under Ansuino da Forlì appears to rest on no foundation. Little is known of this Ansuino, save the slight part he took in the frescoes of the Eremitani Chapel at Padua, which were finished prior to 1460. He would thus have brought to his pupil the teachings of Mantegna, but it

is more probable that Melozzo fell under no influence other than that of Piero della Francesca. Piero was always engrossed with perspective, and has even left us a treatise on it; therefore it is to him that Melozzo owes his mastery of the subject, as well as his love for large tableaux and the heroic character of his work. Melozzo was one of the artists summoned to the Court of Urbino by the magnificent Signor Federigo da Montefeltro, to whom perhaps he was introduced by Giovanni Santi, the father of Raphael. None of the work he did there has reached us. However, the Barberini Palace (Rome) contains a part of the Urbino series, and among them a few pictures that adorned the duke's study and which, like the incrustations, date from 1476. The "Federigo in armour, with his Son Guidobaldo" is attributed to Melozzo. A charming bust "Guidobaldo, when a child", in the Colonna Palace, is attributed by some to Giovanni Santi, but Berenson thinks it a Melozzo. The famous allegories of the "Arts" and "Sciences" (two paintings in Berlin and two in London) and the busts of the "Philosophers" (in the Louvre and in the Barberini), formerly in Federigo's palace, are probably not by Melozzo but by the Fleming, Justus of Ghent. It was doubtless through Federigo that the artist was recommended to Sixtus IV. The importance of this pope's part in the history of art is well known, for he was the first of the Renaissance popes, the herald of Julius II and Leo X, and the founder of the Sixtine Chapel and the Vatican Library. Melozzo became more or less his official painter. With him he opened the Academy of St. Luke.

The Sixtine chapel was already decorated when Melozzo arrived, but the pope associated him with two other great undertakings. In 1477 he ordered him to paint a picture commemorating the inauguration of the Vatican. This fresco, now in the Pinacoteca of the Vatican, shows the jurisconsult Platina kneeling before the pope and receiving from him the keys of the library. Grouped around are the pope's four nephews, among whom are the prothonotary, Giulio Riario, in a monk's robe, and Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere, the future Julius II. The scene is set in a hall of marvellous Renaissance style. The beauty of the architecture, the splendour of the decoration, the vigour of the portraits, the calm and dignity of the composition, and the importance of the persons it deals with, make this magnificent work an incomparable page of history. Art has no creation of more unconstrained majesty, so realistically and nobly alive. It is a perfect picture of the papacy of those days, a vision of the court life of the pontiff, who was the first to make Rome the capital of the arts, and the intellectual metropolis of the world, to crown it with the sciences and the masterpieces of art and to invent nepotism. Sixtus IV also commanded Melozzo to paint, an "Ascension" for the choir of the church of the Apostles. It was a remarkable painting and Vasari speaks admiringly of it, but unfortunately it was destroyed in 1711 when Clement IX enlarged the choir. He was unwilling, however, that such a work of art should be completely lost, so a few detached figures from the group were saved, of which that of "Christ Triumphant" may be seen on the Quirinal staircase. It is one of the earliest known examples of perspective applied to the human figure on roof or ceiling decoration; that is to say, a figure viewed from below. This foreshortened method, a great novelty at that time, has been surpassed a hundredfold, and by third-rate painters, since the day of Correggio.

Melozzo's chief merit is that he created a type of supple and nobly sensuous juvenile beauty, and gave expression to it with inspired ease and lyric swing. This quality stands out more prominently in other fragments of the same fresco, preserved in the larger sacristy at St. Peter's, especially in the choral angels, whose faces are irresistible. No artist of that period, and very few since, would have been able to conceive these poetical and vigorous forms, in which womanly charm blends with virile strength, which are so full of health, joy of life, movement, and passion. This wonderful work was executed in 1482. A less important one (1478), of "Christ as Judge of the World", can be seen in the Minerva. This power of giving pleasing expression to a life full of richness and harmony, this incomparable gift of plasticity, claims for Melozzo a place apart. Not so great and, especially, not so profound as Mantegna or Signorelli, he has nevertheless a truly Italian charm all his own, in which the other two masters are lacking. This charm he knew how to utilize even in depicting the everyday occurrences of life. To illustrate this, Vasari cites in the fresco work of the church of the Apostles a frieze of vine-gatherers which resembles the *genre* painting of Benozzo Gozzoli (see his fresco in the Campo Santo at Pisa), but which is treated with quite a new power and with all the grace and technique of a painter of genius. This frieze has been lost, but we can imagine what it was like from a little picture in the College of Forlì which shows a druggist's apprentice ("Pesta, Pepe") pounding sugar in a mortar. Never was the joy of living expressed in so bewitching a manner. The paintings in the Treasury Chapel at Loretto were merely outlined and begun by Melozzo; their execution is almost entirely the work of his pupil Palmezzano.

Music (?)
Melozzo da Forlì, National Gallery, London

Vasari, ed. Milanesi, III (Florence, 1878); Crowe and Cavalcaselle, *A new history of painting in Italy* (London, 1864–66); Burckhardt, *Le Cicerone*, Fr. tr. (Paris, 1892); Schmarzow, *Melozzo da Forlì* (Berlin, 1886); Steinmann, *Rom in der Renaissance* (Leipzig, 1899); Berenson, *The Central Italian painters of the Renaissance* (3rd ed., London and New York, 1900); Ricci, *Melozzo da Forlì* (Rome, in press).

Louis Gillet.

Melrose, Abbey of, in Roxburghshire, founded in 1136 by King David I, was the earliest Cistercian monastery established in Scotland. Its first community came from Rielvaux, the Yorkshire house colonized from Cîteaux. In less than ten years St. Mary's Abbey, Melrose, had been completely built. It stood in a broad glen south of the Tweed, two miles distant from the Celtic monastery of Old Melrose, where St. Cuthbert had lived five centuries before. Melrose Abbey suffered greatly from hostile incursions of more than one English monarch; the soldiers of Edward II desecrated, pillaged, and burned the church; Richard II in 1385 laid waste the surrounding country and set fire to the abbey. Mainly through the generosity of Robert the Bruce, a more stately church was begun in 1326, and scarcely completed by the sixteenth century.

Cruciform in shape, built in English Perpendicular, Decorated, and Flamboyant styles, two hundred and fifty feet in length, Melrose was distinguished for the fairy-like lightness of its carvings and window-tracery, finished with exquisite care. Not only the royal founder, but succeeding sovereigns, and countless benefactors, nobles and commoners, so richly endowed Melrose with lands and possessions that its annual revenue is computed at one hundred thousand pounds of present money value. One example of the application of such revenues is told in twelfth century records. During a time of famine four thousand starving people were fed by the monastery for three months. Many of the abbots were men of distinction: Abbot Waltheof (1148), stepson of David I, and honoured as a saint; Abbot Joscelin, afterwards Bishop of Glasgow (1175), took a prominent part in the erection of the fine cathedral of that city, as a shrine for the

Melrose Abbey

body of St. Mungo; Abbot Robert (1268) had been formerly Chancellor of Scotland; Abbot Andrew (1449) became Lord High Treasurer; many others were raised to the episcopate. The English troops of Henry VIII burned Melrose in 1544. Although the monks once numbered two hundred, and there were one hundred and thirty as late as twenty years before the Reformation, eleven only received pensions at the dissolution, so quickly must they have been dispersed. After many vicissitudes, the possessions of the abbey came finally to the Buccleuch family. The ruins were further devastated by a fanatical mob in 1569, when statues and carvings were ruthlessly destroyed; but more wanton still was the subsequent carting away of the sacred stones in great numbers to serve as building materials. The result is seen in the carved religious emblems still appearing upon surrounding houses. The ruins of the once noble abbey form a strikingly beautiful picture from the North British Railway, about thirty-seven miles south of Edinburgh.

Liber de Melros, ed. Innes (2 vols., Bannatyne Club, 1837); Morton, *Monastic Annals of Teviotdale* (1832); *Scottish Cistercian Houses* in *Dublin Review* (April, 1902).

Michael Barrett.

Melrose, Chronicle of (Chronica de Mailros).—It opens with the year 735, ends abruptly in 1270, and is founded solely upon the Cottonian Manuscript, Faustina B. ix, in the British Museum, the only ancient copy preserved. All others are transcripts from this one original. The names of its authors are unknown, but some expressions used by them prove this chronicle to have been written in the abbey, whilst evidence from writing shows it to have been the work of monks who were inmates of Melrose in successive periods. The first portion, namely from the commencement to about the year 1140, is a compilation from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and other existing histories by Simeon of Durham and Hoveden. This portion should, therefore, be used with caution. The second portion, namely from about the year 1140 to the abrupt termination of the Chronicle in 1270, is considered by historians to be possessed of the highest credibility. The information is then quite original and the numerous and progressive variations in the handwriting show that it is generally, if not always, contemporaneous. The Manuscript, now in the British Museum, was probably carried off from Melrose at the time of the Reformation. It was edited in 1835 by J. Stevenson, S.J., for the Bannatyne Club. The Oxford edition issued in 1684 by Fulman is by no means satisfactory, as the editor had no opportunity of collating the Oxford transcript with the original. Besides its chronicle, Melrose has handed down hundreds of charters and royal writs, dating from the reign of David I to that of Bruce, and forming a most valuable collection, rich in illustrations of the social life and economy of the period. They were edited by Cosmo Innes.

Stevenson, *Chronica de Mailros* (Edinburgh, 1835); Innes, *Liber de S. Marie de Melros* (Edinburgh, 1837); Douglas, *History of Roxburghshire.*

W. Forbes-Leith.

Melzi, Francesco, b. at Milan, about 1490; d. 1568. He was a mysterious personage. He was a friend of Leonardo da Vinci, and Vasari tells us that he was a Milanese nobleman, an exceedingly handsome young man, and that he possessed the principal part of the anatomical drawings of Leonardo. He inherited Leonardo's manuscripts, instruments, books, and drawings; he furnished both Vasari and Lomazzo with

notes on the master's life, and to him we are indebted for the preservation of the wonderful collection of the artist's writings. Whether he was a painter, however, we are unable to state. There is not an actual authentic work by him that can be mentioned; Vasari does not say a word about his artistic talent. Lomazzo compliments Melzi in extravagant language, as a wonderful miniature painter, and it was suggested in 1523, in a letter from Bendedei, the ambassador at Milan, to his master Alfonso, Duke of Ferrara, that Melzi was a skilful painter; but the letter only implies that he painted as an amateur or as a dilettante. He has, however, by some writers been exalted into the position of being Leonardo's favourite and best pupil, most eminent and most skilful, and a picture of Vertumnus and Pomona in the Berlin Gallery, a Madonna at Bergamo, another Madonna at Vaprio, and two portraits at Isola Bella have been attributed to him, but all of them without definite authority. He is spoken of as Il Conte, and is mentioned more than once in letters written in France, dealing with Leonardo, as the master's friend, and once as a miniaturist, but in all probability he was merely a skilful amateur, devoted to Leonardo, and perhaps a clever draughtsman, who practised painting occasionally as an amusement.

LOMAZZO, *Trattato dell' Arte della Pittura* (Milan, 1584); IDEM, *Grotteschi* (Milan, 1587); DOLCE, *Dialogo della Pittura* (Venice, 1557; Florence, 1735); AMORETTI, *Memorie di Leonardo da Vinci* (Milan, 1804); MORELLI, *Italian Masters in German Galleries* (London, 1883); BURCKHARDT, *The Cicerone.*

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Memberton, principal chief of the Micmac Indians of Nova Scotia at the time of the establishment of the French colony under De Monts and Poutrincourt in 1605, and noted in mission annals as the first Christian in the tribe. The French form Memberton is a dialectic corruption of the Micmac name Maopeltu, which is itself a contracted form for Maoi-Napeltu, "chief of all", i. e. "principal chief", from *maoi* (all) and *napeltu* (chief, or leader). On St. John's Day, 24 June, 1610, he was baptized with twenty others of his family by the secular priest Father Messire Jesse Flèche at Port Royal, now Annapolis, Nova Scotia, Poutrincourt and his son acting as sponsors for the King and Dauphin of France. He was given the name of Henry, after Henry IV, his wife was named Marie after the queen regent, while his children and other relatives were called after members of the royal family. Then very old, although vigorous mentally and physically, he claimed to remember the first visit of Cartier to the Saint Lawrence in 1534. For many years the acknowledged chief and war captain, medicine man and priest of tribal ceremonies, in the midst of paganism he led a temperate and moral life, even before baptism limiting himself to one wife, where polygamy was the rule among the great men, one chief having as many as eight. On account of their good offices in the serious illness of his son, he became strongly attached to the Jesuit missionaries Biard and Massé, who arrived in June, 1611, and proved an earnest, practical Christian, frequently expressing a fervent hope for the conversion of his whole tribe. Towards the end of August, 1611, seized with his last illness, he was brought at his own request to Father Biard's house, where he died a week later, after having received every attention, and, having given consent to be buried in the Christian cemetery as an example to his people, whom he repeatedly exhorted to maintain friendship with the French, he was buried with full ecclesiastical solemnity as befitted his rank and character. Father Biard says of him, "This was the greatest, most renowned, and most formidable savage within the memory of man; of splendid physique, taller and longer-limbed than is usual among them; bearded like a Frenchman, although scarcely any of the others have hair upon the chin; grave and reserved; feeling a proper sense of dignity for his position as commander. God impressed upon his soul a greater idea of Christianity than he has been able to form from hearing about it, and he has often said to me in his savage tongue, 'Learn our language quickly, for as soon as thou knowest it and hast taught me well I wish to become a preacher like thee'. Even before his conversion he never cared to have more than one living wife." In accordance with a universal Indian dislike to name the dead, his people referred to him after his death simply as the "Great Chief". At the Micmac mission town of Sainte-Anne de Ristigouche, Quebec, a monument was unveiled on the third centenary of his baptism to commemorate the beginning of the Micmac mission.

Jesuit Relations, ed. THWAITES, I, II, III (BIARD, LESCARBOT, etc.) (Cleveland, 1896–1897).

FATHER PACIFIQUE.

Membre, ZENOBIUS, b. 1645 at Bapaume, Department of Pas-de-Calais, France, was a member of the Franciscan province of St. Antony. He arrived in Canada in 1675, and in 1679 he accompanied Robert de la Salle to the country of the Illinois, of which he wrote a description. Though Membre laboured zealously for the conversion of the natives, owing to their moral degradation the success was small. In 1681 he descended the Mississippi with La Salle to the Gulf of Mexico, returned with the leader of the expedition to Europe by way of Canada, and became superior of the Franciscan monastery in his native city. In 1684 Membre with two Franciscans and three Sulpicians followed La Salle into Texas. The commander erected Fort St. Louis at Espiritu Santo Bay in 1685, but Membre endeavoured to establish a mission among the Cenis Indians. In this he failed. After about two years of toil he was killed by the savages, along with Fr. Maximus Le Cerq, Rev. Chefdeville, and the small garrison which La Salle had left at the settlement.

BARCIA, *Ensayo Cronológico* (Madrid, 1723); HENNEPIN, *Description de la Louisiane* (Paris, 1683); THWAITES, *A New Discovery of a Vast Country* (Chicago, 1903); SHEA, *Cath. Church in Colonial Days* (New York, 1886); *Cath. Missions* (New York, 1854); WALLACE, *Illinois and Louisiana* (Cincinnati, 1893).

Z. ENGELHARDT.

Memento. See CANON OF THE MASS, sub-title III; DIPTYCH.

Memling, HANS, Flemish painter, b. about 1430–35; d. at Bruges 11 August, 1494. This date was discovered in 1889 by Père Henri Dusart in a MS. chronicle of the library of St. Omer, which adds that this painter, "the best in Christendom", was born at Mainz (*oriundus Moguntiaco*), and that he was buried in the church of St. Gilles. This valuable text destroys the celebrated legend of Memling, which relates that this great painter, a soldier of Charles the Bold, was wounded at the battle of Granson, and was cared for at Bruges by the Hospitallers of St. John. Through gratitude the injured soldier painted the marvellous pictures still to be seen there. Here in an "Adoration of the Magi" is seen his own portrait, wan and bearded, wearing an invalid's cap. It was said at Bruges that he desired to be buried in the convent which held so many of his masterpieces, but another tradition relates that he died in Spain at the Carthusian monastery of Miraflores near Burgos, where a picture ascribed to him is found. These two accounts of a pleasing hagiographical tint are therefore mere fables, evidently the tales of sacristans, inspired by the pictures which they endeavoured to explain. They did not arise until the middle of the eighteenth century (cf. Descamps, "Vies des peintres flamands", 1753, I, 12). On the other hand, the researches of Mr. James Weale show Memling under quite a different aspect. The wretched and pitiable soldier of Charles the Bold received by charity into a hospital of Bruges becomes in reality an important burgher of that prosperous city. If he had no official station at the court, it was because circumstances no longer permitted; he had nevertheless property of his

own, being in 1480 the owner of three houses, one of them "a large stone house" (*domus magna lapidea*), and figuring on the fiscal registers among the two hundred and forty-seven highest taxed citizens. At this time he married Anne de Valkenære (d. 1487), by whom he had three sons, Jean, Cornelius, and Nicholas. With a studio filled with pupils, he received commissions from the chief citizens of the town, such as Moreel and Floreins, and his fame reached beyond Flanders. The "Anonyme" of Morelli, who wrote in 1521, seems to know but two Flemish painters; every picture of this school at Bergamo, Venice, Padua, which he does not attribute to Jan van Eyck he attributes to Memling.

The remainder of Memling's history is that of his works. The first certain date is 1467. In that year the painter executed the portrait, now at Antwerp, of the Italian medallist Nicolo Spinelli, then in the service of the Duke of Burgundy. The following year he executed the triptych of the Donne family, now at Chatsworth in the collection of the Duke of Devonshire. In fact Sir John must have formed part of the escort which accompanied Margaret of York at the time of her marriage with Charles the Bold. The following chronological list constitutes almost all our information: 1478, retable executed for the illuminator Guillaume Vrelant, now at the Academy of Turin; 1479, triptych of the "Adoration of the Magi", executed for Jean Floreins; triptych of the "Mystical Marriage of St. Catherine", with the "Life" of the two Saint Johns, both in the hospital of St. John at Bruges; 1480, retable for Peter Bultinc, now at the old Pinacothek of Munich; triptych of the Grocer's Guild, a lost picture; portraits of Guillaume Moreel and his wife (Museum of Brussels), and of their daughter Marie Moreel (the Sibyl Sambeth) in the hospital of St. John at Bruges; 1484, triptych of the Moreel family, at the Academy of Bruges; 1487, diptych of Martin van Nieuenhove, at the hospital of St. John at Bruges; portrait of a man in the Uffizi Museum, Florence; 1489, recovery of the shrine of St. Ursula, and placing of relics in this shrine; 1491, polyptych of the "Cathedral of Lubeck". By adding to these works several other pictures (the Louvre possesses the greatest number) we have a total of twenty exquisite paintings constituting the whole of Memling's authentic work. Some critics, like Kämmerer (Memling, 1899) have sought, without good reason, to augment this catalogue by adding to it other works by analogy. Another school, that of Würzbach, refuses to admit that all the works cited above are the works of a single author. They withdraw from Memling, the pictures of Munich and Turin; the "Reliquary of St. Ursula"; the polyptychs of Lubeck and Dantzig, allowing him almost nothing except the portraits and pictures of the hospital of St. John, the Triptych of Chatsworth, and two or three others closely related. Such a discussion cannot be entered into here, but even if Memling were the author of only the few pictures in the hospital of Bruges, none the less is he one of the most delightful geniuses of painting, and the keenest poet of the whole Flemish school.

THE PRESENTATION
Memling, The Prado, Madrid

Though he accomplished nothing comparable to Van Eyck's great painting, the retable of the "Mystic Lamb", there is in his work a rarer, nobler, and more touching quality. The general characteristics of Flemish painting are an unsurpassed technical perfection, a realism, a rigour in the study and imitation of facts, such as render it impossible to say whether this perfection is more the condition or the effect. As a craftsman Memling is inferior to none of his Flemish predecessors or imitators; he paints fabrics, velvets, flesh tints like Jan van Eyck himself. In sentiment he is far superior, or rather dwells in a finer atmosphere, for the price of the uncompromising realism of the Flemish is often ugliness and vulgarity. In some works of Jan van Eyck, as the "van der Pæle Virgin" at the Academy of Bruges, the mediocrity of the types, the absence of imagination and taste, in a word the flatness, reach a painful degree. The same is true of the subsequent works, such as the celebrated "Nativity" of van der Goes in the Uffizi of Florence, in which the power of the "study" is only equalled by the insignificance or the triviality of its taste, and of those of the entire school from Petrus Christus and the Master of Flémalle to the pretentious Thierry Bouts and the early works of Gérard David. All these works are strong in execution but weak in feeling. It is true that Roger Van der Weyden attempted to introduce passion into this realism, but his painful intensity most frequently results in a convulsive, distorted, affected style. Emotionalism runs riot with him, producing the effect of nervous strain or disease. In the midst of this powerful but inartistic school the work of Memling astonishes by its subtle grace and refinement. In execution equal to anyone of his contemporaries, he transfigured all that he touched. Through all his portraits shines the radiance of the soul within. Compare, for example, the St. William of the Moreel triptych, in his black armour, that wonderful type of Christian knight and soldier monk, with the awkward St. George of the "van der Pæle Virgin", that soldier so ill at ease in his rôle of saint, and measure the difference between the crudeness of Van Eyck and the psychological insight of Memling. This gift has made Memling the only Flemish painter who knew how to depict woman. He bestowed on her the same external luxury of draperies and attire, the same mantles, the same furs, the same wide skirts in majestic folds, with which the Flemish school in general loves to adorn her; but beneath this beautiful attire the Virgins of Van Eyck remain *bourgeoises* while those of Memling are young queens. His saints are

princesses. He endows them with slender figures, white and graceful necks, sweet and long profiles, long drooping eyelashes, pure brows and clear temples, with that immaterial something which tolerates in its vicinity only virginal dreams and chaste thoughts. Whatsoever is too worldly in their grace he corrects by an ideal but natural atmosphere, by the familiar and serene charm of his landscapes. A delicate symmetry lends a mysterious rhythm to these peaceful compositions and dominates them with the harmony of unheard music. Angel lute players with blue and rose-coloured wings seem the expression of this unuttered song, the personified voice of the choir. Grace of figures, nobility and richness of decoration, serenity of landscapes, balancing of groups, melody of colours, lines, and sentiment all unite to produce a masterpiece of mystical poetry, pious romance, and supernatural beauty.

But all these things, it must be repeated, are almost inexplicable in the Flemish school, at once the most natural and the most commonplace. These characteristics have their origin elsewhere, and the very legend concerning Memling, the story of a man coming as a stranger to art by a special vocation, is an unhistorical attempt to account for this singularity. Mr. James Weale had already conjectured that Memling's name contained the key to the enigma and concealed the clew to the painter's origin; he thought that it was according to a frequent custom of the Middle Ages, the name of a country. As a matter of fact there was a borough called Memelynck near Alkmaar in Holland, and in the neighbourhood of Aschaffenburg in Germany there was another called Mumling or Mömling. For a time it was difficult to decide which of these two was the painter's birthplace, but Père Dusart's discovery has definitely cut short all uncertainty. The solution of the problem is that Memling was a German from Mainz, as is shown by his exclusively German Christian name, Hans. Before taking up his residence at Bruges he studied art at Cologne, for northern Europe the home and fatherland of Christian art. Vasari and Guicciardini relate that Memling was the pupil of Roger Van der Weyden, but the only work of Memling's with a trace of Roger's influence is after a Pietà in a church of Cologne. His "Reliquary of St. Ursula" again proves that he lived a long time in that city; the views of Basle and Rome are fancifully depicted, whereas in those of Cologne the slightest details of the cathedral then in course of construction, the steeples of the churches of St. Martin and St. Pantaleon are reproduced with a fidelity which shows that the author had grown up in the familiar shadow of these monuments. Memling's whole work breathes a spirit of poetry rarely found in the fifteenth century save in a few painters of Cologne and Sienna. His favourite themes are the devotions honoured in Cologne, the city of the Magi and of the Eleven Thousand Virgins. The mystical peace and beauty which surrounds his figures, those calm brows and clear temples are not met with prior to him save in certain works of the Rhenish school such as the "Adoration of the Magi" of the great Stephen Lochner or in his "Virgin of the rosebush". This alliance of German spirituality with Flemish technic, this infusion of soul, of the spiritual, the immaterial, into the school best able to paint the real, constituted the genius and the rôle of Memling. Through him the Flemish school was rescued from the shallow naturalism where for fifty years it had grown barren. Memling's influence was as great as it was beneficial. When we compare the early works of Gérard David, so harsh and brutal, such as the "Justice of Otto" and the "Marriage of Cana" of the Louvre, with those which were later executed under Memling's influence, we can estimate the service which the stranger, the "duitscher Hans", rendered to the country of his adoption. There is no doubt that he owes to it a practical skill which he would not otherwise have had, but in return he brought it the spirit which revivified it. The works of the next generation show this more clearly; the "Mystical Marriage" of the Museum of Brussels and the "Deposition" of Antwerp by Quentin Metzys. And when we remember that of all the masters of his country it was Metzys whom Rubens esteemed most, we can understand the importance of the rôle played in the destinies of the Flemish school by the young painter from Aschaffenburg who taught it poetry and idealism.

CAREL VAN MANDER, *Livre des Peintres* (1604), ed. HYMANS (Paris, 1884); DESCAMPS, *Vies des peintres flamands* (1753); CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE, *Les anciens peintres flamands*, with notes and additions by RUELENS and PINCHART (1863); VITET, *Etudes d'Art*, III (1864); WEALE, *Hans Memling* (1865); FROMENTIN, *Les Maîtres d'autrefois* (1876); KUGLER, *Handbook of Painting*, ed. CROWE (1879); CONWAY, *Early Flemish Artists* (1887); KÄMMERER, *Memling* (Bielefeld, 1899); JAMES WEALE, *Hans Memlinc* (London, 1901); WYZEWA, *Peintres de jadis et d'aujourd'hui* (1903).

LOUIS GILLET.

Memmi, SIMONE. See MARTINI, SIMONE.

Memory (Lat., *memoria*), is the capability of the mind, to store up conscious processes, and reproduce them later with some degree of fidelity. Strictly speaking, however, a revived conscious process is not remembered, unless it is, at the same time, recognized as something which occurred before. Memory, therefore, involves a process of recognition. Voluntary reproduction of mental processes is frequently spoken of as recollection, and involuntary, as recall.

DIVISIONS OF MEMORY.—St. Thomas distinguishes two kinds of memory, *sensory* and *intellectual*. He excludes, however, from the former the function of merely storing up the mental image; this he assigns to imagination. Sensory memory preserves that which can not be received by the special senses and yet is individual, and therefore does not belong to the intellectual memory, which takes cognizance of nothing but the universal. For instance, the utility of an object and its setting in past time; by the utility of an object must not be understood any abstract concept of its purpose, but only the sensory experience which all animals acquire, that certain things are beneficial or harmful. Sensory memory is located by St. Thomas in the bodily organism (I, lxxviii, a. 4). The intellectual memory receives and stores up the abstract and universal. Its seat is the passive intellect, a division, or perhaps only an aspect of the faculty of understanding. The complement of the passive intellect is the *intellectus agens*, which is conceived of as actively working over the data of sense, abstracting from them the universal (*species intelligibilis*) which they contain and impressing it on the passive intellect. St. Thomas argues that there must be an intellectual memory, because that which is acted upon must retain the effect of the agent all the more perfectly in proportion to its own stability. Since the impressions of sense leave lasting traces on the bodily organism, which is subject to decay,—*a fortiori* the universal must, in some way, be stored up in the passive intellect, which is a spiritual faculty, permanent as the soul itself (I, Q., lxxix, a, 6–7).

This argument assumes that there are cognitive processes specifically different from those of sensation, a doctrine which has received scant recognition in modern psychology until quite recently. The tacit or expressed assumption of many experimental psychologists has been the very opposite, viz.: that all our cognitive processes are sensations or sensory complexes. Recently, however, the attempt has been made to demonstrate experimentally the existence of abstract thought, totally distinct from mental imagery (phantasms). Along with this admission of a difference between sensation and thought, experimental psychology is beginning to emphasize the distinction between sensory and intellectual memory.

ADORATION OF THE MAGI—MEMLING, ALTAR-PIECE, HOSPITAL OF ST. JOHN, BRUGES

Sensory memory has long been subdivided by psychologists into several "types", chief among which are the auditory, visual, and motor. Anyone may remember at times by visual, auditory or other sensory images; but the prevailing character of his imagery determines his memory type. To some extent the type depends on training; but there is evidence to show that it is in part determined by anatomical or physiological conditions of the brain. This, however, does not exclude the modification of images by any exercise of memory in which they function; for the type is quite elastic (Watt, "Experimentelle Beiträge zu einer Theorie des Denkens" in "Archiv für die Ges. Psychol.", 1905, IV, 367–8).

Besides sensory and intellectual memory, a third division, affective memory, is often mentioned. Meumann (Vorlesungen zur Einfürhung in die experimentelle Pädagogik, I, 174) recognizes it as a distinct form, because in children under thirteen, it is but little developed; whereas other forms of memory are already far advanced. Meumann's view is based on the experiments of Netschajeff and Lobsien. Ribot, who was the first to make a special study of affective memory, maintained that to the visual, auditory, and motor types, we must add another, which is just as well defined, i. e. the affective type (La Psychologie des sentiments, 166). Titchener ("Affective Memory" in "Philos. Review", IV, 1895), objected to the type theory of affective memory, on the ground that affections, unlike mental images, are recalled in company with ideational mental processes. They are not independent but dependent mental processes, and can only be attended to, or recalled in company with the representative processes, of which they are but qualities or tones. Conclusive evidence is at present lacking, to decide whether or not feelings are dependent or independent processes. But the settlement of this problem is not necessary for the recognition of an affective memory of some kind. The expression "affective memory" is justified because affective processes are distinct from sensory and intellectual.

The Development of Memory.—The growth of memory from childhood to maturity is dependent upon the development of many mental faculties, and is therefore a very complex affair. It is a growth of many memories, rather than of a single faculty. For purposes of experiment, the following forms of memory have been distinguished: (1) memory for special sensations, (2) for impressions of space and time, (3) for things and events of the outside world, (4) for numbers and abstract concepts, (5) for emotional states of mind. Each shows a period of rapid growth, followed by a standstill or even a retardation. The fourteenth and fifteenth year of childhood is especially unfavourable for the development of all kinds of memory. The order in which these forms of memory undergo their period of rapid development, is, for boys: (1) external objects, (2) words of visual content, (3) words of auditory content, (4) tones, (5) touch and sensations of movement, (6) numbers and abstract ideas, (7) emotions (cf. Meumann, "Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die experimentelle Pädagogik", I, 178). It is not true that the memory of children is better than that of adults. Except for a retardation at the ages of fourteen and fifteen, memory grows continuously, reaching a maximum between twenty and twenty-five. After that, for those in learned pursuits, it declines very slowly, until about the fiftieth year, when it commences to fall off more rapidly. Ebbinghaus, who made continual tests of his powers of retention, could say at the age of fifty-two, that for twenty years his memory remained almost constant. By analogy with the general biological law of exercise, Meumann concludes that memory fails more slowly the more frequently it is used.

The Method of Memorizing.—The experimental study of memory has not been barren in results of practical value. It is now possible to give suggestions for the practical work of memorizing that are based upon very definite data. These suggestions refer primarily to the mechanical part of memory. Practical experience tells us that if we want to memorize any kind of connected narrative, we are greatly helped if we first analyse its logical sequence of thought. Memory systems for translating dates into words and memorizing the words which can be re-translated into dates, are so cumbersome that their value is doubtful. The results of experimental work aid us chiefly in the drudgery of memorizing—just where conjecture about the best method is most likely to fail. In learning a a poem by heart, the usual method would be to read the first few lines several times, then read from the beginning on down a few lines further and so, little by little, commit the whole to memory. Another method would be to read it each time, from beginning to end, until it was perfectly memorized. Although there is a prejudice in favour of the first method, it is the one that consumes the greatest amount of time.

Several pieces of experimental work have shown that memorizing by reading from beginning to end, is the quicker and more permanent method. The reason is to be sought in the mechanics of association, by which one part of the piece memorized is bound to the other. When a series of words is memorized, it may be shown that a word is not merely associated with the one that precedes and the one that follows it, but also with every other word of the series. Consequently the "total" method, avoids the trouble of connecting the separate sections of the partial method, makes the bonds between the divisions more secure, and gives to all the parts a certain equality of value by which the whole is better united. (Steffens, "Experimentelle Beiträge, etc." Ch. iii.) One will, of course, combine at times the two methods. When certain portions of a piece present special difficulties, these parts will be more deeply impressed by a few special readings. It has also been found that, in memorizing, it is better to read half aloud than entirely to oneself. In memorizing poetry, it should be read with the rhythmic swing of the metre. As to the rate of reading, it has been found that, if one wants to learn a piece so as to be able to repeat it, as soon as he has memorized it, he will save time by reading rapidly. But he will forget it more quickly than if he reads leisurely. Since one generally wants to remember what he has learned for some hours at least, it is better to read through the material at a leisurely rate. Meumann recommends that in the first part of the memorizing, one should read slowly, and more rapidly later on, as the material becomes familiar.

Theory of Memory.—As a psychological process, memory includes three elements: (1) retention, (2) reproduction, (3) recognition. The process of recognition is usually treated more or less as a separate problem, so that the discussion of the theory of memory has centred around the question, how it is possible for ideas to be retained and reproduced. What becomes of the idea after it leaves the present state of consciousness? Does it continue to exist, preserving its own peculiar being, somewhere in the depths of the mind, and reappear when the occasion is propitious? Such was the opinion of the German philosopher and pedagogue Herbart (1776–1841). This would only be possible, if the idea were a substantial being, which rose up from the depths of consciousness whenever the mind became aware of it, disappearing when it was forgotten—a theory more picturesque than true. If the idea is not a substantial entity, it must be a kind of accident—a transient something that continues to exist only in the traces that it leaves in passing. This is the common theory of memory, which takes on many forms, according as the "trace" is located and explained. Descartes located the trace primarily in the bodily organism. In remembering, the soul has

to drive the "animal spirits" hither and thither in the brain, till they encounter the trace of the idea it wishes to recall. But, besides the cerebral traces, there are also, according to Descartes, vestiges left in thought itself. Leibnitz located the trace in the monad of the soul and conceived of it as becoming vanishingly small, but never equal to zero. For others again, the trace is entirely material. Some even go so far as to locate each image in a special ganglion cell of the cortex. On account of its definite character and picturesqueness, this theory has found many popular expositions. But there are facts that seem to make it untenable. For instance, disturbances of vision caused by unilateral lesion in one visual area of the cortex of a dog, wear off after about six weeks. This was explained by supposing that new memory images are deposited in the surrounding area. But it was shown by Loeb, that when dogs are kept in complete darkness after the operation (so that the acquisition of new visual images would be impossible), on being released after a period of six weeks, they are, nevertheless, entirely normal (Loeb, op. cit. infra, xvii).

More recently, it has been maintained (Robertson, "Sur la dynamique du Système nerveux etc.", 438), that the trace is a chemical condition left in the brain by the passing activity of the original impression. This contention is not pure speculation, but is based upon experiments which aim to show that sensory processes are connected with the liberation of acids in the cerebral tissues. This leads to the assumption that "the extent of the memory-trace is proportional to the amount of material transformed in a self-catalysed chemical reaction, that the number of syllables memorized must be connected with the number of repetitions (or time of learning) according to the following function: Log. $n=Kr+b$; where n is the number of syllables memorized, r is the number of repetitions, and k and b are constants (that is, do not vary when n and r vary)" ("Monist", 1909, XIX, 383). The quantity n also corresponds to the amount of substance transformed in the chemical reaction, and r to the time during which it goes on. Calculations based on this equation, compared with observed results, gave very small percentages of error: 0·46 per cent. to 2·5 per cent. Such results seem to indicate that the term "sensory trace" will eventually receive a definite explanation, but they are far from affording us the basis of a complete explanation of memory. The insufficiency lies in the fundamental defect of all materialistic theories. They fall short of that which they start out to explain: the *conscious* processes of memory. It is not sufficient to show that there are cerebral traces. This has long been *a priori* evident, and it is to be supposed that such traces will obey a definite law. Over and above this, a complete theory of memory must show how these cerebral traces recall definite conscious processes. This problem remains unsolved. In our haste to find some solution we must neither deny, with the materialist, the first facts known to us, our conscious processes, nor with the idealist refuse to allow one of the primary deductions from these facts, an external something that gives rise to our sensations. Scholastic philosophy has always recognized the fact of man's dual nature—a fact which must be taken account of in any theory of memory. St. Thomas postulated the existence of physiological traces in the organism. But he also pointed out that there must be some kind of residue of the ideas left in the soul itself. Since the ideas are but acts of intelligence, and not intelligent substances—transient activities of the soul itself—and not complete beings on which the mind turns its gaze, they can only live on, as dynamic traces in the passive intellect, awaiting the time when they will exert their influence on some future process of thought—apparently rising from the depths of consciousness, in the act of memory.

The function of memory is further significant as evidence for the substantial nature of the soul. Since ideas are transient processes, there must be a permanent something in the mind to account for their retention and reappearance; and since they are recognized as ideas that were formerly in consciousness there must be something that identifies them and that consequently persists during their absence from consciousness (see SOUL). The attempt to explain retention by means of psychical dispositions distinct from cerebral traces, is obviously futile unless it postulates a substance of mind in which such dispositions are preserved.

ST. THOMAS AQUINAS, I, Q. lxxviii, a. 4; lxxix, a. vi–vii; *Expositio in librum Aristotelis De Memoria et Reminiscentia;* DUBRAY, *The Theory of Psychical Dispositions, Diss.* (Washington, 1905); LOBSIEN, *Experimentelle Untersuchungen über die Gedächtnissentwickelung bei Schulkindern* in *Zeitschrift für Psychol.* (1902), XXVII, 34–76; LOEB, *Comparative Physiology of the Brain* (New York, 1900); MEUMANN, *Vorlesungen zur Einührung in die experimentelle Pädagogik* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1907); NETSCHAJEFF, *Experimentelle Untersuchungen über die Gedächtnissentwickelung bei Schulkindern* in *Zeitschrift für Psychol.* (1900), XXIV, 321–351; RIBOT, *La Psychologie des Sentiments* (3rd ed., Paris, 1899), ch. xi; ROBERTSON, *Sur la dynamique chimique du système nerveux central* in *Arch. internationales de physiologie* (1908), VI, 388–454; *A Biochemical Conception of the Phenomena of Memory and Sensation* in *The Monist* (1909), XIX, 367–386; STEFFENS, *Experimentelle Beiträge zur Lehre vom ökonomischen Lernen. Diss.* (Göttingen, Leipzig, 1900); TITCHENER, *Affective Memory* in *Philos. Review* (1895), IV, 65–76; WATT, *Experimentelle Beiträge zu einer Theorie des Denkens* in *Archiv. für die Ges. Psychol.* (1905), IV, 289–436.

THOMAS V. MOORE.

Memphis, ancient capital of Egypt; diocese of the province of Arcadia or Heptanomos, suffragan of Oxyrynchus. Memphis was called in Egyptian Mennophir, "the good place". This name, at first reserved to the pyramid of Pharaoh Pepi I (sixth dynasty) afterward passed to the surrounding quarter, then to the whole city. The Egyptian inscriptions give it other names, several of which properly indicate quarters of the city. It is called Aneb or Aneb-u, "the city of the wall" or "of the walls"; Aneb-hadj, "the white wall", an appellation properly signifying the citadel (Herodotus, III, 91); Ha-ka-Ptah, "the dwelling of the person of Ptah", an expression first applied to the temple of Ptah, then to the city and which according to certain authors became in the Greek tongue Αἴγυπτος, Egypt; Kha-nofer, "the good crown"; Khu-to-ui, the "light of the two countries", i. e. of Upper and Lower Egypt; Ha-ka-knum-nuteru, "the house of the worship of the divine architects"; Ma-kha-to-ui, "the balance of the two countries", i. e. the dividing point between Upper and Lower Egypt. Memphis is considered to have been founded by Menes, a native of Thini (Herodotus, II, 99; Diod. Sic., I, 50, 51, 67). It was the capital of several dynasties (third, fourth, sixth, eighth, twenty-fourth). It was after Thebes, says Brugsch, the city "concerning which the epigraphical monuments and the papyri have most to teach us". Memphis is often mentioned in the Bible under the name of Môf or Nôf (Osee, ix, 6; Is., xix, 13; Jer., ii, 16; xlvi, 14, 19; Ezech., xxx, 13, 16). The Prophets predicted in strong terms the destruction of this city, and the prophecies were so well fulfilled that the scholars of the French expedition could scarcely discover the true site of Memphis. Memphis has often, but incorrectly, been identified with the ancient Cairo, the Babylon of Egypt. It is now certain that Memphis extended into the plain where stand the villages of Bedrashen and Mit-Rahinet, on the west bank of the Nile, about twelve and a half miles from Cairo. Its size must have been considerable. In this plain are sometimes exhumed colossal statues like that of Rameses II; but there remains none of the monuments of Memphis unless we except the neighbouring tombs of Saqqarah, where its inhabitants were formerly buried. Linant Pacha recovered the great dike built by the founder Menes to turn aside the course of the Nile; this must be the

great dike of Cocheiche at present utilized. According to Revillout in "Le Nil" (1880), 19, 25, "terrible floods must have buried the great cities of Thebes and Memphis under enormous masses of clay". The great Egyptologist Mariette sees in this destruction of Memphis the verification of the prophetic predictions. "There is no city", he writes, "whose end was so lamentable as that of Memphis. It was formerly the chief of cities, the pride of Egypt. It astonished the world by the number and the magnificence of its buildings. To-day it is not even a ruin. Thus is fulfilled the word of the prophet (Jer., xlvi, 19): "Furnish thyself to go into captivity, thou daughter inhabitant of Egypt, for Memphis shall be made desolate and shall be forsaken and uninhabited" (Mariette, "Voyage en Haute-Egypte", 1878, I, 31).

See in Le Quien, II, 585–88 (Gams, 461) the list of the known bishops of Memphis. John, the first on this list, was one of the opponents of St. Athanasius (Athan., "Apol. de fuga sua"; "Apol. contra Arianos"; "Epist. ad solitarios"; Sozomen, II, xxxi). Antiochus of Memphis took part in the Council of Nicæa. Palladius (Hist. laus., LXXVI) and Rufinus (Vit. Patrum, II, v) state that they saw in the neighbourhood of Memphis and Babylon innumerable multitudes of monks. Some Synaxaria mention for 5 Oct., the holy virgin St. Hierais of Memphis (Delehaye, "Synaxarium Eccles. Constantinop., Propylæa ad Acta Sanctor." 112, 8).

Peter, Martyr of Anghera, *Legatio babylonica* (1577), 434; Le Mascrier, *Description de l'Egypte d'après les mémoires de Maillet* (Paris, 1735), 261 sq.; *Ægypti historiæ compendium* (Oxford, 1789), 199 sq.; *Description de l'Egypte, expédition de l'armée française*, V; Abd-Allatif, *Relation de l'Egypte* (tr. Paris, 1810), 184–94; Brugsch, *Dict. géog. de l'Egypte* (Leipzig, 1879–80); Idem, *Egypt under the Pharaohs* (1881), I, 50; de Rougé, *Géog. ancienne de la Basse-Egypte* (1891), 1–7; *Annales du musée égyptien* (Cairo, 1899), I, 149, 230, 280; II, 97, 240, 244, 285; III, 1, 169, 182; IV, 76, etc.; Maspero, *Mission archéol. institut français*, II, ii, 133; De Vit, *Totius latinitatis onomasticon*, IV (1887), cites all the passages from ancient authors, Greek and Latin, where mention is made of Memphis; Larrivaz in Vig., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Memphis;* Le Quien, *Oriens christ.* (Paris, 1740), II, 585–88; Smith, *Dict. of Greece and Roman Geogr.*, s. v.

S. Salaville.

Mena, Juan de, Spanish poet, b. 1411 at Cordova; d. 1456 at Torrelaguna. Prominent at the court of Juan II of Castile, Mena was for a while the monarch's *secretario de cartas latinas* and then the royal historiographer. In his work as a poet he manifests little originality, and shows to a considerable degree the influence of Italian and classic Latin models; for the impress of the Renaissance is already clear in him. The Dantesque allegory gave form to his poem "La Coronacion", an allegorical vision in which he makes a journey to Parnassus to witness the coronation of his friend, the Marquis of Santillana, as poet and hero. Didactic and allegorizing tendencies are visible in his versified "Siete pecados mortales". Along with a paramount influence of Dante there is noticeable also a considerable influence of the Latin poet Lucan in his poetical masterpiece, the "Laberinto" (also termed Las Trecientas). Here the poet pictures himself as wandering in a forest where he is threatened by wild beasts. A beautiful woman (Providence) appears and offers to guide him and explain the secrets of life. A description of the universe is then given. It consists of three wheels of fate set within a number of circles or spheres. The wheels are those of the past, present, and future. That of the present is in motion, the other two are constantly moving. In these wheels are seen various personages, whom his guide points out to him, expatiating on their characteristics. The machinery is obviously borrowed from the Divine Comedy and especially from the Paradise. Certain passages are genuinely poetical. Of the prose works of Mena there may be mentioned his "Iliada", an arid compendium of the story of Troy, and his pedantic Commentary on his own poem "La Coronacion". His minor lyrics, found in the Cancioneros are of slight importance.

Obras, ed. Sanchez (Madrid, 1804); *Laberinto*, ed. Foulche-Delbosc (Macon, 1904); *Revue Hispanique*, IX, 75 sqq.; Menendez y Pelayo, *Antologia*, V, 165 sqq.

J. D. M. Ford.

Menachery, John. See Trichur, Vicariate Apostolic of.

Menahem. See Manahem.

Menaion (*μηναῖον* from *μήν*, "month") is the name of the twelve books, one for every month, that contain the offices for immovable feasts in the Byzantine rite. As in the West, the Byzantine Calendar consists of two series of offices. First there are the movable days, the days of the ecclesiastical year turning around Easter (*proprium de tempore*); overlying this, as it were, are the feasts of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints that are fixed to certain days of the month of the civil year. The offices for these feasts are contained in the menaia, which therefore correspond to the *proprium sanctorum* in the Roman breviary.

The origin and first compilation of the menaia is obscure. Apparently the various elements that make up the collection were put together gradually. It seems that the Synaxarion (now an extract from the menaia) was composed first. The Synaxarion contains only short accounts of the saints' lives, the history of the feast and so on, like the lessons of the second nocturn in the breviary. These lives of saints are attributed to Symeon Metaphrastes (q. v.). The menaia include the Synaxarion and supply also all the other texts and poems (the Canons with their heirmoi, troparia, stichera, kontakia, and so on) required to complete the office. A great part of these poems are ascribed to Romanos, the chief hymn-writer of the Byzantine Church (fifth century). The menaia do not affect the holy liturgy (which is hardly influenced by the calendar), being used only in the Divine Office. The Byzantine ecclesiastical year begins with September. That month therefore forms the first menaion; there is then one for each month to August. The rules for coincidence of feasts and the manner of saying the office on any day must be sought in the typikon; but extracts from the typikon are printed in the menaia. Each office fills five or six small folio pages, the rubrics being printed in red. The general arrangement is this: first come the verses (stichera) sung at the Hesperinos, then the Biblical lessons with the *prokeimena* and any *troparia* that may be wanted. The Canon sung at the Orthros follows with all its odes and their troparia. The Synaxarion of the feast follows the sixth ode. The psalms and other unchanging matter are not given. They are found in the other books (Triodion, Parakletike, Oktœchos). The churches of the Byzantine rite that do not use Greek liturgically have translations of the menaia with additional offices for their special feasts and any other modifications they may have introduced. The Slavonic name for the book is *mineja*, Arabic *minaiun*, Rumanian *mineiu*. Parts of the menaia were translated into Syriac by the Melchites during the time that they used that language (a list in Charon: "Le Rite byzantin dans les Patriarcats melkites", Rome, 1908, pp. 33–44). The whole has not been translated into Arabic. The Orthodox and Melchites of Egypt and Syria use instead a selection from them called in Greek "*Ανθολόγιον*" (but "minaiun" in Arabic). The "Menology" (*μηνολόγιον*) is either an ecclesiastical calendar or a kind of Synaxarion. The first printed edition of the menaia was made by Andrew and James Spinelli at Venice (1528–1596), and reprinted (1596–1607). The latest Greek editions were published at Venice, in 1873 (Orthodox), and at Rome, in 1888 (Uniate).

Allatius, *De libris eccles. Græcorum* (Paris, 1645 and 1646); Krumbacher, *Gesch. der byzant. Litt.* (Munich, 1897), 658–659; Nilles, *Kalendarium manuale* (2nd ed., Innsbruck, 1896); Malt-

ZEW, *Die Nachtwache . . . der Orth. kath. Kirche* (Berlin, 1892); NEALE, *Hist. of the Holy Eastern Church*, III (London, 1850); Selections from the Russian menaia in English are published by ORLOFF, *The General Menaion* (London, 1899), and *The Ferial Menaion* (London, 1900).

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Ménard, LÉON, writer, b. at Tarrascon, 12 Sept., 1706; d. in Paris, 1 Oct., 1767. When he had completed his humanities under the Jesuits at Lyons, he studied jurisprudence at Toulouse and became counsellor at the Superior Court of Nîmes. From 1744 he was constantly in Paris busied with historical research. His first work concerned the history of his native city and its bishops, and was entitled "Histoire des Evêques de Nîmes" (2 vols., The Hague, 1737). Later he enlarged this work, and between 1750 and 1758 he published at Paris the "Histoire Civile, Ecclésiastique et Littéraire de la ville de Nîmes" in seven volumes with illustrations. An abridgement appeared at Paris in 1790, and one at Nîmes in 3 vols., 1831–33. He also wrote: "Les Amours de Callisthène et de Chariclée", The Hague, 1740, Paris, 1753 (also Paris, 1765, under the title of "Callisthène ou le modèle de l'amour et de l'amitié"); "Mœurs et usages des Grecs" (Lyons, 1743), a widely-read work which became the model of similar productions. In addition he wrote a number of articles for periodicals, especially on detached subjects of the history of France in Roman times. In 1762 the Magistracy of Avignon sent for him and confided to him the task of writing a history of that city. But after two years of work he was constrained by ill-health to leave it unfinished. He was a member of the Académie des Inscriptions, and several other learned bodies.

LE BEAU, *Eloge de Ménard* in *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscript.*, XXXVI.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Ménard, NICOLAS-HUGUES, of the Congregation of St. Maur, b. in Paris, 1585; d. 21 Jan., 1644. His father was private secretary to Catherine de Medici, his mother was a native of Blois. After a liberal education Ménard entered the Order of St. Benedict, 3 Feb., 1607, at St. Denis, and made his religious profession 10 Sept., 1612. In the next year he joined the reform movement of St. Vannes in Verdun which some years later developed into the Congregation of St. Maur; and he became one of its main helps. After some time he was called to Paris, where he soon became a favourite preacher and frequently occupied the principal pulpits. For sixteen years he taught rhetoric at the College of Clugny. By word and deed he sought to induce his fellow religious to unite an exemplary life with love for study especially of Church history and patrology. On account of failing health he was placed by his superiors in the abbey of St. Germain des Prés, where he lived in great seclusion. In his small circle of intimate friends the Jesuit Sirmond stood foremost. Ménard is much praised for his profound learning, his great modesty and his wonderful memory.

Works: "Martyrologium Sanctorum ordinis St. Benedicti", to which he added several biographies and explanatory notes which greatly enhance the value of the work (Paris, 1629); "Concordia regularum, auctore St. Benedicto Anianæ abbate", from a manuscript found in the Abbey of Fleury, which is supplemented by a life of St. Benedict of Aniane (Paris, 1638); "St. Gregorii I Papæ Liber Sacramentorum", from a manuscript Missal of St. Eligius (Paris, 1642). This also appears in the edition of the works of St. Gregory of the year 1705. The commentary on the book is highly praised by Muratori (Dissert. de rebus liturgicis, ch. 6), who states that Tomassi and Mabillon would have preferred the text of Pamelius, but the Maurists, when publishing the notes of Ménard had also to use his text "De unico Dionysio Areopagita Athenarum et Parisiorum episcopo", a defence of the identity of the Areopagite and first Bishop of Paris, written (at first anonymously) against Launoy, in defence of Millet (Paris, 1643); "S. Barnabæ Apostoli (ut fertur) Epistola Catholica, ab antiquis olim ecclesiæ patribus sub ejusdem nomine laudata et usurpata" (Paris, 1645). The Greek text had been found by Sirmond at Rome, and Menard discovered a Latin translation at the Abbey of Corvey.

Kirchenlexicon, s. v.; TASSIN, *Congr. von St. Maur* (Frankfort, 1773), I, 27; *Theologische Quartalschrift*, XV, 391, 421; HURTER, *Nomencl.* (Innsbruck, 1907), III, 1148.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Ménard, RENÉ, missionary, b. at Paris, 1604; d. about 10 Aug., 1661, in what is now Wisconsin. After the usual course of studies he set out from Dieppe in the beginning of May, 1640. Arriving at Quebec he was assigned to work among the Hurons, labouring first, however, among the Nippisriens. After the destruction of the Huron missions he went to Three Rivers, and on 17 May started for the Iroquois country. He was sent to the Cayugas, where for the first two months he was brutally treated, but after that he won the affection of the savages. When the Iroquois missions were interrupted, he again went to Three Rivers, but in 1659 started with 300 Ottowas for the Far West. He was then fifty-five years of age. In all probability the post he endeavoured to establish was at Keweenaw, one hundred leagues west of Sault Ste. Marie. The story of his sufferings there forms one of the most pathetic pages of the "Relations". From Keweenaw he set out to reach the Dacotahs, who, according to a letter written by him in July, 1661, lived three hundred leagues farther on. With him was a single Frenchman, not Guérin the famous "Donné", but an armourer or blacksmith. They became separated in the forests, and Ménard was never heard of again. He was probably murdered at the first rapid of the Menominee.

MÉNARD, *Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland); SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, I (New York, s. d.); ROCHEMONTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle France;* WINSOR, *Narrative and Critical History of America.*

T. J. CAMPBELL.

Menas, SAINT, martyr under Diocletian, about 295. According to the Greek Acts, published with Latin translation in "Analecta Bollandiana", III, 258 (Surius, XI, 241), Menas, a Christian, and an Egyptian by birth, served in the Roman army under the tribune Firmilian. When the army came to Cotyæus in Phrygia, Menas hearing of the impious edicts issued against the Christians by the Emperors, Diocletian and Maximian, left the army, retired to a solitude in the mountains and served God by fasting, vigils, and prayer. During the celebration of a great festival Menas appeared in the midst of the populace in the circus, and fearlessly professed his faith. He was led before the prefect Pyrrhus, cruelly scourged, put to torture, and finally beheaded. His body was brought to Egypt and the martyr was soon invoked in many needs and afflictions. The fame of the miracles wrought, spread far and wide, and thousands of pilgrims came to the grave in the desert of Mareotis between Alexandria and the valley of Natron. For centuries Bumma (Karm-Abum-Abu Mina) was a national sanctuary and grew into a large city with costly temples, a holy well, and baths. A beautiful basilica was erected by the Emperor Arcadius. The cult was spread into other countries, perhaps by travelling merchants who honoured him as their patron. As a result of various vicissitudes, the doctrinal disputes and the conquest of Egypt by the Arabians under Omar in 641, the sanctuary was neglected and ultimately forgotten. During 1905 Mgr C. M. Kaufmann of Frankfort led an expedition into Egypt which made excavations at Bumma. He found in a vast field of ruins, the grave, the well and thermæ, the basilica, the monastery, numerous inscriptions on the

walls imploring aid through the intercession of the saint, and thousands of little water pitchers and oil lamps. The rich finds are partly in the Museum of Alexandria and Cairo, and partly in Frankfort and Berlin. The monsignor published an official report of his expedition in 1908, "La découverte des Sanctuaires de Menas dans le désert de Mareotis". His feast is celebrated on 11 November.

Several saints of the name Menas were highly honoured in the ancient Church about whose identity or diversity much dispute is raised. Delahaye (Anal. Boll., XXIX, 117) comes to the conclusion that Menas of Mareotis, Menas of Cotyæus, and Menas of Constantinople, surnamed *Kallikelados*, are one and the same person, that he was an Egyptian and suffered martyrdom in his native place, that a basilica was built over his grave which became one of the great sanctuaries of Christendom, that churches were built in his honour at Cotyæus and Constantinople, and gave rise to local legends.

QUENTIN, *Les Martyrologes historiques* (Paris, 1908), 271; *Röm. Quartalschr.*, XX, 188; *Pastoralblatt* (St. Louis), XLIV, 41.

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Mencius (Latinized form of Chinese MENG-TZE, i. e. MENG THE SAGE), philosopher, b. 371 or 372 B. C. He was a disciple of the grandson of Confucius, and ranks next to the great master as an expounder of Confucian wisdom. His work, known as the "Book of Mencius", or simply, "Mencius", is one of the four *Shuh*, or books, given the place of honour in Chinese literature after the *King*, or classics. Of Mencius' life only a meagre account has been handed down, and this is so like the story of Confucius in its main outlines, that one is tempted to question its strictly historical character. He is said to have lived to the advanced age of eighty-four years, being thus a contemporary of the great Greek philosophers, Plato and Aristotle. His father died when he was very young. The care of his training was thrown upon his mother, and so well did she fulfil her task that she has been honoured ever since, among the Chinese of all classes, as the pattern of the true mother. After a thorough instruction in the doctrine of Confucius, Mencius was honoured with the position of minister of state to one of the feudal princes, Hsüan. But after some years, seeing that the prince was not disposed to follow his counsels, he resigned his charge, and for years went about from state to state, expounding the principles of Confucius. At last he was kindly received by Prince Hui, and was instrumental in promoting the welfare of his people through his wise measures of reform. After the death of the prince he retired to private life, and spent his last years instructing his disciples, and preparing with them the book that bears his name.

The "Book of Mencius" consists of seven parts or books, and treats of the proper regulation of human conduct from the point of view of society and the state. Religion as a motive of right conduct seems to have concerned him much less than it did Confucius. He is interested in human conduct only in so far as it leads to the highest common weal. One of his recorded sayings runs:—"The people are of the highest importance; the gods come second; the sovereign is of lesser weight." His work abounds in sententious utterances. If we may trust the records, he knew how to speak plainly and strongly. To Prince Hui, whom he found living in careless luxury, while his people were perishing for lack of economic reforms, he said:—"In your kitchen there is fat meat, and in your stables there are sleek horses, while famine sits upon the faces of your people, and men die of hunger in the fields. This is to be a beast and prey on your fellow men." Mencius was a staunch champion of the Confucian principle that human nature tends to what is morally good, and only runs to evil by reason of the perverse influences of external environment. His treatise is one of the most noteworthy attempts to teach morality independently of religion. The "Book of Mencius" is generally accepted as genuine, though the evidence of its Mencian authorship is of a kind that would not be judged sufficient if it fell within the scope of modern historic criticism. In a Chinese history dating from 100 B. C., a short account of Mencius is given, in which he is declared to be the author of the work in seven books that bears his name. There are extant portions of literary works composed as early as 186–178 B. C., containing quotations from the "Book of Mencius". There remains still, somewhat more than a century to bridge over, but the reputation for accuracy of the Chinese annals is taken as a warrant that the work goes back to the days of Mencius and issued from his pen.

A partial acquaintance with the teachings of Mencius was obtained by European scholars through the writings of the Jesuit missionaries to China in the eighteenth century. The "Book of Mencius" was translated into Latin by Stanislaus Julien in the early part of the last century. English readers have ready access to the sayings of Mencius in the admirable edition and version of the "Chinese Classics", by J. Legge.

LEGGE, *The Works of Mencius, Chinese Classics*, II (London, 1861); JULIEN, *Meng Tseu* (Paris, 1829); FABER, *The Mind of Mencius* (Boston, 1882); GILES, *A History of Chinese Literature* (New York, 1901).

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

Mendaña de Neyra, ALVARO DE, a Spanish navigator and explorer, b. in Saragossa, 1541; d. in Santa Cruz, Solomon Islands, 18 October, 1596. Little is known of his early years, but about 1558 he went to Lima upon invitation of his uncle, Lope García de Castro, who was then Viceroy of Peru. At that time the Spaniards were well aware that the Pacific offered an extensive field for exploration and discovery, and García de Castro, wishing to explore that vast region, equipped an expedition of two ships at the head of which he placed his nephew Mendaña. The expedition set out from Callao in November, 1567. In the course of about a year they discovered several islands of Oceanica, and returned to Peru in 1568. Mendaña's travels did not awaken much interest at first, so he gave an elaborate and glowing description of the archipelago to which he gave the name of Solomon Islands, as it was supposed that here King Solomon had obtained the gold with which he had adorned the temple at Jerusalem. These reports of the wealth of the islands, some years later, caused the fitting out of a second expedition for the purpose of colonizing them. By order of Philip II, Mendaña was placed in command, and the expedition sailed 11 April, 1595. Several groups of islands were discovered, among them the Marquesas Islands which he so named in honour of the wife of García de Mendoza, Marquis of Cañete, who was at the time Viceroy of Peru. The explorer Cook, in 1774, gave the name of Nukahiva to this group, that being the native name of the largest island of the archipelago. The expedition continued westward, visiting several other groups of islands, but Mendaña died before he reached the end of the voyage. Before his death, he delegated his powers to his wife in whom he had great confidence and who was with him on the voyage. The widow, a very resolute woman, took charge, and led the expedition into Manila, where they arrived safely in February, 1596. Mendaña left notes describing both of his voyages which were collected after his death by the historian Pedro Guérico de Victoria under the title of "Derrotero de Mendaña de Neyra". The manuscript is now in the National Library in Paris.

Mendaña de Neyra in *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie* (Paris, 1898); *Discovery of the Solomon Islands* in *Scottish Geographical Magazine* (Edinburgh, 1902); *Discovery of the Solomon Islands* in *Publications of the Hakluyt Society* (London, 1901).

VENTURA FUENTES.

Mende, Diocese of (Mimatensis), includes the department of Lozère, in France. Suffragan of Bourges under the old régime, it was re-established by the Concordat of 1801 as a suffragan of Lyons and united with the department of Ardèche. The See of Mende lost this second department in 1822 by the creation of the Diocese of Viviers and became a suffragan of Albi. According to late legends belonging to the Limousin cycle of legends relating to St. Martial, he passed through the territory of the Gabali (Gévaudan) of which Mende is the capital, and appointed as its first bishop, St. Severian his disciple, about the beginning of the first century. (See Limoges.) The first bishop known to history is Saint Privatus, who according to Gregory of Tours, died in a grotto of Mount Mimmat, a victim of the ill treatment he suffered at the time of the invasion of the Alamanni under their King Chrocus. Gregory of Tours places this event about 260; though Fredegarius puts the invasion of Chrocus at 407. Mgr. Duchesne places the invasion of Chrocus and the death of St. Privatus at the beginning of the reign of Constantine, perhaps before the Council of Arles. It is certain that there was an organized church in the country of the Gabali from about 314, since in that year it was represented at the Council of Arles. We do not know the exact date of the episcopate of Saint Firminus whom the church of Mende honours to-day. Other bishops of the Gabali, who doubtless resided at Javoulx, near Mende,were: Saint Hilary, present at the Council of Auvergne in 535, and founder of the monastery of Canourgue, and whose personality has been wrongly described in certain traditions concerning Saint Illier, and St. Frézal of Canourgue (ninth century) assassinated, it is said, under Louis le Débonnaire.

Towards the year 1000 Mende became the seat of the bishopric. Under Venerable Aldebert III (1151–86), Alexander III passed some days at Mende in 1162; Aldebert wrote two works, on the passion and on the miracles of St. Privatus, whose relics were discovered at Mende in 1170. M. Leopold Delisle has shown us the historical interest of these two works of this bishop. Mende had later as bishops, Guillaume Durand (1285–96), the author of "Speculum juris", and of the "Rationale divinorum officiorum", who was secretary of the general council of Lyons in 1270, and his nephew, Durand le Jeune (1296–1328) who, by the act called "Pariage", agreed upon with Philippe le Bel, definitively settled in Gévaudan the respective rights of king and bishop, and who left a work on the general councils and on the reform of abuses. Guillaume de Grimoard, born about 1310 at the castle of Grisac near Mende, was sickly and deformed, but was restored at the prayer of his godfather, St. Elzéar de Sabran, who had come to baptize him. Elected pope in 1362 under the name of Urban V, he administered the Diocese of Mende himself from 1368 to 70, as it had been left vacant by the removal of his nephew to the See of Avignon.

Among the bishops of Mende were: Guillaume de Chanac, who occupied the see but a few months, when he became cardinal in 1371; Pietro Riario (1473–74), nephew of Sixtus IV and a cardinal; Giuliano della Rovere (1478–83) later pope under the name of Julius II; and his nephews, Cardinal Clement della Rovere (1483–1504) and Francesco della Rovere (1504–24); Castellane (1768–92) massacred at Versailles, 9 Sept., 1792.

Urban II visited the Diocese of Mende in 1095 and had consecrated in his presence the church of the monastery of Saint Sauveur de Chirac or of Monastier founded in 1062 and dependent on the Abbey of Saint Victor. Mende was captured for the first time by the Huguenots in 1562; the celebrated adventurer Merle from 1573–81 led into the region bands of Protestants who were masters of Mende for eighteen months, and destroyed a great part of the cathedral that Urban V had caused to be rebuilt. The Diocese of Mende was one of the regions where the insurrection of the Camisards (q. v.) broke out at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Cardinal Dominique de la Rochefoucauld, Archbishop of Rouen, who presided in 1789 over the last assembly of the clergy of France, was born in 1712 at Saint Chély d'Apcher, in the diocese. The chemist Chaptal (1756–1832) was one of the last of those who profited by the scholarships founded by Urban V for twelve young students at Montpellier.

The following saints are specially venerated in the diocese: St. Ilpide, martyr (third century); the preacher St. Veran, Bishop of Cavaillon, a native of Gévaudan (sixth century); St. Lupentius, abbot of the basilica of St. Privatus, beheaded by order of Brunehaut whom he reproached for the irregularities of her life (sixth century); the nun St. Enimie, daughter of Clotaire II and sister of Dagobert (seventh century), foundress of a monastery of Benedictine nuns in the present St. Enimie. The principal pilgrimages of the diocese are: at Mende itself, Notre Dame de Mende where the statue of the Black Virgin was brought, perhaps in 1213, by the Crusaders of Gévaudan, and the hermitage of Saint Privatus; Notre Dame de la Carce, the origin of the city of Marvéjols; Notre Dame de Quézac, a pilgrimage dating from 1052 and where Urban V founded a chapter-house of eight canons, and Our Lady All-powerful, at Langogne. There were in the diocese, before the application of the law of associations of 1901, various teaching orders of brothers and several teaching orders of nuns of a local origin: the Sisters of Christian Unity (L'Union chrétienne), founded in 1696 (mother-house at Mende); the United Sisters of the Holy Family, founded at Palhers in 1750, transferred to Mende in 1824; the Sisters of Christian Doctrine (mother-house at Meyrueis) founded in 1837. The religious congregations in 1900 directed in the diocese fifteen infant schools, one orphan asylum for boys, four orphan asylums for girls, nine hospitals and almshouses, twelve religious houses for the care of those ill at home, and one insane asylum. In 1905 at the end of the régime of the Concordat, the diocese had 128,866 inhabitants, 26 parishes, 191 succursal churches, and 135 vicarages, supported by the state.

Gallia christiana (nova 1715), I, 83–110, 295–6; *instrumenta*, 23–7, 202–3; Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux*, II, 54–5 and 124–6; Pascal, *Gabalum christianum* (Paris, 1853); Charbonnel, *Origine et histoire abrégée de l'église de Mende* (Mende, 1859); Léopold Delisle, *Un manuscrit de la cathédrale de Mende* in *Journal des Savants* (Oct., 1908); Ollier, *Notice historique sur le Gévaudan*, ed. Remize (Mende, 1908); Idem, *Histoire des guerres de religion en Gévaudan aux 16e, 17e et 18e siècles* (Tours, 1886); Chevalier, *Topobibl.*, 1902–3.

Georges Goyau.

Mendel, Mendelism. — Gregor Johann Mendel (the first name was taken on entrance to his order), b. 22 July, 1822, at Heinzendorf near Odrau, in Austrian Silesia; d. 6 January, 1884, at the Augustinian Abbey of St. Thomas, Brünn. His father was a small peasant-farmer, and the pecuniary resources of the family were very meagre, as is shown by the fact that a younger sister of Mendel's voluntarily gave up a large part of her dowry in order that the plans which his family had formed for his education might be carried out. The debt was afterwards repaid, and more than repaid, by Mendel. After a period of study at the school of Leipnik, Mendel distinguished himself so much that his parents made a great effort and sent him to the gymnasium at Troppau, and subsequently, for a year, to Olmütz. At the former place one of his teachers was an Augustinian, and, whether *post* or *propter hoc*, at the end of his period of study at the gymnasium Mendel applied to be admitted as a novice in the Abbey of St. Thomas at Brünn, commonly known as the "Königskloster". This was in 1843, and in 1847 he was ordained priest and seems to have occupied

himself in teaching until 1851, when he was sent, for a two years' course of study in mathematics, physics, and the natural sciences, to the University of Vienna. When this course terminated, in 1853, he returned to his abbey, and was appointed a teacher, principally of physics, in the Realschule. He continued in this position for fifteen years and appears to have been genuinely devoted to teaching and to have gained the reputation of being extraordinarily successful in interesting his pupils in their work. In 1868 he was obliged to relinquish his educational labours on assuming the position of abbot of his monastery, to which office he was then elected.

When appointed to this important post, Mendel, already much engrossed with his biological experiments, hoped that he might have more time for his researches than was possible in the midst of his labours at the Realschule. But this was not to be. The jurisdiction and privileges of the abbey are somewhat extensive, and its abbot must, in ordinary times, find himself with plenty of occupation. Mendel, however, in addition to the multiplicity of his duties as abbot, became involved in a lengthy controversy with the Government which absorbed his attention and embittered the last years of his life. The Government had imposed special taxes on religious houses, and these Mendel refused to pay, alleging that, as all citizens were, or should be, equal in the eye of the law, it was unjust to ask one kind of institution to pay a tax from which another kind was free. At the commencement of the struggle several other monasteries sided with him, but one by one they submitted, until at last Mendel was left alone in his opposition to the tax. Great efforts were made to induce him to yield but he refused, and even allowed the goods of the abbey to be distrained upon rather than submit. In the end—though not till after Mendel's death—the obnoxious tax was repealed. The result of all this strain, as may easily be understood, was a complete cessation in Mendel's scientific work. His appointment as abbot may have been an excellent thing for the monastery, but it cannot be denied that it was a great misfortune for science. The latter years of his life were rendered unhappy, not only by constant strife with the Government, and by the racial controversies which tore that part of Austria at the time in question, but also by constant ill-health due to the chronic nephritis of which he ultimately died. The result of these various troubles was to change that sunny cheerful nature, which had secured Mendel many friends, into a somewhat morose disposition and suspicious attitude of mind. A public monument to his memory was unveiled at Brünn, 2 October, 1910.

Mendel's experiments, on which his fame rests, were commenced while he was still a novice, and carried out in the large gardens attached to his monastery. Dissatisfied with the Darwinian views, then commencing to be known, he undertook a series of experiments on peas which occupied his spare time for eight years. The results of these observations were published in the "Transactions" of the Brünn Natural History Society in 1866, and a further paper on Hieracium appeared in the same periodical in 1869. Two short papers of less importance were published during the period of study at Vienna, and this seems to complete the list of the communications which he gave to the world, with the exception of his annual meteorological records, also published by the same society. It is, however, known that he devoted himself to various lines of investigation, bestowing much labour on the heredity of bees. He collected queen bees of all attainable races, European, Egyptian, and American, and made many crosses between the various races. Unfortunately, the notes which he is known to have made on this subject have completely disappeared, and it is not impossible that he may have destroyed them himself in some of the dark hours which he was called upon to endure during the last years of his life.

The Brünn Society was not a wholly unknown organization, but its Journal was scarcely one which could be expected to give the widest publicity to a new discovery or theory. It is perhaps largely on this account that Mendel's views seemed for a third of a century to have been still-born. Bateson, however, thinks that this would not so long have delayed his recognition, but that "the cause is unquestionably to be found in that neglect of the experimental study of the problem of Species which supervened on the general acceptance of the Darwinian doctrines", and Bateson's opinion, as that of the man who has done more than any other to make Mendel's views known, is worthy of all consideration. Whatever may have been the cause, the fact remains that Mendel's work was unrecognized until, in 1899, three men of science—de Vries in Holland, Correns in Germany, and Tschermak in Austria—almost simultaneously called attention to his publications and started the interest in his line of investigations which has steadily continued to grow and increase since that date. Mendel himself, though grievously disappointed at the neglect of his views, never lost confidence in them, and was wont to exclaim to his friends, "Meine Zeit wird schon kommen". He was abundantly justified in his belief.

It now remains to give some account of the theory put forward by Mendel and the influence of his work during the past ten years. Mendel himself confined his experiments to plants, and his most important observations were made on the garden pea, *Pisum sativum*. Later observers have dealt, not only with a number of other members of the vegetable kingdom, but also with a variety of animals, using that word in the widest possible sense. With the details of their publications it is not possible here to deal, but a short account of Mendel's own work will suffice to show the lines of his theory. He did not, as others had done and have since done, direct his attention to the entire group of characteristics making up the individual, but concentrated his attention on certain pairs of opposed features observable in certain plants. In the case of the pea, he observed that some were tall, some dwarf in habit; some had round seeds, others wrinkled; some had green endosperm, others yellow. For the purpose of his own observations he selected seven such characters and studied their behaviour under hybridization. From what occurred he was led to believe that the progeny of the various crosses behaved in regard to these characters, not in a haphazard manner, but in one which was reducible to the terms of a so-called "Natural Law". One instance given by Bateson will explain what happens: there are tall and short (or "Cupid") sweet peas, and in them we have plants showing a pair of marked and easily recognizable opposite characters. The tall and short forms are crossed with one another, and the seeds collected and sown. The resultant plants will be found to belong entirely to the tall variety, which has apparently wiped out the short. If, however, this generation of seeds is sown and the flowers of the resultant plants be self-fertilized the result is that, when their seeds are sown, and have sprung up into plants, it is found that these are mixed, and mixed in definite proportions, for, on the average, it will be found that there are three tall forms for every one of the short. It follows that the dwarfishness was not wiped out, but that it was temporarily obscured in the second generation, though present all the time potentially. To the character which alone appears in the first cross is given the name *dominant* (in this instance tallness is dominant), and to the hidden character that of *recessive* (dwarfishness, in the example). When the talls and dwarfs of the

third generation are allowed to be self-fertilized, it is found that all the recessives (dwarfs) breed true and, what is more, will go on breeding true as long as uninterfered with. Not so the dominants, which, after self-fertilization, produce both talls and dwarfs. Some of the talls of this generation will breed true and continue to breed true; others will not, but will produce a mixed progeny. Hence, out of the first plants, seventy-five will be talls (dominants), and twenty-five dwarfs (recessives), these last being pure. Of the seventy-five talls, twenty-five will be pure and will go on producing talls; fifty will be mixed, and their progeny will consist of pure dominants, mixed dominants, and recessives, as has been stated above.

Davenport thus enunciates the laws underlying these facts: "Of the two antagonistic peculiarities possessed by two races that are crossed, the hybrid, or mongrel, exhibits only one; and it exhibits it completely, so that the mongrel is not distinguishable as regards this character from one of the parents. Intermediate conditions do not occur. . . . Second: in the formation of the pollen, or egg-cell, the two antagonistic peculiarities are segregated; so that each ripe germ-cell carries either one or the other of these peculiarities, but not both. It is a result of the second law that in the second generation of mongrels each of the two qualities of their grandparents shall crop out on distinct individuals, and that the recessive quality shall appear in twenty-five per cent of the individuals, the remaining seventy-five per cent having the dominant quality. Such recessive individuals, crossed *inter se*, should never produce anything but recessive offspring."

Such, in brief, are the main outlines of Mendel's theory; but in the few years which have elapsed since it first engaged the attention of the scientific world, there has grown up an enormous literature on the subject which has much added to the complexity of the minor developments of the laws above enunciated, and has still more added to the difficulty of the terminology of Mendelism. With these developments it is impossible to deal here: they will be found very fully treated in Bateson's work (see below). It would, however, be negligent to omit all mention of the estimation in which the theory itself is held by men of science of the present day. Bateson claims that "his experiments are worthy to rank with those which laid the foundation of the atomic laws of chemistry"; and Lock, that his discovery was "of an importance little inferior to those of a Newton or a Dalton". Punnett also states that, owing to Mendel's labours, "the position of the biologist of to-day is much the same as that of the chemist a century ago, when Dalton enunciated the law of constant proportions. In either case the keynote has been Discontinuity—the discontinuity of atom and the discontinuity of the variations in living forms". It is a remarkable fact that Mendel's writings never appear to have come under the notice of Charles Darwin, and many have speculated as to the effects which they might probably have exercised on that writer had he made their acquaintance. T. H. Morgan does not hesitate to say that Mendel's laws give the final *coup de grâce* to the doctrine of Natural Selection, and others consider that his views, if finally proved to be correct, will at least demand a profound modification in the theories associated with the name of Darwin.

It would not, however, be by any means correct to suppose that Mendel's views have been received with complete acceptance by the scientific world; indeed there is a sharp, and at times even embittered, controversy between the supporters of Mendel and his opponents, amongst whom the late Professor Weldon may perhaps be considered to have been one of the most important. The end of the controversy is not yet in sight, nor is it likely to be for some time, judging by the extraordinarily varied results which observers have drawn from even identical series of facts. For instance, from the same materials afforded by the colours of thoroughbred horses given in the pages of Weatherby's "General Studbook of Horses", a Mendelian (Mr. Hurst) has deduced evidence in favour of the view which he upholds, and an anti-Mendelian (the late Professor Weldon) has arrived at a diametrically opposite conclusion. This, at least, may safely be said: that Mendel's views have been endorsed by a number—it would probably be safe to say a steadily increasing number—of scientific men; that they seem to be likely to exercise a profound influence on agriculture and on the scientific breeding of horses and stock; and that, with such modifications as farther experience may suggest, the main underlying principles of the work will probably become more and more firmly established.

As above stated the papers in which Mendel's theories were made public are contained in the "Proceedings" of the Brünn Society. They have been made available for English readers by the translation which appears in Bateson's work (see bibliography below).

BATESON, *Mendel's Principles of Heredity* (Cambridge, 1909) (this is the most important work in English, and contains a translation of Mendel's papers and a biography as well as a full account of all recent work on Mendelian lines); PUNNETT, *Mendelism* (Cambridge, 1905), a good brief account of the subject; LOCK, *Recent Progress in the Study of Variation, Heredity and Evolution* (London, 1906); WALSH, *Catholic Churchmen in Science* (Philadelphia, 1906). See also *Royal Society Reports on Evolution*. In BATESON's book, and in KELLOG, *Darwinism To-Day* (New York, 1907), many references to foreign periodical literature on the subject will be found.

B. C. A. WINDLE.

Mendes de Silva, João, better known as Amadeus of Portugal, b. 1420, d. at Milan, 1482, began his religious life in the Hieronymite monastery of Notre-Dame de Guadalupe (Spain), where he spent about ten years. Desirous of joining the Franciscans, he went to Italy, where after some delay he was received into the order and, living in various convents, chiefly at Milan, attracted attention by his virtue and miracles. Under the protection of the Archbishop of Milan, he established the convent of Notre-Dame de la Paix (1469) which became the centre of a Franciscan reform. The minister general of the order, Francesco della Rovere, later pope under the name of Sixtus IV, extended his protection to him. Other foundations were made in Italy, among them one at Rome. Supernatural favours obtained through his intercession aided in the spread of his cult, and the Bollandists testify to the authenticity of the title "Blessed" bestowed on him. He composed a yet unpublished treatise entitled "De revelationibus et prophetiis", two copies of which are mentioned by Nicholas Antonio. The work of another Amadeus, "Homilies on the Blessed Virgin", has been erroneously attributed to him. The convents he founded continued after his death to form a distinct branch of the Franciscans; the friars were called the Amadeans or Amadists, and they had twenty-eight houses in Italy, the chief one, Saint Peter de Montorio, in Rome. Innocent VIII gave them the convent of Saint Genesto near Cartagena in Spain (1493). The successors of Blessed João, Georges de Val-Camonique, Gilles de Montferrat, Jean Allemand, Bonaventura de Cremona, preserved his foundation in its original spirit until Saint Pius V suppressed it along with similar branches of the Franciscan Order uniting them into one great family of Friars Minor Observants (1568).

Acta SS., August, II, 562–606; ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca vetus hispana*, II, 217–18; WADDING, *Annales Minorum*, VI, VII, VIII; HÉLYOT, *Histoire des ordres religieux*, VII, 106–12.

J. M. BESSE.

Méndez and Gualaquiza, Vicariate Apostolic of, established by Leo XIII on 3 February, 1893, in the southern part of the province of Oriente, Ecuador. It depends directly on the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs. The vicar-Apostolic is Mgr Giacomo Costamagna, Salesian, titular Bishop of Colonia, elected, 18 March, 1895. The mission was entrusted to the Salesians, who sent thither three fathers, two scholastics, and one catechist. They were all expelled under the anti-clerical regime in 1895. The province of Oriente is populated almost exclusively by Indians of the Jibaro (q. v.) stock. In the eighteenth century many of the tribes had been converted by the Jesuits, but on the expulsion of the latter in 1767 the missionaries who replaced them failed in the work of evangelization and the natives relapsed into paganism. Oriente is estimated to contain 150,000 Indians.

Wolf, *Geog. y geología del Ecuador* (Leipzig, 1892).

A. A. MacErlean.

Mendíburu, Manuel de, b. at Lima, 29 October, 1805; d. 21 January, 1885. He was educated in the University of S. Marcos del Rimac under the direction of Dr. Javier de Luna Pizarro, and in 1819 was appointed amanuensis of the Consulate. Upon the declaration of Peruvian independence he entered the army as an ensign and was afterwards promoted by General San Martin to the rank of lieutenant. Having been present at the battles of Calana Locucuba, Torata, and Moquegua, captured by the Spaniards, and then set at liberty, he rose to be captain in 1830. A year later he was sent on special commissions to Brazil and thence to Spain. Early in 1834 he became known in politics, and in 1851 was promoted to brigadier general. After serving as prefect of several departments in succession, he was appointed in 1870 director of the School of Arts and Trades at Lima. He also held at various times the portfolios of agriculture, foreign affairs, war, and marine, served several terms as a member of the Chamber of Deputies, became general-in-chief of the army, vice-president of the constitutent Assembly, and diplomatic representative of Peru in Great Britain, Bolivia, and Chile, in which last post he won general esteem by his uprightness and kindness. Mendíburu's monumental work, the "Diccionario historico biografico del Perú", a model of its kind in America, cost him long years of constant labour. It relates the principal achievements of those who did good service to Peru, and is an historical thesaurus of great utility to those engaged in the special study of Peruvian history during the rule of the Incas and in the colonial period. He also reorganized the library and national archives at Lima.

Dicc. Enciclopéd. Hispano-Americano, IX (Barcelona, 1892).

Camillus Crivelli.

Mendicant Friars are members of those religious orders which, originally, by vow of poverty renounced all proprietorship not only individually but also (and in this differing from the monks) in common, relying for support on their own work and on the charity of the faithful. Hence the name of begging friars. There remain from the Middle Ages four great mendicant orders, recognized as such by the Second Council of Lyons, 1274, Sess. 23 (Mansi, XXIV, 96), the Order of Preachers, the Friars Minor, the Carmelites, and the Hermits of St. Augustine. Successively other congregations obtained the privilege of the mendicants. The Council of Trent (Sess. XXV, cap. iii) granted to all the mendicant orders, except the Friars Minor and the Capuchins, the liberty of corporate possession (see Friar). The object of the present article is to outline I, the origin and characteristics of the mendicants; II, the opposition which they encountered.

I. Historical reasons for the origin of the mendicants are obvious. Since the struggle regarding investitures a certain animosity against church property had remained. Arnold of Brescia (q. v.) preached that monks and clerics who possessed property could not be saved. A little later John Valdes founded the "Poor Men of Lyons", soon followed by similar sects. The movement thus started in France and Italy had spread among the poorer classes at the beginning of the thirteenth century and threatened to become dangerous to the Church. By uniting utter poverty to entire subjection towards the Church, St. Francis became with St. Dominic the bulwark of orthodoxy against the new heretics, and the two orders of Friars Minor and Preachers proved themselves a great help both to the inner and to the external life of the Church. Nor was absolute poverty the only characteristic of the new orders. They did not confine themselves to the sanctification of their own members; their maxim was *non sibi soli vivere sed et aliis proficere* (not to live for themselves only, but to serve others). At once contemplative and active, to the complete renunciation of all things they joined the exercise of the apostolic ministry, devoting themselves to the evangelization of the masses, and thus introducing another element into monastic life. A necessary consequence of their close contact with the people, the convents of the mendicants, unlike those of the Benedictines, Cistercians and of the monks generally, were situated in the towns, in which, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, communal life was rapidly developing. Now as Brewer (Monumenta Franciscana I, p. xvii) observes, and his words may be applied to all the mendicants, "it was to this class of the population, in the first instance, that the attention of the Franciscan was directed; in these wretched localities (suburbs of the towns) his convent and order were seated. A glance at the more important will show the general correctness of this statement. In London, York, Warwick, Oxford, Bristol, Lynn and elsewhere, their convents stood in suburbs and abutted on the city walls". The work of the mendicants in the pulpit, in the confessional, in the service of the sick and the socially weak, in the foreign missions, had no parallel in the Middle Ages.

This same apostolical activity had two consequences, which form further characteristics of the mendicant friars, a new organization of claustral life and the adoption of a special means of providing subsistence. The mendicants, unlike the monks, were not bound by a *votum stabilitatis* (vow of permanency) to one convent but enjoyed considerable liberty. Not only might they be called upon to exercise their ministry within the limits of a province, but, with permission of the general, they could be sent all over the world. The form of government itself was rather democratic, as for the most part the superiors were not elected for life and were subject to the General Chapter. From their apostolical ministry the mendicants derived the right of support from all Christian people: *dignus est operarius mercede sua.* (The labourer is worthy of his hire.) It was only just that having left everything in the world in obedience to Christ's counsel (Matt., xix, 21; xvi, 24; Luke, ix, 1–6) in order to devote themselves to the well-being of the people, they should look to the people for their support. And in fact those alms were regarded as the due of their apostolic work. When later the Apostolici (q. v.) tried to live in the same way as the mendicants without doing their work, Salimbene rebuked them indignantly: "They wish to live", he writes, "on the charity of the Christian people, although they do nothing for it, they hear no confessions, they do not preach, nor do they give edification, as do the Friars Minor and the Preachers" (Mon. Ger. Hist. Script. XXXII, 255–57, 259, 264). But provision for the necessities of life was not left to chance. Each convent had its limit or district (*limes, terminus*), in which brothers, generally two and two, made regular visits to solicit alms. This institution still exists in Catholic countries, as in Italy, Spain and some parts of Germany and in the Tyrol, while in

others, even Catholic countries, it is forbidden by law, as in some parts of Austria-Hungary.

II. This new form of conventual life was not introduced without strong opposition. With what feelings the older orders occasionally regarded the rapid spread of the mendicants may be gathered from the bitter words of Matthew of Paris, "Chronica majora, ad an. 1243", ed. Luard, IV, London, 1877, 279, 80; "ad. an. 1246", ibid., 511–17. Still it is well known that St. Francis was indebted to the Benedictines for the "Portiuncula", the first church of his order. The chief opposition came from elsewhere; from the universities and from the bishops and secular clergy. The mendicants did not confine themselves to the sacred ministry, but had almost from the beginning learned members who claimed equality with other doctors at the universities. The Dominicans were the first religious order to introduce the higher studies as a special point in their statutes and if they probably owe their mendicancy to the influence of St. Francis over St. Dominic, the Friars Minor are probably indebted for their higher studies to the influence or at least to the example of the Preachers. On the other hand the Church appreciated the work of the new orders and exempted them from the jurisdiction of the bishops, granting them extensive faculties for preaching and hearing confessions, together with the right of burial in their own churches, rights reserved hitherto to the secular clergy. It should be stated here that this opposition was not inspired merely by envy or other mean motives, but rather from economical reasons. For the parish priests depended in great part for their income on the offerings of the faithful, which threatened to diminish through the great popularity enjoyed by the mendicants. On the whole it might be said that the Church protected the regulars against unjust attacks, while on the other hand she found means to redress abuses, tending to endanger the legitimate interests of the secular clergy. The opposition to the mendicants was particularly strong at the University of Paris, and in France generally, less violent at the University of Oxford and in England. Isolated cases are to be found also in other countries. As early as 1231–32 Gregory IX had to protect the mendicants against the pretensions of some prelates, who wanted the friars to be subject to their jurisdiction like the ordinary faithful. See different forms of the Bull "Nimis iniqua" (Bull. Franc. I, 74–77), repeated by Innocent IV, 1245 (op. cit., 368). Although this Bull speaks in a general way and is addressed to different countries, the abuses enumerated by it were probably of local character.

The first great storm broke out at Paris, where the Dominicans had opened their schools (1229–30) and erected two chairs of theology; the Friars Minor followed them (1231). At first (1252) the opposition was directed against the Dominicans, the university wishing to grant them only one professorship [Denifle, "Chartularium" (see below) I, 226]. The university sought allies and so drew the bishops and the secular clergy into the struggle (Chartularium I, 252), with the result that Innocent IV, at first favourable to the mendicants (Chartularium I, 247), took away their privileges with regard to preaching, confession, and burial rights in the Bull "Etsi animorum", 21 Nov., 1254 (Chartularium I, 1267). This sudden change of attitude towards the mendicants in Innocent IV has not yet been sufficiently explained. The first step of Alexander IV was to suspend the dispositions of his predecessor, Bull "Nec insolitum", 22 Dec., 1254 (Chartularium I, 1276), in which he promised new dispositions and forbade meanwhile to act against the mendicants. In these critical circumstances it was doubly unfortunate that Gerard di Borgo S. Donnino should publish his book "Introductorius in Evangelium æternum" (1254), which, besides many other Joachimite errors, attributed to the mendicants a special vocation, to take the place of the secular clergy in the near future (1260). The answer was not long delayed. William of St. Amour, the leader of the opposition against the mendicants, publicly attacked the treatise in his sermon "Qui amat" (ed. Brown, "Fasciculus rerum expetendarum" . . . London, 1690, II, 51; Guil. a S. Amore, "Opera omnia," Constance, 1632, 491). It has been made evident of late that the professors extracted from Gerard's treatise and from Joachim's "Concordia" the thirty-one propositions, partly falsifying them (Matt. Parisiensis, first ed., VI, London, 1882, 335–39; "Chartularium" I, 272), and denouncing them with the book to Innocent IV. William went farther and wrote his famous treatise against the mendicants, "De periculis novissimorum temporum" ("Opera om.", op. cit., 17–72; Brown, op. cit., II, 18–41, here under a false title). The author starts from II Tim., iii sqq., and sees the fulfillment of those words in the rise of the mendicant friars, who however are not specified, though everybody knew the significance. The whole list of vices enumerated by the apostle is applied to the mendicants, whom William blames on all the points which formed their characteristic note. The danger, he goes on, is at our doors, and it is the duty of the bishops to avert it. In order that those impostors and pseudo-preachers may be the more easily detected, William draws up forty-one signs, by which they are to be recognized. This treatise made an enormous impression.

Alexander IV, however, in the Bull "Quasi lignum vitæ", 14 April, 1255 ("Bull. Franc." II; "Bull. Træd." I, 276; "Chartularium" I, 279), settled the questions at issue between the university and the mendicants, independently of the case of Gerard di Borgo S. Donnino. The pope annulled the statutes of the university against the mendicants, who were authorized to continue their public schools, even with the two chairs of the Dominicans, as a part of the university. On the other hand, the Master General of the Dominicans wrote from Milan, May, 1255, to his brethren to be careful and not to provoke the secular clergy against the order ("Chartularium" I, 289; Reichert, "Monumenta Ord. Frat. Prædicatorum", V, Rome, 1900, 21). At the same time the common interests of the Preachers and Friars Minor inspired the beautiful letter of John of Parma (q. v.) and Humbert of Romans, Milan, May, 1255 (Reichert, op. cit., V, 25; Wadding, "Annals Ord. Min.", III, 380). The professors and students of Paris nevertheless did not accept the Bull "Quasi lignum vitæ": they wrote 2 Oct., 1255, a sharp protest against it (Chartularium I, 292). Alexander IV, 23 Oct., 1255, condemned the "Introductorius in Evangelium æternum" (Denifle, "Archiv. f. Litt. u Kirchengesch.", I, 87 sqq.). Moreover 5 Oct., 1256, he condemned the treatise "De Periculis novissimorum temporum" in the Bull "Romanus Pontifex" (Chartularium I, 531). Reluctantly the university submitted to the orders of the pope. William alone resisted and having been banished from Paris and France, he wrote another attack against mendicants, "Liber de antichristo et eiusdem ministris" (ed. under a false name by Martène-Durand, "Vet. Scriptor. amplissima collectio", IX, Paris, 1733, 1271). This redoubtable attack against the mendicants, conducted by the most famous university, was met by the ablest writers from among the friars. St. Thomas Aquinas wrote "Contra impugnantes Dei cultum"; St. Bonaventure, "Quæstio disputata de paupertate" (Opera omnia, ed. Quaracchi, V, 125), "Apologia pauperum" (VIII, 233), "De tribus quæstionibus" (VIII, 331). Directly against William's "De periculis" another Franciscan, Bertrand of Bayonne, or perhaps Thomas of York, wrote the treatise, "Manus quæ contra omnipotentem" (Chartularium I, 415). John of Peckham, later Archbishop of Canterbury, took part in the controversy with his "De perfectione evangelica", partly ed. by Little in

"Fratris Johannis Pecham . . . tractatus tres de paupertate" (British Society of Franciscan Studies, II, Aberdeen, 1910). The seculars continued the fight, even with popular compositions, of which the best known is the "Roman de la Rose". At the second Council of Lyons new attempts were made against the mendicants, partly because of the rise of other mendicant bodies, some of which were of objectionable form, as the "Apostolici" and the "Friars of the Sack" (*Saccati*) (see Salimbene, "Mon. Germ. Hist. Script.", XXXII, 245 sqq.) All mendicants were abolished, but the four great orders were excepted on account of the manifest good they wrought. Martin IV, "Ad fructus uberes", 13 Dec., 1281, and 10 Jan., 1282 (Bull. Franc., III, 480) extended the privileges of the mendicants with regard to preaching and hearing confessions, a measure which caused much opposition among the bishops and clergy, especially in France. Only in late years have we come to know of the existence of a great transaction on this subject, at Paris, 1290, where Cardinal Gaetano, later on Boniface VIII, skilfully defended the regulars (see bibliography). Boniface VIII revised the legislation regarding the privileges of the mendicants in favour of the clergy. His Bull "Super Cathedram", 18 Feb., 1300 (c. 2 in "Clem.", III, 7; "Extravag. com.", cap. 2, III, 6; "Bull Franc.", IV, 498) is in substance even now in force.

The controversies between the mendicants and the secular priests in England and Ireland took an acrimonious form in the fourteenth century. We have a peculiarly interesting instance of this in the case of Richard Fitzralph, Archbishop of Armagh (q. v.), who preached seven or eight times in London against the mendicants and in nine propositions attacked their poverty and their privileges interfering with parochial rights. Denounced at the papal court of Avignon, he was cited by Innocent VI and defended himself in a treatise, which he read in a public consistory, 8 Nov., 1357, printed under the title "Defensorium Curatorum" in Goldast, "Monarchia S. Romani Imperii . . .", II, Frankfort, 1614, 1391–1410, and in Brown, "Fasciculus rerum", II, 466–487. There is a compendium of the nine propositions in Old English in Howlett, "Monumenta Franciscana", II, 276–77. This curious document might be called a negative exposition of the rule of the Friars Minor. An English Franciscan, Richard Conway, defended the friars against Fitzralph; his treatise is edited by Goldast, op. cit., II, 1410–44. Innocent VI gave a Bull, 1 Oct., 1358, in which he stated that a commission had been named to examine the differences between the Archbishop of Armagh and the mendicants and forbade meanwhile the prelates of England to hinder the four mendicant orders from exercising their rights (Bull. Franc., VI, 316). In the following year a Bull prescribing the observance of the Decretal "Super Cathedram" of Boniface VIII was directed to different bishops of the continent and to the Archbishop of York, 26 Nov., 1359 (Bull. Franc., VI, 322). Towards the end of the fourteenth century the mendicants in England were attacked more fiercely and on a broader scale by the Wicliffites. Wiclif himself, at first, was not on bad terms with the friars; his enmity was confined to the last few years of his life. While Wiclif had only repeated the worn-out arguments against the mendicants, his disciples went much farther and accused them of the lowest vices. Nor did they confine their calumnies to learned treatises, but embodied them in popular poems and songs, mostly English, of which we have many examples in the two volumes published by Wright (see bibliography). The chief place of controversy was Oxford, where the friars were accused even of sedition. On 18 Feb., 1382, the heads of the four mendicant orders wrote a joint letter to John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaster, protesting against the calumnies of the Wicliffites and stating that their chief enemy was Nicholas Hereford, Professor of Holy Scripture, who in a sermon announced that no religious should be admitted to any degree at Oxford. This letter is inserted in Thomas Netter's "Fasciculi Zizaniorum magistri Joh. Wyclif" (ed. Waddington, Rer. Brit. Script., London, 1858, 292–95). There are in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries many other instances of hostility with which the friars, especially the Minorites, were regarded by the University of Oxford. Though the Black Death and the Great Schism had evil effects on their general discipline, the mendicants, thanks to the rise of numerous branches of stricter observance, on the whole flourished until the Reformation. Notwithstanding the heavy losses sustained during that period, the mendicants have nevertheless continued to take their part, and that a considerable one, in the life of the Church down to the present day.

For full bibliography see the several Mendicant Orders. RIPOLL, *Bullarium Ordinis FF. Prædicatorum* (8 vols., Rome, 1729 sqq.); SBARALEA-EUBEL, *Bullarium Franciscanum* (7 vols. Rome, 1759 sqq.); DENIFLE-CHATELAIN, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* (Paris, 1889 sqq.); WRIGHT, *Political Poems and Songs relating to English History* in *Rer. Brit. Script.*, 2 vols. (London, 1859–61); BREWER, *Monumenta Franciscana*, I (London, 1858), II (ed. HOWLETT, London, 1882); LITTLE, *The Grey Friars in Oxford* (London, 1892); BRYCE, *The Scottish Grey Friars*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh, 1909); DENIFLE, *Die Constitutionen des Prediger-Ordens vom Jahre 1228* in *Archiv für Litteratur und Kirchengeschichte*, I (Berlin, 1885), 165–227, cf. V (Freiburg, 1889), 530–64; MORTIER, *Histoire des Maitres Généraux de l'ordre des Frères Prêcheurs*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1903–09); HOLZAPFEL, *Manuale Historiæ Ordinis Fratrum Minorum* (Freiburg, 1909); German ed., ibid.; KOCH, *Die frühesten Niederlassungen der Minoriten im Rheingebiete und ihre Wirkungen auf d. kirch. u. polit. Leben* (Leipzig, 1881); PAULUS, *Welt und Ordensklerus beim Ausgang des XIII. Jahrhunderts im Kampfe um die Pfarr-Rechte* (Essen-Ruhr, 1900); OTT, *Thomas von Aquin und das Mendikantentum* (Freiburg, 1908); WIESEHOFF, *Die Stellung der Bettelorden in den deutschen freien Reichsstädten im Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 1905); FINKE, *Das Pariser Nationalkonzil vom Jahre 1290, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Bonifaz VIII und der Pariser Universität* in *Römische Quartalschrift*, IX (Rome, 1895), 171–82; IDEM, *Aus den Tagen Bonifaz VIII*, III–VII (Münster, 1902), 9–24; MATTIOLI, *Antologia Agostiniana, I, Studio critico sopra Egidio Romano Colonna* (Rome, 1896), 52–64; EUBEL, *Zu den Streitigkeiten bezüglich des jus parochiale im Mittelalter* in *Römische Quartalschrift*, IX (Rome, 1895), 395–405; IDEM, *Die Stellung des Würzburger Pfarrklerus zu den Mendikantenorden während des Mittelalters* in *Passauer theologish-praktischen Monatschrift*, I, 481–94; BERNOUILLI, *Die Kirchengemeinden Basels vor der Reformation* (Basle, 1895); RASHDALL, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, I (Oxford, 1898); SEPPELT, *Der Kampf der Bettelorden an der Universität Paris seit der Mitte des 13. Jahrhunderts*, part I in *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen*, ed. SDRALEK, III (Breslau, 1905), 197–244; part II, *ibid.*, VI (Breslau, 1908), 73–140.

LIVARIUS OLIGER.

Mendieta, JERÓNIMO, Spanish missionary; b. at Vitoria, Spain, 1525; d. in the City of Mexico, 9 May, 1604. While still a youth he took the habit of St. Francis at Bilbao, and arrived in New Spain at the end of June, 1554. Being desirous of helping in the conversion of the Indians, he applied himself with zeal to study the Mexican language, and it is said that, although a natural defect interfered with his speaking Castilian and kept him from preaching to Spaniards, yet, when he mounted the pulpit to address the Indians in their language, he spoke clearly and without stammering. At Tlaxcala he probably had for his father guardian F. Toribio de Motolinia, the last survivor of the first band of twelve Franciscans. He was so highly esteemed in his province that the provincials, Diego de Olarte and Miguel Navarro, took him with them on their visitation of the convents and the Indians, while the entire province, assembled in chapter, judged him capable of selecting at his own individual discretion all the provincial officers, a selection which in the event proved satisfactory to all.

In 1569 Mendieta accompanied Miguel Navarro on his way to the general chapter in France, and while on his journey he remained in his native town, Vitoria. Here he put himself in communication with Juan de Ovando, the distinguished magistrate of the Council of the Inquisition, who had been nominated visitor of the Council of the Indies and was

afterwards its president. Ovando no doubt already knew Mendieta by name, through his letters written from New Spain in 1562 and 1565 to the commissary, Bustamante, and to King Philip II. The questions propounded to Mendieta by Ovando concerned the civil as well as the religious administration, the two being, in consequence of the existing relations between Church and Crown, very closely interwoven; and Mendieta's replies reveal, not merely isolated opinions, but a fairly complete and systematic theory of government. In his view the authority of the Viceroy of New Spain should be increased; that of the *Audiencia* diminished, and limited exclusively to judicial matters. In the administration of justice, except in criminal cases, he would desire separate tribunals for Spaniards and for Indians, particularly in suits concerning the possession of land. As to the question of compulsory Indian labour, in agriculture and mining, he was perplexed. The difficulty was a serious one: if the Indians were not compelled to work, then, perhaps content with their land and what little they obtained from it, they would not assist the Spaniards, and these latter could not by their own unaided efforts provide for themselves and for the other Spaniards who inhabited the cities, nor could they, without the Indians, derive from the mines the profit which they looked for. Lastly, however, Mendieta pointed out that in some cases the Indians voluntarily entered into contracts to work for hire, and that this ought to be wisely encouraged and facilitated. His love of the Indians impelled him to speak unfavourably of the Spanish colonists. He advocated complete separation of the two races in different towns and villages, saying that the Spaniards ought to have only such settlements as might be necessary to secure the country against foreign invasion; and he would have these Spanish settlements situated on the borders of the Chichimecas and the savage tribes, with the sole object of guarding the frontier. The Indians, he said, ought all to be confined to certain towns chosen by themselves, and some of these towns ought to be transferred from their actual sites to others more suitable. To Ovando's inquiry, by what means the friars and the bishops could be made to dwell together in peace, his answer clearly betrays his fiery character and the partiality of his views. He suggests the appointment of two bishops in each diocese, one for the Spaniards and one for the Indians, clearly giving it to be understood, at the same time, that the bishops ought all to be chosen from the religious orders. The secular clergy he treats without either mercy or justice, although it appears from the testimony of Bishop Montufar that at that time they were performing their duties correctly, that they knew the language of the aborigines, and were on good terms with the friars. Mendieta concluded by proposing that a commissary-general of the Indies should be appointed, with residence at Seville, who should arrange all the affairs of his order with the Council of the Indies. This last was the only one of his suggestions which met with approval, the first commissary-general appointed being Francisco de Guzman, in 1572, to whom Mendieta immediately wrote his congratulations.

On 26 June, 1571, his general ordered him back to New Spain, asking permission, as was usual, from the Council of the Indies. Jerónimo de Albornoz, Bishop of Tucuman, a member of the council, opposed the granting of the permission, but these difficulties were overcome in 1573, when Mendieta set out, taking with him several religious of his order. In 1575 and 1576 he was guardian of Xochimilco; in 1580 he was at Tlaltelolco, and in 1585 was superior of the convent of Tlaxcala. Soon after this he accompanied the commissary, Alonso Ponce, on visitations, and by his admirable tact and prudence kept himself out of those troubles which arose within the order from the opposition of the provincial and his partisans to Ponce's execution of his commission. In 1591 he was guardian in Santa Ana of Tlaxcala, and in 1597 of Xochimilco. He was buried in the convent of Mexico.

Having undertaken to write the history of the Indies on his return from Spain, he was delayed in executing the work for twenty-five years by the large number of duties which he had to discharge, and, in addition, the consultations and negotiations with which he was charged by the Government. It is known, for instance, that, while he was guardian at Tlaxcala, he was busy with the work of removing four hundred families of Christian Indians, to colonize among the Chichimecas. Mendieta's principal work is his "Historia Eclesiastica Indiana". The general, Cristobal de Capitefontium, gave him the command to write on 27 June, 1571; the work was not completed until 1596. He sent it immediately to Spain, as he had been ordered to do, and never had any further knowledge of it. No writer later than Torquemada ever quoted it, until, through the exertions of Señor Joaquin Garcia Icazbalceta, the manuscript, acquired at Madrid, was printed in Mexico in 1870. It is divided into five books. The first book, consisting of seventeen chapters and a prologue, treats "Of the introduction of the Gospel and the Christian religion in the islands of Española and the neighbouring regions which were first discovered". The second, containing forty-one chapters and a prologue, tells "Of the rites and customs of the Indians of New Spain and their infidelity". The third, containing sixty chapters and a prologue, treats "Of the manner in which the Faith of Our Lord Jesus Christ was introduced and planted among the Indians of New Spain". The fourth, containing forty-six chapters and a prologue, treats "Of the improvement of the Indians of New Spain and the progress of their conversion." The fifth book is divided into two parts: the first contains fifty-eight chapters, and "There are related the lives of the noble men, apostolic workers of this new conversion, who have ended in peace with a natural death"; the second part, only ten chapters, treats "Of the Friars Minor who have died for the preaching of the Gospel in this New Spain". In this work he displays, without fear or human respect, and even exaggerates at times, the vices, disorders, abuses, tyrannies, and wrongs done by the colonists; he goes so far as to flout the Government, not excepting the sovereign himself. The lofty spirit of rectitude and justice which dominates the work enhances the value of its simple, terse narration, while the vigour and freedom with which it is written, as well as its clarity and propriety of language, render it pleasing to the reader.

MENDIETA, *Historia Eclesiástica Indiana* (Mexico, 1870); ICAZBALCETA, *Obras* (Mexico, 1905); BERISTAIN, *Biblioteca hispano-americana septentrional* (Amecameca, 1883); BETANCOURT, *Menologio franciscano* (Mexico, 1873).

CAMILLUS CRIVELLI.

Mendoza, DIEGO HURTADE DE, a Spanish diplomat and writer, and one of the greatest figures in the history of Spanish politics and letters; b. in Granada, of noble parentage, about 1503; d. in Madrid, 1575. He received his early education under private tutors and later at the University of Salamanca. A powerful personality, he was a man who carried to a successful termination whatever he undertook. He was destined originally for the Church, and acquired much knowledge suited to further his ecclesiastical advancement, both at home, where he learned to speak Arabic fluently, and at Salamanca, where he studied Latin, Greek, philosophy, civil and canon law. But he preferred politics and literature, and attracted the notice of Charles V, who sent him in 1530 as ambassador to the Republic of Venice. In 1543 the emperor sent him as one of his representatives to the Council of Trent, where he successfully sustained the imperial interests. While at the Council he was appointed in 1547 special ambassador to Rome and



ST. DAVID'S CATHEDRAL, ST. DAVID'S, WALES

captain-general of Siena in Tuscany, whence he returned to Spain in 1554.

As a poet Mendoza excelled in both the older Spanish and the new Italian measures, but his specimens of the latter show more richness of thought, and he probably exercised considerable influence in popularizing and securing the triumph of the Italian school of lyric poetry in Spain. In his "Guerra de Granada", published in Lisbon in 1627, he shows himself a master of prose. It was written during his exile at Granada (1568–1571), whither he had been sent by Philip II after some trouble with a noble at court, and is a masterly piece of Spanish prose writing. His "Lazarillo de Tormes" is a work of genius. He is said to have written it while he was at the university or soon after leaving it. It is the autobiography of a boy born on the banks of the Tormes near Salamanca, and its object is to satirize all classes of Spanish society. It is written in rich idiomatic Spanish, and after 1553, when it first appeared, it went through many editions, both in Spain and abroad. Like other books that enjoy great popularity, it led to many imitations.

Just before his death he presented to Philip II for the Escurial library his valuable collection of books and manuscripts including the Arabic ones he had found in Granada, and they remain there to this day. La Biblioteca de Autores Españoles (Madrid, 1848–86) publishes his "Lazarillo" in the third volume, his poems in the thirty-second, and selected works in the twenty-first and thirty-sixth volumes.

TICKNOR, *History of Spanish Literat.* (Boston, 1866); FITZMAURICE-KELLY, *History of Spanish Literat.* (New York, 1906).

VENTURA FUENTES.

Mendoza, FRANCISCO SARMIENTO DE, Spanish canonist and bishop; b. of a noble family at Burgos; d. 1595, at Jaen. He made such progress in his studies at Salamanca that at the age of 21 years he already occupied a professorial chair in canon law. After being auditor for six years at Valladolid, he was appointed auditor of the rota in Rome and held this office for twelve years. In 1574 he became Bishop of Astorga, whence he was transferred to the more important See of Jaen in 1580. He was a model bishop and extremely charitable. He wrote some works on canon law, the best known of which are "Selectarum interpretationum libri VIII" (Rome, 1571, Burgos, 1573, 1575, Antwerp, 1616), and "De redditibus ecclesiasticis" (Rome, 1569, Burgos, 1573, 1575). In the latter, which is dedicated to Pius V, he argues against the famous canonist Martin Azpilcueta, that clerics are not bound in justice, but only in charity, to give to the poor that part of their revenues which is not necessary for their own sustenance. His complete works were published in three volumes (Antwerp, 1616).

ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca Hispana nova* (Madrid, 1783–8), I, 476; SCHULTE, *Die Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des Canonischen Rechtes* (Stuttgart, 1880), I, 729.

MICHAEL OTT.

Mendoza, PEDRO GONZALEZ DE, Cardinal and Primate of Spain, b. at Guadalajara, 3 May, 1428; d. there, 11 January, 1495. He came to the court of King Juan II of Castile in 1450, was made canon of Toledo the same year, and became Bishop of Calahorra on 28 November, 1453, and of Siguenza on 30 October, 1467. On 7 May, 1473, he was created cardinal-deacon with the titular church of S. Maria in Dominica; on 9 May, 1474, he became Archbishop of Seville; on 6 July, 1478, cardinal-priest with the titular church of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme; and finally, on 13 November, 1482, Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain. From 8 July, 1482, to 15 January, 1483, he was also administrator of the Diocese of Osma. In 1473 he was appointed chancellor of King Henry IV of Castile and, after Henry's death in 1474, grand chancellor of Ferdinand and Isabella. In his younger days he lived a life of laxity, but, during the twenty-two years of his chancellorship, he used his great influence for the good of the Church and his country, being one of the few great men of Spain who advocated the cause of Columbus. His great revenues were consumed in the erection of magnificent churches and charitable institutions; at Valladolid he erected at his own expense the College of Santa Cruz for poor students, and at Toledo a hospital of the same name for foundlings. To the latter he bequeathed his entire fortune of 75,000 ducats. On his death-bed he recommended the great Ximenes as his successor.

MEDINA Y MENDOZA, *Vida del cardenal Pedro Gonzalez de Mendoza* in *Memorial histor. Español*, VI (Madrid, 1853), 147–310; SALAZAR DE MENDOZA, *Cronica de el gran cardenal de España, don Pedro Gonçales de Mendoça* (Toledo, 1625); PRESCOTT, *Hist. of the Reign of Ferdinand and Isabella*, passim, especially pt. ii, chap. v

MICHAEL OTT.

Menendes de Aviles, PEDRO. See FLORIDA.

Meneses, OSORIO FRANCISCO, Spanish painter, b. at Seville, 1630; d. probably in the same place, 1705. It is extraordinary that so very little is known of his history. He was not only a pupil of Murillo, but by far the most perfect of his imitators, and undoubtedly many of the works commonly attributed to the master came from the brush of his pupil. We know that he was regarded by Murillo as his friend, that he was an intimate acquaintance of Juan Garzon, with whom he worked, that he was at one time secretary, and later on president of the Academy of Seville, and that while in that city he had a high reputation, not only for his skill, but also for his personal devoutness. This reputation, it is said, was somewhat discounted after his death, because it was considered that some of his copies of Murillo's works were so accurate that he should have signed the master's name. It was in fact suggested that two of his copies had been accepted as genuine works by Murillo. On the other hand, these statements are declared by one Spanish author to have been made only with a view of discrediting Meneses. His principal work was painted for the church of Saint Martin at Madrid, and represents the Prophet Elijah. There is a fine work by him in the museum at Cadiz, and in the museum at Seville, a picture dealing with the Order of St. Francis. A work representing St. Catherine, which is preserved at Cadiz, is said to have been commenced by Murillo. Meneses is stated to have had a special devotion for St. Philip Neri, and to have been buried in the church dedicated to that saint.

QUILLIET, *Dictionnaire des Peintres Espagnols* (Paris, 1816); PALOMINO DE CASTRO Y VELASCO, *El Museo Pictorico y Escala* (Madrid, 1715); MAXWELL, *Annals of the Artists of Spain* (London, 1848); HUARD, *Vie Complète des Peintres Espagnols* (Paris, 1839).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Menevia, DIOCESE OF (MENEVENSIS).—*Menevia* is said to be derived from *Menapia*, the name of an ancient Roman settlement supposed to have existed in Pembrokeshire, or *Hen Meneu* (*vetus rubus*) where St. David was born. From the time of the establishment of the four vicars Apostolic in England, in 1688, Wales belonged to the Vicariate of the Western District. In 1840 it was made a separate vicariate by Gregory XVI: in 1850 the Catholic hierarchy was re-established, and Wales was divided between the Dioceses of Shrewsbury and Newport. In 1895 the principality, with the exception of Glamorganshire was again formed into a separate vicariate Apostolic. Right Rev. Francis Joseph Mostyn, son of Sir Pyers Mostyn, eighth baronet, of Talacre in North Wales, was appointed first vicar Apostolic, his titular see being Ascalon. In 1898 he was transferred to Menevia when the vicariate was made a diocese by Leo XIII. The Bishop of Menevia is the only member of the hierarchy who holds one of the ancient titles of pre-Reformation times. The diocese is under the patronage of Our Lady Help of Christians, St. David, and St. Winefride, patrons of

Wales. It covers 6500 square miles of country, most of which is rugged and mountainous; there are no large towns, so that the Catholic population of some 8500 souls is much scattered in country districts. To meet the spiritual needs of this little flock there are forty-three public churches, chapels, and stations, besides twelve chapels belonging to religious communities. The number of priests (in 1910) is eighty-two, twenty-eight seculars and fifty-four regulars; more than half this number of regulars is accounted for by the monastery of Breton Benedictines, at Caermaria, near Cardigan, the convent of Franciscan Capuchins at Pantasaph, and St. Beuno's College, the theologate of the English Jesuits. These religious, as well as Oblates of Mary Immaculate and Passionists, serve various missions throughout the diocese. There are convents of nine congregations of nuns, the Sisters of the Holy Ghost (White Sisters) having no less than seven. The church of Our Lady of Dolours, Wrexham, serves as pro-cathedral; on 10 August, 1909, a cathedral chapter, consisting of a provost and four canons, was erected.



East Choir, St. David's Cathedral (formerly Catholic), St. David's, Wales

The diocese is rich in relics of the Ages of Faith, thickly strewn as it is with churches once Catholic, but now used for Protestant worship, and with ruins of ancient Catholic sanctuaries and holy wells named after the countless saints of the British Church; most famous of these is the holy well of St. Winefride (q. v.) at Holywell, which is and always has been in Catholic hands. This miraculous well has been a centre of pilgrimage from the earliest days of authentic Welsh history, and the saint still attracts her votaries to the shrine, and dispenses her miraculous favours even in this unbelieving age. The beautiful building which stands over the well was erected towards the close of the fifteenth century. The mission has been served by the Society of Jesus since about 1600. St. Mary's College is a small episcopal college in the town, for the education of boys to supply priests for the diocese; the Welsh language is a prominent feature in the curriculum. The Diocese of Menevia is the restoration of the ancient Catholic Diocese of St. David's, the foundation of which, in the latter half of the sixth century, is traditionally attributed to that saint. The contention of recent historians that there were no territorial bishops in Wales at so early a date, but only monastic bishops without sees, is considered baseless by Dr. Zimmer, no partisan authority. "Though monasticism was strong in it, it did not impart to the (Welsh) Church either its character or its form" (Realencyklopädie, X, 224). The four independent Welsh sees were co-extensive with the four independent principalities that had come into being during the sixth century; Menevia with Dyfed, Llandaff with Gwent, St. Asaph with Powys, Bangor with Gwynedd.

The records of the history of the diocese before Norman times are very fragmentary, consisting of a few chance references in old chronicles, such as "Annales Cambriæ" and "Brut y Tywysogion" (Rolls Series). Originally corresponding with the boundaries of Dyfed (Demetia), St. David's eventually comprised all the country south of the River Dovey and west of the English border, with the exception of the greater part of Glamorganshire, in all some 3500 square miles. Though it was never an archbishopric, it is far from clear when St. David's came definitely under the metropolitan jurisdiction of Canterbury. About 1115, however, Henry I intruded a Norman, Bernard (1115–1147), into the see. Bernard's rule was wise and vigorous; but on the death of Henry he claimed metropolitan jurisdiction over Wales, and presented his suit unsuccessfully before six successive popes. This claim was afterwards revived in the time of Giraldus Cambrensis (q. v.). Among the more famous bishops who held the see before the Reformation may be mentioned Peter de Leia (1176–1203), who began the building of the present cathedral of St. David's; Henry Gower (1328–47); and Edward Vaughan (1509–23), who made considerable additions to the same; the learned John Thorsby (1347–50) afterwards transferred to the Archbishopric of York; Henry Chicheley (q. v.) (1408–14), afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury; and the notorious William Barlow (1536–48), the so-called consecrator of Archbishop Parker in 1559. The last Catholic bishop, Henry Morgan (1554–59), was, like the rest of the Catholic bishops, deprived of his see by Elizabeth, but was saved by death from sharing their imprisonment for the Faith.

The oldest portions of the cathedral, dating from 1180, belong to the period of transition from the Early English to the Decorated style of architecture; the additions of Bishop Gower, including the beautiful stone rood screen, are excellent examples of the Decorated style, while to the north of the cathedral are the ruins of his magnificent episcopal palace. In 1862 a partial restoration of the cathedral was begun by Sir G. G. Scott. The shrine of St. David in the cathedral was a famous place of pilgrimage; it is said that by favour of Callistus II, who canonized the saint, two pilgrimages to St. David's were to be accounted equal to one to Rome:—

> Meneviam pete bis, Roman adire si vis;
> Merces æqua tibi redditur hic et ibi;
> Roma semel, quantum dat bis Menevia, tantum

(ancient lines found at the shrine by Archbishop Peckham, 1240–92).

Catholic Directory (1840–1850; 1895–1910); Foley, *Records of English Province S. J.*, IV (London, 1878), 528 (for Holywell); Bevan, *Diocesan Histories, St. David's* (London, 1888); Jones and Freeman, *History of St. David's* (Oxford, 1856); Baring Gould and Fisher, *Lives of British Saints*, II (London, 1908), 285; Giraldus Cambrensis, *De Jure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiæ* (Rolls Series); Zimmer in *Realencykl. für prot. Theol. und Kirche*, s. vv. *Keltische Kirche in Britannien und Irland; Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. *Gower; Vaughan; Thoresby; Chicheley; Barlow.*

Kenelm Digby Beste.

Mengarini, Gregorio, pioneer missionary of the Flathead tribe (q. v.) and philologist of their language, b. in Rome, 21 July, 1811; d. at Santa Clara, California, 23 September, 1886. He entered the Jesuit novitiate in 1828, when barely seventeen, and later served as instructor in grammar, for which his philological bent particularly fitted him, at Rome, Modena, and Reggio. While studying at the Roman College in 1839, a letter from Bishop Rosati of St. Louis, voicing the appeal of the Flatheads for missionary priests, was read out in the refectory, and Mengarini was at

once moved to volunteer for the work. Ordained in March, 1840, he sailed with Father Cotling, another volunteer, from Leghorn on 23 July, and after a tedious nine weeks' voyage landed at Philadelphia. From Baltimore the missionaries found their way to the University of Georgetown, District of Columbia, and a little later to St. Louis, where it was decided Father Cotling should remain. Mengarini was chosen for the distant mission of the upper Missouri, partly on account of his voice and knowledge of music —possessions of no little value in Indian mission work. On 24 April, 1841, Fathers De Smet, Mengarini, and Point, with the lay brothers Specht, Huett, and Classens, and nine other companions, began the long journey by river and overland trail to Fort Hall, Idaho, then a trading post, where they arrived on the Feast of the Assumption (15 August), and found a party of Flatheads waiting to conduct them to their final destination. It was nearly a month later when they arrived at the chosen site on St. Mary's river, Montana, in the Flathead country, and began the foundations of the log mission, the missionaries themselves leading the work of cutting the frozen earth with axes. The church and house were of logs plastered between with clay, and were thatched with reeds, the rooms being partitioned with curtains of deerskin and thin scraped deerskin being used in lieu of glass for the windows. The winter cold was so intense that the buffalo-skin robes in which they wrapped themselves at night were frozen stiff, and had to be thawed out each morning. To the native of sunny Italy these early winters in Montana mountains were among the most vivid recollections of later years.

The missionaries at once began the study of the language, translating into it simple prayers and hymns. Mengarini composed a Salish grammar which is still the standard for the cognate dialects. He taught the children to sing in Salish hymns of his own composition, and even trained an Indian band for service on feast days. The work progressed until 1849, when, in consequence of the inroads of the Blackfeet and the defection and relapse of a large part of the Flathead tribe under a rival claimant for the chieftainship, it was decided to close the mission, and Mengarini was summoned to join Father Accolti, the superior of the north-western Jesuit missions, in Oregon. About a year later, on request of Archbishop Alemany of San Francisco for Jesuit workers, he was sent to aid in establishing at Santa Clara the Californian mission which was the nucleus of the present college. In the meantime the repentant Flatheads had sent to Oregon to ask for his return. They were told this was impossible as he was then assigned to another station, but on their urgent desire the Flathead mission was re-established at St. Ignatius in 1851. Mengarini remained at Santa Clara for the rest of his life, acting for thirty years as treasurer or vice-president, until a stroke of apoplexy and failing sight caused his retirement from active duties. The hardest trial came when his eyes became too weak to allow him to read Mass. A third stroke of apoplexy ended his life work in his seventy-sixth year.

Mengarini's principal contribution to philology is his "Selish or Flathead Grammar; Grammatica linguæ Selicæ"—published by the Cramoisy Press (New York, 1861) from the third manuscript copy, the first two, laboriously written out by him, having been lost by Indian carelessness or accident. Originally intended solely for the use of the missionaries, it was written in Latin, and he himself always said that the first draft was the most correct. He also furnished vocabularies of the cognate Salishan languages—of Shwoyelpi (Colville), S'chitzui (Cœur d'Alene), and Salish proper (Flathead) in Powell's "Contributions to North American Ethnology", I (Washington, 1877), and of the Santa Clara dialect of California in Powers's "Tribes of California", volume III of the same series, published in the same year. He contributed some linguistic notes in the "Journal of the Anthropological Institute of New York", I (1871–2). His interesting personal memoir, "The Rocky Mountains", published in the Woodstock Letters for 1888, was dictated a few months before his death.

In addition to the memoir just mentioned, consult *Obituary Notice* in *Woodstock Letters*, XVI (Woodstock, Maryland, 1887); Sommervogel, *Bibl. de la C. de J.*, Bibliogr., V (new ed., Brussels and Paris, 1894); Pilling, *Bibliography of the Salishan Languages* in *Bur. Amer. Ethnology* (Washington, 1893); Shea, *Catholic Missions* (New York, 1854).

James Mooney.

Mengs, Anthon Rafael, Bohemian painter, usually regarded as belonging to the Italian or Spanish school, b. at Aussig in Bohemia, 12 March, 1728; d. in Rome, 29 June, 1779. He received his instruction from his father, Ismael Mengs, who went to Dresden while his son was quite young, and in 1741 moved to Rome, where he copied in miniature some works of Raphael for the Elector of Saxony, which were intended for Dresden. From his youth Mengs was an energetic and skilful artist, and he was appointed a painter to the Elector of Saxony before he was sixteen years old, his skill in crayon portraiture having attracted attention in Dresden. He did not, however, feel disposed to accept the position, and declined it with becoming modesty, returning to Rome, devoting himself to his studies, and working with his father for four years. In Rome he married Margarita Quazzi, a poor and virtuous peasant girl who had sat for him as a model. At the same time Mengs became a Catholic, and the marriage took place in the Catholic church. Shortly afterwards he returned again to Dresden with his father, but speedily had a serious difficulty with him, being turned with his wife and daughter into the street. The King of Poland, who was then Elector of Saxony, promptly named him a second time as a painter in ordinary to the Royal household, and employed him to decorate the Catholic church in Dresden. Owing to difficulties in the king's finances, Mengs went again to Rome in 1752, and was there employed by the Duke of Northumberland to make copies of several important pictures by Raphael still in the possession of the present holder of the title, and to be seen at Albury and Alnwick. For many years Mengs supported himself in Rome by various commissions, as all his income from Dresden had been stopped, the Emperor Frederick having driven the King of Poland out of Saxony. It was at this time that Mengs painted a superb fresco on the dome of the church of St. Eusebius in Rome, and another very important work in the Villa Albani. He then went on to Naples, and executed various commissions, painting an important altar-piece for Caserta, and some portraits, but quickly returned to Rome for a short time, and was then pressed to enter the service of the Spanish King, Charles III. He arrived at Madrid in 1761. Here he carried out a very large number of commissions, and was a member, and eventually the director of the Academy of St. Ferdinand. Once more he went back to Rome for the sake of his health, and was employed by Clement XIV in the Vatican. He then returned to Madrid in 1773, and painted "the Apotheosis of Trajan" in the royal palace, and several other pictures for Charles III. Again his health broke down, and he finally returned to Rome, where his wife died. He also died there, and was buried in the church of San Michele, where there is a bronze monument to his memory.

Mengs was a skilful writer, as well as a clever painter, but a man of melancholy disposition, and of strange, stern habits, too sparing in his diet, and given to over-exertion. He was an affectionate father and husband, but somewhat improvident, and had so little faith in his own profession that he refused to allow his children to be educated for it. As a copyist, he had

extraordinary merit, and his original pictures are eclectic in their composition and technique, correct in design, smooth in execution, but somewhat too sweet, and a trifle insipid. As a portrait painter, he had great success, and his works in pastel and crayon are amongst his finest creations. There are many of his paintings in Dresden and Vienna, and in the former city are some excellent miniature portraits and some copies in miniature of paintings by Raphael.

Quilliet, *Dict. des Peintres Espagnols* (Paris, 1816); Palomino de Castro y Velasco, *El Museo Pictorico y Escala* (Madrid, 1715); Stirling-Maxwell, *Annals of the Artists of Spain* (London, 1848); Huard, *Vie Complète des Peintres Espagnols* (Paris, 1839).

George Charles Williamson.

Mennas, Patriarch of Constantinople from 536 to 552. Early in 536 Pope St. Agapetus came to Constantinople on a political mission forced on him by the Gothic king, Theodahad. Anthimus, Archbishop of Trebizond, had just been transferred to Constantinople through the influence of the Empress Theodora, with whose Monophysite leanings he was in sympathy. Agapetus promptly deposed Anthimus and he consecrated Mennas patriarch. Anthimus was deposed partly because his transfer from one see to another was uncanonical, and partly on account of his doubtful orthodoxy. The question next arose whether he should be allowed to return to his old see. Agapetus was preparing to deal with this question when he died. Mennas proceeded with the affair at a synod held in Constantinople the same year, 536, presiding over it, the place of honour on his right hand being assigned to five Italian bishops who represented the Apostolic See. The result was that Anthimus, who failed to appear and vindicate his orthodoxy, was excommunicated together with several of his adherents. In 543 the Emperor Justinian acting with the approval, if not under the prompting of Mennas and the Roman representative, Pelagius, issued his celebrated edict against the teaching of Origen, at the same time directing Mennas to hold a local council to consider the matter. No record of this synod has been preserved, but Hefele demonstrates it to be more than probable that the celebrated Fifteen Anathematisms of Origen, mistakenly ascribed to the Fifth Œcumenical Council, were there promulgated. We now come to the part played by Mennas in the initial stage of the Three Chapters controversy (see Constantinople, Councils of). The first from whom the emperor Justinian demanded subscription to the edict anathematizing the Three Chapters was Mennas. He hesitated, but eventually gave way on the understanding that his subscription should be returned to him if the pope disapproved. Later on he compelled his suffragans to subscribe. Many of them complained to the papal legate Stephen of the constraint put upon them. Stephen broke off communion with Mennas. When Pope Vigilius arrived at Constantinople in 547, he cut Mennas off from Church communion for four months. Mennas retorted by striking the pope's name off the diptychs. When Vigilius issued his "Judicatum", the two were reconciled. In 551 Mennas was again excommunicated. When Vigilius and Justinian came to terms, Mennas once more made his peace with the former, asking pardon for having communicated with those whom the pope had excommunicated. He died in August, 552.

All that is known about Mennas will be found in Hefele, *Councils*, IV (Eng. tr.). The most important of the original sources are the *Acts* of the synod at Constantinople in 536 Hardouin, II, Mansi, VIII, and Facundus, *Pro defensione trium Capitulorum* (*P. L.*, LXVII, *Gallandi*, XI).

F. J. Bacchus.

Mennonites, a Protestant denomination of Europe and America which arose in Switzerland in the sixteenth century and derived its name from Menno Simons, its leader in Holland. Menno Simons was born in 1492 at Witmarsum in Friesland. In 1515 or 1516 he was ordained to the Catholic priesthood and appointed assistant at Pingjum not far from Witmarsum. Later (1532) he was named pastor of his native place, but 12 January, 1536, resigned his charge and became an Anabaptist elder. The rest of his life was devoted to the interests of the new sect which he had joined. Though not an imposing personality he exercised no small influence as a speaker and more particularly as a writer among the more moderate holders of Anabaptist views. His death occurred 13 January, 1559, at Wustenfelde in Holstein. The opinions held by Menno Simons and the Mennonites originated in Switzerland. In 1525 Grebel and Manz founded an Anabaptist community at Zürich. Persecution followed upon the very foundation of the new sect, and was exercised against its members until 1710 in various parts of Switzerland. It was powerless to effect suppression and a few communities exist even at present. About 1620 the Swiss Mennonites split into Amish or Upland Mennonites and Lowland Mennonites. The former differ from the latter in the belief that excommunication dissolves marriage, in their rejection of buttons and of the practice of shaving. During Menno's lifetime his followers in Holland divided (1554) into "Flemings" and "Waterlanders", on account of their divergent views on excommunication. The former subsequently split up into different parties and dwindled into insignificance, not more than three congregations remaining at present in Holland. Division also weakened the "Waterlanders" until in 1811 they united, dropped the name of Mennonites and called themselves "Doopsgezinde" (Baptist persuasion), their present official designation in Holland. Menno founded congregations exclusively in Holland and Northwestern Germany. Mennonite communities existed at an early date, however, in South Germany where they were historically connected with the Swiss movement, and are found at present in other parts of the empire, chiefly in eastern Prussia. The offer of extensive land and the assurance of religious liberty caused a few thousand German Mennonites to emigrate to Southern Russia (1788). This emigration movement continued until 1824, and resulted in the foundation of comparatively important Mennonite colonies. In America the first congregation was founded in 1683 at Germantown, Pennsylvania. Subsequently immigration from Germany, Holland, Switzerland, and since 1870 from Russia, considerably increased the number of the sect in North America. There are twelve different branches in the United States in some of which the membership does not reach 1000. Among the peculiar views of the Mennonites are the following: repudiation of infant baptism, oaths, law-suits, civil office-holding and the bearing of arms. Baptism of adults and the Lord's Supper, in which Jesus Christ is not really present, are retained, but not as sacraments properly so-called. Non-resistance to violence is an important tenet and an extensive use is made of excommunication. All these views, however, are no longer universally held, some Mennonites now accepting secular offices. The polity is congregational, with bishops, elders, and deacons. The aggregate membership of the Mennonites is now usually given as about 250,000; of these there are some 60,000 in Holland; 18,000 in Germany; 70,000 in Russia; 1500 in Switzerland; 20,000 in Canada, and according to Dr. Carroll (Christian Advocate, New York, 27 January, 1910), 55,007 in the United States.

Cramer, *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica*, II and V (The Hague, 1903, sqq.); Carroll, *Religious Forces of the United States* (New York, 1896), 206–220; Wedel, *Geschichte der Mennoniten* (Newton, Kansas, 1900–04); Smith, *The Mennonites of America* (Goshen, Indiana, 1909); Cramer and Horsch in *New Schaff-Herzog Encycl.* s. v. (New York, 1910).

N. A. Weber.

Menochio, Giovanni Stefano, Jesuit Biblical scholar, b. at Padua, 1575; d. in Rome, 4 Feb., 1655.

He entered the Society of Jesus, 25 May, 1594. After the usual years of training and of teaching the classics, he became professor of sacred scripture and then of moral theology at Milan; thereafter began his long life of superiorship. He was successively superior of Cremona, Milan, and Genoa, rector of the Roman College, provincial of the provinces of Milan and Rome, assistant of Italy, and admonitor to the Fathers-General Carafa and Piccolomini. The exegetical work of Menochio is still deservedly famous. His first essay along this line was a politico-Biblical study: "Hieropoliticon, sive Institutiones Politicæ e Sacris Scripturis depromptæ", 956 pages (Lyons, 1625). This book on theocratic politics was dedicated to Cardinal Alessandro Orsini. A second edition (Cologne, 1626) was dedicated to Ferdinand III. The Jesuit poet Sarbiewski made this study the subject of an ode (see "Lyrica", II, n. 18).

The next year there appeared an economic study of the Bible: "Institutiones Œconomicæ ex Sacris Litteris depromptæ", 543 pages (Lyons, 1627). The author translated into Italian these lessons on the care of one's own household; this translation was a posthumous publication: "Economia Christiana", 542 pages (Venice, 1656). The work by which Menochio lives and will live is his "Brevis Explicatio Sensus Litteralis Sacræ Scripturæ optimis quibusque Auctoribus per Epitomen Collecta", 3 vols., 115 pages, 449, 549+29 (Cologne, 1630). Many other editions of this commentary have been published in many lands: Cologne, 1659; Antwerp, 1679; Lyons, 1683, 1697, 1703; the revised editions of Tournemine, S.J., published at Paris, 1719, 1721, 1731; Avignon, 1768; Ghent, 1829; the enlarged and revised editions of Zaccaria, S.J., published at Venice, 1743, 1755, 1761. The *scholia* of Menochio are introduced into the "Biblia Magna" and "Biblia Maxima" of de La Haye; the "Biblia Sacra" of Lucas Brugensis; the "Cursus Script. Sacr." of Migne; fourteen editions of the "Sainte Bible" of Carrière, S.J.; and "La Sainte Bible" of Drioux (Paris, 1873).

The clearness, brevity, and critical acumen of Menochio have won him the praise of friend and foe. The father of modern criticism, Simon, though not at all in sympathy with the orthodoxy of the Jesuit, says: "C'est un des plus judicieux scoliastes que nous ayons tant sur le Vieux que sur le Nouveau Testament" (Hist. Crit. du N. T., xliv). Reusch (Kirchenlex.) prefers the notes of Menochio to those of Sa and Mariana. The method of this great commentator was that of the best Catholic exegetes of to-day; a method which sought to find the literal meaning of Holy Writ in the Bible and the Fathers. Menochio studied the text in its original, and brought to bear upon that study a vast store of knowledge of Jewish antiquities.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de J.*, V, IX.

WALTER DRUM.

Men of Understanding (HOMINES INTELLIGENTIÆ), name assumed by a heretical sect which in 1410–11 was cited before the Inquisition at Brussels. Its leaders were Egidius Cantoris, an illiterate layman, and the Carmelite William of Hildernissen, near Bergen-op-Zoom. The sect was doctrinally related with the earlier Brethren of the Free Spirit. It taught the eventual salvation of all human beings and even of the demons, maintained that the soul of man cannot be defiled by bodily sin, and believed in a mystical state of illumination and union with God so perfect, that it exempted from all subjection to moral and ecclesiastical laws and was an infallible pledge of salvation. Both leaders gloried in the visions with which they claimed to have been favoured. Cantoris in a moment of religious exaltation went so far as to run nude through the streets of Brussels declaring himself the saviour of mankind. About 1410 Peter d'Ailly, Bishop of Cambrai, seems to have taken the first steps towards the suppression of the heresy. William of Hildernissen consented to a retractation, the sincerity of which appeared doubtful. In 1411 a second investigation resulted in another retractation, but also in a sentence compelling William to return permanently to an extra-diocesan Carmelite monastery after three years' detention in one of the episcopal castles. No information has reached us respecting the result of the inquisitorial procedure against the other members of the sect.

FREDERICQ, *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis Neerlandicæ*, I, 267–79 (Ghent, 1889); HAUPT in *Realenc. f. prot. Theol.*, VIII, 311–12; LEA, *History of the Inquisition*, II, 405–06 (New York, 1888).

N. A. WEBER.

Menologium.—Although the word Menologium (in English also written Menology and Menologe) has been in some measure, as we shall see, adopted for Western use, it is originally and in strictness a name describing a particular service-book of the Greek Church. From its derivation the term Menologium (*μηνολόγιον*, from *μήν* "a month") means "month-set", in other words, a book arranged according to the months. Like a good many other liturgical terms, e. g. lectionary (q. v.), the word has been used in several quite distinct senses by writers of authority, and the main purpose of the present notice must be to try to elucidate this confusion.

(1) In the first place Menologium is not unfrequently used as synonymous with Menaion (*μηναῖον*). The Menaia usually in twelve volumes, one to each month, but sometimes bound in three, form an office-book, which in the Greek Church, corresponds, though very roughly, to the *Proprium Sanctorum* of the Breviary. They include all the movable parts of the services connected with the commemoration of saints and in particular the canons sung in the Orthros, the office which corresponds with our Lauds, including the synaxaries, i. e. the historical notices regarding the saints of the day, which are always inserted between the sixth and seventh odes of the canon. The Synaxaries are read in this place very much as the Martyrologium for the day is interpolated in the choral recitation of Prime in the offices of Western Christendom. (2) Secondly and more frequently, the term Menologium is used to denote the bare collection of those historical notices just mentioned, without the odes and the other matter of the canons in which they are inserted. Such a collection, consisting as it does purely of historical matter, bears a considerable resemblance, as will be readily understood, to our Martyrology, although the notices of the saints are for the most part considerably larger and fuller than those found in our Martyrology, while on the other hand the number of entries is smaller. The "Menology of Basil", a work of early date often referred to in connexion with the history of the Greek Offices, is a book of this class. (3) Thirdly, it frequently happens that the tables of scriptural lessons, arranged according to months and saints' days, which are often found at the beginning of manuscripts of the gospels or other lectionaries, are described as menologia. The saints' days are briefly named and the readings indicated beside each; thus the document so designated corresponds much more closely to a calendar than anything else of Western use to which we can compare it. (4) Lastly the word Menologium is very widely applied to the collections of long lives of the saints of the Greek Church, whenever these lives, as commonly happens, are arranged according to months and days of the month. This arrangement has always been a favourite one also in the great Legendaria of the West, and it might be illustrated from the "Acta Sanctorum" or the well-known Lives of the Saints by Surius. The Greek compilers however regard September as the first and August as the last month of the ecclesiastical year.

As for propriety of usage it must be confessed that the question is primarily one of convenience; but on the whole it seems desirable that the term Menologium should be limited to the fourth acceptation among those just given. One of the most important collections of this kind is that made by a writer in the second half of the tenth century known to us as Symeon Metaphrastes. Something more than ten years ago Father Delehaye and Professor Albert Ehrhard working independently succeeded for the first time in correctly grouping together the works which are really attributable to this author, but great uncertainty still remains as to the provenance of his materials, and as to the relation between this collection and certain contracted biographies many of which exist among the manuscripts of our great libraries. The synaxaries, or histories for liturgical use, are nearly all extracted from the older Menologia, but Fr. Delehaye who has given special attention to the study of this class of documents, considers that the authors of these compendia have added, though sparsely, materials of their own, derived from various sources. (See Delehaye in his preface to the "Synaxarium Eccles. Cp.", published as a Propylæum to the "Acta SS." for November, lix–lxvi.)

Menologies in the West.—The fact that the word Martyrology (q. v.) was already consecrated to a liturgical or quasi-liturgical compilation arranged according to months and days, and including only canonized saints and festivals universally received, probably led to the employment of the term Menologium for works of a somewhat analagous character, of private authority, not intended for liturgical use and including the names and *elogia* of persons in repute for sanctity but not in any sense canonized Saints. In most of the religious orders it became the custom to commemorate the memory of their dead brethren specially renowned for holiness or learning. In more than one such order during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the collection of these short eulogistic biographies was printed under the name of Menologium and generally so arranged as to form a selection for each day of the year. Since they were made by private authority which could not pronounce judgment on the sanctity of those so commemorated, the Church prohibited the reading of these compilations as part of the Divine Office; but this did not prevent the formation of such menologies for private use or even the reading of them aloud in the chapter-house or in the refectory. Thus the collection made by the Franciscan Fortunatus Hüber of the abbreviated lives of those of the Friars Minor who had died in the odour of sanctity, printed in 1691 under the title of "Menologium Franciscanum", was evidently intended for public recitation. In lieu of the concluding formula "Et alibi aliorum" etc. of the Roman Martyrology, the compiler suggests (364) as the *ferialis terminatio cuiuscumque diei* the three verses of the Apocalypse (vii, 9–11) beginning: "Post hæc vidi turbam magnam". The earliest printed work of this kind is possibly that which bears the title "Menologium Carmelitanum" compiled by the Carmelite, Saracenus, and printed at Bologna in 1627; but this is not arranged day by day in the order of the ecclesiastical year, and it does not include members of the order yet uncanonized. A year or two later, in 1630, Father Henriquez published at Antwerp his "Menologium Cisterciense". That no general custom then existed of reading the Menology at table appears from his remark: "It would not appear unsuitable if it (the Menologium) were read aloud in public or in chapter or at least in the refectory at the beginning of dinner or supper". Again quite a number of works have been printed under the name Menologium by Fathers of the Society of Jesus, one or other of which it has been and still is the custom of the order to read aloud in the refectory during part of the evening meal. Though Fathers Nuremberg and Nadasi compiled collections of a similar character, they did not bear the name Menologium. The earliest Jesuit compilation which is so styled seems to have been printed in the year 1669. A more elaborate Menologium was that compiled by Father Patrignani in 1730, and great collections were made during the last century by Father de Guilhermy for the production of a series of such menologies, divided according to the groups of provinces of the Society called "Assistencies". The author did not live to complete his task, but the menologies have been published by other hands since his death. The term Menologium is also loosely used for any calendar divided into months, as, for example, the "Anglo-Saxon Menologium" first published by Hickes.

The whole subject of the Greek Menologia has been treated in fullest detail by FATHER DELEHAYE in the *Anal. Bolland.* (1895), 396 sqq., (1897), 311 sqq., (1898), 448 sqq., as well as in the *Synaxarium Constantinopolitanum* which forms the Propylæum of the *Acta SS.* for November. Consult also NILLES, *Calendarium Utriusque Ecclesiæ* (Innsbruck, 1896); MALTZEW, *Das Menologion* (2 vols., Berlin, 1900); KELLNER, *Heortology* (Eng. trans., London, 1908).

HERBERT THURSTON.

Menominee Indians, a considerable tribe of Algonquian linguistic stock, formerly ranging over north-eastern Wisconsin to the west of Menominee River and Green Bay, and now occupying a reservation in Shawano and Oconto counties within the same territory. The name by which they are commonly known (translated *Folles Avoines* by the French) is taken from their term for the wild rice, *menomin*, Lat. *Zizania aquatica*, which grows abundantly in the small lakes, and forms a staple food of the tribes of that region. Before their first contact with the whites the Menominee may have numbered about 3000 souls; in 1909 they were officially reported at 1487. The earliest known explorer among the Menominee was Champlain's interpreter, Jean Nicolet, who visited the tribes about Green Bay in 1634, being probably the first white man within the present State of Wisconsin. In 1640 they are mentioned under the name of *Maroumine* by the Jesuit Le Jeune, as one of the tribes still without missionaries. In the "Relation" for 1657–8 they are spoken of as *Malouminek*, allied with the Noukek and Winnebago and "reaping without sowing" a wild rye considered superior to corn, the first notice of the now well-known wild rice.

In May, 1670, the Jesuit explorer Claude Allouez visited them near the mouth of the Menominee River. They were then greatly reduced by wars, probably with their hereditary enemies, the Sioux. They listened to his teaching and asked him to remain. A small mission, St. Michel, was established, and placed under the jurisdiction of the central Potawatomi mission of St. Francis Xavier on Green Bay. In 1673 the Jesuit Louis André arrived and ministered for several years both to the Menominee and to other tribes, travelling in summer by bark canoe and in winter over the ice. Soon after his arrival he found set up an image of the sun, with a number of net floaters attached, as a sacrifice to the sun for a prosperous fishing season, their exertions having been thus far disappointing. After explaining that the sun was not a god, he persuaded them to allow him to substitute a crucifix. The next morning the fish entered the river in such abundance that the Indians, firmly convinced of the efficacy of his teaching, crowded to be instructed every evening on their return from their fishing. Following up this victory, he induced them to abandon their superstitious dream ceremonies on setting out against the Sioux, although apparently he was unable to prevent the expedition. Among his converts was a principal medicine-man, who claimed the thunder spirit as his special *medicine*, and was accustomed to invoke it with songs and naked

antics during storms. Father André was slow to baptize adults, however, and records how one man thus baptized on fervid assurance of change of heart had called in the medicine-man on his death-bed.

In 1673 Father Marquette visited the Menominee on his way to the Mississippi, and describes in detail their manner of gathering and preparing the wild rice. Three years later Father André's cabin, with all that it contained, was burned by an Indian whose two small children, after one had been baptized, had been killed by an enemy, the grief-stricken father, in Indian fashion, attributing his misfortune to the ceremony.

The Menominee mission grew and flourished until the outbreak of the long war inaugurated by the Foxes against the French (1712), which continued some thirty years, and resulted in the almost complete destruction of the Fox tribe and the ruin of the Wisconsin missions. Close upon this came the seven years' French and Indian War (1754–60); the Pontiac war (1763–4); the Revolution and its Indian aftermath (1775–95); and finally Tippecanoe and the War of 1812 (1811–15). In all of these the Menominee, like the other tribes of the central region, had their part, fighting on the French side until the fall of Quebec and afterwards supporting the English against the United States. In 1817 they made their peace with the United States, and by various subsequent treaties, have disposed of all of their ancient territory excepting their present reservation of about 360 square miles.

Samuel Mazzuchelli

In 1762 the Jesuit missions had been suppressed by the French Government, and "for thirty years there was no priest west of Detroit" (Shea quoting McCabe). Deprived of their teachers and for sixty years compelled to make almost constant war against the advancing whites, a large part of the former mission Indians in all the tribes relapsed into paganism, while still cherishing an affection for their former friends. In 1823 the Ottawa tribe of lower Michigan addressed to Congress two remarkable petitions asking to have Jesuit missionaries again sent among them. No response came, but in 1825 Father J. V. Badin made a tour of the lake tribes, in 1827 Father Dejean visited the Ojibwa at Mackinaw and in 1829 founded the new Ottawa mission at Arbre Croche (Harbor Springs, Michigan), and in 1830 Father Samuel Mazzuchelli established a school and church among the Menominee at Green Bay, for which the Government, in accordance with the policy at that period, made an appropriation. Soon afterwards Father Mazzuchelli extended his labours to the Winnebago. A church for the few white residents had already been begun by Father Gabriel Richard in 1823. Father Mazzuchelli was assisted in the school by two sisters and by Mrs. Rosalie Dousman (1831), who continued in the work for a number of years. Later missionaries of the same period were Fathers Simon Sänderl, Redemptorist, and T. J. Van den Broeck. In 1827 an Episcopal mission was started, but was discontinued in 1838 owing to non-attendance of the Indians. In 1844 Fr. Van den Broeck established a second mission, St. Francis, at Lake Powahegan on the Wolf River, which within a short time had 400 Indians. In 1847 he was succeeded by Father F. J. Bonduel, who added another school, and who in turn was succeeded in 1852 by Fr. Otho Skolla, the first of the Franciscans, to which order the Menominee work has now been confided for nearly two generations. The present mission of St. Michael's, at Keshena, Wisconsin, in charge of Reverend Blase Krake, assisted by two other Franciscan fathers, counts upon its rolls about two-thirds of the tribe, being the whole Christian body. The attached St. Joseph's industrial school, conducted by eleven Sisters of St. Joseph and three Franciscan brothers, is in a prosperous condition. The official reports of Agent Ellis (1847) and Superintendent Murray (1852) exhibit the high appreciation of the civil authorities.

Physically the Menominee are among the finest of the native tribes of America, being well formed, straight, and of a rather light complexion, with manly, intelligent, and mild expression. In their primitive condition they derived their subsistence chiefly from the wild rice, fishing and hunting, wild berries, and the syrup and sugar prepared according to the Indian method from the maple. Wild rice still constitutes an important part of their diet, being boiled with meat and seasoned with syrup. They do but little farming, and devote their chief energies to lumbering. Their houses were formerly circular frameworks covered with bark or mats of rushes, but log houses are now the rule. The art of making pottery has become extinct among the Menominee, but their women still produce basketware, mats of rushes and cedar bark, and beautifully woven bead and porcupine quill work. The primitive weapons were the bow, knife, and hatchet. They had both bark and dugout canoes. Snowshoes were used for winter travel. Their amusements included the ball game (lacrosse), dice, hunt the button, foot races, and several minor dances. Their dead were usually buried in bark coffins, over which was built a roof, with an opening through which food was inserted for the spirit. The corpse, dressed in its best attire, was sometimes placed in a sitting position facing the west, over it being erected a bark shelter on which was carved or painted an inverted figure indicating the totem, or gens, to which the deceased had belonged.

Their mythology and religious belief and ritual closely resembled that of their neighbours, the Ojibwa, centering about Manabush, the "Great Rabbit", or dawn god, and the songs and ceremonies of the secret society of the *Midewiwin* or "Grand Medicine", which still flourishes among the pagan members of the tribe. They had the clan, or gentile, system, with (as now existing) twenty-four gentes grouped into three phratries, the Bear, Big Thunder, and Wolf. In ancient times, it is said, they had twenty-two gentes in five phratries. The members of the same gens were considered near relatives, and were not allowed to intermarry. Descent and inheritance were in the female line. The tribe council included a principal chief, a war chief, and a number of subordinate band or gentile chiefs, and chieftainship was usually hereditary. Among distinguished chiefs have been Thomas Carron, a French Canadian half-breed (d. 1780), his son Tomah (i. e. Thomas, d. 1818); Keshena (Swift Flyer); Oshkosh (Claws; d. 1858); and Niopet (Four-in-a-den), his son and successor elected in 1875.

The literature of the Menominee language, which is distinct from all others of its kindred Algonquian stock, consists chiefly of a series of prayer books and hymn collections by Father Zephyrin (Charles Anthony) Engelhardt, former Franciscan missionary in the tribe; these were issued between 1881 and 1884, the hymn book being printed by the author upon a small hand press. Father Engelhardt is also the author of a collection of Menominee translations of the Gospel, a volume of sermons and instructions, an extended vocabulary and several linguistic treatises

on the language, all still in manuscript. His present successor at the mission, Father Blase Krake of the same order, is also a master of the language, of which he has written a manuscript grammar and dictionary. A vocabulary of some thirty pages accompanies Hoffman's monograph.

HOFFMAN in *Fourth Report of the Bureau of Ethnology*, I (Washington, 1896); COMMISSIONER OF IND. AFFAIRS, *Annual Repts.* (Washington); JENKS, *Wild Rice Gatherers*, ibid., II (Washington, 1900); *Jesuit Relations*, ed. THWAITES (Cleveland), especially vols. XVIII, XLIV, LIV, LV, LVIII, LIX, LX, LXII; PILLING, *Bibliography of Algonquian Languages* in *Bureau of Amer. Ethnology* (Washington, 1891); SHEA, *Catholic Ind. Missions* (New York, 1854); *Wisconsin Hist. Soc. Colls.*, XIV (Madison, 1898); ANON., *Rise and Progress of the Province of St. Joseph of the Capuchin Order in the U. S.* (New York, 1907).

JAMES MOONEY.

Mensa, Mensal Revenue (Lat. *Mensa*, table).—The Latin word *mensa* has for its primitive signification "a table for meals"; it designates by extension the expenses, or better, the necessary resources of sustenance, and generally, all the resources for personal support. He who lives at the expense of another, and at his table, is his "commensal". In ecclesiastical language, the mensa is that portion of the property of a church which is appropriated to defraying the expenses either of the prelate or of the community which serves the church, and is administered at the will of the one or the other. Thus, in a cathedral, to which both the bishop and the chapter belong, the bishop's mensa is distinct from that of the chapter, the former consisting of property the revenues of which are enjoyed by the prelate, the latter by the chapter. The capitular mensa consists chiefly of individual property, for the primitive mensa of the chapter has almost everywhere been divided among the canons, each of whom has his personal share under the designation of a "prebend". Similarly, in the case of abbeys given *in commendam* (cf. c. Edoceri, 21, De rescriptis), the abbatial mensa, which the abbot enjoys, is distinct from the conventual mensa, which is applied to the maintenance of the religious community. The curial mensa, which is of later origin, is of the same nature: the property reserved for the personal maintenance of the parish priest, as distinct from that applied to the expenses of worship or to the support of other clergy, has been regarded as curial mensa. To constitute a mensa in the canonical sense, therefore, it is not enough that a certain portion of church property be appropriated to the maintenance of the clergy (for in that case every benefice would be a mensa, which is untrue); it is necessary that there be a partition made in the property of one particular church so as to appropriate certain property to the maintenance of the prelate or rector, or of the clergy subject to him; it follows, therefore, that the administration of this property belongs to those who enjoy it.

Thus the bishop, the secular abbot, the chapter, the religious community, administer, each within appropriate limits, the property of their respective mensæ, without being liable to any accounting for the employment of its revenues; this is true of the parish priest who has a curial mensa. The other resources of the cathedral or parish church, or monastery, destined for religious worship, pious works, the maintenance of buildings, etc., are subject to the general or special rules for the administration of church property, whether this be done by church committees, trustees, or other administrative organ, or by the rector of the church as sole administrator; in all cases an accounting is due to the bishop and, in general, to the ecclesiastical authorities, for the administration of such property and for the uses to which all the revenues and resources accruing may have been put, whereas no one is accountable for the use of his mensal property. There are, however, some exceptions to this principle. Since mensæ, particularly episcopal mensæ, are legal entities, property and foundations have in the course of centuries often been annexed to them for purposes other than the maintenance of prelates; these properties or foundations may be real "opera pia" or pious works in the canonical sense. In this way some episcopal mensæ control property and houses for the benefit of aged or infirm priests, also for educational and other establishments; to some curial mensæ schools or hospitals are attached, and for these various good works administrative rules may be provided at the time of their foundation. But such cases it is easily seen are later extensions, foreign to the primary and chief aim of the mensæ. Even in respect to these properties the old rule applies, in the sense that they are not common ecclesiastical possessions and are not administered as such, but after the manner of mensal property.

Although appropriated to the maintenance of certain definite persons, mensal property is nevertheless church property, and its administrator is bound to observe the canonical rules concerning it. As to the administration strictly speaking, he must keep the property in good condition and execute all works expedient to that end; in short, he must act like a good head of a household. But he cannot do anything that would infringe upon proprietary rights, for he is not the proprietor: any alienation, or any contract which the law regards as similar to alienation, is forbidden him, excepting under prescribed juridical formalities, under pain of excommunication (Extrav. Ambitiosæ, "De reb. eccl. non alienandis"; see also BENEFICE; PROPERTY, ALIENATION OF CHURCH). The chief of these prescribed formalities is the Apostolic authorization, given either directly or by Indult, and that only when the alienation or similar contract is to the advantage of the Church. For the alienation of mensal property, or for making any similar contract, the bishop is, in particular, bound to safeguard himself with the consent of the chapter (S. C. Concilii, 25 July, 1891).

HISTORY.—Like all ecclesiastical institutions, the mensa has reached its present juridical status as the result of various modifications. In the first ages, all the church property of a diocese formed but one mass connected, like everything else, with the principal, or cathedral church. The administration of it belonged to the bishop alone, who administered it himself or through his *œconomus* or his deacons. The clergy received a portion of the revenues of this property, sometimes fixed (one-fourth in Italy, one-third in Spain; see the collected texts, c. 23–30, C., XII, q. ii; c. 1–3, C., X, q. iii), sometimes left to the equitable decision of the bishop. Soon the churches outside of the episcopal city had distinct administrations of their own, and the wealth appropriated to religious worship or to the support of the clergy was regarded as their property. After the fifth century we find bishops granting to certain clerics church property, by way of "precarium", i. e. property revocable at will, which such clerics used for their own support. So long as the bishop, the abbot, or the rector of the church remained faithfully in residence and discharged his ecclesiastical functions, there was no reason for surrendering to the inferior clergy, or the monks, a part of the ecclesiastical wealth that they might thence draw their support. But when the early Carlovingians, especially Charles Martel, habitually gave abbeys and churches to their companions in arms, and when bishops nominated by royal favour ceased to reside habitually at their sees, there arose a kind of division and opposition between the prelate, abbot, or bishop and the community of monks or clerics, who were on more than one occasion left in want by greedy or negligent superiors. The remedy for this was the institution of mensæ.

To secure what was necessary to the community, the beneficiary was compelled to reserve for its use a sufficient portion of the property of the church or monastery. Thus the superior's administration was made lighter for him, while he could enjoy in peace and quiet

the balance of the property reserved for his own proper use (*indominicatum*); on the other hand the community gained, besides material security, a renovation of religious life, since material privation was inevitably a cause of relaxation of discipline. The Carlovingian reforms, notably those of Louis the Pious, were chiefly responsible for the establishment of mensæ properly imposed and regulated in regard to monasteries; as to cathedrals the mensa was more commonly a benevolent concession on the part of the bishop, who in this way fostered community life (*vita canonica*) among his clergy. This community life becoming more and more rare after the end of the ninth century, each canon received his own share of the mensal revenues—his "prebend". Later on, indeed, the canons often had the separate administration of their respective properties, either as the result of partition or, more particularly, in pursuance of provisions made in the foundation. The mensæ, of whatever character, were legally capable of acquiring additions. It was through them that church property, intended, as before the division, not only for the support of the clergy, but for all religious and charitable works, was re-established.

LESNE, *L'origine des menses dans le temporel des églises et des monastères de France au ix^e siècle* (Paris, 1910); PÖSCHL, *Bischofsgut und Mensa Episcopalis* (2 vols., Bonn, 1908–1909); THOMASSIN, *Vetus et nova disciplina*, pars. III, lib. ii; SÄGMÜLLER, *Lehrbuch des kathol. Kirchenrechts* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1909), 244, 874; TAUNTON, *Law of the Church* (London, 1906), s. v.; see BENEFICE; PROPERTY, ECCLESIASTICAL.

A. BOUDINHON.

Mensing (MENSINGK), JOHN, theologian and celebrated opponent of Luther, b. according to some at Zütphen, Holland, but more probably at Magdeburg, Saxony, date unknown; d. about 1541. In 1495 he entered the Dominican Order and made part of his theological studies in the *studium* of his province. Matriculating at the university of Wittenberg in 1515, he received there in 1517 the licentiate in theology, and the following year received in Frankfort-on-the-Oder the doctorate in theology from the hands of the general of his order. According to the Dominican historian, Quétif, he taught theology in 1514 in the monastery at Ulm, but it is highly improbable that Mensing, belonging to the province of Saxony, should act as professor in another province which had no *studium generale* of its own. He lived at a time when controversy was rife, when men, abandoning beaten paths, began to set up systems of their own. The heretical teachings of the reformers spread rapidly throughout Germany. No province seemed exempt from the invasions of Luther's emissaries. To prevent these doctrinal innovations from gaining a foothold in his province, Mensing zealously entered into all the controversies with the sectaries. From 1522 to 1524 he occupied the pulpit in the cathedral of Magdeburg, where he also composed his first apologetic works on the Sacrifice of the Mass. Notwithstanding his efforts, the boldness of the enemy forced him to leave and seek other fields of labour. Upon the invitation of the Princess Margaretha von Anhalt, who ruled during the minority of her sons, he proceeded to Dessau to support her in her efforts against heresy in her territory. In 1529 he was professor in the University of Frankfort-on-the-Oder and preacher in the cathedral. The following year he attended, as theologian to the Elector Joachim von Anhalt, the Diet of Augsburg, and secured from Charles V a renewal of the letter of protection for the Dominican Order in Germany which Charles IV had granted them in 1355 and 1359. In 1534 he was elected provincial of his own province, but before the termination of his office Paul III made him suffragan Bishop of Halberstadt. In 1540 and 1541 he attended the theological conferences of Worms and Ratisbon, where with Eck, the vice-chancellor of the University of Ingolstadt, and Pelargus, he took a leading part in the deliberations. His vast theological knowledge and remarkable command of the German language made him one of the foremost controversialists of the first half of the sixteenth century. A complete list of his works, all of which bear a polemical tinge, is given by Streber in the "Kirchenlexikon".

QUÉTIF-ECHARD, *SS. Ord. Præd.*, II, 84; PAULUS, *Die deutschen Dominikaner im Kampfe gegen Luther* (Freiburg, 1903), 16–45; PAULUS, *Katholik* (1893), II, 21–36, 120–139.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

Mental Reservation, the name applied to a doctrine which has grown out of the common Catholic teaching about lying (q. v.) and which is its complement. According to the common Catholic teaching it is never allowable to tell a lie, not even to save human life. A lie is something intrinsically evil, and as evil may not be done that good may come of it, we are never allowed to tell a lie. However, we are also under an obligation to keep secrets faithfully, and sometimes the easiest way of fulfilling that duty is to say what is false, or to tell a lie. Writers of all creeds and of none, both ancient and modern, have frankly accepted this position. They admit the doctrine of the lie of necessity, and maintain that when there is a conflict between justice and veracity it is justice that should prevail. The common Catholic teaching has formulated the theory of mental reservation as a means by which the claims of both justice and veracity can be satisfied. The doctrine was broached tentatively and with great diffidence by St. Raymund of Pennafort, the first writer on casuistry. In his "Summa" (1235) St. Raymund quotes the saying of St. Augustine that a man must not slay his own soul by lying in order to preserve the life of another, and that it would be a most perilous doctrine to admit that we may do a less evil to prevent another doing a greater. And most doctors teach this, he says, though he allows that others teach that a lie should be told when a man's life is at stake. Then he adds: "I believe, as at present advised, that when one is asked by murderers bent on taking the life of someone hiding in the house whether he is in, no answer should be given; and if this betrays him, his death will be imputable to the murderers, not to the other's silence. Or he may use an equivocal expression, and say 'He is not at home', or something like that. And this can be defended by a great number of instances found in the Old Testament. Or he may say simply that he is not there, and if his conscience tells him that he ought to say that, then he will not speak against his conscience, nor will he sin. Nor is St. Augustine really opposed to any of these methods." Such expressions as, "He is not at home", were called equivocations, or amphibologies, and when there was good reason for using them their lawfulness was admitted by all. If the person inquired for was really at home, but did not wish to see the visitor, the meaning of the phrase, "He is not at home", was restricted by the mind of the speaker to this sense, "He is not at home for you, or to see you". Hence, equivocations and amphibologies came to be called mental restrictions or reservations. It was commonly admitted that an equivocal expression need not necessarily be used when the words of the speaker receive a special meaning from the circumstances in which he is placed, or from the position which he holds. Thus, if a confessor is asked about sins made known to him in confession, he should answer: "I do not know", and such words as those when used by a priest mean: "I do not know apart from confession", or "I do not know as man", or "I have no knowledge of the matter which I can communicate". All Catholic writers were, and are, agreed that when there is good reason, such expressions as the above may be made use of, and that they are not lies. Those who hear them may understand them in a sense which is not true, but their self-deception may be permitted by the speaker for a good reason. If there is no good reason to the contrary, veracity requires all to speak frankly and openly in

such a way as to be understood by those who are addressed. A sin is committed if mental reservations are used without just cause, or in cases in which the questioner has a right to the naked truth. In the sixteenth century a further development of this commonly received doctrine began to be admitted even by some theologians of note. We shall probably not be far wrong if we attribute the change to the very difficult political circumstances of the time due to the wars of religion. Martin Aspilcueta, the "Doctor Navarrus", as he was called, was one of the first to develop the new doctrine. He was nearing the end of a long life, and was regarded as the foremost authority then living on canon law and moral theology, when he was consulted on a case of conscience by the Fathers of the Jesuit college at Valladolid. The case sent to him for solution was drawn up in these terms: "Titius, who privately said to a woman, 'I take thee for my wife', without the intention of marrying her, answered the judge who asked him whether he had said those words, that he did not say them, understanding mentally that he did not say them with the intention of marrying the woman." Navarrus was asked whether Titius told a lie, whether he had committed perjury, or whether he committed any sin at all. He drew up an elaborate opinion on the case and dedicated it to the reigning pontiff, Gregory XIII. Navarrus maintained that Titius neither lied, nor committed perjury, nor any sin whatever, on the supposition that he had a good reason for answering as he did. This theory became known as the doctrine of strict mental reservation, to distinguish it from wide mental reservation with which we have thus far been occupied. In the strict mental reservation the speaker mentally adds some qualification to the words which he utters, and the words together with the mental qualification make a true assertion in accordance with fact. On the other hand, in a wide mental reservation, the qualification comes from the ambiguity of the words themselves, or from the circumstances of time, place, or person, in which they are uttered. The opinion of Navarrus was received as probable by such contemporary theologians of different schools as Salon, Sayers, Suarez, and Lessius. The Jesuit theologian Sanchez formulated it in clear and distinct terms, and added the weight of his authority on the side of its defenders. Laymann, however, another Jesuit theologian of equal or greater weight, rejected the doctrine, as did Azor, S.J., the Dominican Soto and others. Laymann shows at considerable length that such reservations are lies. For that man tells a lie who makes use of words which are false with the intention of deceiving another. And this is what is done when a strict mental reservation is made use of. The words uttered do not express the truth as known to the speaker. They are at variance with it and therefore they constitute a lie. The opinion of Navarrus was freely debated in the schools for some years, and it was acted upon by some of the Catholic confessors of the Faith in England in the difficult circumstances in which they were frequently placed. It was, however, condemned as formulated by Sanchez by Innocent XI on 2 March, 1679 (propositions xxvi, xxvii). After this condemnation by the Holy See no Catholic theologian has defended the lawfulness of strict mental reservations.

St. Raymund, *Summa de Pœnitentia* (Rome, 1603); Aspilcueta, *Opera omnia* (Venice, 1618); Sanchez, *In Decalogum* (Antwerp, 1631); Laymann, *Theologia moralis* (Munich, 1634); Slater, *Manual of Moral Theology*, I (New York, 1908).

T. Slater.

Mentelin (Mentel), Johannes, b. c. 1410; d. 12 Dec., 1478; an eminent German typographer of the fifteenth century, and the first printer and bookseller at Strasburg (Alsace). He belonged to a respected family at Schlettstadt. After 1447 he was a "goldschreiber" (illuminator) at Strasburg, where he became a burgess and member of the painters' and goldsmiths' guilds. It was as an illuminator that he became connected with printing; and he received his printer's training at Mainz; he began printing at Strasburg before 1460. His establishment at once developed great activity; in a few years it produced quite a number of immense folio volumes with a masterly finish. He also procured the sale of his prints by means of printed catalogues. These "publisher's catalogues" have proved a very valuable means of identifying and ascertaining facts about Mentelin's prints, because he usually appended neither name, place nor date to his works. His type is nearly always conspicuous as being a simplified Gothic round-hand (the minuscule used in the books of the period). Though they cannot compare either in design or technical finish with those of Gutenberg and Schöffer, they are not without some original features especially in the capital letters, which occur both in flourishing Gothic and in the simple Roman lapidary style. Of his larger printed works, about 30 in number, including at least 35 large folio volumes, the following are the most conspicuous: the Latin edition of the Bible of 1460, and 1463; the German Bible, about 1466; also the first editions of the writings of St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, Aristotle, Isidore, and the "Canon" of Avicenna. The business was carried on by his son-in-law Adolf Rusch, and afterwards by Johann Prüss. Although Mentelin cannot be reckoned the inventor of the art of printing books, as his grandson Johann Schott claimed in 1521, he was nevertheless one of the most skilful of the early typographers.

Schmidt, *Gesch. der ältest. Bibliotheken und der ersten Buchdrucker zu Strassburg* (1882); *Allg. deutsch. Biog.*, XXI (Leipzig, 1885).

Heinrich Wilh. Wallau.

Menzini, Benedetto; priest and poet, b. at Florence, 1646; d. at Rome, 7 Sept., 1704. His family being poor, he early gave himself up to teaching, becoming a professor of belles-lettres at Florence and at Prato. He was already in Holy Orders. In 1681 he failed to obtain the chair of rhetoric in the University of Pisa partly because of the jealousy of other clerics, and partly because of the acrimony constantly shown by him in his words and acts. In 1685 he went to Rome and enjoyed the favour of Queen Christina of Sweden, until her death in 1689. Pope Innocent XII then gave him a canonry, and appointed him to a chair of rhetoric in one of the institutions of the city of Rome. Following the models provided by the poems of Chiabrera and Testi, Menzini wrote his Pindaric "Canzoni eroiche e morali" (1674–80). These observe the Greek division—strophe, antistrophe, and epode, and deal with subjects that were also engaging the attention of the contemporary poet Filicaja, e. g., the freeing of Venice, the taking of Budapest. Some seventeen of his elegies treat of matters of various interest. The poem "Il Paradiso terrestre" is almost a continuation of the "Mondo creato" of Tasso, Menzini's favourite poet. In the "Academia Tusculana", in mingled prose and verse, he introduces leading spirits of the time, who discuss subjects of many sorts. The pastoral note was struck by him with no little success in his "Sonetti pastorali", and in his "Canzonette anacreontiche" he produced a number of graceful little lyrics. Perhaps the most famous work of Menzini is his satires, some thirteen in number, in which he assails in acrid terms the hypocrisy prevailing in Tuscany in the last years of the Medici rule. In like fashion he lashes in his "Arte poetica" the artificiality and the uncouthness of the versifiers of his time.

Opere (4 vols., Florence, 1731); *Satire* (Amsterdam, 1728) and *Borghini*, III (1876); Paolucci, *Vita di Benedetto Menzini* (Florence, 1732); Magrini, *Studio critico su Benedetto Menzini* (Naples, 1885); Tonchini, *Benedetto Menzini e le sue opere* (Cairo, 1893). For more recent edition of his work see *Satire, rime e lettere scelte di Benedetto Menzini* (Florence, 1874).

J. D. M. Ford.

Mercadé, EUSTACHE, French dramatic poet of the fifteenth century. The dates of his birth and death are not known. In 1414 he was official of the Abbey of Corbie near Amiens. According to a document that has been discovered quite recently, he was removed from his office in 1427 but was reinstated in 1437, in accordance with a decision of the court of the Châtelet which was ratified by the Parliament of Paris on 2 May, 1439. Martin Franc, or "le Franc", who wrote in the middle of the fifteenth century, mentions Mercadé as one of the most famous "rhetoricians" of the time. In the "Mystery" that he composed, the author is mentioned on the back of the last but one sheet: Ustasse Mercade, Docteur en decret, Bachelier en théologie, Official de Corbie. The complete title of the Mystery to which he has attached his name is: "La Vie, la Passion et la Vengeance de Jésus Christ." It is kept in the library of Arras under No. 625; the last part only, or the Vengeance, should be considered as the work of Mercadé. It contains 312 characters, of whom 112 have a speaking part.

PETIT DE JULLEVILLE, *Les Mystères* (Paris, 1880); CREIZENACH, *Geschichte des neuern Dramas* (Halle, 1893); *Mémoires des Antiquaires de Picardie*, VIII.

P. J. MARIQUE.

Mercator, MARIUS. See MARIUS MERCATOR.

Mercedarians (ORDER OF OUR LADY OF MERCY), a congregation of men founded in 1218 by St. Peter Nolasco, b. 1189, at Mas-des-Saintes-Puelles, Department of Aude, France. Joining Simon de Montfort's army, then attacking the Albigenses, he was appointed tutor to the young king, James of Aragon, who had succeeded to the throne after the death of his father, Pedro II, killed at the battle of Muret. Peter Nolasco followed his pupil to his capital, Barcelona, in 1215. From the year 1192 certain noblemen of that city had formed a confraternity for the purpose of caring for the sick in the hospitals, and also for rescuing Christian captives from the Moors. Peter Nolasco was requested by the Blessed Virgin in a vision to found a religious order especially devoted to the ransom of captives. His confessor, St. Raymond of Pennafort, then canon of Barcelona, encouraged and assisted him in this project; and King James also extended his protection. The noblemen already referred to were the first monks of the order, and their headquarters was the convent of St. Eulalie of Barcelona, erected 1232. They had both religious in holy orders, and lay monks or knights; the choir monks were clothed in tunic, scapular, and cape of white. These religious followed the rule drawn up for them by St. Raymond of Pennafort. The order was approved, first by Honorius III and then by Gregory IX (1230), the latter, at the request of St. Raymond Nonnatus presented by St. Peter Nolasco, granted a Bull of confirmation and prescribed the Rule of St. Augustine, the former rule now forming the constitutions (1235). St. Peter was the first superior, with the title of Commander-General; he also filled the office of Ransomer, a title given to the monk sent into the lands subject to the Moors to arrange for the ransom of prisoners. The holy founder died in 1256, seven years after having resigned his superiorship; he was succeeded by Guillaume Le Bas.

The development of the order was immediate and widespread throughout France, England, Germany, Portugal, and Spain. As the Moors were driven back, new convents of Mercy were established. Houses were founded at Montpellier, Perpignan, Toulouse, and Vich. This great number of houses, however, had a weakening effect on the uniformity of observance of the rule. To correct this, Bernard de Saint-Romain, the third commander-general (1271), codified the decisions of the general chapters. In the fourteenth century, disputes arising from the rivalry between the convents of Barcelona and Puy, and from the discord between the priests and knights, which ended in the latter's suppression, disturbed the peace of the order. Christopher Columbus took some members of the Order of Mercy with him to America, where they founded a great many convents in Latin America, throughout Mexico, Cuba, Brazil, Peru, Chile, and Ecuador. These formed no less than eight provinces, whereas they only had three in Spain and one in France. This order took a very active part in the conversion of the Indians. At the beginning of the seventeenth century Father Gonzales, who had made his profession at the convent of Olmedo in 1573, conceived the idea of a reform, at that time necessary. The commander-general, Alfonso de Montoy, at first supported this scheme, but ended by opposing it. In this undertaking Gonzales was assisted by the Countess of Castellan, who obtained for him the necessary authorization from Clement VIII, and presented him with three convents for his reformed monks (at Viso, Diocese of Seville; Almoragha, Diocese of Cadiz; Ribas). The reform was confirmed at the provincial chapter of Guadalajara in 1603. Father Gonzales took the name of John Baptist of the Blessed Sacrament, and died at Madrid in 1618. Paul V approved his reform in 1606; in 1621 Gregory XV declared it independent of the monks of the Great Observance. Their convents formed two provinces, with houses at Madrid, Salamanca, Seville, and Alcalá, with a few foundations in Sicily.

Father Antoine Velasco founded a convent of nuns of Our Lady of Mercy at Seville in 1568, of which the first superioress was Blessed Anne of the Cross. This foundation had been authorized by Pius V. The reformed branch also established houses of barefooted nuns, or Nuns of the Recollection, at Lura, Madrid, Santiago de Castile, Fuentes, Thoro, and elsewhere. The female tertiaries go back to the very beginning of the order (1265). Two widows of Barcelona, Isabel Berti and Eulalie Peins, whose confessor was Blessed Bernard of Corbario, prior of the convent there, were the foundresses. They were joined by several companions, among them St. Mary of Succour (d. 31 Decemb., 1281), the first superior of their community. Blessed Mary Anne of Jesus (d. 1624), founded another community of tertiaries, under the jurisdiction of the reformed branch. The Order of Mercy of late years has much decreased in membership. The restoration of the reformed convent at Thoro, Diocese of Zamora, Spain, is worthy of note (1888). At present the order has one province and one vice-province in Europe, and four provinces and two vice-provinces in America, with thirty-seven convents and five to six hundred members. The Mercedarian convents are in Palermo; Spain; Venezuela (Caracas, Maracaibo); Peru (Lima); Chile (Santiago); Argentina (Cordova, Mendoza); Ecuador (Quito); and Uruguay. The Mercedarians of Cordova publish "Revista Mercedaria".

Besides the founder, St. Peter Nolasco, the following illustrious members of the order may be mentioned: St. Raymond Nonnatus (d. 1240), the most famous of the monks who gave themselves up to the work of ransoming captives; Blessed Bernard of Corbario, already mentioned; St. Peter Paschal, Bishop of Jaen, who devoted all his energies to the ransom of captives and the conversion of the Mussulmans, martyred in 1300; St. Raymond was a cardinal, as also were Juan de Luto and Father de Salazar. It is unnecessary to enumerate the archbishops and bishops. Writers were numerous, especially in Spain and Latin America in the seventeenth century. To mention only a few: Alfonso Henríquez de Almendaris, Bishop of Cuba, who had founded a college for his order at Seville, and from whom Philip III received an interesting report on the spiritual and temporal condition of his diocese in 1623; Alfonso de Monroy, who drew up the constitutions of the reform, and was a bishop in America; Alfonso Ramón, theologian, preacher, and annalist of his order; Alfonso Velásquez de Miranda (1661), who

took a considerable part in political affairs; Fernando de Orio, general of the order, who translated and learnedly commented on Tertullian's treatise "De Pœnitentia"; Fernando de Santiago (1639), one of the favourite preachers of his time; Francisco Henríquez; Francisco de Santa Maria; Francisco Zumel; Gabriel de Adarzo (1674), theologian, preacher, and statesman; Gabriel Téllez (1650), dramatic author; Gaspar de Tórrez, Bishop of the Canary Islands; Pedro de Ona, whom Philip III sent on important missions both in America and in the Kingdom of Naples.

RAMÓN, *Historia general de la Orden de Nuestra Señora de la Merced*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1618, 1633); DE VARGAS, *Chronica sancti et militaris Ordinis Beatæ Mariæ de Mercede redemptionis captivorum*, 2 vols. (Palermo, 1619); SINAO, *Bullarium cælestis ac regalis Ordinis Beatæ Mariæ Virginis de Mercede* (Barcelona, 1696); PEDRO DE SANTA CECILIA, *Annales de los Descalsos de la Orden de Nuestra Señora de la Merced*, 2 vols. (Madrid, 1699); GARI Y SIUMELL, *Bibliotheca mercedaria* (Barcelona, 1875); HÉLYOT, *Histoire des ordres monastiques*, III, 266–296; CURRIER, *Hist. of Religious Orders* (New York, 1896), 180–4.

J. M. BESSE.

Mercier, LOUIS-HONORÉ, a French Canadian statesman, b. 15 October, 1840, at Iberville, Quebec, of a family of farmers; d. 30 October, 1894. He received his classical education at the Jesuit college, Montreal, and prepared for the Bar in the employ of a prominent legal firm of St-Hyacinthe, acting meanwhile (1862), when only 22, as editor of "Le Courrier de St-Hyacinthe". His views were then opposed to the confederation of the provinces, which he considered as the death-blow to French Canadian influence. In his later years he inclined towards annexation to the United States. In 1873 Rouville county elected him for the Federal Parliament; and, in 1881, St-Hyacinthe returned him to the local House of Assembly, Quebec. The general indignation caused among the Canadians of French origin by the execution of the half-breed leader, Louis Riel, at Regina, an act rightly attributed to Orange fanaticism and vindictiveness, provided Mercier with the opportunity of founding the National party (1885) which comprised elements from the ranks of both Liberals and Conservatives. It was during his premiership (1887 to 1892), that was passed the famous Jesuit Estate Bill, partly indemnifying the Society for the properties confiscated by the British Crown after the cession of Canada. It was Mercier's honour and merit to have brought to a successful conclusion the negotiations to that effect pursued under his predecessors in office—an event almost unparalelled in modern legislation, and to which the Ottawa Federal Parliament, with its conservative majority, lent its concurrence. His devotedness in behalf of the interests of his former teachers proved his fidelity and attachment to his Alma Mater. In recognition of this act of justice, he was knighted by Leo XIII. A vigorous and redoubtable debater rather than an eloquent orator, Mercier spoke with great clearness and force. He possessed a remarkable talent of exposition and argumentation, which gave him a prominent rank in the Canadian Bar. Certain utterances in some of his published speeches unfortunately betray the influence of a reprehensible school of thought and too great intimacy with the literature of its representative minds. The Legislature of Quebec has voted (1910) a monument to his memory.

PELLAND, *Biographie, discours, conférences, etc., de l'Hon. Honoré Mercier* (Montreal, 1890); *Le Courrier du Canada* (Quebec, 1894).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Mercuriali, GERONIMO, better known by his Latin name Mercurialis, famous philologist and physician, b. at Forli, 30 September, 1530; d. there, 13 November, 1606. His preliminary studies and some of his medical courses were taken at Bologna, but he received his degree at Padua and then settled down to practice in Forli. He was sent by his townfolk on a political mission to Paul IV and made such good friends at Rome that he was persuaded to take up his residence there. He studied the old classic medical writers for some seven years and then wrote his "De arte gymnastica", in which he gathered all that the ancients had taught with regard to the use of natural methods for the cure of disease. This gave him a great reputation throughout Europe. Appreciation of it by the Venetian senators led to his call to the chair of medicine of Padua in 1569. Here he devoted himself to the critical study of the works of Hippocrates. His exhaustive monograph, "Censura et dispositio operum Hippocratis" (Venice, 1583), enhanced his reputation and he began the preparation of a critical study of Hippocrates' works in Greek and Latin, which was published at Venice, 1588. In the meantime his reputation had gone abroad, and in 1573 he was called to Vienna for consultation during the illness of Emperor Maximilian. The emperor was so pleased with his service that he made him Count Palatine. After the publication of further works on the medical classics, he was called in 1587 to the chair of medicine in Bologna. The Grand Duke of Tuscany was sparing no effort to increase the prestige of the University of Pisa, so he tempted Mercurialis to accept the chair of medicine there by the offer of a salary probably the largest ever paid to a professor up to this time, 1800 gold crowns to become 2000 crowns after the second year. He remained at Pisa till his seventy-fifth year when he retired to Forli. His great merit is his critical study of the ancient medical classics, especially Hippocrates and his disciples. He wrote many other medical works including text books of the diseases of children, of women, of the skin, and on practical medicine; all of which were widely read and used in many of the medical schools of his time.

Dictionnaire historique de la Médecine (Mons, 1778); BRAMBILLA, *Storia delle scoperte fatte dagli uomini illustri Italiani* (Milan, 1780); *Biographie médicale* (Paris, 1824).

JAMES J. WALSH.

Mercy, BROTHERS OF OUR LADY OF, founded at Mechlin in 1839 by Canon J. B. Cornelius Scheppers for the instruction and care of prisoners and of the sick. They were invited to S. Balbina at Perugia by Cardinal Pecci, afterwards Leo XIII, who had witnessed their work while he was nuncio at Brussels. It was at his instance that Pius IX confirmed the constitution of the Brothers in 1854. In 1855 Cardinal Manning invited them to London, where they have undertaken the care of the prisoners in Catholic reformatories and are also occupied with the education of the children of poor. They are under simple vows and the term of the novitiate is one year. They wear a black habit and scapular with a brown cross on the breast.

HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen*, III, 361; STEELE, *Monasteries and Religious Houses of Great Britain* (London, 1903), 51.

BLANCHE M. KELLY.

Mercy, CORPORAL AND SPIRITUAL WORKS OF.—Mercy as it is here contemplated is said to be a virtue influencing one's will to have compassion for, and, if possible, to alleviate another's misfortune. It is the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas that although mercy is as it were the spontaneous product of charity, yet it is to be reckoned a special virtue adequately distinguishable from this latter. In fact the Scholastics in cataloguing it consider it to be referable to the quality of justice mainly because, like justice, it controls relations between distinct persons. It is as they say *ad alterum*. Its motive is the misery which one discerns in another, particularly in so far as this condition is deemed to be, in some sense at least, involuntary. Obviously the necessity which is to be succoured can be either of body or soul. Hence it is customary to enumerate both corporal and spiritual works of mercy. The traditional enumeration of the corporal works of mercy is as follows: (1) To feed the hungry; (2) To give drink to the thirsty; (3) To

clothe the naked; (4) To harbour the harbourless; (5) To visit the sick; (6) To ransom the captive; (7) To bury the dead. The spiritual works of mercy are: (1) To instruct the ignorant; (2) To counsel the doubtful; (3) To admonish sinners; (4) To bear wrongs patiently; (5) To forgive offences willingly; (6) To comfort the afflicted; (7) To pray for the living and the dead. It will be seen from these divisions that the works of mercy practically coincide with the various forms of almsgiving. It is thus that St. Thomas regards them. The word *alms* of course is a corruption of the Greek ἐλεημοσύνη (mercy). The doing of works of mercy is not merely a matter of exalted counsel; there is as well a strict precept imposed both by the natural and the positive Divine law enjoining their performance. That the natural law enjoins works of mercy is based upon the principle that we are to do to others as we would have them do to us.

The Divine command is set forth in the most stringent terms by Christ, and the failure to comply with it is visited with the supreme penalty of eternal damnation (Matt., xxv, 41): "Then he shall say to them also that shall be on his left hand: Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels. For I was hungry, and you gave me not to eat: I was thirsty, and you gave me not to drink. I was a stranger, and you took me not in: naked, and you covered me not: sick and in prison, and you did not visit me", etc. Here it is true there is mention directly and explicitly of only the corporal works of mercy. As, however, the spiritual works of mercy deal with a distress whose relief is even more imperative as well as more effective for the grand purpose of man's creation, the injunction must be supposed to extend to them also. Besides there are the plain references of Christ to such works as fraternal correction (Matt., xviii, 15) as well as the forgiveness of injuries (Matt., vi, 14). It has to be remembered however that the precept is an affirmative one, that is, it is of the sort which is always binding but not always operative, for lack of matter or occasion or fitting circumstances. It obliges, as the theologians say, *semper sed non pro semper*. Thus in general it may be said that the determination of its actual obligatory force in a given case depends largely on the degree of distress to be aided, and the capacity or condition of the one whose duty in the matter is in question. There are easily recognizable limitations which the precept undergoes in practice so far as the performance of the corporal works of mercy are concerned. These are treated in the article on Alms and Almsgiving (q. v.). Likewise the law imposing spiritual works of mercy is subject in individual instances to important reservations. For example, it may easily happen that an altogether special measure of tact and prudence, or, at any rate, some definite superiority is required for the discharge of the oftentimes difficult task of fraternal correction. Similarly to instruct the ignorant, counsel the doubtful, and console the sorrowing is not always within the competency of every one. To bear wrongs patiently, to forgive offences willingly, and to pray for the living and the dead are things from which on due occasion no one may dispense himself on the plea that he has not some special array of gifts required for their observance. They are evidently within the reach of all. It must not be forgotten that the works of mercy demand more than a humanitarian basis if they are to serve as instruments in bringing about our eternal salvation. The proper motive is indispensable and this must be one drawn from the supernatural order. Finally it is interesting to note that for the exercise of the sixth among the corporal works of mercy two religious orders have at different times in the history of the Church been instituted. In the year 1198 the Trinitarians were founded by St. John of Matha and St. Felix of Valois, and just twenty years later St. Peter Nolasco and St. Raymond of Pennafort established the Order of Our Lady of Ransom. Both of these communities had as their chief scope the recovery of Christians who were held captive by the infidels. In the religious body which owes its origin to St. Peter Nolasco, the members took a fourth vow to surrender their own persons in place of those whom they were not otherwise able to redeem from slavery.

Spirago, *The Catechism Explained* (New York, 1899); Walsh, *The Thirteenth, Greatest of Centuries* (New York, 1907); Lehmkuhl, *Theologia Moralis* (Freiburg, 1887); Billuart, *Summa Sancti Thomæ* (Paris); St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* (Turin, 1885).

Joseph F. Delany.

Mercy, Sisters of, a congregation of women founded in Dublin, Ireland, in 1827, by Catherine Elizabeth McAuley, b. 29 September, 1787, at Stormanstown House, County Dublin. Descended from an ancient and distinguished Catholic family, she was the eldest of three children. At a time when Catholicism was crushed, Mr. McAuley strove as much as was possible to keep the faith alive in those who had so many inducements to relinquish it, and engaged in many charitable works. In these he was little assisted by Mrs. McAuley, whose charm and accomplishments made her a favourite in society. After Mr. McAuley's death (1794) the pecuniary affairs of the family became so involved that the widow sold Stormanstown House and removed to Dublin. Here the family came so completely under the influence of Protestant fashionable society that all, with the exception of Catherine, became Protestants. She revered the memory of her father too greatly to embrace a religion he abhorred. Mrs. McAuley did not long survive her husband, and after her death the orphans passed into the family of a relative who invested their patrimony for their benefit. From one relative to another the orphans passed, each guardian doing all in his power to strengthen the children in the Protestant religion. Catherine, however, could not be induced by threats or promises to join in Protestant worship, for she clung with strange pertinacity to the very name Catholic; but having no one to consult in her doubts, she finally became unsettled in her religious ideas. Precocious and serious beyond her years, she grew daily more alive to the insecurity of her spiritual position, and finally acceded to the desires of her friends to examine the religion she saw practised among her truly virtuous relatives. The more she read, the more she thought and studied, the stronger her doubts in regard to Protestantism became. Its dissensions and contradictions, the coldness and the barrenness of its spiritual life, repelled her and all thought of becoming a Protestant died away. Catherine is described as being beautiful, her complexion was very fair, her eyes blue, and her hair golden; her nature was singularly unselfish, amiable, and affectionate. Though several advantageous alliances were proposed, nothing could induce her to marry.

More and more attracted to the faith of her father, Catherine became acquainted with Dean Lubé of St. James' Church, Dublin, and Dr. Betagh, whose friendship greatly aided her. About this time a distant relative of her mother's, returning from India, purchased Coolock House, a few miles from Dublin, and being attracted by Catherine's appearance, desired to adopt her; consequently, in the year 1803 Catherine removed to her new and beautiful home. Catherine's interior disquietude now became such that she determined to follow the dictates of her conscience. She sought an interview with Rev. Dr. Murray, afterwards Archbishop of Dublin, and shortly after was received into the Church. Her kind guardians allowed her to practise the charitable works to which she felt inclined and even provided her with the necessary means; but they were so opposed to everything having an appearance of Catholicism that they would not allow a crucifix,

religious picture, or any pious article in the house, nor did they make any provision for fast days. Her sacrifices and prayers were rewarded by the conversion of Mrs. Callahan, on her death bed; and in 1822 Mr. Callahan also, when dying, was duly reconciled. To Catherine he left his entire fortune. She immediately devised a system of distributing food and clothing to the poor who flocked to Coolock House, and her time was fully devoted to these works of charity, to visiting the sick and to instructing the poor. When Catherine came into full possession of her property, she felt that God required her to do something permanent for the poor, and she was now able to carry out her early visions of founding an institution in which women might, when out of work, find a temporary home. In this undertaking Rev. Dr. Blake and Rev. Dr. Armstrong were her advisors.

After some deliberation, these clergymen selected a site for the new building at the junction of lower Baggot and Herbert Streets, Dublin, and in June, 1824, the corner-stone was laid by the Rev. Dr. Blake. As Dr. Blake was called to Rome soon after, the Rev. Edward Armstrong undertook to assist her, but died before the work was completed. On the feast of Our Lady of Mercy, 24 September, 1827, the new institution for destitute women, orphans, and poor schools was opened and Catherine, with two companions, undertook its management. There was no idea then of founding a religious institution; on the contrary, the foundress's plan was to establish a society of secular ladies who would spend a few hours daily in instructing the poor. Gradually the interior life of these associates and their external occupations and relations became too much like the monastic life to be allowed to remain under secular rule. The ladies had already assumed a sombre dress and playfully called each other "Sister"; moreover, they occasionally took a meal on the premises and even at times remained over night. In 1828 the archbishop permitted the staff of the institute to assume a distinctive dress and to publicly visit the sick. The uniform adopted was a black dress and cape of the same material reaching to the belt, a white collar and a lace cap and veil—such a costume as is now worn by the postulants of the congregation. In the same year the archbishop desired Miss McAuley to choose some name by which the little community might be known, and she chose that of "Sisters of Mercy", having the design of making the works of mercy the distinctive feature of the institute. She was, moreover, desirous that the members should combine with the silence and prayer of the Carmelite, the active labours of a Sister of Charity. The position of the institute was anomalous, its members were not bound by vows nor were they restrained by rules and Dr. Blake held a consultation with the archbishop in which it was decided that the Sisters of Mercy must declare their intentions as to the future of their institute, whether it was to be classed as a religious congregation or to become secularized. The associates unanimously decided to become religious. It was deemed better to have this congregation unconnected with any already existing community.

The Sisters of Mercy were now bound to the laborious duties of instructing the ignorant, visiting the sick and imprisoned, managing hospitals, orphanages, and homes for distressed women; in fact to every work of mercy. They were to make perpetual vows, observe choir, and spend some six or seven hours daily in spiritual exercises and about three weeks altogether in strict retreat; the midsummer retreat proper covering eight full days, a triduum occupying the last three days of each year, and the first Sunday of every month except two being devoted in silence to a preparation for death. On the Octave of the Ascension 1829 the archbishop blessed the chapel of the institution and dedicated it to Our Lady of Mercy. This combination of the contemplative and the active life necessary for the duties of the congregation called forth so much opposition that it seemed as though the community, now numbering twelve, must disband; but it was settled that several of the sisters should make their novitiates in some approved religious house and after their profession return to the institute to train the others to religious life. In June, 1830, the institute received from Pope Pius VIII a Rescript of Indulgences dated 23 May, 1830. The Presentation Order, whose rules are based upon those of St. Austin, seemed the one best adapted for the training of the first novices of the new congregation and Miss Catherine McAuley, Miss Elizabeth Harley, and Miss Anna Maria Doyle began their novitiate at George's Hill, Dublin, on 8 Sept., 1830. On the second day of the Octave of the Immaculate Conception 1830 the three postulants received the habit and on 12 December, 1831, they pronounced the usual three vows to which they added a fourth, that of persevering in the congregation until death. Miss McAuley, now known as Sister Mary Catherine, was appointed first superior of the congregation, an office which she held for the remainder of her life. The office of superior of each mother-house of the congregation is held for three years except in the case of a foundress when it may be held for six years.

The costume adopted by the sisters consists of a habit of black material falling in folds from the throat to the feet and lengthened into a train behind, which is worn looped up except in the chapel, the community-room, and the parlour. The habit is confined to the waist by a leather girdle, or cincture, from which depends a black rosary with the ebony cross of the congregation. The sleeves are long and wide with close-fitting undersleeves of the same material as the habit. The veil is black, long, and flowing. The novices wear shorter veils of white cambric, otherwise their dress is the same as that of the professed sisters. Church cloaks of white woollen material are worn on great feasts in the chapel and for certain ceremonies. The gimp is a white linen collar, very deep in front. The coif is of white linen. The rule and constitutions of the congregation were not completed until 1834, nor approved until 1835, yet they contained in substance only that which had been observed from the year 1827. The basis of the rule was that of St. Austin although circumstances required many alterations before its approval. Kingstown was the first place outside the capital in which a house of the congregation was opened, and outside of the archdiocese Tullamore was the first town to welcome the sisters. In 1838, at the suggestion of Rev. Peter Butler of Bermondsey, some English ladies came to Ireland to serve a novitiate for the purpose of introducing the congregation into England. Upon their return, Mother M. Clare Moore was appointed the superior of the Bermondsey Convent. Lady Barbara Eyre, daughter of the Catholic Earl of Newburgh, was the first one to be received into the new congregation. As Sister Mary de Sales, she made her vows in 1841 and after a very edifying life died in 1849.

From England the congregation rapidly spread, beginning with Guernsey, one of the Channel Islands (1868). Through the efforts of Bishop Murdock, the sisters from Limerick opened a house in Glasgow (1849). Under the patronage of Dr. Brady, Bishop of Perth, the sisters were introduced into Australia (1846). Three years later, Bishop Pompallier, of New Zealand, brought a band from Carlow, Ireland. In May, 1842, at the request of Bishop Flemming, a small colony of Sisters of Mercy crossed the Atlantic to found the congregation at St. John's, New Foundland. In September, 1843, Bishop O'Connor, of Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, U. S. A., applied to Carlow for a colony of Sisters of Mercy for his diocese. Seven religious were appointed for this mission of whom Mother Francis Warde (see WARDE), was the first superior.

On the 22 December, 1843, the sisters opened the first house of the congregation in the United States. In 1844 they opened the parochial school attached to the cathedral. In 1845 St. Xavier's Academy and Boarding-school was begun. In 1846 the sisters took charge of the orphans, and on the first day of the year 1847 the first hospital in Western Pennyslvania was opened under their management. In 1846 Pittsburg sent out its first foundation to Chicago under Mother M. Agatha O'Brien. This was in reality the second house of the congregation asked for in the United States, although it could not be opened until several months after the New York community had crossed the ocean. In 1850 at the request of Bishop O'Reilly of Pittsburg, the sisters opened a school in Providence, Rhode Island. This state was considered the most bitter opponent of Catholicism in the Union, and the most bitter people in the state were thought to be concentrated in its capital; accordingly this foundation called for heroic souls, and one of the foremost of these was Rev. Mother Warde, who had just resigned the office of superior in the Pittsburg community. In 1855 Pittsburg sent out its third foundation to Baltimore at the solicitation of the Rev. Edward McColgan. Towards the close of 1845 Bishop Hughes of New York applied to Baggot Street, the mother-house of the entire congregation, for sisters for his diocese. This was a difficult request to grant, as that house had been greatly diminished by the many calls made upon it. The bishop was referred to Mother M. Agnes O'Connor, who had gone to England for the purpose of opening a new convent there and then returning to Dublin. Upon her consent to return with the bishop, five sisters, a novice, and a postulant from different houses formed her band. Arriving in New York City, 14 May, 1846, the sisters found a temporary home in Washington Place; but two years later secured a larger house at the corner of Houston and Mulberry Streets. In 1869 St. Joseph's Industrial Home for girls was opened on Madison Avenue, corner of Eighty-first Street. They have also opened a Home for Boys in Tarrytown-on-the-Hudson and a Home for Business Women in West One Hundred and Sixth Street, New York City. Later the community moved to a new building adjoining their Industrial Home for Girls on Madison Avenue. From New York, houses have been established in St. Louis, Brooklyn, Worcester, Greenbush (now Rensselaer), and in Eureka, California. The first American postulant to enter the New York house was Josephine, second daughter of Mother Seton, foundress of the Sisters of Charity of Emmitsburg, Maryland. In 1854 the Rev. Hugh Gallagher visited Kinsale Convent, Ireland, on the part of Bishop Allemany to procure the Sisters of Mercy for his diocese of San Francisco, California. Among those selected for this mission was Sister Mary Baptist Russell, a sister of Lord Chief Justice Russell of Killowen. From these beginnings, the Sisters of Mercy have spread throughout the world. In Ireland, England, the United States, in Australia, New Zealand, Newfoundland, South America, Mexico, and the West Indies their name is well known.

Statistics.—Number of Sisters of Mercy in the United States of America, 4732; pupils in parochial schools, 104,726; orphans and children in institutions, 3834; pupils in academies and high schools, 9967; hospitals conducted by Sisters of Mercy, 53; orphanages, 67.

Annals of the Sisters of Mercy; MURPHY, *Sketches of Irish Nunneries* (London, 1866); CARROLL, *Life of Catherine McAuley* (London, s. d.); MEMBER OF THE ORDER OF MERCY, *Life of Catherine McAuley.*

MARY STANISLAS AUSTIN.

Mercy, SISTERS OF, OF ST. BORROMEO, originally a pious association of ladies formed in 1626 for the care of the sick in the hospital of St. Charles at Nancy, but constituted a religious community in 1652 after being generously endowed by the father of Emmanuel Chauvenel, a young advocate who had given his life in the service of the sick. The members placed themselves under the patronage of St. Charles Borromeo, the Apostle of Charity, and adapted the rules and constitutions drawn up by Père Epiphane Louys, Abbot of Estival and Vicar-General of the Reformed Premonstratensians. By the middle of the eighteenth century the congregation was in charge of numerous hospitals, and shortly afterwards took up as an additional task the Christian education of children. During the Revolutionary period the members, although dispersed and deprived of their garb, continued their work so heroically as to win the encomiums of their persecutors. On 22 July, 1804, they reassumed their religious habit, obtained the approval of Napoleon, and were soon in a flourishing condition. Their rule, based on that of St. Augustine, received papal approbation in 1859, and additional constitutions were confirmed by Leo XIII in 1892. Their work includes the direction of all manner of charitable institutions, such as domestic and trade schools, homes for first communicants, protectories, poor-houses, homes for defectives, and female reformatories, as well as the care of the sick in their homes. They also have charge of schools, including a number of normal institutes in Austria. Candidates must spend one year as postulants and from three to four and a half years as novices before being admitted to the congregation. The auxiliary sisters for the care of the sick renew their vows annually.

There are several entirely independent branches of Borromean Sisters. In 1838 one was established by Aloysius Joseph Freiherr von Schrenk, Prince-Bishop of Prague (d. 1849), which was confirmed as a separate congregation in 1841, and now numbers 900 members in 102 houses, chiefly in Bohemia, Moravia, and Upper and Lower Austria. In 1848 Melchior Freiherr von Diepenbrock, Prince-Bishop of Breslau, invited the Prague Borromeans to found a house at Neisse, which, in 1857, was raised to the rank of the mother-house of a separate congregation. Later the mother-house was transferred to Trebnitz, and temporarily, during the Kulturkampf, to Teschen, where a provincial house for Austria was later established (1889). A house of this congregation founded at Alexandria in 1884 was, in 1894, made a provincial mother-house and a novitiate for the Orient, with the direction of schools, an asylum for the aged, and a hospice for German pilgrims. Affiliated foundations have been made at Jerusalem (1886), Haifa (1888), Cairo (1904), and Emmaus. The members of the Trebnitz congregation number 1900, in 211 houses. In 1811 a foundation was made from Nancy at Trier, whence the congregation spread to other cities of Western Germany. In 1849 a provincial house was erected at Trier, which, by decree of Pius IX (18 September, 1872), was made the mother-house of an independent congregation. A famous Borromean institution is St. Hedwig's Hospital at Berlin, founded in 1846 by Angelika Eschweiler. The Trier branch comprises over 1200 sisters in 70 houses. A foundation was also made at Maastricht in 1837 by Peter Anton van Baer.

Hist. de la cong. des sœurs de St. Charles (Nancy, 1898); HOHN, *Die Nancy-Trierer Borromärinnen* (1899); IDEM, *Barmherzige Schwestern von hl. Karl Borromäus 1652–1900* (1900); HEIMBUCHER, *Orden u. Kongregationen* (2 vols., 1896).

FLORENCE RUDGE MCGAHAN.

Meredith, EDWARD, English Catholic controversialist, b. in 1648, was a son of the rector of Landulph, Cornwall. He studied with distinction at Westminster School and in 1665 was elected to a scholarship at Christ Church, Oxford. In 1668 he went to Spain as secretary of the ambassador, Sir William Godolphin, and while residing there embraced the Catholic faith. He returned to England after three years and engaged in a religious controversy with Stillingfleet (8 August, 1671). In this discussion, an account of which he pub-

lished in 1684, he was aided by Edmund Coleman, who was executed seven years later for alleged complicity in the Titus Oates plot. In 1682 Meredith wrote a reply to one Samuel Johnson, who had libelled the Duke of York in a work entitled "Julian the Apostle". On 7 September, 1684, he entered the Jesuit novitiate at Watten, Flanders, under the name of Langford (or Langsford). He evidently returned in a few years to England, where he published several controversial pamphlets. On the fall of James II, he withdrew to Saint-Germain. He was resident in Rome during the years 1700 and 1701; the year of his death is uncertain, but his will, dated 1715, is said to be preserved in the archives of the English College, Rome. He translated from the Latin a devotional work under the title "A Journal of Meditations for every day of the year" (London, 1687).

FOLEY, *Collectanea Eng. Prov. S. J.*, part I (London, 1882), 502.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

Merici, ANGELA. See ANGELA MERICI, SAINT.

Mérida (EMERITENSIS IN INDIIS), DIOCESE OF, a suffragan see of Santiago of Venezuela or Caracas, comprises the State of Los Andes, and part of Zulia and Zamora. It lies in the north-western portion of the republic, to the south of Lake Maracaibo. Until 17 Jan., 1905, it included the territory of the Goajira. Mérida was first erected into a bishopric on 17 Feb., 1777. Its first bishop, Juan Ramos de Lora, a Franciscan, b. at Palacios y Villafranca, Diocese of Seville, in 1722, was nominated in the consistory of 23 Sept., 1782, and was a suffragan of Santa Fe de Bogotá. His immediate successors were Emanuelo Candido de Terrissos in 1791; and in 1795 Antonio Espinosa, of Corvera in the Diocese of Saragossa. In 1801 Pius VII appointed Jaime Hernández Milanes of Nieza, in the Diocese of Salamanca. By a Bull of the same pontiff, "In Universalis Ecclesiæ", 24 Oct., 1803, Mérida became suffragan to Caracas, which had just been raised to the archiepiscopal rank. In 1816 Rafael Laso de La Vega was elected bishop. Owing to the troubles consequent on the rebellion against Spain, Leo XII nominated Bonaventura Arias in the consistory of 2 Oct., 1826, as auxiliary bishop. When Bishop Laso was transferred to Quito, 15 Dec., 1828, Mgr Arias continued to govern the diocese till Gregory XVI declared him a vicar Apostolic. His successor, José Vicente Unda of Guanara, was nominated in the consistory of 11 July, 1836, and on his death, 27 Jan., 1842, Juan Ilario Boset, of Puerto de Gueya, was elected.

The present occupant of the see is Mgr Antonio Raymondo Silva, b. at Caracas, 26 June, 1850, and elected 21 May, 1894. The diocese contains 15 vicariates, 108 parishes, 150 churches and chapels, 100 priests, and a population of about 450,000, all Catholics except about 20,000 pagans, Timotes and Mucuchic Indians, and 300 Protestants and Jews. There are only two religious congregations in the diocese at the present time (1910): (1) the Sisters of Saint Rosa of Lima, at Mérida, San Cristóbal, and Rubio, a diocesan order devoted to hospital and orphanage work; (2) the Servants of the Holy Family, with houses at La Grita, San Cristóbal, and Táriba. The fine cathedral is dedicated to the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady. The city of Mérida stands at an elevation of 5500 feet on the right bank of the Rio Chamo in a valley of the Sierra Nevada, which here rises to about 15,000 feet. It is about 60 miles from Lake Maracaibo and 300 from Caracas. The city was founded by Juan Rodríguez Suárez in 1558 under the name of Santiago de los Caballeros. It suffered severely from earthquakes, notably in 1644, 1812, and 1894, notwithstanding which it is a thriving business town with 12,000 inhabitants. The old seminary was changed into a university in 1810, and still flourishes, besides that of Caracas.

Boletín de Estadística de los Estados Unidos de Venezuela (Caracas, 1905), 224–27.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

Merit.—By merit (*meritum*) in general is understood that property of a good work which entitles the doer to receive a reward (*præmium, merces*) from him in whose service the work is done. By antonomasia, the word has come to designate also the good work itself, in so far as it deserves a reward from the person in whose service it was performed. In the theological sense, a supernatural merit can only be a salutary act (*actus salutaris*), to which God in consequence of his infallible promise owes a supernatural reward, consisting ultimately in eternal life, which is the beatific vision in heaven. As the main purpose of this article is to vindicate the Catholic doctrine of the meritoriousness of good works, the subject is treated under the four following heads: I. Nature of Merit; II. Existence of Merit; III. Conditions of Merit, and IV. Objects of Merit.

I. NATURE OF MERIT.—(a) If we analyse the definition given above, it becomes evident that the property of merit can be found only in works that are positively good, whilst bad works, whether they benefit or injure a third party, contain nothing but demerit (*demeritum*) and consequently deserve punishment. Thus the good workman certainly deserves the reward of his labour, and the thief deserves the punishment of his crime. From this it naturally follows that merit and reward, demerit and punishment, bear to each other the relation of deed and return; they are correlative terms of which one postulates the other. Reward is due to merit, and the reward is in proportion to the merit. This leads to the third condition, viz., that merit supposes two distinct persons, the one who acquires the merit and the other who rewards it; for the idea of self-reward is just as contradictory as that of self-punishment. Lastly, the relation between merit and reward furnishes the intrinsic reason why in the matter of service and its remuneration the guiding norm can be only the virtue of justice, and not disinterested kindness or pure mercy; for it would destroy the very notion of reward to conceive of it as a free gift of bounty (cf. Rom., xi, 6). If, however, salutary acts can in virtue of the Divine justice give the right to an eternal reward, this is possible only because they themselves have their root in gratuitous grace, and consequently are of their very nature dependent ultimately on grace, as the Council of Trent emphatically declares (Sess. VI, cap. xvi, in Denzinger, 10th ed., Freiburg, 1908, n. 810): "the Lord . . . whose bounty towards all men is so great, that He will have the things, which are His own gifts, be their merits."

Ethics and theology clearly distinguish two kinds of merit: (1) condign merit or merit in the strict sense of the word (*meritum adæquatum sive de condigno*), and (2) congruous or quasi-merit (*meritum inadæquatum sive de congruo*). Condign merit supposes an equality between service and return; it is measured by commutative justice (*justitia commutativa*), and thus gives a real claim to a reward. Congruous merit, owing to its inadequacy and the lack of intrinsic proportion between the service and the recompense, claims a reward only on the ground of equity. This early-scholastic distinction and terminology, which is already recognized in concept and substance by the Fathers of the Church in their controversies with the Pelagians and Semipelagians, were again emphasized by Johann Eck, the famous adversary of Martin Luther (cf. Greving, "Joh. Eck als junger Gelehrter," Münster, 1906, pp. 153 sqq.). The essential difference between *meritum de condigno* and *meritum de congruo* is based on the fact that, besides those works which claim a remuneration under pain of violating strict justice (as in contracts between employer and employee, in buying and selling, etc.), there are also other meritorious works which at most are entitled to reward or honour for reasons of equity (*ex æquitate*) or mere distributive justice (*ex iustitia distributiva*), as in the case of gratuities and military decorations. From

an ethical point of view the difference practically amounts to this that, if the reward due to condign merit be withheld, there is a violation of right and justice and the consequent obligation in conscience to make restitution, while, in the case of congruous merit, to withhold the reward involves no violation of right and no obligation to restore, it being merely an offence against what is fitting or a matter of personal discrimination (*acceptio personarum*). Hence the reward of congruous merit always depends in great measure on the kindness and liberality of the giver, though not purely and simply on his good will.

In applying these notions of merit to man's relation to God it is especially necessary to keep in mind the fundamental truth that the virtue of justice cannot be brought forward as the basis of a real title for a Divine reward either in the natural or in the supernatural order. The simple reason is that God, being self-existent, absolutely independent, and sovereign, can be in no respect bound in justice with regard to his creatures. Properly speaking, man possesses nothing of his own; all that he has and all that he does is a gift of God, and, since God is infinitely self-sufficient, there is no advantage or benefit which man can by his services confer upon Him. Hence on the part of God there can only be question of a gratuitous promise of reward for certain good works. For such works He owes the promised reward, not in justice or equity, but solely because He has freely bound himself, i.e., because of His own attributes of veracity and fidelity. It is on this ground alone that we can speak of Divine justice at all, and apply the principle: *Do ut des* (cf. St. Augustine, Serm. clviii, c. ii, in P. L., XXXVIII, 863).

(b) There remains the distinction between merit and satisfaction; for a meritorious work is not identical, either in concept or in fact, with a satisfactory work. In the language of theology, satisfaction means: (1) atoning by some suitable service for an injury done to another's honour or for any other offence, in somewhat the same fashion as in modern duelling outraged honour is satisfied by recourse to swords or pistols; (2) paying off the temporal punishment due to sin by salutary penitential works voluntarily undertaken after one's sins have been forgiven. Sin, as an offence against God, demands satisfaction in the first sense; the temporal punishment due to sin calls for satisfaction in the second sense (see PENANCE). Christian faith teaches us that the Incarnate Son of God by His death on the cross has in our stead fully satisfied God's anger at our sins, and thereby effected a reconciliation between the world and its Creator. Not, however, as though nothing were now left to be done by man, or as though he were now restored to the state of original innocence, whether he wills it or not; on the contrary, God and Christ demand of him that he make the fruits of the Sacrifice of the Cross his own by personal exertion and co-operation with grace, by justifying faith and the reception of baptism. It is a defined article of the Catholic Faith that man before, in, and after justification derives his whole capability of meriting and satisfying, as well as his actual merits and satisfactions, solely from the infinite treasure of merits which Christ gained for us on the Cross (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. VI, cap. xvi; Sess. XIV, cap. viii).

The second kind of satisfaction, that namely by which temporal punishment is removed, consists in this, that the penitent after his justification gradually cancels the temporal punishments due to his sins, either *ex opere operato*, by conscientiously performing the penance imposed on him by his confessor, or *ex opere operantis*, by self-imposed penances (such as prayer, fasting, almsgiving, etc.) and by bearing patiently the sufferings and trials sent by God; if he neglects this, he will have to give full satisfaction (*satispassio*) in the pains of purgatory (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XIV, can. xiii, in Denzinger, n. 923). Now, if the concept of satisfaction in its twofold meaning be compared with that of merit as developed above, the first general conclusion will be that merit constitutes a debtor who owes a reward, whilst satisfaction supposes a creditor whose demands must be met. In Christ's work of redemption merit and satisfaction materially coincide almost to their full extent, since as a matter of fact the merits of Christ are also works of satisfaction for man. But, since by His Passion and Death He truly merited, not only graces for us, but also external glory for His own Person (His glorious Resurrection and Ascension, His sitting at the right hand of the Father, the glorification of His name of Jesus, etc.), it follows that His personal merit extends further than His satisfaction, as He had no need of satisfying for Himself. The substantial and conceptual distinction between merit and satisfaction holds good when applied to the justified Christian, for every meritorious act has for its main object the increase of grace and of eternal glory, while satisfactory works have for their object the removal of the temporal punishment still due to sin. In practice and generally speaking, however, merit and satisfaction are found in every salutary act, so that every meritorious work is also satisfactory and vice versa. It is indeed also essential to the concept of a satisfactory work of penance that it be penal and difficult, which qualities are not connoted by the concept of merit; but since, in the present state of fallen nature, there neither is nor can be a meritorious work which in one way or another has not connected with it difficulties and hardships, theologians unanimously teach that all our meritorious works without exception bear a penal character and thereby may become automatically works of satisfaction. Against how many difficulties and distractions have we not to contend even during our prayers, which by right should be the easiest of all good works! Thus, prayer also becomes a penance, and hence confessors may in most cases content themselves with imposing prayer as a penance. (Cf. De Lugo, "De pœnitentia," disp. xxiv, sect. 3.)

(c) Owing to the peculiar relation between and material identity of merit and satisfaction in the present economy of salvation, a twofold value must in general be distinguished in every good work: the meritorious and the satisfactory value. But each preserves its distinctive character, theoretically by the difference in concepts, and practically in this, that the value of merit as such, consisting in the increase of grace and of heavenly glory, is purely personal and is not applicable to others, while the satisfactory value may be detached from the meriting agent and applied to others. The possibility of this transfer rests on the fact that the residual punishments for sin are in the nature of a debt, which may be legitimately paid to the creditor and thereby cancelled not only by the debtor himself but also by a friend of the debtor. This consideration is important for the proper understanding of the usefulness of suffrages for the souls in purgatory (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. XXV, Decret. de purgat., in Denzinger, n. 983). When one wishes to aid the suffering souls, one cannot apply to them the purely meritorious quality of his work, because the increase of grace and glory accrues only to the agent who merits. But it has pleased the Divine wisdom and mercy to accept the satisfactory quality of one's work under certain circumstances as an equivalent of the temporal punishment still to be endured by the faithful departed, just as if the latter had themselves performed the work. This is one of the most beautiful and consoling aspects of that grand social organization which we call the "Communion of Saints" (q. v.), and moreover affords us an insight into the nature of the "heroic act of charity" approved by Pius IX, whereby the faithful on earth, out of heroic charity for the souls in Purgatory, voluntarily renounce in their favour the satisfactory fruits of all

their good works, even all the suffrages which shall be offered for them after their death, in order that they may thus benefit and assist the souls in purgatory more quickly and more efficaciously.

The efficacy of the prayer of the just, be it for the living or for the dead, calls for special consideration. In the first place it is evident that prayer as a pre-eminently good work has in common with other similar good works, such as fasting and almsgiving, the twofold value of merit and satisfaction. Because of its satisfactory character, prayer will also obtain for the souls in purgatory by way of suffrage (*per modum suffragii*) either a diminution or a total cancelling of the penalty that remains to be paid. Prayer has, moreover, the characteristic effect of impetration (*effectus impetratorius*), for he who prays appeals solely to the goodness, love, and liberality of God for the fulfilment of his desires, without throwing the weight of his own merits into the scale. He who prays fervently and unceasingly gains a hearing with God because he prays, even should he pray with empty hands (cf. John, xiv, 13 sq.; xvi, 23). Thus the special efficacy of prayer for the dead is easily explained, since it combines efficacy of satisfaction and impetration, and this twofold efficacy is enhanced by the personal worthiness of the one who, as a friend of God, offers the prayer. (See DEAD, PRAYERS FOR THE.) Since the meritoriousness of good works supposes the state of justification, or, what amounts to the same, the possession of sanctifying grace, supernatural merit is only an effect or fruit of the state of grace (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. VI, cap. xvi). Hence, it is plain that this whole article is really only a continuation and a completion of the doctrine of sanctifying grace (see GRACE).

II. THE EXISTENCE OF MERIT.—(a) According to Luther justification consists essentially in the mere covering of man's sins, which remain in the soul, and in the external imputation of Christ's justice; hence his assertion that even "the just sin in every good work" (see Denzinger, n. 771), as also that "every work of the just is worthy of damnation [*damnabile*] and a mortal sin [*peccatum mortale*], if it be considered as it really is in the judgment of God" (see Möhler, "Symbolik", 22). According to the doctrine of Calvin (Instit., III, ii, 4) good works are "impurities and defilement" (*inquinamenta et sordes*), but God covers their innate hideousness with the cloak of the merits of Christ, and imputes them to the predestined as good works in order that He may requite them not with life eternal, but at most with a temporal reward. In consequence of Luther's proclamation of "evangelical liberty", John Agricola (d. 1566) asserted that in the New Testament it was not allowed to preach the "Law", and Nicholas Amsdorf (d. 1565) maintained that good works were positively harmful. Such exaggerations gave rise in 1527 to the fierce Antinomian controversy, which, after various efforts on Luther's part, was finally settled in 1540 by the recantation forced from Agricola by Joachim II of Brandenburg. Although the doctrine of modern Protestantism continues obscure and indefinite, it teaches generally speaking that good works are a spontaneous consequence of justifying faith, without being of any avail for life eternal. Apart from earlier dogmatic declarations given in the Second Synod of Orange of 529 and in the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 (see Denzinger, 191, 430), the Council of Trent upheld the traditional doctrine of merit by insisting that life everlasting is both a grace and a reward (Sess. VI, cap. xvi, in Denzinger, n. 809). It condemned as heretical Luther's doctrine of the sinfulness of good works (Sess. VI, can. xxv), and declared as a dogma that the just, in return for their good works done in God through the merits of Jesus Christ, should expect an eternal reward (loc. cit., can. xxvi).

This doctrine of the Church simply echoes Scripture and Tradition. The Old Testament already declares the meritoriousness of good works before God. "But the just shall live for evermore: and their reward is with the Lord" (Wis., v, 16). "Be not afraid to be justified even to death: for the reward of God continueth for ever" (Ecclus., xviii, 22). Christ Himself adds a special reward to each of the Eight Beatitudes, and he ends with this fundamental thought: "Be glad and rejoice, for your reward is very great in heaven" (Matt., v, 12). In His description of the Last Judgment, He makes the possession of eternal bliss depend on the practice of the corporal works of mercy (Matt., xxv, 34 sqq.). Although St. Paul insists on nothing more strongly than the absolute gratuitousness of Christian grace, still he acknowledges merits founded on grace and also the reward due to them on the part of God, which he variously calls "prize" (Phil., iii, 14; I Cor., ix, 24), "reward" (Col., iii, 24; I Cor., iii, 8), "crown of justice" (II Tim., iv, 7 sq.; cf. James, i, 12). It is worthy of note that, in these and many others, good works are not represented as mere adjuncts of justifying faith, but as real fruits of justification and part causes of our eternal happiness. And the greater the merit, the greater will be the reward in heaven (cf. Matt., xvi, 27; I Cor., iii, 8; II Cor., ix, 6). Thus the Bible itself refutes the assertion that "the idea of merit is originally foreign to the Gospel" ("Realencyklopädie für protest. Theologie," XX, 3rd ed. Leipzig, 1908, p. 501). That Christian grace can be merited either by the observance of the Jewish law or by mere natural works (see GRACE), this alone is foreign to the Bible. On the other hand, eternal reward is promised in the Bible to those supernatural works which are performed in the state of grace, and that because they are meritorious (cf. Matt., xxv, 34 sqq.; Rom., ii, 6 sqq.; II Cor., v, 10).

Even Protestants concede that, in the oldest literature of the Apostolic Fathers and Christian Apologists, "the idea of merit was read into the Gospel," and that Tertullian by defending "merit in the strict sense gave the key-note to Western Catholicism" (Realencykl., pp. 501, 502). He was followed by St. Cyprian with the declaration: "You can attain to the vision of God, if you deserve it by your life and works" ("De op. et elemos.", xiv, ed. Hartel, I, 384). With St. Ambrose (De offic., I, xv, 57) and St. Augustine (De morib. eccl., I, xxv), the other Fathers of the Church took the Catholic doctrine on merit as a guide in their teaching, especially in their homilies to the faithful, so that uninterrupted agreement is secured between Bible and Tradition, between patristic and scholastic teaching, between the past and the present. If therefore "the reformation was mainly a struggle against the doctrine of merit" (Realencyklopädie, loc. cit., p. 506) this only proves that the Council of Trent defended against unjustified innovations the old doctrine of the meritoriousness of good works, founded alike on Scripture and Tradition.

(b) This doctrine of the Church, moreover, fully accords with natural ethics. Divine Providence, as the supreme lawgiver, owes it to itself to give efficacious sanction to both the natural and the supernatural law with their many commandments and prohibitions, and to secure their observance by holding out rewards and punishments. Even human laws are provided with sanctions, which are often very severe. He who denies the meritoriousness of good works performed by the just must necessarily also deny the culpability and demerit of the sinner's misdeeds; must hold that sins remain without punishment, and that the fear of hell is both groundless and useless. If there be no eternal reward for an upright life and no eternal chastisement for sin, it will matter little to the majority of people whether they lead a good or a bad life. It is true that, even if there were neither reward nor punishment, it would be contrary to rational nature to lead an immoral life; for the moral obligation

to do always what is right, does not of itself depend on retribution. But Kant undoubtedly went too far when he repudiated as immoral those actions which are performed with a view to our personal happiness or to that of others, and proclaimed the "categorical imperative," i. e., frigid duty clearly perceived, as the only motive of moral conduct. For, though this so-called "autonomy of the moral will" may at first sight appear highly ideal, still it is unnatural and cannot be carried out in practical life, because virtue and happiness, duty and merit (with the claim to reward), are not mutually exclusive, but, as correlatives, they rather condition and complete each other. The peace of a good conscience that follows the faithful performance of duty is an unsought-for reward of our action and an interior happiness of which no calamity can deprive us, so that, as a matter of fact, duty and happiness are always linked together.

(c) But is not this continual acting "with one eye on heaven", with which Professor Jodl reproaches Catholic moral teaching, the meanest "mercenary spirit" and greed which necessarily vitiates to the core all moral action? Can there be any question of morality, if it is only the desire for eternal bliss or simply the fear of hell that determines one to do good and avoid evil? Such a disposition is certainly far from being the ideal of Catholic morality. On the contrary, the Church proclaims to all her children that pure love of God is the first and supreme commandment (cf. Mark, xii, 30). It is our highest ideal to act out of love. For he who truly loves God would keep His commandments, even though there were no eternal reward in the next life. Nevertheless, the desire for heaven is a necessary and natural consequence of the perfect love of God; for heaven is only the perfect possession of God by love. As a true friend desires to see his friend without thereby sinking into egotism so does the loving soul ardently desire the Beatific Vision, not from a craving for reward, but out of pure love. It is unfortunately too true that only the best type of Christians, and especially the great saints of the Church, reach this high standard of morality in everyday life. The great majority of ordinary Christians must be deterred from sin principally by the fear of hell and spurred on to good works by the thought of an eternal reward, before they attain perfect love. But, even for those souls who love God, there are times of grave temptation when only the thought of heaven and hell keeps them from falling. Such a disposition, be it habitual or only transitory, is morally less perfect, but it is not immoral. As, according to Christ's doctrine and that of St. Paul (see above), it is legitimate to hope for a heavenly reward, so, according to the same doctrine of Christ (cf. Matt., x, 28), the fear of hell is a motive of moral action, a "grace of God and an impulse of the Holy Ghost" (Council of Trent, Sess. XIV, cap. iv, in Denzinger, n. 898). Only that desire for remuneration (*amor mercenarius*) is reprehensible which would content itself with an eternal happiness without God, and that "doubly servile fear" (*timor serviliter servilis*) is alone immoral which proceeds from a mere dread of punishment without at the same time fearing God. But the dogmatic as well as the moral teaching of the Church avoids both of these extremes (see ATTRITION).

Besides blaming the Church for fostering a "craving for reward," Protestants also accuse her of teaching "justification by works". External works alone, they allege, such as fasting, almsgiving, pilgrimages, the recitation of the rosary etc., make the Catholic good and holy, the interior intention and disposition being held to no account. "The whole doctrine of merit, especially as explained by Catholics is based on the erroneous view which places the essence of morality in the individual action without any regard for the interior disposition as the habitual direction of the personal will" (Realencyklopädie, loc. cit., p. 508). Only the grossest ignorance of Catholic doctrine can prompt such remarks. In accord with the Bible the Church teaches that the external work has a moral value only when and in so far as it proceeds from a right interior disposition and intention (cf. Matt., vi, 1 sqq.; Mark, xii, 41 sqq.; I Cor., x, 31, etc.). As the body receives its life from the soul, so must external actions be penetrated and vivified by holiness of intention. In a beautiful play on words St. Augustine says (Serm. iii, n. xi): *Bonos mores faciunt boni amores.* Hence the Church urges her children to forming each morning the "good intention", that they may thereby sanctify the whole day and make even the indifferent actions of their exterior life serve for the glory of God; "all for the greater glory of God", is the constant prayer of the faithful Catholic. Not only does the moral teaching of the Catholic Church attribute no moral value whatever to the mere external performance of good works without a corresponding good intention, but it detests such performance as hyprocrisy and pretence. On the other hand, our good intention, provided it be genuine and deep-rooted, naturally spurs us on to external works, and without these works it would be reduced to a mere semblance of life.

A third charge against the Catholic doctrine on merit is summed up in the word "self-righteousness", as if the just man utterly disregarded the merits of Christ and arrogated to himself the whole credit of his good works. If any Catholic has ever been so pharisaical as to hold and practise this doctrine, he has certainly set himself in direct opposition to what the Church teaches. The Church has always proclaimed what St. Augustine expresses in the words: "Non Deus coronat merita tua tanquam merita tua, sed tanquam dona sua" (De grat. et lib. arbitrio, xv), i. e., God crowns thy merits, not as thine earnings, but as His gifts. Nothing was more strongly and frequently inculcated by the Council of Trent than the proposition that the faithful owe their entire capability of meriting and all their good works solely to the infinite merits of the Redeemer Jesus Christ. It is indeed clear that meritorious works, as "fruits of the justification", cannot be anything but merits due to grace, and not merits due to nature (cf. Council of Trent, Sess. VI, cap. xvi). The Catholic certainly must rely on the merits of Christ, and, far from boasting of his own self-righteousness, he must acknowledge in all humility that even his merits, acquired with the help of grace, are full of imperfections, and that his justification is uncertain (see GRACE). Of the satisfactory works of penance the Council of Trent makes this explicit declaration: "Thus, man has not wherein to glory, but all our glorying is in Christ, in whom we live, move, and make satisfaction, bringing forth fruits worthy of penance, which from Him have their efficacy, are by Him offered to the Father, and through Him find with the Father acceptance" (Sess. XIV, cap. viii, in Denzinger, n. 904). Does this read like self-righteousness?

III. CONDITIONS OF MERIT.—For all true merit (*vere mereri;* Council of Trent, Sess. VI, can. xxxii), by which is to be understood only *meritum de condigno* (see Pallavicini, "Hist. Concil. Trident.", VIII, iv), theologians have set down seven conditions, of which four regard the meritorious work, two the agent who merits, and one God who rewards.

(a) In order to be meritorious a work must be morally good, morally free, done with the assistance of actual grace, and inspired by a supernatural motive. As every evil deed implies demerit and deserves punishment, so the very notion of merit supposes a morally good work. St. Paul teaches that "whatsoever good thing [*bonum*] any man shall do, the same shall he receive from the Lord, whether he be bond, or free" (Eph. vi, 8). Not only are more perfect works

of supererogation, such as the vow of perpetual chastity, good and meritorious, but also works of obligation, such as the faithful observance of the commandments. Christ Himself actually made the attainment of Heaven depend on the mere observance of the ten commandments when he answered the youth who was anxious about his salvation: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments" (Matt., xix, 17). According to the authentic declaration of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), the married state is also meritorious for heaven: "Not only those who live in virginity and continence, but also those who are married, please God by their faith and good works and merit eternal happiness" (cap. Firmiter, in Denzinger, n. 430). As to morally indifferent actions (e. g., exercise and play, recreation derived from reading and music), some moralists hold with the Scotists that such works may be indifferent not only in the abstract, but also practically; this opinion, however, is rejected by the majority of theologians. Those who hold this view must hold that such morally indifferent actions are neither meritorious nor demeritorious, but become meritorious in proportion as they are made morally good by means of the "good intention". Although the voluntary omission of a work of obligation, such as the hearing of Mass on Sundays, is sinful and thereby demeritorious, still, according to the opinion of Suarez (De gratia, X, ii, 5 sqq.), it is more than doubtful whether conversely the mere omission of a bad action is in itself meritorious. But the overcoming of a temptation would be meritorious, since this struggle is a positive act and not a mere omission. Since the external work as such derives its entire moral value from the interior disposition, it adds no increase of merit except in so far as it reacts on the will and has the effect of intensifying and sustaining its action (cf. De Lugo, "De pœnit.", disp. xxiv, sect. 6).

As to the second requisite, i. e., moral liberty, it is clear from ethics that actions, due to external force or internal compulsion, can deserve neither reward nor punishment. It is an axiom of criminal jurisprudence that no one shall be punished for a misdeed done without free will; similarly, a good work can only then be meritorious and deserving of reward when it proceeds from a free determination of the will. This is the teaching of Christ (Matt., xix, 21): "If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast, and give it to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven."

The necessity of the third condition, i. e., of the influence of actual grace, is clear from the fact that every act meriting heaven must evidently be supernatural just as heaven itself is supernatural, and that consequently it cannot be performed without the help of prevenient and assisting grace, which is necessary even for the just. The strictly supernatural destiny of the Beatific Vision, for which the Christian must strive, necessitates ways and means which lie altogether beyond what is purely natural (see GRACE).

Finally, a supernatural motive is required because good works must be supernatural, not only as regards their object and circumstances, but also as regards the end for which they are performed (*ex fine*). But, in assigning the necessary qualities of this motive, theologians differ widely. While some require the motive of faith (*motivum fidei*) in order to have merit, others demand in addition the motive of charity (*motivum caritatis*), and thus, by rendering the conditions more difficult, considerably restrict the extent of meritorious works (as distinguished from merely good works). Others again set down as the only condition of merit that the good work of the just man, who already has habitual faith and charity, be in conformity with the Divine law, and require no other special motive. This last opinion, which is in accordance with the practice of the majority of the faithful, is tenable, provided faith and charity exert at least an habitual (not necessarily virtual or actual) influence upon the good work, which influence essentially consists in this, that man at the time of his conversion makes an act of faith and of love of God, thereby knowingly and willingly beginning his supernatural journey towards God in heaven; this intention habitually retains its influence as long as it has not been revoked by mortal sin. And, since there is a grave obligation to make acts of faith, hope, and charity from time to time, these two motives will thereby be occasionally renewed and revived. For the controversy regarding the motive of faith see Chr. Pesch, "Prælect. dogmat.", V, 3rd ed. (1908), 225 sqq.; on the motive of charity, see Pohle, "Dogmatik" II 4th ed. (1909), 565 sqq.

(b) The agent who merits must fulfil two conditions; he must be in the state of pilgrimage (*status viæ*) and in the state of grace (*status gratiæ*). By the state of pilgrimage is to be understood our earthly life; death, as a natural (although not an essentially necessary) limit, closes the time of meriting. The time of sowing is confined to this life; the reaping is reserved for the next, when no man will be able to sow either wheat or cockle. Comparing the earthly life with day and the time after death with night, Christ says: "The night cometh, when no man can work [*operari*]" (John, ix, 4; cf. Eccl., xi, 3; Ecclus., xiv, 17). The opinion proposed by a few theologians (Hirscher, Schell), that for certain classes of men there may still be a possibility of conversion after death, is contrary to the revealed truth that the particular judgment (*judicium particulare*) determines instantly and definitively whether the future is to be one of eternal happiness or of eternal misery (cf. Kleutgen, "Theologie der Vorzeit", II, 2nd ed., Münster, 1872, pp. 427 sqq.). Baptized children, who die before attaining the age of reason, are admitted to heaven without merits on the sole title of inheritance (*titulus hæreditatis*); in the case of adults, however, there is the additional title of reward (*titulus mercedis*), and for that reason they will enjoy a greater measure of eternal happiness.

In addition to the state of pilgrimage, the state of grace (i. e., the possession of sanctifying grace) is required for meriting, because only the just can be "sons of God" and "heirs of heaven" (cf. Rom., viii, 17). In the parable of the vine Christ expressly declares the "abiding in him" a necessary condition for "bearing fruit": "He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit" (John, xv, 5); and this constant union with Christ is effected only by sanctifying grace. In opposition to Vasquez, most theologians are of opinion that one who is holier will gain greater merit for a given work than one who is less holy, although the latter perform the same work under exactly the same circumstances and in the same way. The reason is that a higher degree of grace enhances the godlike dignity of the agent, and this dignity increases the value of the merit. This explains why God, in consideration of the greater holiness of some saints specially dear to Him, has deigned to grant favours which otherwise He would have refused (Job, xlii, 8; Dan., iii, 35).

(c) Merit requires on the part of God that He accept (*in actu secundo*) the good work as meritorious, even though the work in itself (*in actu primo*) and previous to its acceptance by God, be already truly meritorious. Theologians, however, are not agreed as to the necessity of this condition. The Scotists hold that the entire condignity of the good work rests exclusively on the gratuitous promise of God and His free acceptance, without which even the most heroic act is devoid of merit, and with which even mere naturally good works may become meritorious. Other theologians with Suarez (De gratia, XIII, 30) maintain that, before and without Divine acceptance, the strict equality that exists between merit and re-

ward founds a claim of justice to have the good works rewarded in heaven. Both these views are extreme. The Scotists almost completely lose sight of the godlike dignity which belongs to the just as "adopted children of God", and which naturally impresses on their supernatural actions the character of meritoriousness; Suarez, on the other hand, unnecessarily exaggerates the notion of Divine justice and the condignity of merit, for the abyss that lies between human service and Divine remuneration is ever so wide that there could be no obligation of bridging it over by a gratuitous promise of reward and the subsequent acceptance on the part of God who has bound himself by His own fidelity. Hence we prefer with Lessius (De perfect. moribusque div., XIII, ii) and De Lugo (De incarnat. disp. 3, sect. 1 sq.) to follow a middle course. We therefore say that the condignity between merit and reward owes its origin to a twofold source: to the intrinsic value of the good work and to the free acceptance and gratuitous promise of God (cf. James, i, 12). See Schiffini, "De gratia divina" (Freiburg, 1901), pp. 416 sqq.

IV. The Objects of Merit.—Merit in the strict sense (*meritum de condigno*) gives a right to a threefold reward: increase of sanctifying grace, heavenly glory, and the increase thereof; other graces can be acquired only in virtue of congruous merit (*meritum de congruo*).

(a) In its Sixth Session (can. xxxii), the Council of Trent declared: "If any one saith . . . that the justified man by good works . . . does not truly merit [*vere mereri*] increase of grace, eternal life, and the attainment of that eternal life—if so be, however, that he depart in grace—and also an increase in glory; let him be anathema." The expression "vere mereri" shows that the three objects mentioned above can be merited in the true and strict sense of the word, viz., *de condigno*. Increase of grace (*augmentum gratiæ*) is named in the first place to exclude the first grace of justification concerning which the council had already taught: "None of those things, which precede justification—whether faith or works—merit the grace itself of justification" (Sess. VI, cap. viii). This impossibility of meriting the first habitual grace is as much a dogma of our Faith as the absolute impossibility of meriting the first actual grace (see Grace). The growth in sanctifying grace, on the other hand, is perfectly evident from both Scripture and Tradition (cf. Ecclus., xviii, 22; II Cor., ix, 10; Apoc., xxii, 11 sq.). To the question whether the right to actual graces needed by the just be also an object of strict merit, theologians commonly answer that, together with the increase of habitual grace, merely sufficient graces may be merited *de condigno*, but not efficacious graces. The reason is that the right to efficacious graces would necessarily include the strict right to final perseverance, which lies completely outside the sphere of condign merit although it may be obtained by prayer (see Grace). Not even heroic acts give a strict right to graces which are always efficacious or to final perseverance, for even the greatest saint is still obliged to watch, pray, and tremble lest he fall from the state of grace. This explains why the Council of Trent purposely omitted efficacious grace and the gift of perseverance, when it enumerated the objects of merit.

Life everlasting (*vita æterna*) is the second object of merit; the dogmatical proof for this assertion has been given above in treating of the existence of merit. It still remains to inquire whether the distinction made by the Council of Trent between *vita æterna* and *vitæ æternæ consecutio* is meant to signify a twofold reward: "life everlasting" and "the attainment of life everlasting", and hence a twofold object of merit. But theologians rightly deny that the council had this in view, because it is clear that the right to a reward coincides with the right to the payment of the same. Nevertheless, the distinction was not useless or superfluous because, notwithstanding the right to eternal glory, the actual possession of it must necessarily be put off until death, and even then depends upon the condition: "si tamen in gratia decesserit" (provided he depart in grace). With this last condition the council wished also to inculcate the salutary truth that sanctifying grace may be lost by mortal sin, and that the loss of the state of grace *ipso facto* entails the forfeiture of all merits however great. Even the greatest saint, should he die in the state of mortal sin, arrives in eternity as an enemy of God with empty hands, just as if during life he had never done anything, meritorious. All his former rights to grace and glory are cancelled. To make them revive a new justification is necessary. On this "revival of merits" (*reviviscentia meritorum*) see Schiffini, "De gratia divina" (Freiburg, 1901), pp. 661 sqq.; this question is treated in detail by Pohle, "Dogmatik", III (4th ed., Paderborn, 1910), pp. 440 sqq.

As the third object of merit the council mentions the "increase of glory" (*gloriæ augmentum*) which evidently must correspond to the increase of grace, as this corresponds to the accumulation of good works. At the Last Day, when Christ will come with his angels to judge the world, "He will render to every man according to his works [*secundum opera eius*]" (Matt., xvi, 27; cf. Rom., ii, 6). And St. Paul repeats the same (I Cor., iii, 8): "Every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labour [*secundum suum laborem*]". This explains the inequality that exists between the glory of the different saints.

(b) By his good works the just man may merit for himself many graces and favours, not, however, by right and justice (*de condigno*), but only congruously (*de congruo*). Most theologians incline to the opinion that the grace of final perseverance is among the objects of congruous merit, which grace, as has been shown above, is not and cannot be merited condignly. It is better, however, and safer if, with a view to obtaining this great grace on which our eternal happiness depends, we have recourse to fervent and unremitting prayer, for Christ held out to us that above all our spiritual needs he would infallibly hear our prayer for this great gift (cf. Matt., xxi, 22; Mark, xi, 24; Luke, xi, 9; John, xiv, 13, etc.). For further explanation see Bellarmine, "De justif.", V, xxii; Tepe, "Instit. theol.", III (Paris, 1896), 258 sqq.

It is impossible to answer with equal certainty the question whether the just man is able to merit in advance the grace of conversion, if perchance he should happen to fall into mortal sin. St. Thomas denies this absolutely: "Nullus potest sibi mereri reparationem post lapsum futurum neque merito condigni neque merito congrui" (Summa Theol., I-II, Q. cxiv, a. 7). But because the Prophet Jehu declared to Josaphat, the wicked King of Juda (cf. II Par., xix, 2 sqq.), that God had regard for his former merits, almost all other theologians consider it a "pious and probable opinion" that God, in granting the grace of conversion, does not entirely disregard the merits lost by mortal sin, especially if the merits previously acquired surpass in number and weight the sins, which, perhaps, were due to weakness, and if those merits are not crushed, as it were, by a burden of iniquity (cf. Suarez, "De gratia", XII, 38). Prayer for future conversion from sin is indeed morally good and useful (cf. Ps., lxx, 9), because the disposition by which we sincerely wish to be freed as soon as possible from the state of enmity with God cannot but be pleasing to Him. Temporal blessings, such as health, freedom from extreme poverty, success in one's undertakings, seem to be objects of congruous merit only in so far as they are conducive to eternal salvation; for only on this hypothesis do they assume the character of actual graces (cf. Matt., vi, 33). But, for obtaining temporal favours, prayer is more effective than meritorious works, provided that the granting of the petition be not against

the designs of God or the true welfare of him who prays. The just man may merit *de congruo* for others (e. g., parents, relatives, and friends) whatever he is able to merit for himself: the grace of conversion, final perseverance, temporal blessings, nay even the very first prevenient grace (*gratia prima præveniens*), (Summa Theol., I-II, Q. cxiv, a. 6) which he can in no wise merit for himself. St. Thomas gives as reason for this the intimate bond of friendship which sanctifying grace establishes between the just man and God. These effects are immeasurably strengthened by prayer for others; as it is beyond doubt that prayer plays an important part in the present economy of salvation. For further explanation see Suarez, "De gratia", XII, 38. Contrary to the opinion of a few theologians (e. g., Billuart), we hold that even a man in mortal sin, provided he co-operate with the first grace of conversion, is able to merit *de congruo* by his supernatural acts not only a series of graces which will lead to conversion, but finally justification itself; at all events it is certain that he may obtain these graces by prayer, made with the assistance of grace (cf. Ps., l, 9; Tob., xii, 9; Dan., iv, 24; Matt., vi, 14).

For the concept of merit see Taparelli, *Saggio teoretico del diritto naturale* (Palermo, 1842); *Summa theol.*, I–II, Q. xxi, aa. 3–4; Wirth, *Der Begriff des Meritum bei Tertullian* (Leipzig, 1892); Idem, *Der Verdienstbegriff in der christl. Kirche nach seiner geschichtl. Entwickelung. II: Der Verdienstbegriff bei Cyprian* (Leipzig, 1901). For the Jewish conception of merit see Weber-Schnedemann, *Jüdische Theol.* (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1897). For merit itself cf. *Summa Theol.*, I–II, Q. cix, a. 5; Q. cxiv, aa. 1 sqq.; Bellarmine, *De justific.*, V, i–xxii; Suarez, *De gratia*, XII, i sqq.; Ripalda, *De ente supernaturali*, disp. lxxi–xcvi; Billuart, *De gratia*, dissert. viii, aa. 1–5; Schiffini, *De gratia divina* (Freiburg, 1901), pp. 594 sqq.; Pesch, *Præl. dogmat.*, V (3rd ed., Freiburg, 1908), 215 sqq.; Heinrich-Gutberlet, *Dogmat. Theologie*, VIII (Mainz, 1897); Pohle, *Dogmatik* (4th ed., Paderborn, 1909); Atzberger, *Gesch. der christl. Eschatologie* (Freiburg, 1896); Kneib, *Die Heteronomie der christl. Moral* (Vienna, 1903); Idem, *Die "Lohnsucht" der christl. Moral* (Vienna, 1904); Idem, *Die Jenseitsmoral im Kampfe um ihre Grundlagen* (Freiburg, 1906); Ernst, *Die Notwendigkeit der guten Meinung. Untersuchungen über die Gottesliebe als Prinzip der Sittlichkeit und Verdienstlichkeit* (Freiburg, 1905); Strehler, *Das Ideal der kathol. Sittlichkeit* (Breslau, 1907); Cathrein, *Die kathol. Weltanschauung in ihren Grundlinien mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Moral* (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1910).

J. Pohle.

Mermillod, Gaspard, Bishop of Lausanne and cardinal, b. at Carouge, Switzerland, 22 Sept., 1824; d. in Rome, 23 Feb., 1892. He studied at the Jesuit College at Freiburg, Switzerland; became a priest in 1847, and was soon after a curate in Geneva, where he established two periodicals: "L'Observateur Catholique" and "Les Annales Catholiques". In 1857 he became parish priest of Geneva and at the same time Vicar-General of the Bishop of Lausanne for the canton of Geneva. The splendid edifice of Notre-Dame, still the principal church of Geneva, was built by him from 1851 to 1859. The funds were subscribed from all parts of Christendom. In 1864 he became titular Bishop of Hebron, and auxiliary of the Bishop of Lausanne for the canton of Geneva, with residence at Geneva. For seven years he pursued without hindrance his episcopal functions, and was especially active for Catholic education, founding with Marie de Sales Chappuis the female Oblates of Saint Francis of Sales at Troyes for the protection of poor working girls. When the Holy See made him independent Administrator of Geneva, the Radical Government of the canton protested, and a long and serious conflict ensued. He was at first forbidden to exercise any episcopal functions whatever, and later was declared deposed even as regarded his functions as a parish-priest. When the Bishop of Lausanne renounced unconditionally the title of the See of Geneva, the pope appointed Mermillod to be Vicar-Apostolic of Geneva. The City Council, then, caused his expulsion from Switzerland, whereupon he repaired to Ferney, in French territory, from which place he governed his diocese as best he could. At the cessation of the religious conflict Leo XIII made the newly elected Bishop of Lausanne also Bishop of Geneva, without, however, depriving Mermillod of his office. The Government did not, however, alter its tactics, and Mermillod could return to Switzerland only after the death of the bishop whose successor he became. The conflict was, however, by no means at an end, for the canton of Geneva refused to recognize him as bishop, and normal relations were resumed only when Mermillod became cardinal in 1890. Cardinal Mermillod was one of the great preachers of modern times. In his far-sighted policy he founded in 1885 the "Union Catholique d'études sociales et économiques". His "Lettres à un Protestant sur l'autorité de l'église et le schisme" (Paris, 1860) made a great impression. Another important work was his "De la vie surnaturelle dans les âmes" (Lyons, 1865; Paris, 1881). His collected works were edited by Grospellier (Paris, 1893) in three volumes.

Keller, *In rei memoriam* (Paran, 1883); Belloc, *Le cardinal Mermillod, sa vie, ses œuvres et son apostolat* (Fribourg, 1892).

Patricius Schlager.

Merneptah I (1234?–1214 B. C.), the fourth king of the nineteenth Egyptian dynasty and the supposed Pharaoh of the Exodus, was the thirteenth son of Rameses II whom he succeeded in or about 1234 B. C., being then long past middle age. His rule lasted some twenty years, during which he carried on considerable building operations in the Delta, and notably at Tanis (Zoan), where, indeed as elsewhere, he usurped a number of some of his predecessors' monuments. His original works are comparatively few and insignificant. His name is constantly found on the monuments of his father; it appears also in Nubia, and in the old quarries in the Sinaitic peninsula. In his third year, he quelled a revolt to the N. E., possibly excited by the Hittites; and in his fifth year, he repelled an invasion of Egypt by the Lybians and their allies, which victory is boastfully described on a black granite stela found in 1896 in his funeral temple at Thebes, and bearing the earliest known reference to Israel. He is commonly regarded as the Pharaoh of the Exodus on the following grounds. On the one hand, recent Egyptian discoveries have shown that Rameses II founded the cities represented in Ex., i, 11, as built by the oppressed Hebrews, and therefore point to him as the Pharaoh of the oppression. On the other hand, Ex., ii, 23; iv, 19, imply that the immediate successor of that Pharaoh was on the throne when Moses returned to Egypt where he soon delivered his people. Whence it is not unnaturally inferred that Merneptah I, Rameses' son and successor, is the Pharaoh of the Exodus. The chief objection to this view is that it seems to contradict the final strophe of Merneptah's "Hymn of Victory" over the Lybians inscribed on the granite stela already referred to. After relating the subjection of Chanaan and of Ascalon by the Egyptians, this inscription adds: "Israel is spoiled, his seed is not; Palestine has become a widow for Egypt." How can Merneptah I be the Pharaoh of the Exodus since according to the obvious meaning of this passage, the Israelites when defeated by him were already settled in Palestine, a settlement which as we know from the Bible was effected only after a forty years' wandering and therefore after Merneptah's death? This difficulty has led many scholars to consider an earlier king as the Pharaoh of the Exodus, while others have answered it in various ways. The following is its most probable solution. Scholars not expecting the exact truth to be told in an Egyptian inscription concerning the Exodus disaster, and noticing that in the final strophe of Merneptah's "Hymn of Victory" an actual boastful misrepresentation of his relation to the Hittites, precedes almost immediately the distinct reference to Israel as "spoiled", will readily think that the glory therein claimed by Merneptah over the Israelites is to be taken as a boastful misrepresentation of what

really happened to him as the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Merneptah's mummy was discovered in 1896 and identified in 1900. This find does not disprove the identity of that monarch with the Pharaoh of the Exodus, for nothing in the Sacred Text requires the admission that Pharaoh pursued the Israelites in person, or was drowned as a result.

VIGOUROUX, *Bible et Découvertes Modernes*, 6th ed., II (Paris, 1896); VON HUMMELAUER, *Comm. in Ex.* (Paris, 1897); WALLIS BUDGE, *History of Egypt*, V (New York); FLINDERS PETRIE, *History of Egypt* (London, 1905); BREASTED, *Ancient Records of Egypt* (Chicago, 1906); *History of Egypt* (New York, 1909).

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Mernoc, SAINT. See ERNAN.

Mérode, FRÉDÉRIC-FRANÇOIS-XAVIER GHISLAIN DE, a Belgian prelate and statesman, b. at Brussels, 1820; d. at Rome, 1874. The son of Félix de Mérode-Westerloo who held successively the portfolios of foreign affairs, war, and finances under King Leopold, and of Rosalie de Grammont, he was allied to the best names of France,—Lafayette, Montmorency, Clemont-Tonnerre, etc.; the Mérode family claimed saints like Elizabeth of Hungary, founders like Werner who endowed the monastery of Schwartzenbroch, and a long line of captains from that Raymond-Bérenger who took the cross at St. Bernard's call, to Frédéric, Xavier's grandfather, who gave his life for the autonomy of Belgium. Bereft of his mother at the age of three, Xavier was brought up at Villersexel, in Franche-Comté, by his aunt Philippine de Grammont, attended for a time the Jesuit College of Namur, then entered the Collège de Juilly presided over by de Salinis, whence he passed (1839) to the Military Academy of Brussels. Graduating with the rank of second lieutenant, after a short service at the armoury of Liège, he joined (1844) as foreign attaché the staff of Maréchal Bugeaud in Algeria, taking a brilliant part in the most daring engagements and winning the cross of the *Légion d'honneur*. In 1847, he abruptly resigned the military career and went to study for the priesthood in Rome, where he was ordained (1849). Assigned, after his ordination, as chaplain to the French garrison of Viterbo, he was being pressed by his family to return to Belgium when Pius IX, with a view to attach him permanently to his court, made him *cameriere segreto* (1850), an office which entailed the direction of the Roman prisons. The excellent work done by de Mérode for the material, moral, and religious betterment of the penitentiary system in Rome is described by Lefebvre (Des établissements charitables de Rome, p. 245.) and Maguire (Rome, Its Ruler and Institutions, p. 238); de Rayneval, the French envoy at Rome, praised it in an official report to his government (see "Daily News", 18 March, 1848); Joachim Pecci, Archbishop of Perugia, wanted the young *camerlere* to inaugurate similar work in his metropolis, and the Piedmontese, despite their bias against everything papal, found nothing to change in the regulations introduced by de Mérode. In 1860, when it became evident that the insincere policy of Napoleon III was a poor safeguard against the greed of Piedmont, de Mérode, much against the views of the Roman Prelature, headed by Cardinal Antonelli, persuaded Pius IX to form a papal army and succeeded in enlisting the services of Lamoricière (q. v.) as commander-in-chief and was himself appointed minister of war. The task assumed by de Mérode and Lamoricière was difficult and well-nigh impossible; yet, the disasters of Castelfidardo and Ancona were due, not to the incompetence of the chiefs, nor solely to the heterogeneous nature of the recruits and the lack of proper supplies, but to the treachery of the Piedmontese who, while feigning to curb the Garibaldian bands, led them to the assault of the Papal States.

The ensuing years of comparative quiet de Mérode spent in various public works; the building at his own expense of the *campo pretoriano* outside the Porta Pia, the clearing of the approaches of Santa Maria degli Angeli, the opening of streets in the new section of Rome, the sanitation of the old quarters by the Tiber, etc. His impetuous temperament and progressive views made him enemies among the old traditional Roman element just as the vehemence with which he branded the French Emperor's duplicity turned against him the heads of the French army of occupation. Lamoricière's death (19 Sept., 1865) became the signal of open hostility. Pius IX was forced to discharge his minister whose continuance in office, it was freely asserted, meant the withdrawal of the French troops. Reduced to a simple *cameriere*, de Mérode was not forgotten by Pius IX on Hohenlohe's promotion to the cardinalate, he was given the vacant place of papal almoner and (22 June, 1866) consecrated titular Archbishop of Melitene. His new duties were to distribute the papal alms and to confirm children in danger of death, and he acquitted himself with a liberality and zeal that won him the love of the poor and afflicted. At the Vatican Council, he showed the influence exercised over him by his brother-in-law, de Montalembert, and sided with the minority that deemed the definition of papal infallibility inopportune and even dangerous, but submitted the day the dogma was defined. After the capture of Rome by the Piedmontese (20 Sept., 1870) he followed his master into the retirement of the Vatican, leaving it only to fight the Piedmontese government's pretensions on the *campo pretoriano* or to share de Rossi's work in the excavations of Tor Marancino which resulted in the discovery of the Basilica of St. Petronilla. It is there he welcomed (14 June, 1874) the pilgrims from the United States and his last public utterances were for them. Speaking of his kinsman Lafayette, he regretted his defection from the purity of the Catholic Faith, but remarked that the country which the great general had so loyally served was yielding precious elements for the upbuilding of the Church; then, pointing to a Damasian inscription recently found, "Credite per Damasum possit quid gloria Christi", he added with pathos that the edifying spectacle of American loyalty to Pius IX justified him in saying, "Credite per Pium possit quid gloria Christi". He died of acute pneumonia in the arms of Pius IX, only a few months before the Consistory in which he was to have been made a cardinal. His remains were laid to rest in the Flemish Cemetery near the Vatican, amid a vast concourse of people, the poor he had so generously assisted mingling with the prelates, ambassadors, and princes. De Mérode, in spite of his faults, will be remembered as a model of unswerving loyalty to the Holy See. Such was his popularity that when Don Margotti, in "l'Unità Cattolica", suggested in his behalf a world-wide tribute of prayers, the subscriber's names filled a large album published at Turin, 1875.

LAMY, *Monseigneur de Mérode* (Louvain, 1874); BESSON, *F. F. X. de Mérode, sa vie et ses œuvres* (Paris, 1886); LE POITEVIN, *Mgr. de Mérode* in *Les Contemporains* (Paris, s. d.); VEUILLOT, *Célébrités Catholiques Contemporains;* FLORNOY, *Lamoricière* (Paris, 1904).

J. F. SOLLIER.

Merovingians. See FRANKS.

Mersenne, MARIN, French theologian, philosopher, and mathematician; b. 8 September, 1588 near Oizé (now Department of Sarthe); d. 1 September, 1648, at Paris. He studied at Le Mans and at the Jesuit College of La Flèche, where a lifelong friendship with Descartes, his fellow student, originated. Mersenne entered the novitiate of the Minims at Nigeon near Paris (1611), was sent to Nevers as professor of philosophy (1614–1620), and returned to Paris. His first publications were theological and polemical studies against Atheism and Scepticism, but later, Mersenne devoted his time almost exclusively to science, making personal experimental researches, and

publishing a number of works on mathematical sciences. His chief merit, however, is rather the encouragement which he gave to scientists of his time, the interest he took in their work, and the stimulating influence of his suggestions and questions. Gassendi and Galileo were among his friends; but, above all, Mersenne is known to-day as Descartes's friend and adviser. In fact, when Descartes began to lead a free and dissipated life, it was Mersenne who brought him back to more serious pursuits and directed him toward philosophy. In Paris, Mersenne was Descartes's assiduous correspondent, auxiliary, and representative, as well as his constant defender. The numerous and vehement attacks against the "Meditations" seem, for a moment, to have aroused Malebranche's suspicions; but Descartes's answers to his critics gave him full satisfaction as to his friend's orthodoxy and sincere Christian spirit. Mersenne asked that, after his death, an autopsy be made on his body, so as to serve to the last the interests of science.

Mersenne's works are: "Quæstiones celeberrimæ in Genesim" (Paris, 1623), against Atheists and Deists; a part only has been published, the rest being still in manuscript, as also a "Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel"; "L'impiété des déistes et des plus subtils libertins découverte et réfutée par raisons de théologie et de philosophie" (Paris, 1624); "La vérité des sciences contre les sceptiques et les pyrrhoniens" (Paris, 1625); "Questions théologiques, physiques, morales et mathématiques" (Paris, 1634); "Questions inouïes, ou récréations des savants" (Paris, 1634); "Les mécaniques de Galilée" (Paris, 1634), a translation from the Italian; "Harmonie universelle, contenant la théorie et la pratique de la musique" (Paris, 1636–7); "Nouvelles découvertes de Galilée", and "Nouvelles pensées de Galilée sur les mécaniques" (Paris, 1639), both translations; "Cogitata physico-mathematica" (Paris, 1644); "Euclidis elementorum libri, Apollonii Pergæi conica, Sereni de sectione coni, etc." (Paris, 1626), selections and translations of ancient mathematicians, published again later with notes and additions under the title, "Universæ geometriæ mixtæque mathematicæ synopsis" (Paris, 1644).

DE COSTE, *Vie du R. P. Mersenne* (Paris, 1649); POTÉ, *Eloge de Mersenne* (Le Mans, 1816); BAILLET, *Vie de Descartes* (Paris, 1691); HAURÉAU, *Histoire littéraire de Maine*, I, 321.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Mesa (Gr., Μωσά; Moabite Stone, משע; Heb., מישע, meaning "deliverance" according to Gesenius), a King of Moab in the ninth century B. C., whose history is given in IV Kings, iii. He paid tribute to Achab, King of Israel, "a hundred thousand lambs and a hundred thousand rams with their fleeces" (verse 4). This seems to have been paid annually, and was possible since Moab was rich in pastures; accordingly Mesa is styled נקד, which, though left untranslated in the Greek text, means "sheep-owner" (Gesenius). After Achab's death Mesa refused to pay tribute, on which account Joram, King of Israel, Josaphat, King of Juda and the King of Edom entered into an alliance against him. They went by the southern route passing through an arid country, where they would have perished of drought, had not the prophet Eliseus miraculously supplied them with water. The ditches they had dug by command of the prophet were filled, and at sunrise the Moabites "saw the waters over against them red, like blood" (verse 22). Thinking their enemies had killed one another, they rushed to the camp with the cry "Moab to the spoils" (verse 23), only to be driven back with great slaughter. The allies followed. Mesa having tried, with seven hundred warriors, to cut his way through the besiegers and failed, took his eldest son, and upon the wall of the city, in sight of all, put him to death. "There was great indignation in Israel", so that, for reasons not given in detail, "they departed from him".

The Moabite Stone, perhaps the greatest Biblical discovery of modern times, throws some light on the period referred to. Through the learning and enterprise of M. Clermont-Ganneau, the inscription on the stone was published, and the stone itself is now one of the treasures of the Louvre, Paris. The monument, discovered in 1868 at Dhîbân (Dibon) in the land of Moab, is of basalt, about three feet eight inches by two feet three inches and fourteen inches thick. It resembles a head-stone, and is inscribed with thirty-four lines of writing, in which Mesa gives us the chief events of his reign. The stone was unfortunately broken by the Arabs as soon as they saw Europeans taking an interest in it; but squeezes had been taken previously, so that the inscription is almost intact. The fragments were collected, and missing parts supplied by plaster, the inscription on which was written from the squeezes. A writer in Smith's "Dict. of the Bible" (s. v. MOAB), knowing nothing about the Moabite Stone, says: "From the origin of the nation and other considerations, we may perhaps conjecture that their language was more a dialect of Hebrew than a different tongue". This conjecture the Moabite Stone makes a certainty. "The historical allusions and geographical names which we find in this inscription of Mesha tally so well with the O. T. that a suspicion could be aroused as to the genuineness of the stone" (Jour. of the Am. Or. Soc., XXII, 61). Suspicions have been aroused, but scholars almost unanimously set them aside as groundless. From the evidence furnished by the stone we may conclude that Josaphat, King of Juda, and Mesa, King of Moab, might have conversed, each in his own tongue, and understood each other. The old Phœnician character (found also in the Siloam inscription), the words, the grammatical forms and peculiarities of syntax in the two languages are nearly identical. The difference of pronunciation we cannot, of course, estimate since the vowels were not written. While the stone seems to be somewhat at variance with Scripture, yet the two substantially agree: Mesa says "Omri (Amri) King of Israel oppressed Moab", mentions his own revolt and adds, "Chemosh (Chamos) delivered me from all kings". He also describes his work of fortifying Moab, and as this made the north very strong, we see why the allies took the route south of the Dead Sea to attack him. The Bible hints at some disaster to the invaders, who withdrew suddenly on the very point of taking the city; while Mesa, like all Oriental monarchs in their records, may have magnified his victories and either omitted or minimized his defeats. The discrepancies therefore are only apparent, and chronological difficulties would be explained with better knowledge of the history of the period.

CLERMONT-GANNEAU, *La Stèle de Mésa, Roi de Moab* (1870): the first public notice of the stone; GINSBURG, *The Moabite Stone* (2nd ed., London, 1871); BENNETT in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. *Moab*, gives inscription, linguistic features, various readings, etc.; GEIKIE, *Hours with the Bible:* chap. IV, *Rehoboam to Hezekiah;* VIGOUROUX, *La Bible et les Découvertes Modernes*, 3rd ed., IV, Book II, ch. iv; SAYCE, *The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments* (1894); HOMMEL, *The Ancient Heb. Trad.* (tr. 1897), 273 sq.; 361 sq.; DRIVER in *Ency. Bib.*, s. v. *Mesha*, gives history of inscription, text, references, etc.; JOSEPHUS, *Ant.*, IX, iii.

JOHN J. TIERNEY.

Mesha. See MESA.

Mesopotamia, Kurdistan, and Armenia, DELEGATION APOSTOLIC OF, created by Gregory XVI, 17 Dec., 1832. Mgr. Trioche, Archbishop of Babylon or Bagdad, became its first titular; he resided habitually in Bagdad. Resigning in 1850, Mgr. Trioche returned to France, retaining his title of Archbishop of Bagdad, but losing that of Apostolic delegate which passed to other bishops. These, while having charge of the administration of the Archdiocese of Bagdad, resided at Mosul, where they could better discharge their duties as Apostolic delegates in behalf of the Chaldeans, Syrians, and Armenians. Four out of six, from 1850 to 1887, were Dominicans. When Mgr. Trioche died in

France 27 Nov., 1887, the delegate Apostolic, Mgr Altmayer, received the title of Archbishop of Babylon or Bagdad, but continued to reside at Mossul. In 1902 he resigned and was replaced in the See of Bagdad by a Carmelite, Mgr. Drure, who on 5 March, 1904, received the title of delegate Apostolic of Mesopotamia and still bears it. He usually resides at Mossul. The Delegation Apostolic of Mesopotamia has almost the same boundaries as the Archdiocese of Bagdad, but comprises part of the mission of Greater Armenia and the Nestorians of Turkish Kurdistan, which mission is confided to the Dominicans of Mossul. (See BAGDAD; MOSSUL.)

PIOLET, *Les Missions*, I (Paris, 1900), 236–44.

S. VAILHÉ.

Mesrob, also called MASHTOTS, one of the greatest figures in Armenian history, b. about 361 at Hassik in the Province of Taron; d. at Valarsabad, 441. He was the son of Vartan of the family of the Mamikonians. Goriun, his pupil and biographer, tells us that Mesrob received a liberal education, and was versed in the Greek, Syriac, and Persian languages. On account of his piety and learning Mesrob was appointed secretary to King Chosroes III. His duty was to write in Greek, Persian, and Syriac characters the decrees and edicts of the sovereign, for, at this time, there was no national alphabet. But Mesrob felt called to a more perfect life. Leaving the court for the service of God, he took Holy orders, and withdrew to a monastery with a few chosen companions. There, says Goriun, he practised great austerities, enduring hunger and thirst, cold and poverty. He lived on vegetables, wore a hair shirt, slept upon the ground, and often spent whole nights in prayer and the study of the Holy Scriptures. This life he continued for a few years, preparing himself for the great work to which Providence was soon to call him. Indeed both Church and State needed his services. Armenia, so long the battle-ground of Romans and Persians, lost its independence in 387, and was divided between the Byzantine Empire and Persia, about four-fifths being given to the latter. Western Armenia was governed by Greek generals, while an Armenian king ruled, but only as feudatory, over Persian Armenia. The Church was naturally influenced by these violent political changes, although the loss of civil independence and the partition of the land could not destroy its organization or subdue its spirit. Persecution only quickened it into greater activity, and had the effect of bringing the clergy, the nobles, and the common people closer together. The principal events of this period are the invention of the Armenian alphabet, the revision of the liturgy, the creation of an ecclesiastical and national literature, and the readjustment of hierarchical relations. Three men are prominently associated with this stupendous work: Mesrob, Patriarch Isaac, and King Vramshapuh, who succeeded his brother Chosroes III in 394.

Mesrob, as we have noted, had spent some time in a monastery preparing for a missionary life. With the support of Prince Shampith, he preached the Gospel in the district of Golthn near the Araxes, converting many heretics and pagans. However, he experienced great difficulty in instructing the people, for the Armenians had no alphabet of their own, but used the Greek, Persian, and Syriac scripts, none of which was well suited for representing the many complex sounds of their native tongue. Again, the Holy Scriptures and the liturgy, being written in Syriac, were, to a large extent, unintelligible to the faithful. Hence the constant need of translators and interpreters to explain the Word of God to the people. Mesrob, desirous to remedy this state of things, resolved to invent a national alphabet, in which undertaking Isaac and King Vramshapuh promised to assist him. It is hard to determine exactly what part Mesrob had in the fixing of the new alphabet. According to his Armenian biographers, he consulted Daniel, a bishop of Mesopotamia, and Rufinus, a monk of Samosata, on the matter. With their help and that of Isaac and the king, he was able to give a definite form to the alphabet, which he probably adapted from the Greek. Others, like Lenormant, think it derived from the Zend. Mesrob's alphabet consisted of thirty-six letters; two more (long O and F) were added in the twelfth century.

The invention of the alphabet (406) was the beginning of Armenian literature, and proved a powerful factor in the upbuilding of the national spirit. "The result of the work of Isaac and Mesrob", says St. Martin (Histoire du Bas-Empire de Lebeau, V, 320), "was to separate for ever the Armenians from the other peoples of the East, to make of them a distinct nation, and to strengthen them in the Christian Faith by forbidding or rendering profane all the foreign alphabetic scripts which were employed for transcribing the books of the heathens and of the followers of Zoroaster. To Mesrob we owe the preservation of the language and literature of Armenia; but for his work, the people would have been absorbed by the Persians and Syrians, and would have disappeared like so many nations of the East". Anxious that others should profit by his discovery, and encouraged by the patriarch and the king, Mesrob founded numerous schools in different parts of the country, in which the youth were taught the new alphabet. But his activity was not confined to Eastern Armenia. Provided with letters from Isaac he went to Constantinople and obtained from the Emperor Theodosius the Younger permission to preach and teach in his Armenian possessions. He evangelized successively the Georgians, Albanians, and Aghouanghks, adapting his alphabet to their languages, and, wherever he preached the Gospel, he built schools and appointed teachers and priests to continue his work. Having returned to Eastern Armenia to report on his missions to the patriarch, his first thought was to provide a religious literature for his countrymen. Having gathered around him numerous disciples, he sent some to Edessa, Constantinople, Athens, Antioch, Alexandria, and other centres of learning, to study the Greek language and bring back the masterpieces of Greek literature. The most famous of his pupils were John of Egheghiatz, Joseph of Baghin, Eznik, Goriun, Moses of Chorene, and John Mandakuni.

The first monument of this Armenian literature is the version of the Holy Scriptures. Isaac, says Moses of Chorene, made a translation of the Bible from the Syriac text about 411. This work must have been considered imperfect, for soon afterwards John of Egheghiatz and Joseph of Baghin were sent to Edessa to translate the Scriptures. They journeyed as far as Constantinople, and brought back with them authentic copies of the Greek text. With the help of other copies obtained from Alexandria the Bible was translated again from the Greek according to the text of the Septuagint and Origen's Hexapla. This version, now in use in the Armenian Church, was completed about 434. The decrees of the first three councils—Nicæa, Constantinople, and Ephesus—and the national liturgy (so far written in Syriac) were also translated into Armenian, the latter being revised on the liturgy of St. Basil, though retaining characteristics of its own. Many works of the Greek Fathers also passed into Armenian. The loss of the Greek originals has given some of these versions a special importance; thus, the second part of Eusebius's "Chronicle", of which only a few fragments exist in the Greek, has been preserved entire in Armenian. In the midst of his literary labours Mesrob did not neglect the spiritual needs of the people. He revisited the districts he had evangelized in his earlier years, and, after the death of Isaac in 440, looked after the spiritual administration of the patriarchate.

He survived his friend and master only six months. The Armenians read his name in the Canon of the Mass, and celebrate his memory on 19 February.

SMITH AND WACE, *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v. *Mesrobs;* LANGLOIS, *Collection des Historiens de l'Arménie*, II (Paris, 1869); WEBER, *Die kathol. Kirche in Armenien* (1903); NEUMANN, *Versuch einer Gesch. der armen. Litteratur* (Leipzig, 1836); GARDTHAUSEN, *Ueber den griech. Ursprung der armen. Schrift* in *Zeitschr. der deutsch. morgenländ. Gesellschaft*, XXX (1876); LENORMANT, *Essai sur la propagation de l'alphabet phénicien*, I (1872).

A. A. VASCHALDE.

Messalians (Praying folk; participle Pa'el of צלא, Aramaic for "to pray"), an heretical sect which originated in Mesopotamia about 360 and survived in the East until the ninth century. They are also called Euchites from the Greek translation of their Oriental name (εὐχῆται from εὔχομαι, to pray); Adelphians from their first leader; Lampetians from Lampetius, their first priest (ordained about 458); Enthusiasts from their peculiar tenet of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost by Whom they thought themselves inspired or possessed (ἔνθους). The non-Christian sect of the Euphemites were also called Messalians, and Epiphanius (Hær., lxxx), our sole informant about these, considers them the forerunners of the Christian Messalians. The non-Christian Messalians are said to have admitted a plurality of gods, but to have worshipped only one, the Almighty (Παντοκράτωρ). They were forcibly suppressed by Christian magistrates and many of them put to death. Hence they became self-styled *Martyriani*. The Christian Messalians were a kind of Eastern Circumcellions or vagrant Quietists. Sacraments they held to be useless, though harmless, the only spiritual power being prayer, by which one drove out the evil spirit which baptism had not expelled, received the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, and arrived at union with God, becoming so perfect that the passions ceased to trouble. They disregarded discipline in the matter of fasting, wandered from place to place, and in summer were accustomed to sleep in the streets. To avoid persecution they would conform to ecclesiastical usages, profess orthodoxy, and deny any heretical doctrines ascribed to them. They engaged in no occupations, were solely occupied in prayer, as they said, or rather in sleep, as Theodoret sarcastically remarks. The intensity of their prayer brought them into immediate communication with the Godhead. When they had reached the passionless state (ἀπάθεια, "apathy"), they saw the Trinity, the three Divine Persons becoming one and dwelling within them. They likewise saw the evil spirits that go through the world for the ruin of souls, and trod them under foot. In fact every man had within him a demon, who could only be replaced by the Holy Ghost. Even Christ's body was full of demons once.

Flavian, the Bishop of Antioch, tried to suppress them in his city about 376. By feigning sympathy he made Adelphius disclose his real doctrines; and then he banished him and his followers. They then wandered to the south-east of Asia Minor. Amphilochius of Iconium caused them to be again condemned at the Synod of Side (388 or 390). Letoius, Bishop of Melitene, finding some monasteries tainted with this Quietism, burnt them and drove the wolves from the sheepfold, as Theodoret narrates. The "Asceticus", "that filthy book of this heresy", as it is called in the public acts of the Third General Council (431), was condemned at Ephesus, after it had already been condemned by a Council of Constantinople in 426 and by the local council at which Amphilochius of Side presided. Yet the sect continued to exist. At first it included only laymen. Lampetius, one of the leaders after the middle of the fifth century was a priest, having been ordained by Alypius of Cæsarea. He was degraded from his priesthood on account of unpriestly conduct. He wrote a book called "The Testament". Salmon refers to a fragment of an answer by Severus of Antioch to this work of Lampetius (Wolf, "Anecdota Græca", III, 182). In Armenia in the middle of the fifth century strict decrees were issued against them, and they were especially accused of immorality; so that their very name in Armenian became the equivalent for "filthy". The Nestorians in Syria did their best to stamp out the evil by legislation; the Messalians ceased to exist under that name, but revived under that of the Bogomili. In the West they seem hardly to have been known; when the Marcianists, who held somewhat the same tenets as the Messalians, were mentioned to Gregory the Great, he professed never to have heard of the Marcian heresy.

EPIPHANIUS, *Hær.*, lxxx; THEODORET, *Hist. Ec.*, IV, x; IDEM, *Hær. fab.*, IV, xi; CYRIL OF ALEX., *De Adorat. in Spir. et Verit.*, III in *P. G.*, LXVIII, 282; TIMOTHEUS in *Eccles. Græc. mon.*, III, 400 sqq.; TER-MKRTTSCHIAN, *Die Paulikianer im byz. Kaiserreich* (Leipzig, 1893); PHOTIUS in *P. G.*, CIII, 187 sqq.

J. P. ARENDZEN.

Messene, a titular see, suffragan to Corinth, in Achaia. Under this name at least, the city dates only from the fourth century B. C. When Epaminondas had crushed the Spartans at Leuctra, he recalled the scattered Messenians and caused them to build, on the slopes of Mount Ithome, a new capital which they called Messene (370 B. C.). The fortified walls surrounding this city were over five and a half miles in length, and were accounted the best in Greece. The portion of them which still remains justifies this reputation. Christianity early took root there, though only a few of its bishops are known (Le Quien, "Oriens christianus", II, 195–98). At the beginning of the tenth century the "Notitia episcopatuum" of Leo the Wise gives Messene as an independent archbishopric (Gelzer, "Ungedruckte . . . Texte der Notitiæ episcopatuum", 551); and the same is true for the beginning of the fourteenth century (op. cit., 612). As this diocese does not figure in the "Notitia" of the fifteenth century, it may be assumed that it had then ceased to exist. The little village of Mavromati, with a population of 600, the capital of the Deme of Ithome, now stands upon the ruins of ancient Messene.

LEAKE, *Morea*, I, 336; MURE, *Tour in Greece*, II, 264; CURTIUS, *Peloponnesos*, II, 138; SMITH, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*, II, 338–340.

S. VAILHÉ.

Messias.—The name Μεσσίας is a transliteration of the Hebrew, משיח, "the anointed". The word appears only twice of the promised prince (Dan., ix, 26; Ps. ii, 2); yet, when a name was wanted for the promised one, who was to be at once King and Saviour, it was natural to employ this synonym for the royal title, denoting at the same time the King's royal dignity and His relation to God. The full title "Anointed of Jahveh" occurs in several passages of the Psalms of Solomon and the Apocalypse of Baruch, but the abbreviated form, "Anointed" or "the Anointed", was in common use. When used without the article, it would seem to be a proper name. The word Χριστός so occurs in several passages of the Gospels. This, however, is no proof that the word was generally so used at that time. In the Palestine Talmud the form with the article is almost universal, while the common use in the Babylonian Talmud without the article is not a sufficient argument for antiquity to prove that in the time of Christ it was regarded as a proper name. It is proposed in the present article: I, to give an outline of the prophetic utterances concerning the Messias; II, to show the development of the prophetic ideas in later Judaism; and III, to show how Christ vindicated His right to this title.

I. THE MESSIAS OF PROPHECY.—The earlier prophecies to Abraham and Isaac (Gen., xviii, 17–19; xxvi, 4–5) speak merely of the salvation that shall come through their seed. Later the royal dignity of the promised deliverer becomes the prominent feature. He is described as a king of the line of Jacob (Num., xxiv, 19), of Juda (Gen., xlix, 10: "The sceptre shall

not pass from Juda until he comes to whom it belongs"—taking שִׁלֹה as standing for לוֹ אשׁר), and of David (II Kings, vii, 11–16). It is sufficiently established that this last passage refers at least typically to the Messias. His kingdom shall be eternal (II Kings, vii, 13), His sway boundless (Ps. lxxi, 8); all nations shall serve Him (Ps. lxxi, 11). In the type of prophecy we are considering, the emphasis is on His position as a national hero. It is to Israel and Juda that He will bring salvation (Jer., xxiii, 6), triumphing over their enemies by force of arms (cf. the warrior-king of Ps. xlv). Even in the latter part of Isaias there are passages (e. g. lxi, 5–8) in which other nations are regarded as sharing in the kingdom rather as servants than as heirs, while the function of the Messias is to lift up Jerusalem to its glory and lay the foundations of an Israelitic theocracy.

But in this part of Isaias also occurs the splendid conception of the Messias as the Servant of Jahveh. He is a chosen arrow, His mouth like a sharp sword. The Spirit of the Lord is poured out upon Him, and His word is put into His mouth (xlii, 1; xlix, 1 sq.). The instrument of His power is the revelation of Jahveh. The nations wait on His teaching; He is the light of the Gentiles (xlii, 6). He establishes His Kingdom not by manifestation of material power, but by meekness and suffering, by obedience to the command of God in laying down His life for the salvation of many. "If he shall lay down his life for sin, he shall see a posterity and prolong his days" (liii, 10; cf. Knabenbauer, in loc.); "Therefore will I distribute to him very many, and he shall divide the spoils of the strong, because he hath delivered his soul unto death, and was reputed with the wicked" (liii, 12). His Kingdom shall consist of the multitude redeemed by His vicarious satisfaction, a satisfaction confined to no race or time but offered for the redemption of all alike. (For the Messianic application of these passages, especially Is., lii, 13–liii, cf. Condamin or Knabenbauer, in loc.) In spite, however, of Justin's use of the last-mentioned passage in "Dial. cum Tryphone", lxxxix, it would be rash to affirm that its reference to the Messias was at all widely realized among the Jews. In virtue of his prophetic and priestly offices the title of "the Anointed" naturally belonged to the promised one. The Messianic priest is described by David in Ps. cix, with reference to Gen., xiv, 14–20. That this psalm was generally understood in a Messianic sense is not disputed, while the universal consent of the Fathers puts the matter beyond question for Catholics. As regards its Davidic authorship, the arguments impugning it afford no warrant for an abandonment of the traditional view. That by the prophet described in Deut., xviii, 15–22, was also understood, at least at the beginning of our era, the Messias is clear from the appeal to his gift of prophecy made by the pseudo-Messias Theudas (cf. Josephus, "Antiq.", XX, v, 1) and the use made of the passage by St. Peter in Acts, iii, 22–23.

Special importance attaches to the prophetic description of the Messias contained in Daniel, vii, the great work of later Judaism, on account of its paramount influence upon one line of the later development of Messianic doctrine. In it the Messias is described as "like to a Son of Man", appearing at the right hand of Jahveh in the clouds of heaven, inaugurating the new age, not by a national victory or by vicarious satisfaction, but by exercising the Divine right of judging the whole world. Thus, the emphasis is upon the personal responsibility of the individual. The consummation is not an earth-won ascendancy of the chosen people, whether shared with other nations or not, but a vindication of the holy by the solemn judgment of Jahveh and his Anointed One. Upon this prophecy were mainly based the various apocalyptic works which played so prominent a part in the religious life of the Jews during the last two centuries before Christ. Side by side with all these prophecies speaking of the establishment of a kingdom under the sway of a Divinely-appointed legate, was the series foretelling the future rule of Jahveh himself. Of these Is., xl, may be taken as an example: "Lift up thy voice with strength thou that bringest good tidings to Sion: lift it up, fear not. Say to the cities of Juda: Behold your God. Behold the Lord your God himself shall come with strength and his arm shall rule." The reconciliation of these two series of prophecies was before the Jews in the passages—notably Ps. ii and Is., vii–xi—which clearly foretold the Divinity of the promised legate. "His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, God the Mighty, the Father of the world to come, the Prince of Peace"—titles all used elsewhere of Jahveh Himself (cf. Davidson, "O. T. Prophecy", p. 367). But there seems to have been little realization of the relation between these two series of prophecy until the full light of the Christian dispensation revealed their reconciliation in the mystery of the Incarnation.

II. Messianic Doctrine in Later Judaism (see Apocrypha).—Two quite distinct and parallel lines are discernible in the later development of Messianic doctrine among the Jews, according as the writers clung to a national ideal, based on the literal interpretation of the earlier prophecies, or an apocalyptic ideal, based principally on Daniel. The national ideal looked to the establishment on earth of the Kingdom of God under the Son of David, the conquest and subjugation of the heathen, the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the Temple, and the gathering in of the Dispersed. The apocalyptic ideal drew a sharp distinction between *αἰων οὗτος* and *αἰων μέλλων*. The future age was to be ushered in by the Divine judgment of mankind preceded by the resurrection of the dead. The Messias, existing from the beginning of the world, should appear at the consummation, and then should be also manifested the heavenly Jerusalem which was to be the abode of the blessed.

National Ideal.—The national ideal is that of official Pharisaism. Thus, the Talmud has no trace of the apocalyptic ideal. The scribes were mainly busied with the Law, but side by side with this was the development of the hope of the ultimate manifestation of God's Kingdom on earth. Pharisaic influence is clearly visible in vv. 573–808 of Sibyl. III, describing the national hopes of the Jews. A last judgment, future happiness, or reward are not mentioned. Many marvels are foretold of the Messianic wars which bring in the consummation—lighted torches falling from heaven, the darkening of the sun, the falling of meteors—but all have for end a state of earthly prosperity. The Messias, coming from the East, dominates the whole, a triumphant national hero. Similar to this is the work called the Psalms of Solomon, written probably about 40 B. C. It is really the protest of Pharisaism against its enemies, the later Asmoneans. The Pharisees saw that the observance of the law was not of itself a sufficient bulwark against the enemies of Israel, and, as their principles would not allow them to recognize in the secularized hierarchy the promised issue of their troubles, they looked forward to the miraculous intervention of God through the agency of a Davidic Messias. The seventeenth Psalm describes his rule: He is to conquer the heathen, to drive them from their land, to allow no injustice in their midst; His trust is not to be in armies but in God; with the word of his mouth he is to slay the wicked. Of earlier date we have the description of the final glories of the holy city in Tobias (c. xiv), where, as well as in Ecclesiasticus, there is evidence of the constant hope in the future gathering in of the Diaspora. These same nationalist ideas reappear along with a highly developed system of eschatology in the apocalyptic works written after the destruction of Jerusalem, which are referred to below.

Apocalyptic Ideal.—The status of the apocalyptic writers as regards the religious life of the Jews has been keenly disputed (cf. Sanday, "Life of Christ in Recent Research", pp. 49 sqq.). Though they had small influence in Jerusalem, the stronghold of Rabbinism, they probably both influenced and reflected the religious feeling of the rest of the Jewish world. Thus, the apocalyptic ideal of the Messias would seem not to be the sentiment of a few enthusiasts, but to express the true hopes of a considerable section of the people. Before the Asmonean revival Israel had almost ceased to be a nation, and thus the hope of a national Messias had grown very dim. In the earliest apocalyptic writings, consequently, nothing is said of the Messias. In the first part of the Book of Henoch (i-xxxvi) we have an example of such a work. Not the coming of a human prince, but the descent of God upon Sinai to judge the world divides all time into two epochs. The just shall receive the gift of wisdom and become sinless. They will feed on the tree of life and enjoy a longer span than the Patriarchs.

The Machabean victories roused both the national and religious sentiment. The writers of the earlier Asmonean times, seeing the ancient glories of their race reviving, could no longer ignore the hope of a personal Messias to rule the kingdom of the new age. The problem arose how to connect their present deliverers, of the tribe of Levi, with the Messias who should be of the tribe of Juda. This was met by regarding the present age as merely the beginning of the Messianic age. Apocalyptic works of this period are the Book of Jubilees, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, and the Vision of Weeks of Henoch. In the Book of Jubilees the promises made to Levi, and fulfilled in the Asmonean priest-kings, outshadow those made to Juda. The Messias is but a vague figure, and little stress is laid on the judgment. The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs is a composite work. The foundation portion, conspicuous from its glorification of the priesthood, dates from before 100 B. C.; there are, however, later Jewish additions, hostile in tone to the priesthood, and numerous Christian interpolations. Controversy has arisen as to the principal figure in this work. According to Charles (Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, p. xcviii) there is pictured as the Messias a son of Levi who realizes all the lofty spiritual ideals of the Christian Saviour. Lagrange on the other hand (Le Messianisme chez les Juifs, pp. 69 sqq.) insists that, in so far as this is the case, the portrait is the result of Christian interpolations; these removed, there remains only a laudation of the part played by Levi, in the person of the Asmoneans, as the instrument of national and religious liberation. A conspicuous instance in point is Test. Lev., Ps. xviii. While Charles says this ascribes the Messianic characteristics to the Levite, Lagrange and Bousset deny that it is Messianic at all. Apart from the interpolations, it is merely natural praise of the new royal priesthood. There can be no question indeed as to the pre-eminence of Levi; he is compared to the sun and Juda to the moon. But there is in fact a description of a Messias descended from Juda in Test. Jud., Ps. xxiv, the original elements of which belong to the foundation part of the book. He appears also in the Testament of Joseph, though the passage is couched in an allegorical form difficult to follow. The Vision of Weeks of Henoch, dating probably from the same period, differs from the last-mentioned work principally in its insistence on the judgment, or rather judgments, to which three of the world's ten weeks are devoted. Messianic times again open with the prosperity of Asmonean days, and develop into the foundation of the Kingdom of God.

Thus, the Asmonean triumphs had produced an eschatology in which a personal Messias figured, while the present was glorified into a commencement of the days of Messianic blessings. Gradually, however, the deepest religious sentiment of the nation became alienated from the Machabean dynasty, and, when the last of the line fell in 27 B. C., it was realized that a different interpretation of the promises was called for. In the new apocalyptists the Messias was not merely the central figure of the age to come: He is already existing in heaven, waiting to appear at the end of this order, *αἰων οὗτος*. The oppressors of Israel were now the Romans. The ultimate failure of the Machabeans had shown the uselessness of human efforts at liberation, and the Jews could now only await the miraculous intervention that should usher in the Kingdom. To this era belongs the Assumption of Moses. In it there is no marked opposition between just and unjust. Israel is to be saved by a sudden and marvellous manifestation of Divine power. There is no gradual evolution of this age into the next: men will be transported in an instant to the already existing Kingdom of Heaven. Similar is the book of the Similitudes of Henoch, where the Messias is called in the first parable "the Elect", and in the following ones sometimes "the Elect", and sometimes "the Son of Man". Lagrange considers the passages giving this latter title interpolations, whether the work of Christians or of Jews of the Christian era. Charles, however, considers them genuine, believing Christ's use of the title occasioned by its anterior use as instanced in this work. In any case we have the author's mind on the Messias in the certainly authentic picture of "the Elect". No longer the son of David, he presides over the upper world, the abode of the saints, while the earth is under the domination of the wicked. This order will be terminated by the judgment, when the elect shall sit on His throne in glory and judge the actions of men. He does not help towards salvation, except in so far as men are sustained during their trials by the knowledge of His existence. After the judgment as before He shall preside over the Kingdom of the holy ones, which shall now occupy not only heaven but also the transfigured earth. The whole concept bears the stamp of lofty spirituality. The resurrection of good and wicked alike marks the passage from the order of sin to that of absolute justice.

We may regard this as the culmination of the apocalyptic ideal. After the fall of Jerusalem the apocalyptic writers returned to more directly national hopes; the Messias must play some part in the temporal salvation of Israel. This is indeed the only aspect treated in the fifth Sibylline Book. The Messias comes from Heaven, and establishes the reign of Israel in peace and holiness at Jerusalem, rebuilds the holy city and the Temple. There is no universal domination and the rest of the world is almost ignored. IV Esdras is a work on a much grander scale. The writer combines a temporal Messianism with a most advanced eschatology. He sees the whole world corrupted, even the chosen seed of Abraham, among whom, as among the Gentiles, many transgressors may be found. The name of God has thus lost that honour which is due to it. The world, therefore, must be destroyed to be replaced by a better one. But good must first triumph even in this world, which shall witness the victory of the Messias over the Roman Empire, the rebuilding of Jerusalem, and the union of all Israel in the Holy Land. The Messias, conceived as existing from the beginning of the world, comes in the clouds up from the sea, not down from heaven, and by the breath of His mouth destroys the armies of the world arrayed against Him. Then there appears the holy city, before invisible. At the end of time, however, the Messias saves merely Israel upon earth. He has no concern with the ultimate salvation of the just. After accomplishing His work of national restoration He disappears, and the final judgment is the work of the Most High Himself. It is purely individual, not national. Thus this work combines the

national and apocalyptic ideals. The Apocalypse of Baruch, written probably in imitation, contains a similar picture of the Messias. This system of eschatology finds reflection also in the chiliasm of certain early Christian writers. Transferred to the second coming of the Messias, we have the reign of peace and holiness for a thousand years upon earth before the just are transported to their eternal home in heaven (cf. Papias in Eusebius, "Hist. eccl.", III, xxxix).

III. The Vindication of the Messianic Dignity by Christ.—This point may be treated under two heads (a) Christ's explicit claim to be the Messias, and (b) the implicit claim shown in His words and actions throughout His life.

Under the first of these two headings we may consider the confession of Peter in Matt., xvi, and the words of Christ before his judges. These incidents involve, of course, far more than a mere claim to the Messiahship; taken in their setting, they constitute a claim to the Divine Sonship. The words of Christ to St. Peter are too clear to need any comment. The silence of the other Synoptists as to some details of the incident concern the proof from this passage rather of the Divinity than of Messianic claims. As regards Christ's claim before the Sanhedrin and Pilate, it might appear from the narratives of Matthew and Luke that He at first refused a direct reply to the high priest's question: "Art thou the Christ?" But although His answer is given merely as σὺ εἶπας (thou hast said it), yet that recorded by St. Mark, ἐγώ εἰμι (I am), shows clearly how this answer was understood by the Jews. Dalman (Words of Jesus, pp. 309 sqq.) gives instances from Jewish literature in which the expression, "thou hast said it", is equivalent to "you are right"; his comment is that Jesus used the words, as an assent indeed, but as showing that He attached comparatively little importance to this statement. Nor is this unreasonable, as the Messianic claim sinks into insignificance beside the claim to Divinity which immediately follows, and calls from the high priest the horrified accusation of blasphemy. It was this which gave the Sanhedrin a pretext, which the Messianic claim of itself did not give, for the death sentence. Before Pilate on the other hand it was merely the assertion of His royal dignity which gave ground for His condemnation.

But it is rather in His consistent manner of acting than in any specific claim that we see most clearly Christ's vindication of His dignity. At the outset of His public life (Luke, iv, 18) He applies to Himself in the synagogue of Nazareth the words relating to the Servant of Jahveh in Is., lxi, 1. It is He whom David in spirit called "Lord!" He claimed to judge the world and to forgive sins. He was superior to the Law, the Lord of the Sabbath, the Master of the Temple. In His own name, by the word of His mouth, He cleansed lepers, He stilled the sea, He raised the dead. His disciples must regard all as well lost merely to enjoy the privilege of following Him. The Jews, while failing to see all that these things implied, a dignity and power not inferior to those of Jahveh Himself, could not but perceive that He who so acted was at least the Divinely accredited representative of Jahveh. In this connexion we may consider the title Christ used of Himself, "Son of Man" We have no evidence that this was then commonly regarded as a Messianic title. Some doubt as to its meaning in the minds of Christ's hearers is possibly shown by John, xii, 34: "Who is this Son of man?" The Jews, while undoubtedly seeing in Daniel, vii, a portrait of the Messias, probably failed to recognize in these words a definite title at all. This is the more probable from the fact that, while this passage exercised great influence upon the apocalyptists, the title "Son of Man" does not appear in their writings except in passages of doubtful authenticity. Now, Christ not merely uses the name, but claims for Himself the right to judge the world (Matt., xxv, 31–46), which is the most marked note of Daniel's Messias. A double reason would lead Him to assume this particular designation: that He might speak of Himself as the Messias without making His claim conspicuous to the ruling powers till the time came for His open vindication, and that as far as possible He might hinder the people from transferring to Him their own material notions of Davidic kingship.

Nor did His claim to the dignity merely concern the future. He did not say, "I shall be the Messias", but "I am the Messias". Thus, besides His answer to Caiphas and His approval of Peter's affirmation of His present Messiahship, we have in Matt., xi, 5, the guarded but clear answer to the question of the Baptist's disciples: "Art thou ὁ ἐρχόμενος?" In St. John the evidence is abundant. There is no question of a future dignity in His words to the Samaritan woman (John, iv) or to the man born blind (ix, 5), for He was already performing the works foretold of the Messias. Though but as a grain of mustard seed, the Kingdom of God upon earth was already established; He had already begun the work of the Servant of Jahveh, of preaching, of suffering, of saving men. The consummation of His task and His rule in glory over the Kingdom were indeed still in the future, but these were the final crown, not the sole constituents, of the Messianic dignity. For those who, before the Christian dispensation, sought to interpret the ancient prophecies, some single aspect of the Messias sufficed to fill the whole view. We, in the light of the Christian revelation, see realized and harmonized in Our Lord all the conflicting Messianic hopes, all the visions of the prophets. He is at once the Suffering Servant and the Davidic King, the Judge of mankind and its Saviour, true Son of Man and God with us. On Him is laid the iniquity of us all, and on Him, as God incarnate, rests the Spirit of Jahveh, the Spirit of Wisdom and Understanding, the Spirit of Counsel and Fortitude, the Spirit of Knowledge and Piety, and the Fear of the Lord.

Gloag, *The Messianic Prophecies* (Edinburgh, 1879); Maas, *Christ in Type and Prophecy* (New York, 1893, 1896); Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy* (Edinburgh, 1904), xvii–xxiv; Condamin, *Le Livre d'Isaïe* (Paris, 1905); Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums* (Berlin, 1903); Lagrange, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs* (Paris, 1909); Sanday, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research* (Oxford, 1907); Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu* (Leipzig, 1898), tr. *The Words of Jesus* (Edinburgh, 1902); Lepin, *Jésus Messie* (Paris, 1904).

L. W. Geddes.

Messina, Antonello da, b. at Messina, about 1430; d. 1497. After studying for some time in Sicily he crossed over to Naples, where, we are told, he became the pupil of an unknown artist, Antonio Colantonio. It was here, according to Vasari, that Messina, on seeing a painting of John Van Eyck, belonging to Alphonsus of Aragon, determined to devote himself to the study of the Flemish Masters. It would seem too that he set out for Bruges with this purpose; others, however, maintain that he need not have left Italy to ground himself in the new technic as several Flemish artists of renown had already, through the patronage of the princes René of Anjou and Alphonsus of Aragon, won for their pictures no slight reputation. The question will remain a debated point until the discovery of some authentic document shall decide definitively whether the Sicilian painter did or did not sail for Flanders. It is certain, however, that he mastered perfectly the methods followed by the disciples of Van Eyck in oil-painting, methods that had eclipsed all the efforts made by the Italian school. On his return to Messina, Antonello evinced remarkable skill in handling oils in a triptych, unfortunately destroyed in the recent earthquake, representing the Blessed Virgin with St. Gregory and St. Benedict on either side and two angels holding a crown over Our Lady's head. Later, Messina went to Venice, where in 1473 he executed an altar screen, no

longer extant, for the church of San Cassiano. By making known the secret of the Van Eycks, Antonello quickly won success; for the introduction of the new technic, singularly adapted to bring out brilliant colour effects and at the same time ensure their permanency, suited admirably the tastes of the Venetians "already so richly endowed with a feeling for the charm of colour", and "was destined to make Venice the most renowned school in Italy for the study of colouring" (Le Cicerone, II, 610). The new style was eagerly followed by Bartholomew and Louis Vivarini, John and Gentile Bellini, Carpaccio and Cima. Assailed by homesickness, Antonello returned to Messina to leave it no more until his death (cf. Lionello Venturi, loc. cit. infra).

Messina rivals the Flemings in transparency of colouring, though occasionally he may justly be censured for the use of "a dark brown in his flesh-tints" (Müntz, II, 778). If he imitates their careful execution of details, he surpasses them by the distinction and nobility of his figures, a trait in which one recognizes the Italian. He excels only as a portrait painter, and especially in his portraiture of men. Of his work in this department he has left us some masterpieces that evince in a striking degree truth to nature and strength of conception and execution: in the Academy of Venice, a half-length portrait of a man; in the Museum of Berlin, a head of a young man; in the house of the Marquis Trivulci at Milan, the head of a man in the prime of life; in the Civic Museum of Milan, an excellent bust-painting of a poet with flowing hair crowned by a wreath; above all the painting entitled "Condottiere" preserved in the Louvre. Not so successful in religious paintings, at Venice, he reproduced without conviction and almost slavishly Madonnas of the type of G. Bellini. In the National Gallery there is a half-length portrait of the year 1465 representing Christ with His hand raised in blessing. In conclusion let us call special attention to the large studies, entitled "St. Sebastian", "St. Jerome in his Study", "The Crucifixion". "St. Sebastian", in the Museum of Dresden, represents a beautiful young man, almost life-size, naked, of striking figure, and standing out against a background of a landscape brilliantly illuminated. In accordance with the Venetian or Paduan taste the painter has added a certain number of secondary motives, the better to set off the leading theme. This study in the nude is doubly shocking, since it is out of place in a devotional picture, and is nothing but a pretext for displaying his knowledge of anatomy. "St. Jerome", also preserved in the National Gallery, is a carefully executed picture, pleasing to the eye; the studio is vaulted, the window, set high up in the wall and lighting up the studio, has all the charm of a chapel window. On the side may be seen the outlines of a pleasant cloister; another opening discloses a vista of a distant landscape. The learned Doctor, seated in a wooden armchair on a platform slightly elevated, is absorbed in the reading of a book lying open on a desk before him; in the foreground, a beautiful peacock and a little bird. In "The Crucifixion" of the Museum of Antwerp, we are struck by certain realistic touches which Antonello learned from the Flemish school. Skulls are scattered along the ground; the two thieves, fastened not to crosses but to trees, are writhing in pain. The Italian is discernible in the nobility with which Messina invests the figures of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, and St. John. Antonello has been praised for "a feeling, sometimes quite correct, for large strongly lighted landscapes", and the "Crucifixion" witnesses to the truth of this criticism, for the landscape which forms the setting of this pathetic scene on Calvary, in spite of the multiplicity of details, preserves a harmonious unity.

VASARI, *Le Vite de' più eccellenti pittori*, ed. MILANESI, II (Florence, 1878), 563–89; EASTLAKE, *Materials for a History of Oil-painting* (Paris, 1847); BLANC, *Histoire des peintres de toutes les écoles* (Paris, 1865–77); CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE, *History of Painting in North Italy*, II, ii (London, 1871), 77–100; LÜBKE, *Gesch. der italienischen Malerei*, I (Stuttgart, 1878), 558 sq.; LAFENESTRE, *La Peinture italienne jusqu'à la fin du XV^e siècle* (Paris, 1885), 283–84; MÜNTZ, *Histoire de l'art pendant la Renaissance*, II (Paris, 1891), 777–79; BURCKHARDT AND BODE, *Le Cicerone*, II, *l'Art moderne*, French tr. GÉRARD (Paris, 1892), 610; D'AMICO, *Antonello d'Antonio, Le sue opere e l'invenzione della pittura al olio* (Messina, 1906); VENTURI, *Antonello da Messina* in THIEME AND BECKER, *Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Leipzig, 1907), 567 sq.

GASTON SORTAIS.

Messina, ARCHDIOCESE OF (MESSINENSIS), in Sicily. The city is situated, in the shape of an amphitheatre, along the slope of the Hills of Neptune, on an inlet of the sea at the Strait of Messina, which separates Sicily from the peninsula. Its harbour, with its size and fine situation, is one of the most important in Italy after those of Genoa and of Naples. Nevertheless, the hopes entertained for its commerce, in view of the opening of the Suez Canal, were disappointed, for, between 1887 and 1894, the commerce of Messina decreased from 940,000 tons to 350,000 tons; still, in 1908, it grew again to 551,000 tons. The neighbouring seas are rich in coral, molluscs, and fish; and from the mountains are obtained calcic sulphate, alabaster, sulphates of argentiferous lead, antimony, iron, and copper. Messina is said to have been founded by some pirates from Cumæ, a very ancient Greek colony, and to have received from its founders the name of Zancle (sickle) on account of the semicircular shape of the port. In 735 a colony of Messenians was taken there by Gorgos, a son of King Aristomenes, the brave but unfortunate defender of the Messenians against the Spartans. Thereafter, the population of the city was increased by fugitives from Chalcis, Samos, and Eubœa, who had escaped from the Persian invasion; they became preponderant in the town and made it join the Ionian League. In 493 B. C. Anaxilas, tyrant of Rhegium, also a Messenian colony, drove the Samians from Zancle, took the town, and called it Messana (the *a* of the Doric dialect, which becomes *η* in the Ionic, coming later to be pronounced as English *e*). In 426 the city was retaken by the Ionians under the Athenian Laches, who, however, lost it in 415; an attempt of another Athenian, Nicias, to recover it failed. In consequence of the rivalry of the Athenians and the Carthaginians for the possession of Sicily, Messina was pillaged and destroyed by the Carthaginians in 396, but was rebuilt by Dionysius. In 312 the town was taken by Agathocles, and at his death the Campanian mercenaries of his army, called Mamertines, took possession of the city, and established there a military republic; having been defeated by Hiero II near Mylæ (Milazzo) in 269, and then besieged in the town itself, a part of them sought the assistance of the Carthaginians, and a part that of the Romans. The Carthaginians under Hanno were the first to arrive, but in 264 the consul, Appius Claudius Caudex, took the city, repelling Carthaginians and Syracusans. This brought about the Punic Wars. Other events of the pre-Christian history of Messina are the victory of Piso over the slaves in 133; and the naval victory of Agrippa over Pompey in 36. In the Gothic wars Messina had a considerable part; while, in A. D. 831, it fell into the hands of the Arabs. In the Norman conquest of Sicily, Messina was naturally the basis of operations. In 1038 the Byzantine general, George Maniakes, assisted by the Normans, captured the town, but it was lost again, on the recall of that general. In 1060 Count Roger made his first expedition, and in the following year was master of Messina, which from that time followed the fortunes of the Kingdom of Naples. There was a serious revolt against Frederick II in 1232; and in 1282 Messina also had its "Vespers", and on that account was besieged by King Charles II, who was, however, compelled to retreat, and left Sicily to the King of Aragon. In

MESSINA (1907)

PIAZZA AND CATHEDRAL (XI CENTURY)

BAPTISMAL FONT AND PULPIT, THE CATHEDRAL

1676, the Messenians rebelled against Spanish domination, and were assisted by a French fleet, sent by Louis XIV; Viscount Duquesne obtained a naval victory over the Spaniards, but soon a royal order obliged the French to leave the city. Messina had a part in the wars for the union of Italy: it was bombarded in 1848; and in 1860, after a long resistance was taken by Garibaldi.

The city has often been a prey to earthquakes, the most disastrous of which were those of 1783 and of 1908; the latter, on 28 December of that year, destroyed Messina almost entirely. The most beautiful of the palaces and of the churches were overthrown, among them the cathedral, a structure of three naves, containing six great columns of Egyptian marble that came from the ruins of Cape Faro (the ancient Pelorum Promontorium); the chief entrance of this temple was a jewel of Roman art, rich in little columns, fretwork, spirals, bas-reliefs, and statuettes; the marble pulpit, a work of Gagini, was in the shape of a chalice; the tribune was adorned with mosaics of the time of Frederick II; and the walls were decorated with frescoes and oil paintings of great masters. The residence of the canons, and the sacristy also, had paintings by such masters as Salvo d'Antonio, Quagliata, Rodriguez, Catalano, Alibrandi, Fiammingo, etc. On the cathedral square, before the façade of the Franciscan convent, was a monumental fountain, the work of Gian Angelo da Montorsoli (1551). The most beautiful church of Messina is that of the Madonna of Montevergine; other interesting churches are those of San Francesco dei Mercadanti; the church and monastery of San Giorgio with pictures by Guercino and by other masters; Santa Maria dell' Alto where is preserved the only known picture by Cardillo (about 1200); the church of San Francesco d'Assisi, built in the Gothic style, but disfigured in 1721; lastly, the churches of San Nicolò and of San Domenico, the latter containing the mausoleum of the family of Cicala by Montorsoli and a fine Pietà in marble. The episcopal palace, spared by the last earthquake, and the adjoining seminary, are interesting buildings; likewise, the city hall, with its Fountain of Neptune by Montorsoli, and the university dating from 1549, which had a most valuable library of 3000 *editiones principes*, 241 manuscripts, and 10 parchments with miniature paintings, a gallery of pictures, and a collection of coins, all of which is yet buried under the ruins. The hospital of La Pietà and the fortifications, constructed mostly under Charles V, were ornaments of the city.

According to the legend, Christianity was brought hither by Saints Peter and Paul, and there is still preserved at Messina a letter attributed to the Blessed Virgin, which, it is claimed, was written by her to the Messenians when Our Lady heard of their conversion by St. Paul. St. Bachirius or Bacchilus is venerated as the first Bishop of Messina. There is record of several bishops of Messene in the fourth and fifth centuries, but it is not known whether it be Messina, or Messene in Greece, to which reference is made; Eucarpus, a contemporary of Pope Symmachus (498), is the first Bishop of Messina of known date; the bishops who are known to have followed him were Felix (about 600), Peregrinus (649), Benedict (682), Gaudiosus (787), and Gregory (868); the latter was for some time a follower of Photius. Nothing is known of the episcopal see during the time of the Saracen occupation. In 1090, Roger established there, as bishop, Robert, who built the cathedral. Under Bishop Nicholas (1166) Messina was made an archbishopric. Among other bishops of this see may be mentioned the Englishman, Richard Palmer (1182); Archbishop Lando, often an intermediary between Gregory IX and Frederick II; Francesco Fontana (1288), expelled by the Messenians; Guidotto dei Tabiati (1292), whose mausoleum was one of the works of art of the cathedral; Cardinal Antonio Cerdani (1447); in 1473 the chapter elected the Basilian archimandrite, Leontios, and he not being acceptable to the pope or to the king, the friar, Jacob da Santa Lucia, was appointed in his stead, but was not received; Cardinal Pietro Sveglie (1510), who had served on several occasions as pontifical legate; Cardinal Innocenzo Cibo (1538); Cardinal Gianandrea de Mercurio (1550), who had a controversy with the Greek bishop, Pamphilius, the latter claiming jurisdiction over the Greek priests of the archdiocese; Andrea Mastrilli (1618), convoked many synods, and rebuilt the episcopal palace and the seminary; the Dominican, Tommaso Moncada (1743), who at the same time was Patriarch of Jerusalem. The Archbishop of Messina is also Archimandrite of San Salvatore; this convent of Greek Monks of St. Basil was founded by Count Roger in 1094, and its archimandrite had jurisdiction over all the Basilian monasteries of the kingdom, of which there were forty-four, as well as over many parishes. In 1421, the archimandritate was secularized and was given *in commendam* to secular prelates, of whom Bessarion was one. In time the monastery fell into decadence; a fortification was erected on its site (1538), and the monks moved to the church of La Misericordia. Urban VIII made the archimandritate and its territory immediately subject to the Holy See, and Leo XIII in 1883 united it with the Archdiocese of Messina. The collegiate church of Santa Maria del Graffeo, called the "Cattolica", is noteworthy in Messina: the so-called Græco-Latin Rite is used there, its characteristics being a combination of Latin vestments, unleavened bread, etc., with the Greek language: on solemn occasions, the Epistle and the Gospel are read, first in Latin and then in Greek. In certain functions, the canons of the cathedral and those of the "Graffeo" officiate together, either at the latter church or at the cathedral. The clergy of the "Graffeo" have at their head a protopope who is under the jurisdiction of the archbishop. Formerly, the Greek Rite was in use in other churches of Messina, introduced there probably during the Byzantine domination. The archdiocese and the Abbey of San Salvatore together had 179 parishes, with 250,000 inhabitants, 22 religious houses of men, and 26 of women. The seminary was uninjured by the earthquake, and since then the Jesuits reopened a college. There is a Catholic journal that appears three times each week. Within the territory of the archdiocese is the *prælatura nullius* of Santa Lucia del Melo, which has 7 parishes, with nearly 15,000 inhabitants. The suffragan sees of Messina are those of Lipari, Nicosia, and Patti.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XXI (Venice, 1870), 558–71; MORABITO, *Series episcoporum messanensium* (Naples, 1669); PIRRI, *Sicilia sacra*, I-III (1633 sqq.); LA FARINA, *Messina e i suoi monumenti* (Messina, 1840).

U. BENIGNI.

Messingham, THOMAS, Irish hagiologist, b. in the Diocese of Meath, and studied in the Irish College, Paris, proceeding to the degree of S.T.D. Among the Franciscan MSS. in Dublin is an interesting tract sent by David Rothe, Vice-Primate of All Ireland, addressed to my "loving friend Mr. Thomas Messingham at his chambers in Paris", dated 1615. It is evident that at this date Messingham was one of the staff of the Irish College in that city, and was commencing his studies on Irish saints. In 1620 he published Offices of SS. Patrick, Brigid, Columba, and other Irish saints; and in the following year was appointed rector of the Irish College, Paris, in succession to his friend and diocesan, Thomas Dease, who was promoted to the Bishopric of Meath, on 5 May, 1621. Messingham was honoured by the Holy See, and was raised to the dignity of prothonotary Apostolic, and acted as agent for many of the Irish bishops. Though diligent in the quest for materials with a view to an ecclesiastical history of Ireland, Messingham proved a most able and judicious rector of the Irish College, and

he thoroughly organized the course of studies with a view of sending forth capable missionaries to work in their native country. He got the college affiliated formally to the University of Paris, and, in 1626, got the approbation of the Archbishop of Paris for the rules he had drawn up for the government of the Irish seminary. In 1624 he published, at Paris, his famous work on Irish saints, "Florilegium Insulæ Sanctorum", containing also an interesting treatise on St. Patrick's Purgatory, in Lough Derg. In the same year he was appointed by the Holy See to the Deanery of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, in succession to Henry Byrne, but this position was merely honorary, inasmuch as all the temporalities were enjoyed by the Protestant dean, by patent from the Crown. Messingham had a lengthy correspondence with Father Luke Wadding, O.F.M., and was frequently consulted by the Roman authorities in the matter of selecting suitable ecclesiastics to fill the vacant Irish sees. On 15 July, 1630, he wrote to Wadding that he feared it was in vain to hope for any indulgences in religious disabilities from King Charles I. Between the years 1632 and 1638 he laboured for the Irish Church in various capacities, but his name disappears after the latter year, whence we may conclude that he either resigned or died in 1638.

JOURDAIN, *Histoire de l'Université de Paris* (Paris, 1866); BOYLE, *The Irish College in Paris* (London, 1901); *Report on Franciscan Manuscripts, Hist. MSS. Com.* (Dublin, 1905).

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

Messmer, SEBASTIAN GERARD. See MILWAUKEE, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

Metal-Work in the Service of the Church.— From the earliest days the Church has employed utensils and vessels of metal in its liturgical ceremonies. This practice increased during the Middle Ages. The history of the metal-work of the Church in the Middle Ages is in fact the history of the art of metal-working in general, and this not only because the Church was the foremost patron of such works and because almost all the works that have been preserved from the Middle Ages are ecclesiastical in character, but also because until the twelfth century the works of the goldsmith were also almost exclusively manufactured by monks and clerics. But in the period of Renaissance also the manufacture of church metal-work formed a very important branch of the goldsmith's art, and even in our own day these works are counted among those in the production of which that art can be most profitably developed; but not only the goldsmith's art, that is the artistic treatment of the precious metals, had its growth and development in the service of the Church, the base metals also, especially iron, bronze, and brass, have been largely utilized. As we are dealing, however, with the historical development of the metal-work in the service of the Church, we shall confine ourselves more particularly to works in the precious metals, without however entirely excluding those in the inferior metals from our consideration.

ANTIQUITY.— Beginning with antiquity, we must first prove that the Church did in fact make use of valuable works of metal in the most ancient times. Honorius of Autun (d. 1145) makes the remark that the Apostles and their followers had employed wooden chalices in the celebration of the holy Mass, but that Pope Zephyrinus had ordered the use of glass and Pope Urban I of silver and gold vessels (Gemma animæ, P. L., CLXXII, 573). This opinion seems to have been widely disseminated during the Middle Ages; it is nevertheless untenable. Recourse to chalices made of wood or some other cheap material was undoubtedly often made necessary in antiquity as the result of a lack of the more valuable materials or during the stormy times of the persecutions, but this custom cannot have been general. If the earliest Christians believed in the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and of this there can be no doubt, they assuredly also made offering of their most precious vessels in order that the Sacred Mysteries might be worthily celebrated.

The earliest positive notices of the use of metal-work in the service of the Church date from the third and fourth centuries. It is especially the "Liber pontificalis", which is now accessible in the critical editions of Duchesne and Mommsen (see LIBER PONTIFICALIS), from which we derive the most interesting information concerning the subject under discussion. Here we first meet with the statement that Pope Urban had the sacred vessels made of silver, which does not by any means imply that before that time they were all made of glass. Of greater importance are the accounts of the magnificent donations of valuable works in metal made by Emperor Constantine to the Roman basilicas. It would take up too much space to enumerate them all, and we shall content ourselves with mentioning a few examples. To the Vatican basilica he presented seven large chalices (*scyphi*) of the purest gold, each of which weighed ten (Roman) pounds; furthermore forty smaller chalices of pure gold, each weighing one pound. The church of St. Agnes received a chalice of solid gold weighing ten pounds, five silver chalices of ten pounds each, and two silver patens of thirty pounds each. The metal plates for the Eucharistic bread (patens) are often mentioned in connexion with the chalices; thus the Lateran basilica received seven gold and sixteen silver patens of thirty pounds each. Though not to the same extent, the other churches also were in possession of valuable metal-work for the liturgical service. The Church of Carthage, according to the testimony of Optatus, possessed so many valuables of gold and silver, that it was no easy matter to remove or hide them at the time of the persecutions (Contra Parmen., I, xviii). Ibas, Bishop of Edessa, was accused at the Council of Chalcedon (451) of having purloined a valuable chalice set with precious stones, which a pious man had presented to the church.

As to the various kinds of metal-work used in the Church, the "Liber pontificalis" mentions the following in addition to chalice and paten as in use in the lifetime of Pope Sylvester: a silver bowl of ten pounds, which was intended for the reception of the chrism at baptisms and confirmations, a silver baptismal vessel of twenty pounds, a golden lamb weighing thirty pounds, which was set up in the baptistery beside the Lateran, seven silver stags that spouted water, each of which weighed eighty pounds, and especially numerous vessels for wine, e. g., in the Vatican basilica two specimens of the purest gold, each of a weight of fifty pounds. Of importance to us also is the statement that beside the golden lamb just mentioned there stood silver statues, five feet in height, of the Redeemer and St. John, weighing 180 and 125 pounds respectively. Furthermore mention must be made of the metal caskets, crosses, reliquaries, and book-covers, which were likewise made either entirely or in part of precious metal. With this enumeration the number of metallic utensils employed in Christian antiquity is by no means complete. The centre of Christian worship is the sacrifice and the altar; for this reason it was early made of valuable material or at least covered with it. Metal plates were furthermore used to adorn the confession (q. v.) and the immediate surroundings of the altar. Great wealth of the precious metals was spent upon the superstructure of the altar, or ciborium, which was decorated with metal statues, with chalices and votive crowns. When Leo III had the ciborium, presented by the Emperor Constantine, restored, he employed for that purpose 2704½ pounds of silver. A large amount of metal was also used for the iconostasis, a screen connecting from two to six columns; thus Leo III had the iconostasis in

the church of St. Paul re-covered at an expenditure of 1452 pounds of silver.

A large amount of metal-work is also required for the illumination of the basilica. Constantine alone presented to the Lateran church 174 separate articles of the greatest variety intended for this purpose. It is sufficient here to make mention merely of the chandeliers, or lustres (*coronæ*), the candelabra, and lamps; they were made of bronze, silver, or gold. The Lateran church received among the rest a chandelier with fifty lamps of the purest gold, weighing 120 pounds, and a candelabrum of the same material, with eighty lamps. Even the vessels for storing the oil were sometimes made of precious metal. The Lateran basilica was the owner of three such vessels of silver, weighing 900 pounds. Practically nothing however of all these treasures has come down to us; only a few small chandeliers of bronze, dating from the fifth to the eighth centuries, have been found, most of them in Egypt. There remains one more article of metal that was much used in the service of the Church from the earliest centuries, the censer. According to the "Liber pontificalis" the baptistery of St. John at the Lateran had a censer of gold weighing fifteen pounds, which was ornamented with green precious stones. If we take account then of all these articles, the conclusion naturally follows that the use of articles of metal in the service of the Church had attained extraordinary proportions in Christian antiquity.

THE TASSILO CHALICE
Presented by Tassilo and his wife Luitperga in 777 to the Monastery of Kremsmünster, where it is still preserved (see Vol. III, 562)

More difficult than the enumeration of the works in metal is the description of their decoration and the technical processes employed in their manufacture, because on this point our literary sources are almost wholly silent, while of the old Christian works, which might enlighten us, but very few are extant. We must therefore, in this case also, confine ourselves particularly to the statements of the "Liber pontificalis". Here we find numerous references to images (*imagines*) of Christ, the Blessed Virgin, the Angels, and Apostles; in most cases it is impossible to determine whether the works were carved or cast, certain it is that both methods were employed. The statues of Christ and the Apostles on the ciborium presented by Constantine to the Lateran church were undoubtedly carved. In some cases the core of the statue was of wood which was overlaid or covered with silver or gold. Painted images also were sometimes decorated with reliefs of silver or gold. Gregory III, for example, employed five pounds of pure gold and precious stones in the decoration of a statue of the Madonna in S. Maria Maggiore. Precious stones in particular were a favourite form of decoration for articles made of metal; golden statues were at times completely covered with them. When Sixtus I provided the confession of the Vatican basilica with costlier furnishings, Valentinian presented a tablet in relief with the images of Christ and the Apostles, which was studded with precious stones. The baptistery too beside the Lateran church possessed a censer which was adorned with precious stones. The works in bronze were often inlaid with silver decorations. Thus the chapels of St. John received doors with silver ornamentation. This was probably a kind of *niello* (cf. Rosenberg, "Niello", Frankfort, 1908). To obtain colour effects enamel and *verroterie cloisonnée* were likewise employed; of these a more detailed account will be given later. We shall call attention here only to the best-known specimen that has been preserved, the pentaptych in the treasury of Milan cathedral; the central division of this is ornamented by this process with the paschal lamb and the cross.

Finally, as to the workshops from which the Church derived its metal-work, there can be no doubt that they existed in all the larger cities of the civilized countries of ancient Christendom; but the cities of the Eastern Roman Empire, and especially Byzantium, seem to have been pre-eminent. There is a tendency even at the present day to consider almost all of the larger works that have been preserved as products of Eastern art. In fact a large number of works in metal were brought from the Orient to the Western countries. We mention here only a reliquary cross in St. Peter's at Rome, a present of the Byzantine emperor Justin II [cf. Beissel, "Verwendung edler Metalle zum Schmucke römischer Kirchen vom 5-9. Jahrh." in "Zeitschrift für christl. Kunst", Düsseldorf, IX (1896), 331 sqq.].

II. MIDDLE AGES.—A.—We begin the Middle Ages with the Byzantine metal-work, in order to remove at the outset the impression that the term Byzantine is used to express a definite period of time; it is used rather to denote a definite geographical circle of art and culture, that is to say, Byzantium with its immediate and more distant surroundings. There were two factors that exerted a powerful influence upon the Byzantine work: first, the almost boundless extravagance which prevailed at the imperial Court, and which, as a result of the intimate relations existing between State and Church, made itself felt also in the latter; second, the close contact with the art of the inland provinces, particularly with Persian art. The Persian, or, to use a more general term, the Oriental, influence gave rise to an extravagant seeking after colour effects in the art of metal-working accompanied by a suppression of the main object, namely the production of plastic works. To understand the latter change, we must briefly explain a few technical terms.

To give artistic form to the shapeless mass of metal the processes employed are casting and hammering, or chiselling. In the former process the metal is brought to a liquid state and poured into a hollow form, which has previously been prepared by pressing a solid model into a yielding mass. Although casting must be regarded as the original mode of treating metals, nevertheless, so far as giving artistic form to gold and silver is concerned, hammering was of greater importance. By means of hammers the sheet of metal is hollowed out and in this way given plastic form. Very closely connected with hammering is the art of engraving; this consists in directing the blow of the hammer not directly upon the metal but transmitting it by means of small steel chisels. It is these two latter processes that we have chiefly in mind when we speak of the goldsmith's art. By means of these the ancient art of the Occident produced its most beautiful works in metal. A different state of affairs existed in the Orient, and particularly in the home of the Mesopotamio-Persian and Syrian art, where, so to say, the hand had less plastic training than the eye a gift for colour. The glittering gold here received

additional decoration by means of coloured enamels. This preference for coloured representation instead of the plastic was transmitted to Byzantium also. But it will always remain to the credit of the Byzantine goldsmith's art that it produced magnificent works in metal for the service of the Church. The process employed in the Orient and Byzantium is known as cloisonné enamel (*émail cloisonné*); it consists in soldering very thin strips of gold on the gold base-plate so as to form cells into which the coloured enamel-paste is pressed and fused in place, the enamel combining with the metal during fusion.

In Byzantium cloisonné enamel forced the art of hammering and chiselling into a very subordinate position; enamel was used to decorate secular articles, such as bowls and swords, but especially the metal-work of the Church. The ornamentation consisted partly of decorative designs, partly of figurative representations. Among the works that have come down to us there are many of a miniature-like purity, which in spite of their small size are truly monumental in conception. Of the larger works only a very small number have been preserved, the most famous is the golden altar-front (Pala d'oro) of St. Mark's at Venice. The remaining pieces are for the most part relic-cases which were suspended from the neck or placed upon the altar (examples at Velletri and Cosenza), crosses and book-covers (a magnificent specimen in the royal jewel-room at Munich). From the period in which this art reached its highest perfection, the tenth and eleventh centuries, we have the so-called *staurotheca* (a reliquary tablet) in the cathedral at Limburg on the Lahn, the reliquary of Nicephorus Phocas (963–969) in the convent of Lavra (Athos), and the lower band of the so-called crown of St. Stephen in the crown-treasures at Budapest (1076–77). The terrible pillaging of the capital by the western crusaders, 1204, dealt the death-blow to this flourishing art.



Votive Crowns of Spanish-Gothic Kings (VII Cent.) Found at Guarrazar—Now preserved in the Musée de Cluny, Paris

Although the examples of Byzantine metal-work decorated with enamel are by far the most numerous, specimens of hammered work are not entirely lacking. In the first place we may mention two architectural relic-cases which are in the form of a central structure surmounted by a dome (at Aachen and Venice). The reliquary tablets with carved reliefs are either in the form of a small folding-altar or of a cross, which often bears the portraits of the emperor, Constantine, and his mother on the obverse, and on the reverse, the crucifixion. A distinct type of the Greek goldsmith's art are the icons; one of the most valuable is in the Swenigorodskoi collection (St. Petersburg). A rare specimen with excellent chasing, a gilded silver pyx with the crucifixion of Christ, is in the cathedral at Halberstadt (eleventh century). At only one place in the West is it possible at the present day to get an idea of the magnificence and costliness of the Byzantine metal-work, in the treasures and library of St. Mark's at Venice, which still possesses a portion of the booty of the year 1204 (cf. Kondakoff, "Gesch. und Denkmäler des byzant. Emails", Frankfort on the Main, 1892).

B.—Though the manufacture of artistic metal-work for the Church was accompanied by no difficulties in the countries of the older civilization, conditions were much more unfavourable among the barbarian nations which embraced Christianity. Nevertheless we know that among them articles of metal were much used in the service of the Church. Gregory of Tours in one place speaks of sixty chalices, fifteen patens, twenty *encolpia* of pure gold, which King Childebert took as booty in the year 531 in a campaign against the Visigoths (Hist. Francorum, III, x). When St. Patrick came to Ireland, he had in his retinue, among others, three workers in metal, namely Mac Cecht, Laebhan, and Fortchern. There are still in existence fifty-three small bells, tubular and box-shaped, which belong to this Irish art of metal-working; among the Franks, Saint Eligius of Noyon (588–659), a goldsmith, was even consecrated bishop.

Here the interesting question arises, how these "barbarians" succeeded in producing artistic work in metal. The works themselves that have been preserved alone can answer this question. There are, it is true, but few of these; the most important to be considered here are a chalice and a paten, which were found near Gourdon (Burgundy) and are now preserved in the National Library of Paris, a relic-case, also Burgundian, in St. Maurice (Switzerland), the famous votive-crowns of the Visigothic kings from Guarrazar, especially those of Reccevinth and Svintila (631), a Gospel-cover of Queen Theodolinda in Monza, a reliquary in purse form from Hereford (now in Berlin), a Gospel-cover from Lindau (now in the collection of J. Pierpont Morgan) and the Tassilo chalice in Kremsmünster (Austria); there may further be assigned to this period, because of their style, the St. Cuthbert cross in the cathedral at Durham, the chalice of Ardagh, the shrines of several old Irish bells, and a number of croziers and crosses in the collection of the Royal Irish Academy, Dublin, and in the British Museum, London. When we consider that these works extend over a period of more than four centuries and are the products of several races it is at once apparent that we can give but a faint intimation of the character and decoration of the metal-work of the Church among barbarian nations.

The material used in the manufacture of these works is almost exclusively gold, while their artistic decoration consists for the most part of the so-called *verroterie cloisonnée*, a glass mosaic. The process employed in this decoration is akin to that of cloisonné enamel; the setting of the semi-precious stones or paste gems is done in one of two ways: they are either bedded between thin bands of metal like cloisonné enamel, or set in openings which are cut into the gold plate itself. At times the gold plate is completely covered with the stones. Chased orna-



CRUET. GERMAN



RELIQUARY. PORTUGUESE

CANDLESTICK. GERMAN



CENSER. SPANISH

CIBORIUM. PORTUGUESE

CHALICE. SPANISH

MORSE. GERMAN

PLAQUE. RHENISH

METAL-WORK. XII–XVI CENTURIES

mentation on the other hand is of rarer occurrence; it is found in a crude fashion on the Hereford reliquary. That *niello* was not unknown to the "barbarian" nations is proved by the chalice in Kremsmünster, a present of Tassilo, Duke of Bavaria (about 780). In Irish art filigree also found a very delicate development; one of the most valuable examples, one that displays a concentration of all the processes with which the native masters were conversant, is the chalice of Ardagh.

C.—The second period embraces the age of the *Carlovingian* and *Othonian* emperors, i. e., in round numbers a period of 200 years. While it can hardly be said that this period added anything essentially new to the metal-work of the previous centuries, it is nevertheless true that it gave new forms and a further development to many of the articles already in use. We now also more frequently meet with works cast in bronze, whereas in the so-called "style of the period of migrations" of the preceding age it was not necessary even to mention them. With the increase in the wealth of the Church, there arose also the necessity for an increased amount of valuable metal-work; this was especially the case in the large monasteries which counted among their own members metal-workers of great artistic skill. The manufacture of the metal-work for the Church during the tenth and eleventh centuries was in fact so largely in the hands of the monks that this entire period has been designated as the period of monastic art. While France had led in the development during the ninth century, from the tenth century it gradually fell behind Germany. One of the causes that helped to bring about this result was the lively interest which several of the prominent ecclesiastical princes took in the art of metal-working as developed within the Church; the most deserving of mention in this connexion is Archbishop Egbert of Trier and after him Bishops Meinwerk of Paderborn and Bernward of Hildesheim. In France the art of metal-working flourished especially in Reims, but also in Corbie, Tours, and Metz. In Germany the centres of the goldsmith's art of the Church were, besides Trier, especially the monasteries at Ratisbon, Reichenau, Essen, Hildesheim, and Helmershausen.

The characteristic feature of the art of the period of migrations, the *verroterie cloisonnée*, gradually disappears and yields precedence to the Byzantine *cloisonné* enamel which flourished especially at Trier and Reichenau. The revival of the plastic tendency in metal-working was of greater importance. We have from the period under discussion even at this day several altar-decorations and book-covers with figural representations, which reveal a truly amazing skill in metal-hammering; such is the valuable antipendium of Henry II from Basle. The primitive method of covering a wooden core with thin sheets of metal was also still practiced. A madonna in the collegiate church at Essen (Rheinland) and an image of St. Fides (Foy) at Conques, France, are the two best known examples of this art. In Italy the most important work of this period is the decoration of the high altar in the church of St. Ambrose in Milan, the work of Wolvinus, executed under Archbishop Angelbert II (824–66). Prominent examples of the French metal work are the portable altar, shaped like a ciborium, and the binding of a copy of the Gospels in the royal jewel-room at Munich, which were probably made at Reims and were brought to Germany as early as the reign of King Arnulf (d. 899). Germany possesses, as evidence of a more advanced art of metal-working, four crosses in the collegiate church at Essen, which reveal the powerful influence of the Byzantine art. Closely connected with Essen are the school of the monastery at Helmershausen, where the monk Rogerus wrote the first hand-book of the industrial arts, "Schedula diversarum artium", and the school of Hildesheim, which through the activity of Bishop Bernward became the centre of the metal-worker's art in Northern Germany; the folding-doors of the cathedral with crude reliefs, a column, which is patterned after Trajan's Column in Rome, and two candle-sticks belong to this period. In France scarcely a single work of any size has been preserved; in Italy several bronze doors, for instance, those of the basilica of St. Paul at Rome (1070) and Monte Gargano (1070), are noteworthy, because they were procured from Byzantium and show the influence of the Byzantine art.

D.—The golden age of the metal-work of the Church is the *Romanesque* period (1050–1250). We have already, it is true, mentioned above several works belonging to this age, because the various styles of art often overlap, and sharp distinctions can be drawn only by force. The characteristic which at once distinguishes the metal-works of the Romanesque period from the older works, is their large size; this distinction is most noticeable in the reliquaries. For, while the receptacles for relics had up to that time been uniformly of small dimensions, they grew in the Romanesque period into large shrines, for the transport of which three or four men were necessary. Several new varieties of metal-work also were added to the old, especially the *aquamanile*, i. e., a vessel in the form of an animal, used for washing the hands, and the metal structures placed upon the altar; other articles assumed new forms. These changes are in part due to the evolution of the liturgy. Almost to the close of the tenth century, for instance, neither cross nor candle-stick was permitted upon the altar, only small reliquary caskets being tolerated; the altar itself up to this time had preserved the shape of a table or sarcophagus. As soon as these regulations were broken and candle-stick, cross, and superfrontal found a place upon the altar, this change necessarily exerted a strong influence upon the manufacture and decoration of the articles mentioned.

The material employed in the manufacture of the metal-work of the Church also experienced a change, as copper took the place of gold. Furthermore the *cloisonné* enamel was supplanted by the *champlevé*. The *champlevé* enamel differs from the *cloisonné* by the small cells intended to receive the enamel not being made in the Byzantine fashion by means of strips of flat gold wire soldered to the gold plate, but by being dug out of the plate with a burin. A peculiarity of the workshops of Limoges (France) was the affixing of the heads of persons or even of the entire figure in high relief. The design in the figures themselves was for the most part filled out with coloured enamel. A second difference consists in the more frequent occurrence of plastic ornamentations in silver. Of course plastic decorations, as we have already seen, were not lacking in the earlier periods, but the Romanesque period gave a mighty impulse to this branch of the metal-worker's art and can show many extraordinary productions, for instance on the shrine of the Three Kings at Cologne. Lastly, a third difference is apparent in the ornamentation, in that secular types of decoration are now more and more used on articles intended for the Church. On a reliquary at Siegburg (near Cologne), for example, apes, deer, dogs, and naked men are represented; the well-known fabulous creatures of the Romanesque art also win a place for themselves in the art of metal-working.

The evolution in style may be briefly characterized as follows: the monastic art of the previous period with its Byzantine tendencies is subdued but not entirely supplanted by the popular tendency; the two rather enter into a close union which we designate as Romanesque art. Monuments of the Romanesque art in metals still exist in large numbers; but these are almost exclusively works of ecclesiastical origin. This is due not merely to the fact that the

churches, which have been correctly called the oldest museums, have guarded their treasures more carefully than the worldly owners; it is rather to be ascribed to the fact that at that time the metal-work for secular purposes was a practically negligible factor. We must not infer from this, however, that in the Romanesque period, as in the preceding, it was monks and clerics who were the principal manufacturers of the metal-work for the Church. During this period the art of metal-working, as well as the plastic arts in general, gradually passed into the hands of the laity. A number of Benedictine monasteries, it is true, still clung to the old traditions of the order, and remained centres of artistic pursuits.

By far the largest amount of ecclesiastical metal-work of the Romanesque period is to be found in Germany, where the art of metal-working created magnificent works in the districts bordering on the Rhine and the Meuse. On the Rhine the Benedictine monks Eilbert (1130) and Friedericus (1180) of the Benedictine monastery of St. Pantaleon produced several reliquaries and portable altars, which they decorated for the most part with enamel. They were far surpassed by the laymen Godefroi de Claire and Nicholas of Verdun, who combined plastic ornamentation and enamelling with amazing perfection. They are the creators of the two most beautiful reliquaries of this whole period; Godefroi wrought the shrine of St. Heribert at Deutz (1185), and Nicholas the shrine of the Three Kings at Cologne. In France likewise the art of enamelling was zealously cultivated, especially in Limoges, where small articles of metal for church use were manufactured in large quantities and exported in all directions.

Silver Pax
Basilica of St. Ambrose, Milan

The art of casting also can show several famous names such as Reiner of Huy, who cast the well-known baptismal font at Liège, and Riquinus of Magdeburg in whose workshop the gate of the cathedral at Novgorod was probably manufactured (1150). All these works are surpassed by the beautiful baptismal font at Hildesheim, the work of an unknown master. Italy has almost nothing to show from this period, except a few bronze doors, which enlighten us as to the position of casting in bronze; such are the doors of Barifano of Trani in Ravello (1179) and Monreale (1189) and of Bonano at Pisa (1180). (Cf. Falke and Frauberger, "Deutsche Schmelzarbeiten", Frankfort, 1904; Neumann, "Der Reliquienschatz des Hauses Braunschweig-Lüneburg", Vienna, 1891.)

E.—The *Gothic* epoch (1250–1500) brought numerous changes and new requirements, also in church metal vessels. In this period the feast of Corpus Christi was first introduced (1312), and thereby a new metal vessel, the monstrance or ostensory, made necessary. For this purpose a vessel was employed like those which up to that time had been in general use for exhibiting relics. Another vessel, which came into use at this time and upon whose manufacture great stress was laid, is the "pax", or "osculatorium" (*instrumentum pacis*). The growing veneration of saints and relics required an increase of reliquaries. One of the results of this was that these were no longer made as large and costly as in the Romanesque epoch. Combined with this was the striving for constantly new forms of reliquaries, among which busts in particular now became very popular. The early Gothic altars with double folds or wings became in fact small galleries of busts of the saints. The number of cast statues of the saints and of the Blessed Virgin also increases very considerably from the fourteenth century. The material as well as the technique and decoration of the works of the goldsmith again experience a change. Copper, which has been almost a necessity for the bulky Romanesque reliquaries, now gives way to silver; this is employed especially for the figures in relief which were then much used, and which served more frequently than in the Romanesque period as statuettes for the decoration of shrines.

Very intimately connected with this change of material was an alternation in the mode of ornamentation. The *champlevé* enamel had lost its power of attraction, and indeed it could not very well be used upon the thin sheets of silver; translucent enamel therefore took its place; this was applied by cutting the relief-like representation in the silver ground and pouring a transparent enamel over the relief, so that the different parts according as they are higher or lower produce the effect of light and shade in their various gradations. Siena has long been regarded as the starting-point of this new mode of ornamentation, because a chalice in Assisi made by the Sienese Guccio Manaja about 1290 is the oldest example of this process. From Italy it early spread to Germany, where it flourished especially on the Upper Rhine, and to France.

The features of the religious metal-work of this age that more than any other distinguish it from the earlier productions are the superstructure and construction; the same difference prevails as between a Romanesque and a Gothic church. The ponderous Romanesque style is replaced by a pleasing lightness and mobility of form. However in the art of metal-working as in the other arts we must carefully distinguish within this period between the early Gothic work and the late Gothic. Only the early Gothic work may be described as possessing, so to say, an aristocratic character, a certain ideal striving after the sublime; like the fairest period of chivalry, however, this striving lasts but a short time; it soon gives way to the homely and real actuality. The late Gothic metal-work throughout lacks the idealism of the early Gothic. This likewise is connected with the cultural development. The common people, who had grown in power, took pride, as the nobility had done before, in securing for themselves a lasting memorial by means of religious foundations and presents to churches. To dedicate magnificent, artistically executed works, however, their means were in many cases insufficient, thus giving rise to many works in metal of poor workmanship, especially chalices, mon-

strances, and reliquaries. So far as lightness of the structure in particular is concerned, this peculiarity is again best recognized in the reliquary and also in the monstrance. Very frequently since the fourteenth century the form chosen is that of two angels kneeling upon a base-plate and supporting the reliquary, sometimes holding it in a horizontal position as a casket, sometimes vertically as a tower. In Germany there are two excellent examples of this inverted position, two reliquaries in the cathedral treasures of Aachen, which are constructed in the form of chapels with towers abounding in open-work, and are borne by saints. Reliquaries in general assumed the form of churches in miniature; gabled hood-mouldings, pinnacles, finials, crockets, rampant arches and buttresses, in short the whole architectural scaffolding of the early Gothic cathedral are found in the shrines, of which the most important is the reliquary of St. Gertrude in Nivelles, the work of Nicholas in Douai and Jacquemon de Nivelles (1295). The same is true of the remaining works in metal.

The architectural ornaments forced themselves also upon articles on which we would not expect them; thus the knob (nodus) of the chalice often became a small chapel with many sharp corners and edges, making the handling of the chalice more difficult. Likewise, the popular plastic figures were placed upon articles of use that require a heavy formation, such as book-covers. A beautiful silver book-cover from the Benedictine convent of St. Blasien in the Black Forest is studded in this way with numerous figures of saints; they are found even upon the smaller articles of use, as upon a cloak-clasp in the cathedral of Aachen. The manufacture of the religious works is taken more and more out of the hands of the monks and clerics, who now furnish only the ideas, and gradually passes altogether into the hands of the lay goldsmiths. By this statement of course we do not wish to imply that there were not individual artists still active in the convents, for that remains true even to the present day, but for the development of an entire period they are of no moment.

Among the few works of France, that have been preserved, the so-called "golden horse of Altötting" attained great fame; it is a half-worldly, half-religious ornament representing the veneration of the Madonna by King Charles VI, whose horse in the lower part of the picture is held by a squire (1404). In Germany we can find no evidence of such exactly defined schools of art as in the Romanesque age; the works still in existence are exceedingly numerous, especially busts of saints and chalices. In contrast with the preceding epochs Italy now took a pronounced lead in the execution of artistic metal-work for the Church; the Italian works are compact, they favour a strong substructure, which permits the application of the favourite translucent enamel; there is evident also a tendency to excessive ornamentation, whereby the fixed forms are almost suffocated. Among the schools of Italy Siena was at first pre-eminent; from this city the goldsmith Boninsegna was called to Venice in 1345 to make repairs there to the Pala d'Oro of St. Mark's. Sienese masters also began in 1287 the silver altar in the cathedral at Pistoia, which was finally completed in 1399 by Florentine goldsmiths and is the largest piece of work of this kind. The masterpiece of the Florentine school, the silver altar of the baptistery, was begun in 1366 by Leonardo di Ser Giovanna and Berto di Geri; this too was not completed until one hundred years later, when the Renaissance had already fully entered into Italian art.

Bronze casting also continued to produce numerous works for the service of the Church. North Germany and the Netherlands (Dinant) were most prominently active in this field. Here we must mention first of all the numerous baptismal fonts of bronze, which are decorated on their outer sheathing with representations in relief and architectural ornaments, next the seven-armed candelabra, door-knobs, water-vessels (*aquamanile*), lecterns, especially the beautiful eagle-lecterns. In Germany the names of many of the masters have been handed down; in Wittenberg, Wilkin (1342), in Elbing, Bernhuser, and in Lubeck and Kiel, Hans Apengeter. Lastly mention should be made of the bells which were also cast in bronze. While Germany distinguished itself by its religious works cast in bronze, it was surpassed by France in another branch of the metal-worker's art. Here in the beginning of the thirteenth century the art of the smith passed through its first period of full vigour. At that time, thanks to the highly developed technical processes, France produced metal-work for the doors of churches such as has never been produced since. Germany, England, and the Netherlands felt the favourable influence of the French art, which produced its magnificent works on the cathedrals at Rouen, Sens, Noyon, and especially on the cathedral at Paris. Here every wing of the folding doors has three iron bands, that serve also as hinges, divided into a thousand branches and decorated with birds of every kind and fantastic creatures. In addition to the metal-work of the doors the blacksmith furnished the Church with artistic chandeliers, railings, pedestals for the Easter candle, lamps, and lecterns. The first place in the manufacture of artistic railings undoubtedly belongs to Italy, where the high perfection attained by the art of the Italian blacksmiths may best be seen in Florence (Sa Croce), Verona, and Siena.

Reliquary of St. Elizabeth of Hungary
French Goldsmith's Work
(XIII Cent.)

III. Renaissance.—While the religious metal-work in the Gothic style had increased in quantity often at the expense of quality, a decided retrogression in respect to quantity is noticeable during the Renaissance. This is especially true of Germany. The distressing religious agitations, the defection of many of the faithful from the old religion and the increasing indifference to religious faith had the effect of reducing the production of articles for church use to very small proportions. In Italy, it is true, we know the names of numerous artist goldsmiths—there are about 1000 of them—but there also the number of religious works of the Renaissance is very small. At the head of the new movement in metal-work for the Church we find the most distinguished sculptors, in fact the leading masters of the Renaissance preferred to execute their work in metal (bronze); we need mention here only the names of Ghiberti and Donatello, the former the creator of the famous bronze doors of the baptistery at Florence, the latter the maker of the high altar in bronze in Il Santo at Padua; as these works however belong to the domain of sculpture we must leave them out of consideration here.

The changes in style follow the course of the general evolution in art. The vertical forms of the Gothic

style give way to the horizontal tendency, the forms become more vigorous and compact, the vessels acquire a more flexible silhouette. However, the early Renaissance left the forms of the commonest vessels, the chalices and crosses, almost untouched, inasmuch as the tradition of a thousand years made them appear sacred; we have numerous chalices of the Renaissance, the base of which shows the Moorish and Gothic foils and the knob, the Gothic rotuli. Not until the late Renaissance were the circular forms and volutes generally employed. In other respects the customary Renaissance ornaments, which are by no means the least charm of this style, are employed in ecclesiastical and worldly articles indifferently. Putti, hermæ, caryatides, garlands, grotesques, acanthus leaves, furthermore the elements taken from architecture, such as columns, pillars, capitals, entablatures, balusters form an inexhaustible source of constant change.

Silver during the Renaissance no longer maintains the position it won for itself during the Gothic period. Several distinguished religious works in silver have been preserved, but they are far surpassed both numerically and artistically by the works in bronze; the latter are often covered with silver or gold. The artistic ornamentation of both ecclesiastical and secular metal-work consists especially of delicately executed representations in relief, which at first appear in moderation at the more important points, but later presumptuously cover the entire surface. At the same time enamel is very frequently employed, sometimes the previously mentioned translucent enamel, which completely covers the portions in relief with a coloured surface, sometimes also the Venetian enamel, which flourished from about 1500–1550. It was used to coat jugs and bowls, candle-sticks, candelabra, and ciboria. Another favourite form of decoration consisted in the combination of metals and crystals; this type of decoration occurs during the Middle Ages, but was more systematically and artistically carried out in the Renaissance. The art of gem-engraving likewise was again practiced after ancient models upon cameos and gems. The ecclesiastical works of the Renaissance therefore often represent an enormous value. We need mention here only the value of a few papal tiaras. A tiara, which Sixtus IV had made by the Venetian goldsmith Bartolomeo di Tomaso, was valued at 110,000 ducats. Julius II confided to the Milanese jeweller Caradossa the making of a tiara valued at 200,000 ducats (nearly 200,000 dollars). Hardly any works of really marked importance, if we except the previously mentioned altars in Florence and Pistoia, the completion of which falls in this period, have been preserved from the Renaissance. We may again mention a few reliquaries at Siena, which reveal a pronounced change compared with the monumental shrines of the Romanesque and Gothic periods. They are silver caskets with sides in openwork, permitting a view of the relics. The use of crystals is exemplified in a beautiful pax from Monte Cassino (now in Berlin).

Elsewhere the influence of the Renaissance upon church metal-work was early apparent. In the beginning only the non-essentials were borrowed from the Italian Renaissance; it was the ornament that was copied; the fundamental forms long remained Gothic. To the above-mentioned types the Germans added especially the scroll-work, which was by preference combined with the Moresque and then served as a pattern for the surface; it is not unknown in Italy, but in Germany it held almost undisputed sway for about thirty or forty years. In Germany during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the cities of Augsburg and Nuremberg gained extraordinary fame by the manufacture of artistic metal-work; their products were eagerly sought after throughout the entire world. The Augsburg goldsmith, George Seld, in 1492 furnished one of the first Renaissance works in Germany, a silver altar in the Reichen Kapelle at Munich; here we find nude putti, flowers growing out of acanthus calyces, friezes, and panels which breathe wholly the spirit of the Italian Renaissance. A goldsmith of Nuremburg, Melchior Bayo, in 1538, by order of King Sigismund I of Poland, made an altar of chased silver which is in the chapel of the Jagellons in the cathedral at Krakow. Besides these there are no religious works of any importance from this period. As is proved by the "Book of Holy Objects" of Cardinal Albrecht of Mayence, a few prelates indeed were intent on increasing the treasures of their churches in the new style, but as a rule the exigencies of the times did not permit the manufacture of larger works in metal. So far as the smaller utensils are concerned, these, even as late as the middle of the sixteenth century, still show Gothic forms, as, for instance, a chalice of the well-known Gebhard von Mansfeld, Archbishop of Cologne, in the "grünen Gewölbe" at Dresden (about 1560). All the works of this period are surpassed by the productions which the goldsmith Anton Eisenhoit made about the year 1590 for Theodor am Fürstenberg, Prince-Bishop of Paderborn; these are a chalice, crucifix, book-cover, and a vessel for holy water. The articles are most exquisitely ornamented with noble Renaissance forms done in flat chasing. The most beautiful works of the Renaissance in Southern Germany, reliquaries, chalices, monstrances, etc., are in the Reichen Kapelle at Munich. France, like Italy, has a large amount of documentary evidence of the manufacture of metal-work for the Church, but the endless wars of Louis XIV and the Revolution consigned them almost without exception to the melting-pot. A chalice in the church of St-Jean du Doigt (about 1540), which has a stout knob transformed into a chapel, and the cup and base being covered with clumsy tendrils, is the only work which we are able to name here.

Besides the works of the goldsmith's art, the productions in base metal must not remain entirely unnoticed. These came not rarely from the workshops of the goldsmiths. The most important founderies were in Florence and Padua. It is not always easy to distinguish between the works of sculpture and those of the industrial arts. Certainly a large number of magnificent bronze railings belong to the latter—the most beautiful is in the cathedral at Prato, the work of Bruno di Ser Lapo Mazzei (1444)—as do also the candelabra, which, because of their elegance of form and delicate ornamentation, are very effective. The best known specimen is the excessively ornamented candelabrum in Il Santo at Padua, the masterpiece of Riccio (1516). From bronze there were also manufactured for the service of the Church Sanctus bells, candlesticks, vessels for holy water, hanging lamps, about the details of which we need not here concern ourselves. We merely add that the works in iron are confined more particularly to the railings in the side-chapels of the larger churches; they are of no interest, however, from the standpoint of the history of art.

The last periods of church metal-work can be concisely described. Like the whole of the baroque art, the metal-work of the Church of this epoch, when compared with the delicately balanced regularity of the Renaissance, also shows a certain clumsiness and unrest, which in the rococo develops onesidedly into absolute irregularity, to be changed in the Classicism which followed, into the exact opposite, a pedantic, inflexible rigidity. These peculiarities of the new styles do not, of course, find expression in the goldsmith's art to the same extent as in the plastic arts. Nevertheless this evolution is not wholly lacking even in the smaller church utensils; it may, for instance, be clearly observed in the chalice, which in the baroque style is overloaded with broad, clumsy ornaments; in the rococo the forms became more deli-



BRONZE DOORS, RAVELLO (1179)

EXECUTED BY BARIFANO OF TRANI

cate, all the parts assumed wavy lines, false and genuine gems and porcelain paintings formed the decoration; Classicism discarded these baubles and produced chalices of the severest forms and with straight lines.

In France, which during this epoch set the fashion in Europe, the Court and a number of prominent individuals devoted enormous sums to provide valuable church furniture, at times in such a way that true art was lost in splendid display. In a completely equipped "chapel", which Cardinal Richelieu presented to the crown in 1636, there was a cross, ornamented with 2516 diamonds of various kinds, a chalice and a paten with 2113 diamonds, a madonna with 1253 diamonds; altogether 9000 diamonds and 224 rubies were employed in furnishing the chapel. The Sainte-Chapelle at Paris was presented by the "Chambres de comptes" with a reliquary one metre in length, for which they paid 13,060 *livres*. New metal-work was at that time produced in larger quantities in Germany, which in this art especially maintained its pre-eminence. Indeed it is the time of the so-called Counter-Reformation, which in Southern Germany and Austria beheld the erection of so many magnificent churches. The new houses of God, however, required new metal furniture. To the present day the treasure-rooms of many a cathedral—and convent—church are filled with the crosses, candlesticks, and antipendia that were made at that time; they are remarkable, however, for their size rather than their artistic qualities; the material is mostly silver. But works of art of great excellence are not entirely lacking. The Abbey of St. Blasien formerly owned an antipendium portraying the passage of the imperial army through the Black Forest in the year 1678, a most beautiful piece of work (now in Vienna). Other examples of the zeal employed in the manufacture of precious metal-work are the reliquary shrine of St. Engelbert in Cologne, dating from 1633, which shows the saint lying prostrate on the cover, and statues of bishops on the sides, but otherwise only architectural forms; also the shrine of St. Fridolin at Säckingen (Baden), characterized by the complete mobility of its lines; and furthermore the valuable monstrance in Klosterneuburg near Vienna, which is in the form of an elder-tree (1720).

Probably at no time was so little money expended upon religious furniture as during the period of Classicism; it is the age of barren Rationalism, which was practically devastating in its effect upon the liturgy and religious life. To devote large sums to the acquisition of precious furniture was not in consonance with the spirit of this age. For this reason candlesticks and even monstrances were not infrequently made of tin or wood, but to preserve appearances, often coated with silver or gold. We do not desire, however, to leave this period with this gloomy picture. In the baroque period the art of the blacksmith reached its second climax in Germany and France. Under the hammer of the smith the inert mass began to sprout and blossom. The superb choir-railings, lanterns, candle-stands, and chandeliers show to the present day that the art of the blacksmith in the service of the Church was at that time spurred on to the highest endeavours. The revival of the styles of the Middle Ages during the nineteenth century proved beneficial to the religious metal-work also. At the present day candlesticks, chalices, monstrances are manufactured, which in costliness and purity of style are not inferior to the best works of ancient art. Moreover the tendency toward the creation of a new style is noticeable also in the art of metal-working Whether this is to be crowned with lasting success, is a question for the future to decide.

MOLINIER, *L'orfévrerie religieuse et civile* (Paris); LÜER and CREUTZ, *Geschichte der Metallkunst* (Stuttgart, 1904 and 1909); LEHNERT, *Illustrierte Geschichte des Kunstgewerbes* (Berlin, 1909).

BEDA KLEINSCHMIDT.

Metaphrastes, SYMEON (Συμεὼν ὁ μεταφράστης), the principal compiler of the legends of saints in the Menologia of the Byzantine Church. Through the importance of this collection his name has become one of the most famous among those of medieval Greek writers. The epithet Metaphrastes may be rendered Compiler; it is given to him from the usual name for such arrangements of saints' lives (μετάφρασις, compilation). Little is known for certain about his life. His period is the latter half of the tenth century. In one of his legends (the Life of St. Samson) he tells of the saint's miracles continued down to his own time; that time is the reign of Romanos II (959–63) and of John I Tzimiskes (969–76). Michael Psellos (1018–78), who wrote the life of Symeon, afterwards added to those of the other saints in the collection, says he was a Logothete. In this case it means one of the Secretaries of State with the title Magister. Psellus also tells us that Symeon was a favourite of the emperor, at whose command he made his collection of legends. Ehrhard says that this emperor was Constantine VII (Porphyrogennetos, 912–59) who organized a compilation of all kinds of learning to form a kind of universal encyclopædia by the scholars of his Court (Krumbacher, "Byz. Lit.", 200). Ehrhard (loc. cit.) and most authorities now identify the Metaphrast with Symeon Magister the Logothete, who wrote a chronicle under Nicephorus Phocas (963–9). Besides the identity of name and period there is internal evidence from the two works (Chronicle and Legends) for this. A certain Arab chronicler, Yahya ibn Said of Antioch, in the eleventh century refers to "Simon, Secretary and Logothete, who composed the stories of the saints and their feasts" (Delehaye in "Revue des questions hist.", X, 84). Another point that fixes his time as the latter half of the tenth century is that, as Ehrhard has proved, the speech made by Constantine VII at the translation of the portrait of Christ from Edessa on 16 August, 944, is contained in Symeon's part of the Menology ("Die Legendensammlung", etc., pp. 48, 73). Formerly his period was generally thought to be earlier. In his life of St. Theoctistus of Lesbos he gives what seems to be a passage about himself, in which he says that he took part in the expedition of Admiral Himerios to Crete in 902. It is now proved that Symeon simply copied all this life, including the autobiographical note, from an earlier writer, Niketas (Ehrhard, "Byz. Lit.", p. 200).

Symeon's chief work, the one to which he owes his great reputation in the Byzantine Church, is the collection of Legends. But it is not easy to say how much of the Menology was really composed by him. On the one hand, in many cases he simply copied existing lives of saints; on the other, the collection has grown considerably since his time and all of it without discrimination goes by his name. Leo Allatius (op. cit.) ascribes 122 legends only to Symeon, Delehaye ("Les ménologes grecs" in the "Analecta Bollandiana", XVI, 311–29), thinks that 148 or 150 are authentic and original. It may be noticed that the authentic ones are chiefly those in the early months of the year, from September (the Byzantine Calendar begins in September; the saints in the Menology are arranged as their feasts occur). It is certain, that a number of these legends were written by Symeon from such sources as he found (partly oral tradition). The sifting of these from the rest still needs to be done (Ehrhard, l. c., 201–2). His reputation as an author has been restored by the latest students. At one time his name was a byword for absurd fabrications. Ehrhard, Dobschütz, and others have now shown him to be a conscientious compiler who made the best use of his material that he could. The often absurd stories in his lives were already contained in the sources from which he wrote them; he is not responsible for these, since his object was simply to collect and arrange the legends of the saints as they existed in his time. He

has often been compared to the great Western compiler of legends, Jacobus de Voragine (d. 1298). Some (Kondakoff, "Histoire de l'art byzantin," Paris, 1886, I, 46) prefer Symeon of the two. His legends were translated into Latin by Lippomanus, "Vita ss. priscorum patrum" (Venice, vols. V–VII, 1556–1558). Supposing the identity of the Metaphrast and Symeon Magister, we have other works by him, a Chronicle not extant in its original form, but altered and supplemented in the Chronicle that goes by his name, in the Corpus of Bonn (Theophanes continuatus, Bonn, 1828, 603–760), reprinted in P. G., CIX, 663–822; also an Epitome of Canons (P. G., CXIV, 236–292), collections of maxims from St. Basil (P. G., XXXII, 1116–1381) and Macarius of Egypt (P. G., XXXIV, 841–965), some prayers and poems (P. G., CXIV, 209–225) and nine letters (P. G., CXIV, 282–236). Symeon Metaphrastes is a saint in the Orthodox Church. His feast is 28 November.

The collection of legends in *P. G.*, CXIV–CXVI, Vol. CXIV, 185–205, contains MICHAEL PSELLUS's encomium and office for Symeon's feast, the first source for his life.

ALLATIUS, *De Symeonum scriptis diatriba* (Paris, 1664); HANKE, *De byzant. rerum scriptoribus* (1677), 418–60; OUDIN, *Comment. de script. eccles.*, II (1722), 1300–83; KRUMBACHER, *Gesch. der byzantinischen Litteratur* (2nd ed., Munich, 1897), 200–3; EHRARD, *Die Legendensammlung des Symeon Metaphrastes u. ihr ursprüngliche Bestand* (Rome, 1897); IDEM, *Symeon Metaphrastes u. die griechische Hagiographie* in the *Röm. Quartalschrift* (1897), 531–53; DELEHAYE, *Les ménologes grecs* in the *Anal. Bolland.*, XVI (1897), 312–29; IDEM, *Le Ménologe de Métaphraste*, ib., XVII (1898), 448–52; HIRSCH, *Byzantinische Studien* (Leipzig, 1876), 308–11; RAMBAUD, *L'empire grec au X^e siècle* (Paris, 1870). ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Metaphysics, that portion of philosophy which treats of the most general and fundamental principles underlying all reality and all knowledge.

I. THE NAME.—The word metaphysics is formed from the Greek *μετὰ τὰ φυσικά*, a title which, about the year 70 B. C., was prefixed by Andronicus of Rhodes to that collection of Aristotelian treatises which since then goes by the name of the "Metaphysics". Aristotle himself had referred to that portion of philosophy as "the theological science" (*θεολογική*), because it culminated in the consideration of the nature of God, and as "first philosophy" (*πρώτη φιλοσοφία*), both because it considered the first causes of things, and because, in his estimation, it is first in importance. The editor, however, overlooked both these titles, and, because he believed that that part of the Aristotelian *corpus* came naturally after the physical treatises, he entitled it "after the physics". This is the historical origin of the term. However, once the name was given, the commentators sought to find intrinsic reasons for its appropriateness. For instance, it was understood to mean "the science of the world beyond nature", that is, the science of the immaterial. Again, it was understood to refer to the chronological or pedagogical order among our philosophical studies, so that the "metaphysical" sciences would mean, those which we study after having mastered the sciences which deal with the physical world (St. Thomas, "In Lib. Bœtii de Trin.", V, 1). In the widespread, though erroneous use of the term in current popular literature, there is a remnant of the notion that metaphysical means ultraphysical: thus, "metaphysical healing" means healing by means of remedies which are not physical.

II. DEFINITION.—The term metaphysics, as used by one school of philosophers, is narrowed down to mean the science of mental phenomena and of the laws of mind. In this sense, it is employed, for instance, by Hamilton ("Lectures on Metaph.", Lect. VII) as synonymous with psychology. Hamilton holds that empirical psychology, or the phenomenology of mind, treats of the facts of consciousness, rational psychology, or the nomology of mind, treats of the laws of mental phenomena, and metaphysics, or inferential psychology, treats of the results derived from the study of the facts and laws of mind. This use of the term metaphysics is unfortunate because it rests on Descartes's false assumption that the method in metaphysics is subjective, in other words, that all the conclusions of metaphysics are based on the study of subjective, or mental, phenemona.

Taking a wider view of the scope and method of metaphysics, the followers of Aristotle and many who do not acknowledge Aristotle as a leader in philosophy define the science in terms of all reality, both objective and subjective. Here five forms of definition are offered, which ultimately mean one and the same thing:

(1) *Metaphysics is the science of being as being.*—This is Aristotle's definition (*περὶ τοῦ ὄντος ᾗ ὄν*,—Met., VI, 1026 a, 31). In this definition metaphysics is placed in the genus "science". As a science, it has, in common with other sciences, this characteristic that it seeks a knowledge of things in their causes. What is peculiar to metaphysics is the *difference* "of being as being". In this phrase are combined at once the material object and the formal object of metaphysics. The material object is being—the whole world of reality, whether subjective or objective, possible or actual, abstract or concrete, immaterial or material, infinite or finite. Everything that exists comes within the scope of metaphysical inquiry. Other sciences are restricted to one or several departments of being: physics has its limited field of inquiry, mathematics is concerned only with those things which have quantity. Metaphysics knows no such restrictions. Its domain is all reality. For instance, the human soul and God, because they have neither colour nor weight, thermic nor electric properties, do not fall within the scope of the physicist's investigation; because they are devoid of quantity, they do not come within the field of inquiry of the mathematician. But, since they are beings, they do come within the domain of metaphysical investigation. The material object of metaphysics is, therefore, all being. As Aristotle says (Met., IV, 1004 a, 34): "It is the function of the philosopher to be able to investigate all things." Its formal object is also "being", or "beingness." The formal object of any science is that particular phase, quality, or aspect of things which interests that science in a specific way. Man, for instance, is the material object of psychology, ethics, sociology, anthropology, philology, and various other sciences. The formal object, however, of each of these is different. The formal object of psychology is mental phenomena and the subject of them; the formal object of ethics is man's relation to his ultimate destiny; that of sociology is man's relation to his fellow-men in institutions, laws, customs, etc.; that of anthropology is the origin of man, distinction of races, etc.; that of philology is man's use of articulate speech. The formal object of the physical group generally is the so-called physical properties of bodies, such as light, sound, heat, molecular constitution, atomic structure, vital phenomena in general, etc. The formal object of the mathematical group is quantity; what interests the mathematician is not the colour, heat, etc., of an object, but its size or bulk. Similarly the metaphysician is interested in a specific way neither in the physical nor the mathematical qualities of things, but in their entity or beingness. If, then, physics is the science of being as affected by physical properties, and mathematics is the science of being as possessing quantity, metaphysics is the science of being as being. Since the material object of metaphysics is all being, the metaphysician is interested in everything that is or can be. Since the formal object of his study is again, being, the point of view of metaphysics is different from that of the other sciences. The metaphysician studies all reality; still, the resulting science is not a summing up of the departmental sciences which deal with portions of reality, because his point of view is different from that of the student of the departmental sciences.

(2) *Metaphysics is the science of immaterial being.*—"The first science", says Aristotle (Met., VI, 1026 a,

16), "deals with things which are both separate (from matter) and immovable". In this connexion the scholastics (cf. St. Thom., *ibid.*), distinguished two kinds of immaterial: (a) immaterial *quoad esse* or immaterial beings, such as God and the human soul, which exist without matter; (b) immaterial *quoad conceptum*, or concepts, such as substance, cause, quality, into the comprehension of which matter does not enter. Metaphysics, in so far as it treats of immaterial beings, is called special metaphysics and is divided into rational psychology, which treats of the human soul, rational theology, which treats of the existence and attributes of God, and cosmology, which treats of the ultimate principles of the universe. Metaphysics, in so far as it treats of immaterial concepts, of those general notions in which matter is not included, is called general metaphysics, or ontology, that is, the science of Being. Taking the term now in its widest sense, so as to include both general and special metaphysics, when we say that metaphysics is the science of the immaterial, we mean that whatever exists, whether it is an immaterial being or a material being, so long as it offers to our consideration immaterial concepts, such as substance or cause, is the object of metaphysical investigation. In this way, it becomes evident that this definition coincides with that given in the preceding paragraph.

(3) *Metaphysics is the science of the most abstract conceptions.*—All science, according to the scholastics, deals with the abstract. The knowledge of the concrete individual objects of our experience, with their ever changing qualities and the particular individuating characteristics which make them to be individual (for instance, the knowledge of this tree, of that flower, of this particular animal or person) may be very useful knowledge, but it is not scientific. Scientific knowledge begins, when we abstract from what makes the thing to be individual, when we know it in the general principles that constitute it. The first degree of abstraction is found in the physical sciences, which abstract merely from the particularizing, individuating characteristics, and consider the general laws, or principles, of motion, light, heat, substantial change, etc. The mathematical sciences ascend higher in the scale of abstraction. They leave out of consideration not only the individuating qualities but also the physical qualities of things, and consider only quantity and its laws. The metaphysical sciences reach the highest point of abstraction. They prescind, or abstract, not only from those qualities which physics and mathematics abstract from, but also leave out of consideration the determination of quantity. They consider only Being and its highest determinations, such as substance, cause, quality, action, etc. "There is a science", says Aristotle (Met. IV, 1003 a, 21) "which investigates being as being, and the attributes which belong to this in virtue of its own nature" (*τὰ τούτῳ ὑπάρχοντα καθ' αὐτό*). The objection therefore, that metaphysics is an abstract science, would, in the estimation of the scholastics, militate not only against metaphysics but against all the other sciences as well. The peculiarity of metaphysics is not that it is abstract, but that it carries the process of abstraction farther than do the other sciences. This, however, does not make it to be unreal. On the contrary, what is left out of consideration in metaphysics, namely individuating qualities, physical movement, and specific quantity, derive whatever reality they have as conceptions from the concept, Being, which is the object of metaphysics. Metaphysics, in fact, is the most real of all the sciences precisely because, by abstracting from everything else, it has centred, so to speak, its thought on Being, which is the source and root of reality everywhere else in the other sciences.

(4) *Metaphysics is the science of the most universal conceptions.*—This would follow from the consideration offered in the preceding paragraph because, by a well known law of logic, the less the comprehension the greater the extension of a term or concept. The science which deals with the most abstract conceptions must, therefore, be the science of the most universal conceptions. Among our ideas the most universal are Being, and the determinations of it which are called transcendental, namely unity, truth, goodness, and beauty, each of which is coextensive with being itself, according to the formulas, "Every being is one", "Every being is true", etc. Next in universality come the highest determinations of Being in the *suprema genera*, substance and accident, or, if Being be analyzed in the order of metaphysical constitution, essence and existence, potency and actuality. Very high up in the scale of extension will be cause and effect. All these are included within the range of metaphysical inquiry, and are dealt with in every scholastic manual of metaphysics. "Being in its highest determinations" is, then, another way of describing the object of metaphysics. Where, however, shall we draw the line? What determinations are not highest? For instance, are space and time determinations of Being, which are general enough to be considered in metaphysics? The answer to these questions is to be decided according to the dictates of practical convenience. Many of the problems sometimes included in general metaphysics may conveniently be treated in special parts, such as cosmology and psychology.

(5) *Metaphysics is the science of the first principles.*—This definition also is given by Aristotle (Met. IV, 1003 a, 26). Every science is an inquiry into the causes and principles of things; this science inquires into the first principles and highest causes, not only in the order of existence, but also in the order of thought. It belongs, then, to metaphysics (1) to inquire into the nature of cause and principle in general and to determine the meaning of the different kinds of causality, formal, material, efficient, and final: (2) to investigate the first principles in the order of knowledge, and establish the validity, for instance, of the principles of identity and contradiction.

All these definitions are expressions of the Aristotelian doctrine that metaphysics, like physics and mathematics, is a science of reality, it being beyond the scope of metaphysics to inquire whether reality is, or is not, given in experience. This question, which is a fundamentally important one in modern philosophy, was discussed by the scholastics in that portion of logic which they called critica, major logic, or applied logic, but which is now generally called epistemology (see Logic). Nowadays, however, the epistemological problem, by a fatal mistake of method, is assigned to metaphysics, and the result is a confusion between the two branches of philosophy, viz. metaphysics and epistemology. In works like Fullerton's "System of Metaphysics" (New York, 1906) and Hodgson's "Metaphysics of Experience" (London, 1898) no attempt is made to separate the two.

III. The Rejection of Metaphysics, by many schools of philosophy in modern times, is one of the most remarkable developments of post-Cartesian philosophy. A difference in the point of view leads to a very great divergence in the estimate placed on metaphysical studies. On the one side we have the verdict that metaphysics is nothing but "transcendental moonshine", on the other, the opinion that it is "organized common sense", or "an unusually obstinate effort to think accurately". Materialism, naturally, objects to the claim of metaphysics to be a science of the immaterial. If nothing exists except matter, a science of the immaterial has no justification. Materialists, however, forget that the assertion, "Nothing exists except matter", is either a summing up of the individual experience of the materialist himself, meaning that he has never experienced anything except

matter and manifestations of matter, and then the assertion is merely of biographical interest; or it is an affirmation regarding possible human experience, a declaration of the impossibility of immaterial existence, and in that sense it is a statement which in itself has a metaphysical import. Materialism is, in fact, a metaphysical theory of reality and is a contribution to the science which it professes to reject. Philosophical agnosticism, which is derived ultimately from Kant's doctrine of the unknowableness of nouminal reality (*Ding an sich*), rejects metaphysics on the ground that while the immaterial does, indeed, exist, it is unknown and must remain unknowable to the speculative reason. Kant (see KANT) maintained that all metaphysical reasoning, since it attempts by means of the speculative reason to go beyond experience, is doomed to failure, because the a priori forms which the understanding imposes on the empirical data of knowledge modify the quality of that knowledge by making it to be transcendental, but do not extend it beyond the realm of actual sense experience. The followers of Kant stigmatize as intellectual formalism the view that the speculative reason does actually attain ultra-empirical knowledge. This is the contention of the modernists and other Catholic writers who are more or less influenced by Kant. These decry rational metaphysics and offer as a substitute a metaphysics based on sentiment, vital activity, or some other non-rational foundation.

The answer to this line of thought is a denial of its fundamental tenet, the doctrine, namely, that the rational faculty cannot attain a knowledge of the essential or noumenal natures of things. Gratuitous assertion is often best refuted by categorical denial. The rejection of metaphysics by the materialist and the Kantian agnostic does not meet the full approval of the idealist. Instead of banishing metaphysics from the republic of the sciences, the idealist, having deprived it of its scientific character, elevates it to the rank of æsthetic pre-eminence side by side with poetry. He considers that it furnishes a point of view from which to contemplate the beauty, harmony, and value of those things which science merely explains. He holds that it is not the province of metaphysics to assign reasons or causes, but to furnish motives for action and enhance the value of reality. For him, its uplifting and regenerating function is entirely independent of its alleged ability to explain: he considers metaphysics to be, not an ontology, or science of reality, but a teleology, or application of the principle of purpose. That this is a function of metaphysics no one will deny. It is only one function, however, and unless the doctrine of final causes has its foundation in a doctrine of formal and efficient causes, teleological metaphysics is a castle in the air. Finally, the positivist, and the scientist whom the positivist has influenced, reject metaphysics because all our knowledge is confined to facts and the relations among facts. To attempt to go beyond facts and the succession or concomitance of facts is to essay the impossible. Causes, essences, and so forth, are terms which clothe in fictitious garb our ignorance of the real scientific explanation. The whole gist of positivism is contained in Hume's verdict that "it is impossible to go beyond experience". This psychological dictum is accepted by the philosophical positivist, as the death sentence of metaphysics. With the scientist, however, other considerations weigh more than the psychological argument. The scientist points to the present condition of metaphysics; he calls attention to the fact that, while the physical sciences have advanced by leaps and bounds, metaphysics is still grappling with the most fundamental problems and has not even settled the questions on which its very existence depends. The condition of metaphysics is, indeed, such as to invite the contempt and provoke the disdain of the scientist; the fault, however, may lie not so much in the claims of metaphysics as in the vagaries of the metaphysicians.

IV. RELATION OF METAPHYSICS TO OTHER SCIENCES.—The consideration of the relation in which metaphysics stands, or ought to stand, to the other sciences should result in a refutation of the positivist contention that metaphysics is useless. In the first place, metaphysics is the natural co-ordinating science which crowns the unifying efforts of the other sciences. It accomplishes in the highest plane of knowledge that process of unification towards which the human mind tends irresistibly. Without it, the explanations and co-ordinations attained in the lower sciences would be, perhaps, satisfactory within the limits of those sciences, but would fail to meet the requirements of that unifying instinct which the mind tends to apply to knowledge in general. So long as the mind of the knower is one, it is impossible not to attempt to bring under the most general conceptions and principles the conclusions of the various sciences. That is the task of metaphysics. Whenever we look around among the contents of the mind and try to discover order and hierarchical arrangement among them, we are attempting a system of metaphysics. In the next place, the process of explanation which belongs to each of the lower sciences, if pursued far enough, brings us face to face with the demand for a metaphysical explanation. Thus, the chemical problem of atomic or proto-atomic constitution of bodies leads inevitably to the question, What is matter? The biological problem of the nature and origin of life brings us to the point where it is imperative to answer the query, What is life? The questions: What is substance? What is a cause? What is quantity? are additional examples of problems to which physics, mathematics, etc., finally lead. Indeed, the world of science is completely surrounded by the metaphysical world, and every path of investigation brings us to a highroad of inquiry which sooner or later crosses the border and leads us into metaphysics. When therefore, the scientist rejects metaphysics, he suppresses a natural and ineradicable tendency of the individual mind towards unification and, at the same time, he tries to put up in every highway and byway of his own science a barrier against further progress in the direction of rational explanation. Besides, the cultivation of the metaphysical habit of mind is productive of excellent results in the sphere of general culture. The faculty of appreciating principles as well as facts is a quality which cannot be absent from the mind without detriment to that symmetry of development wherein true culture consists. The scientist who objects to metaphysics, rightly condemns the metaphysician who disdains to consider facts. He himself, unless he cultivate the metaphysical powers of his mind, is in danger of reaching the point where he is incapable of appreciating principles. Both the empirical talent for ascertaining facts and the metaphysical grasp of principles and laws are necessary for the rounding out of man's mental powers, and there is no reason why they should not both be cultivated.

V. RELATION OF METAPHYSICS TO THEOLOGY.—The nature of metaphysics determines its essential and intimate relation to theology. Theology, it need hardly be said, derives its conclusions from premises which are revealed, and in so far as it does this it rises above all schools of philosophy or metaphysics. At the same time, it is a human science, and, as such, it must formulate its premises in exact terminology and must employ processes of human reasoning in attaining its conclusions. For this, it depends on metaphysics. Sometimes, indeed, as when it deals with the supernatural mysteries of faith, theology acknowledges that metaphysical conceptions are inadequate and metaphysical formulæ incompetent to express the truths discussed. Nevertheless, if theology had no metaphysical formularies to rely upon, it could

neither express its premises nor deduce its conclusions in a scientific manner. Again, theology relies on metaphysics to prove certain truths, called the *preambula*, which are not revealed but are nevertheless presupposed before revelation can be considered reasonable or possible. These truths are not the foundation on which we rest our supernatural faith. If they should fail, faith would not suffer, though theology should then be rebuilt on another foundation. Furthermore, metaphysics, as Aristotle pointed out, culminates in the discussion of the existence and nature of God. God is the object of theology. It is only natural, therefore, that metaphysics and theology should have many points of contact, and that the latter should rely on the former. Finally, since all truth is one, both in the source from which it is derived, and in the subject, the human mind, which it adorns, there must be a kinship between two sciences which, like theology and metaphysics, treat of the most important conceptions of the human mind. The difference in the manner of treatment, theology relying on revelation, and metaphysics on reason alone, does not affect the unity of purpose and the final harmony of the conclusions of the two sciences.

But, while theology thus derives assistance from metaphysics, there can be no doubt that metaphysics has derived advantages from its close association with theology. Pre-Christian philosophy failed to arrive at precise metaphysical determinations of the notions of substance and person. This defect was corrected in part by Origen, Clement, and Athanasius, and in part by their successors, the scholastics, the impulse in both cases being given to philosophical definition by the requirements of theological speculation concerning the Blessed Trinity. Pre-Christian philosophy failed to give a coherent, satisfactory account of the origin of the world: Plato's myths and Aristotle's doctrine of the eternity of matter could not long continue to satisfy the Christian mind. It was, once more, the Alexandrian School of Christian metaphysics that, by elaborating the Biblical conception of creation *ex nihilo*, gave an explanation of the origin of the universe which is satisfactory to the metaphysician as well as to the theologian. Finally, the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, as discussed by the scholastics, gave occasion for a more definite and detailed determination of the metaphysical conception of accident in general and of quantity in particular.

VI. The Method of Metaphysics.—Among the objections most frequently urged against metaphysics, especially against scholastic metaphysics, is the unscientific character of its method. The metaphysician, we are told, pursues the a priori path of knowledge; he neglects or even condemns the use of the a posteriori empirical method which is employed with so much profit in the investigation of nature; he spins, as Bacon says, the threads of his metaphysical fabric from the contents of his own mind, as the spider spins her web from the substance of her body, instead of gathering from every source in the world around him the materials for his study, and then working them up into metaphysical principles, as the bee gathers nectar from the flowers and elaborates it into honey. In order to clear up the misunderstanding which underlies this objection, it is necessary to remark that there are three kinds of method: (1) the a priori, which, assuming certain self-evident postulates, maxims, and definitions to be true, proceeds deductively to draw conclusions implicated in those assumptions; (2) The subjective a posteriori method, which, from an examination of the phenomena of consciousness builds up empirically, that is, inductively, conclusions based on those phenomena; (3) the objective a posteriori method, which builds on the facts of experience in general in the same way as the subjective method builds on the facts of introspection. The second method is pre-eminently the method of the Cartesians, who, like their leader, Descartes, strive to build the whole edifice of philosophy on the foundation furnished by reflection on our thought-processes: *Cogito, ergo sum.* It is also the method of the Kantians, who, rejecting the psychological basis of metaphysics as unsafe, build on the moral basis, the categorical imperative: their line of reasoning is "I ought, therefore I am free", etc. The third is the method of those who, rejecting the Aristotelean conceptions, essence, substance, cause, etc., substitute so-called empirical conceptions of force, mass, and so forth, under which they attempt to subsume in a system of empirico-critical metaphysics the conceptions peculiar to the various sciences.

The first method is admittedly unscientific (in the popular sense of the word) and is adopted only by those philosophers who, like Plato, consider that the true source of philosophical knowledge is above us, not in the world around and beneath us. If the formula *universalia ante rem* (see Universals) is taken in the exclusive sense, then we may not look to experience, but to intuition of a higher order of truth, for our metaphysical principles. It is a calumny which originated in ignorance perhaps, more than in prejudice, that the scholastics followed this a priori method in metaphysics. True, the scholastic philosopher, often invokes such principles as "Agere sequitur esse" "Quidquid recipitur per modum recipientis recipitur", etc., and therefrom deduces metaphysical conclusions. If, however, we examine more closely, if we go back from the "Summa", or text-book, where the adage is quoted without proof, to the "Commentary on Aristotle" where the axiom is first introduced, we shall find that it is proved by inductive or empirical argument, and is therefore, a legitimate premise from which to deduce other truths. In point of fact, the scholastics use a method which is at once a priori and a posteriori, and the latter both in the objective and the subjective sense. In their exposition of truth they naturally use the a priori, or deductive, method. In their investigation of truth they explore empirically both the world of mental phenomena within us, and the world of physical phenomena without us, for the purpose of building up inductively those metaphysical principles from which they proceed. It may be conceded that many of the later scholastics are too ready to invoke authority instead of investigating; it may be conceded, even, that the greatest of the scholastics were too dependent on books, especially on Aristotle's works, for their knowledge of nature. But, in principle, at least, the best representatives of scholasticism recognized that in philosophy the argument from authority is the weakest argument, and if the circumstances in which they lived and wrote made it imperative on them to master the contents of Aristotle's writings on natural science, it must, nevertheless, be granted by every fair minded critic that in metaphysics at least they improved on the doctrines of the Stagyrite.

VII. History of Metaphysics.—The history of metaphysics naturally falls into the same divisions as the history of philosophy in general. In a brief outline of the course which metaphysical speculation has followed, it will be possible to consider only the principal stages, namely (1) Hindu philosophy, (2) Greek philosophy, (3) Early Christian philosophy, (4) Medieval philosophy, (5) Modern philosophy.

(1) *Hindu Philosophy.*—Of all the peoples of antiquity, the Hindus were the most successful in rising immediately from the mythological explanation of the universe to an explanation in terms of metaphysics. Apparently without passing through the intermediary stage of scientific explanation, they reached at once the heights of the metaphysical point of view. From polytheism or henotheism they proceeded very early to pantheism, and from that to a monistic metaphysical conception of reality. Their starting-point was the realization that man is born into a state of bondage

and that his chief business in life is to deliver himself from that condition by means of knowledge. The knowledge, they taught, which avails most in the struggle for freedom is this: the world of sense phenomena is an illusion (*mâyâ*), all real things are identical in the one supreme substance, the soul is part of this real substance, and will ultimately return to the Whole. The real substance is, as Max Müller remarks, spoken of as a neuter, and in this doctrine "is contained *in nuce* a whole system of philosophy" ("Six Systems of Indian Philosophy", London, 1899, p. 60). The first, and most important of all truths, then, is that reality is one, and that each of us is identical with the All: "*That art thou*" is the highest expression of self-knowledge, and the gate to all salutary truth. Thus, the Hindus, actuated by an ethical, or ascetic, motive, attained a metaphysical formula to which they reduced all reality.

(2) *Greek Philosophy.*—The first Greek philosophers were students of nature. They were actuated not by an ethical motive, but by a kind of scientific curiosity to know the origins of things. There was no metaphysician among the Ionians (see IONIAN SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY). Out of the problem of origins, however, the metaphysical problem was developed by the Eleatics and by Heraclitus. These philosophers considered that the explanations of the Ionians—that the world originated from water or air—were too naïve, relied too much on the verdict of the senses. Consequently, they began to contrast the real truth which the mind (νοῦς) sees, and the illusory truth (δόξα) which appears to the senses. The Eleatics, on the one hand, asserted that the permanent element, which they called Being, alone exists, and that change, motion, and multiplicity are illusions. Heraclitus, on the other hand, reached the conclusion that what mind reveals is change, which alone is real, while permanency is only apparent, is, in fact, an illusion of the senses. Thus, these thinkers thrust into the foreground the problem of change and permanency. They themselves, were not, however, wholly free from the limitations which confined the earlier Ionians to a physical view of the problems of philosophy. They formulated metaphysical principles of reality, but both in the language which they used and in the mode of thought which they adopted, they seemed to be unable to rise above the consideration of matter and material principles. Nevertheless, they did immense service to metaphysics by bringing out clearly the problem of change.

Socrates was primarily an ethical teacher. Still, in laying the foundation of ethics he formulated a theory of knowledge which had immediate application to the problem of metaphysics. He taught that the contrast and apparently irreconcilable contradiction between the verdict of the mind and the deliverance of the senses disappear if we determine the scientific conditions of true knowledge. He held that these conditions are summed up in the processes of induction and definition. His conclusion, therefore, is, that out of the data of the senses, which are contingent and particular, we may form concepts, which are the elements of true scientific knowledge. He himself applied the doctrine to ethics.

Plato, the pupil of Socrates, carried the Socratic teaching into the region of metaphysics. If knowledge through concepts is the only true knowledge, it follows, says Plato, that the concept represents the only reality, and all the reality, in the object of our knowledge. The sum of the reality of a thing, is therefore the Idea. Corresponding to the internal, or psychological, world of our concepts is not only the world of our sense experience (the shadow-world of phenomena), but also the world of Ideas, of which our world of concepts is only a reflection, and the world of sense phenomena, a shadow merely. That which makes anything to be what it is, the essence, as we should call it, is the Idea of that thing existing in the world above us. In the "thing" itself, the phenomenon presented by the senses, there is a participation of the Idea, limited, disfigured and debased by union with a negative principle of limitation called matter. The metaphysical constituents of reality are, therefore, the Ideas as positive factors and this negative principle. From the Ideas comes all that is positive, permanent, intelligible, eternal in the world. From the negative principle come imperfection, negation, change, and liability to dissolution. Thus, profiting by the epistemological doctrines of Socrates, without losing sight of the antagonistic teachings of the Eleatics and of Heraclitus, Plato evolved his theory of Ideas as a metaphysical solution of the problem of change, which had baffled his predecessors.

Aristotle also was a follower of Socrates. He was influenced, too, by the theory of Ideas advocated by his master, Plato. For, although he rejected that theory, he did so after a study of it which enabled him to view the problem of change in the light of metaphysical principles. Like Plato, he accepted the Socratic doctrine that the only true knowledge is knowledge of concepts. Like Plato, too, he inferred from this that the concept must represent the reality of a thing. But unlike Plato, he made at this point an important distinction. The reality, he taught, which the concept represents is in the thing which it constitutes, not as an Idea, but as an essence. He considers that the Platonic world of Ideas is a meaningless duplication of things: the world of essences is in, not above, nor beyond, the world of phenomena: there is, consequently, no contradiction between sense-experience and intellectual knowledge: the metaphysical principles of things are known by abstraction from those individuating qualities, which are presented in sense-knowledge; the knowledge of them is ultimately empirical, and not to be explained by an intuition which we are alleged to have enjoyed in a previous existence. In the essence of material things Aristotle further distinguished a twofold principle, namely the Form, which is the source of perfection, determinateness, activity and of all positive qualities, and the Matter, which is the source of imperfection, indetermination, passivity and of all the limitations and privations of a thing. Coming now to the borderland of metaphysics and physics, Aristotle defined the nature of causality, and distinguished four supreme kinds of cause, Material, Formal, Efficient and Final (see CAUSE). In addition to these contributions to the solution of the problem of change, which had, by historical evolution, become the central problem of metaphysics, Aristotle contributed to metaphysics a discussion of the nature of Being in general, and drew up a scheme of classification of things which is known as his system of Categories. He is least satisfactory in his treatment of the problem of the existence and nature of God, a question in which, as he himself admits, all metaphysical speculation culminates.

After the time of Aristotle, philosophy among the Greeks became centred in problems of human destiny and human conduct. The Stoics and the Epicureans, who were the chief representatives of this tendency, devoted attention to questions of metaphysics, only in so far as they considered that such questions may influence human happiness. As a result of this subordination of metaphysics to ethics, the pantheistic materialism of the Stoics and the materialistic monism of the Epicureans fall far short of the perfection which the doctrines of Plato and Aristotle attained. Contemporaneously with the Stoic and Epicurean schools, a new school of Platonism, generally called Neo-Platonism, interested itself very much in problems of asceticism and mysticism, and, in connexion with these problems, gave a new turn to the drift of metaphysical speculation. The Neo-Platonists, influenced by the monotheism of the Orientals, and, later by that of the Christians, took up the task of explaining how

the manifold, diversified, imperfect world originated from the One, Unchangeable, and Perfect Being. They exaggerated the Platonic doctrine of matter to the point of maintaining that all evil, moral as well as physical, originates from a material source. At the same time, they ascribed to the spiritualized Ideas which they called δαίμονες (spirits) all actuality, intelligence, and force in the whole universe. These intelligences were derived, they said, from the One by a process of emanation, which is akin to the "streaming forth" of light from the illuminating body. This system of metaphysics teaches, therefore, that the One, and intelligences derived from the One, are the only positive principles, while matter is the only negative principle of things. This is the system which was most widely accepted in pagan circles during the first centuries of the Christian era.

(3) *Early Christian Philosophy.*—The first heretics among the Christian thinkers were influenced in their philosophy by Neo-Platonism. For the most part, they adopted the Gnostic view (see GNOSTICISM) that in the last appeal, the test of Christian truth is not the official teaching of the Church or the exoteric doctrine of the gospels, but a secret *gnosis*, a body of doctrine imparted by Christ to the chosen few. This body of doctrine was in reality a modified Neo-Platonism. Its most salient point was the theory that evil is not a creation of God but the work of the devil. The problem of evil thus came to occupy an important place in the philosophical systems of orthodox Christian thinkers down to the time of St. Augustine. Other problems, too, claimed special attention, notably the question of the origin of the universe. From the theological controversies concerning the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation, arose the discussion of the meaning of nature, substance, and person. From all these sources sprang the Christian Neo-Platonism of the great Alexandrian School, which included Clement and Origen, and the later phase of Christian Platonism exemplified by St. Augustine. In the philosophy of St. Augustine we have the greatest constructive effort of the Christian mind during the Patristic Era. It is a philosophy which centres in the problems arising from the nature of God, and the nature and destiny of the human soul. The most crucial of these problems is that of the existence of evil. How can evil exist in a world created and governed by a God, Who is at once supremely good and all-powerful? Rejecting the Manichean theory that evil has an origin distinct from God, St. Augustine devotes all his efforts to showing, from the nature of evil, that it does not demand a direct efficient act on the part of God, but only a permissive act, and that this toleration of evil is justified by the gradation of beings which results from the existence of imperfection, and which is essential to the harmony and variety of the universe in general. Another question which attains a good deal of prominence in St. Augustine's metaphysics is that of the origin of the world. All things, he teaches, were created at the beginning, material creatures as well as angels, and the subsequent appearance of plants, animals, and men in a chronological series is merely the development in time of those "seeds of things" which were implanted in the material world at the beginning. However, St. Augustine is careful to make an exception in the case of the individual human soul. He avoids the doctrine of pre-existence which Origen had taught, and maintains that the individual soul originates at the same time as the body, although he is not prepared to decide definitively whether it originates by a distinct creative act or is derived from the souls of the child's parents (see TRADUCIANISM).

(4) *Medieval Philosophy.*—The first scholastic philosophers devoted their attention to the discussion of logical problems arising out of the interpretation of the texts which were studied in the schools, such as Porphyry's "Isagoge", and Boethius's translation of portions of Aristotle's "Organon". From these discussions they passed to problems of psychology, but it was not until the end of the twelfth century, when Aristotle's metaphysical treatise and his works on psychology became accessible in Latin, that scholastic metaphysics rose to the dignity and proportions of a system. By way of exception, John the Scot (see ERIUGENA), as early as the first half of the ninth century, developed a highly wrought system of metaphysical speculation characterized by idealism, pantheism, and Neo-Platonic mysticism. In the eleventh century the school of Chartres, under the influence of Platonism, discussed in a metaphysical spirit the problems of the nature of reality and the origin of the universe.

The philosophy of the thirteenth century, represented by Alexander of Hales, St. Bonaventure, Roger Bacon, Albert the Great, St. Thomas, and Duns Scotus, accorded to metaphysics its place as the science which completes and crowns the efforts of the mind to attain a knowledge of things human and divine. It acknowledged the importance of the relation which metaphysics bears, on the one hand, to the other portions of philosophy, and, on the other hand, to the science of theology. Fundamentally Aristotelean in its conception of method and scope, the metaphysics of the golden age of scholasticism departed from Aristotle's teaching only to supply the defects and correct the faults which it detected in Aristotle's philosophy. Thus, it worked out on Aristotelean lines the problems of person and nature, substance and accident, cause and effect; it took up and carried to higher systematic development St. Augustine's reconciliation of evil with the goodness of God; it elaborated in detail the question of the nature of matter and the origin of the universe by God's creative act. At the same time, the metaphysics of the schools was obliged to face new problems which were thrust on the attention of the schoolmen by the exegetical and educational activity of the Arabians. Thus, it drew the line of distinction between Theism and Pantheism, discussed the question of fatalism and free will, and rejected the Arabian interpretation of Aristotle which jeopardized the doctrine of personal immortality. Towards the end of the scholastic period the appearance of the anti-metaphysical nominalism of Ockham, Durandus, and others had the effect of driving some of the later schoolmen to adopt an extreme a priorism in philosophy, which more than any other single cause contributed to bring about the antagonism between metaphysics and natural science, which marks the era of scientific discovery. This condition, though widespread, was not, however, universal. Men like Suarez and other great commentators continued down to the seventeenth century to present in their metaphysical treatises the best traditions of the scholasticism of the thirteenth century.

(5) *Modern Philosophy.*—At the beginning of the modern era we find a divergence of opinion concerning the scope and value of metaphysical speculation. On the one hand, Bacon, while himself retaining the name metaphysics to designate the science of the essential properties of bodies, is opposed to the metaphysical philosophy of the scholastics, and chiefly because that philosophy gave too much prominence to final causes and the study of the mind. On the other hand, Descartes, while declaring that "philosophy is a tree, which has metaphysics for its root", understands that the science of metaphysics is based exclusively on the data of the subjective consciousness. Spinoza accepts this restriction, implicitly at least, although his explicit aim in philosophy is ethical, namely to present that view of reality which will lead to the deliverance of the soul from bondage. Leibniz takes a more objective view. He tries to adopt a definition of reality which will reconcile the idealism of Plato with the results of scientific research, and he aims at harmoniz-

ing the materialism of the atomists with the spiritualism of the scholastics. Locke, by limiting all our knowledge to the two sources, sensation and reflection, precludes the possibility of metaphysical speculation beyond the facts of experience and of consciousness: in fact, he maintains (Essay, IV, 8) that all metaphysical formulæ, when they are not merely tautological and, therefore "trifling", have only a hypothetical value. This line of thought is taken up by Hume, who emphatically declares that "it is impossible to go beyond experience", and by Mill, who maintains the hypothetical nature of all so-called necessary truth, mathematical as well as metaphysical. The same position is taken by the French sensists and materialists of the eighteenth century. Berkeley, although his professed aim was merely "to remove the mist and veil of words" which hindered the clear vision of the truth, passed from empirical immaterialism to a system of Platonic mysticism based on the metaphysical principle of causality.

Beginning with Kant, the question of the existence and scope of metaphysical science assumes a new phase. Metaphysics is now the science which claims to know things in themselves, and as Kant sees it, all post-Cartesian metaphysics is wrong in its starting-point. Kant holds that both the empiricist's rejection of metaphysics and the dogmatist's defence of it are wrong. The empiricist is wrong in asserting that we cannot go beyond experience: the dogmatist is wrong in affirming that we can go beyond experience by means of the theoretical reason. The practical reason, the faculty of moral consciousness, can alone take us beyond experience, and lead us to a knowledge of things in themselves. Practical reason, therefore, or the moral law, of which we are immediately conscious, is the only foundation of metaphysical science. The successors of Kant, namely, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Schopenhauer, and Von Hartmann, no matter how much they may differ in other respects, hold that the aim of metaphysics is to attain the ultra-empirical, or absolute, reality, whether this be called self (Fichte), the absolute of indifference (Schelling), the dynamic absolute, spirit or Idea (Hegel), the Will (Schopenhauer), or the Unconscious (Von Hartmann). Another group, the empiro-critics, who also acknowledge their dependence on Kant, assign to metaphysics the task of discussing the fundamental principles of knowledge by means of a critical examination of experience. Finally, there is among German philosophers of our own day, an inclination to use the word metaphysics to designate any view of reality which, transcending the limits of the particular sciences, strives to combine and relate the results of those sciences in a synthetic formula (*Weltanschauung*).

English philosophers either define metaphysics in terms of mental phenomena, as Hamilton does, or restrict its field of inquiry to the problem of the value of knowledge, thus confounding it with epistemology, or go over to the Hegelian point of view that metaphysics is the science of the genesis and development of dynamic categories of reality. The evolutionist school, represented by Herbert Spencer, while they deny the cogency of "metaphysical reasonings", attempt a general synthesis of all truth under the evolutionist formula, which is in reality metaphysics in disguise. Their effort in this direction is, at least, an acknowledgement of the justice of the scholastic claim that there must be a hegemonic science which unifies and co-ordinates in an articulate system the conclusions of the various sciences, and which corrects the tendencies of those sciences towards a specialization which ends in fragmentation.

In so far as pragmatism, represented by James, Dewey, and Schiller, rejects absolute truth, it may be said to cut the ground from under metaphysics. Nevertheless, the latest phase of pragmatism, in which interest is shifted from the epistemological problem to the question, What is reality? is manifestly a step towards a rehabilitation of metaphysics. An analysis of reality is followed inevitably by an attempt to synthesize. The pragmatic synthesis, naturally, will have for its foundation neither the law of identity, that being is being, nor the law of contradiction, that being is not not-being, but some principle of "value", akin to that of the *Werth-Theorie* of Lotze. Of quite special interest is the attempt on the part of Professor Royce to interpret reality in terms of "loyalty". With the exception, then, of Trendelenburg's "Studies", and critical expositions of the text of Aristotle, the only philosophical literature in recent times which adopts the Aristotelean view of the nature and scope of metaphysics, is that which has come from the pens of the Neo-Scholastics. The Neo-Scholastic doctrine on at least one point in metaphysics is given in the following paragraph.

VIII. Doctrine of Being.—The three ideas which are most important in any system of metaphysics are Being, Substance, and Cause. These have a decisive influence, and may be said to determine the character of a metaphysical system. Substance and Cause are treated elsewhere under separate titles (see Cause and Substance). It will, therefore, be sufficient here to give the outlines of the scholastic doctrine of Being, which, indeed, is the most fundamental of the three, and decides, so to speak, beforehand, what the scholastics teach regarding Substance and Cause.

(1) *Description of Being.*—Being cannot be defined: (a) because a definition, according to the scholastic formula, must be "by proximate genus and ultimate difference", and Being, having the widest extension, cannot be included in any genus; (b) because a definition is the analysis of the comprehension of a concept, and Being, having the least comprehension, is, as it were, indivisible in its comprehension, resisting all efforts to resolve it into simpler thought elements. Nevertheless, Being may be described. The word "Being", taken either as a participle or as a noun, has reference to the "act" of existence. Whatever exists, therefore, is a Being, whether it exists in the mind or outside the mind, whether it is actual or only potential, whether it requires a subject in which to inhere or is capable of subsisting without a subject of inherence. Thus, the broadest division of Being is into, notional, which exists only in the mind (*ens rationis*), and, real, which exists independently of the created mind (*ens reale*). Real Being is further divided into the potential and the actual. This is an important point of scholastic teaching, which is sometimes overlooked in the exposition and still more in the criticism of scholasticism. For the scholastics, the real world extends far beyond the actual world of our experience or even of possible experience. Beyond the realm of actually existing things they see a world of tendencies, potencies, and possibilities which are truly real. The oak is really present, though only potentially, in the acorn; the painting is really, though only potentially, present, in the mind of the artist; and so, in every case, before the effect becomes actual it is really present in the cause in the measure in which its actual existence depends on the cause.

(2) *Relation of Being to other Concepts.*—Scholastic psychology, adopting Aristotle's doctrine that all our ideas are acquired through the senses, teaches that the first knowledge which we acquire is sense-knowledge. Out of the material furnished by the senses the mind elaborates ideas or concepts. The first of these ideas is the most general, the poorest in representative content, namely, the idea of "Being". In this sense, therefore, the idea of being, or, more correctly, perhaps, the idea of "something", is the first of all our ideas.

Turning, now, to the logical relation, how, ask the scholastics, is the idea of Being predicated of the lower, or less general concepts, such as substance, acci-

dent, body, plant, tree, etc.? In the first place, the predicate being is never univocally affirmed of lower concepts, because it is not a genus. Neither is it predicated equivocally, because its meaning when predicated of substance, for example, is not entirely distinct from its meaning when predicated of accident. The predication is, therefore, analogical. What, then, is the relation, in comprehension, between Being and the lower concepts? It is obvious that the lower concept has greater comprehension than Being. But can it be said that the lower concept *adds* to the comprehension of Being? Manifestly, that is impossible, because if anything distinct from being is added to being, what is added is "nothing", and there is no addition. The schoolmen, therefore, teach that the lower concept simply brings out in an explicit manner a mode or modes of being which are contained implicitly but not expressed in the higher concept, Being. The comprehension, for example, of substance is greater than that of being. Nevertheless it is not correct to say that, Substance = Being + *a;* for if *a* is distinct from the term Being, to which it is added, it must be Nothing. The truth, then, is that Substance brings out explicitly a mode (namely the power of existing without a subject in which to inhere) which is neither explicitly affirmed nor explicitly denied but only implicitly contained in the concept of Being.

(3) *Being and Nothing.*—Being, therefore, has a comprehension, which, though it is the least of all comprehensions, is definite. It is not a bare, empty concept, and, therefore, equal to "nothing", as the Hegelians teach. This doctrine of the scholastics is the line of demarcation between Aristoteleanism on the one hand and Hegelianism on the other. Aristotle teaches that being has a definite comprehension, that, therefore, the fundamental law of thought as well as the basic principle of reality is the identity of Being with itself: Being=Being, A is A, or Everything is what it is. Hegel does not deny that this Aristotelean principle is true. He holds, however, that Being has an indeterminate comprehension, a comprehension which is dynamic or, as it were, fluent. Therefore, he says, the principle Being=Being, A is A, or Everything is what it is, is only part of the truth, for Being is also equal to Nothing, A = not-A, Everything is its opposite. The full truth is: Being is Becoming; no static or fixed formula is true; everything is constantly passing into its opposite. The consequences which follow from this fundamental divergence of doctrine regarding Being are enormous. Not the least serious of these is the Hegelian conclusion that all reality is dynamic and that God Himself is a process.

(4) *Being, Existence, and Essence.*—As wisdom (*sapientia*) is that by which a person is wise (*sapere*), so essence (*essentia*) is that by which a thing is (*esse*). If one inquires what is the intrinsic cause of a person being wise, the answer is, wisdom; if one asks what is the intrinsic cause of existence, the answer is, essence. Essence, therefore, is that by which a thing is what it is. It is the source of all the necessary and universal properties of a thing, and is itself necessary, universal, eternal, and unchangeable. The act to which it refers is existence, in the same way as the act to which wisdom refers, is the exercise of wisdom (*sapere*). Both existence and essence are realities, the one in the entitative order, the other in the quiddative order. Of course, the existence of a notional being (*ens rationis*) is only notional; its essence, too, is notional. But in the case of a real, created Being, the existence is one kind of reality, a real actuality, and the essence is another kind of reality, a reality in the potential order. This doctrine of the real distinction between essence and existence in real created beings is not admitted by all scholastic philosophers. Suarez, for instance, and his school, hold that the distinction is only logical or notional; the Scotists, too, maintain that the distinction in question is less than real. The Thomists, on the contrary, hold that in God alone essence and existence are identical, that in all creatures there is a real distinction, because in creatures existence is participated, diversified, and multiplied, not by reason of itself but by reason of the essence which it actualizes. There is much controversy not only over the question itself, but also concerning the interpretation of the words of St. Thomas, although there seems very little ground for denying that in the work "De Ente et Essentia" the Angelic Doctor holds a real distinction between essence and existence.

(5) *Transcendental Properties of Being.*—Equally extensive with the concept of Being are the concepts good, true, one, and beautiful. Every being is good, true, one, and beautiful, in the metaphysical sense, or as the scholastics expressed it, Being and Good are convertible, Being and True are convertible, etc. (*Bonum et ens convertuntur*, etc.). Goodness, in this sense, means the fullness of entity or perfection which belongs to each being in its own order of existence; truth means the correspondence of a thing to the idea of it, which exists in the Divine Mind; oneness means the lack of actual division, and beauty means that completeness, harmony or symmetry of essential nature which is only an aspect of truth and goodness. These properties, goodness, truth, oneness, and beauty, are called transcendental, because they transcend, or exceed in extension, all the lower classes into which reality is divided.

(6) *The Categories.*—Real Being is divided (not by strict logical division, but by a process analogous to it) into Finite and Infinite. Finite Being is divided into the supreme genera, Substance and Accident. Accident is further divided into Quantity, Quality, Relation, Action, "Passion", Place, Time, Posture, and Habit (or possession). These nine Accidents, together with the supreme genus, substance, are the ten Aristotelean Categories into which, as supreme classes, all Being is divided.

I. Aristotelean Metaphysics:—Aristotle, *Metaphysics* in the Berlin edition, *Aristotelis Opera Græce et Latine* (Berlin, 1823–7), tr. McMahon (London, 1878, New York, 1887), tr. Ross (Oxford, 1908); commentaries by St. Thomas, *S. Thomæ Opera Omnia*, XXIV (Paris, 1875); Sylvester Maurus, *Aristotelis Opera* (Rome, 1668), etc.; Wallace, *Outlines of Phil. of Arist.* (Cambridge, 1894); Piat, *Aristote* (Paris, 1903).

II. Scholastic Metaphysics:—St. Thomas, *op. cit.*, and *De Ente et Essentia*, with Cajetan's commentary, in *Quæstiones Dispp.*, IV (Rome, 1883); Suarez, *Dispp., Metaphysicæ* in *Opera Omnia*, XXV (Paris, 1866); scholastic manuals, Zigliara, Liberatore, Lorenzelli; Vallet, Reinstadtler, Gredt, Hickey, etc., in Latin; Harper, *Metaphysics of the Schools* (3 vols., London, 1879–84); Rickaby, *General Metaphysics* (London, 1890); Hill, *Elements of Philosophy* (Baltimore, 1873); Mercier, *Ontologie* (Louvain, 4th ed., 1905); Gutberlet, *Allgemeine Metaphysik* (Münster, 1906).

III. Hegelian:—*Hegel's Werke* (18 vols., Berlin, 1832–40); Haldane, *Pathway to Reality* (2 vols., London, 1903); Bradley, *Appearance and Reality* (London, 1902); Stirling, *The Secret of Hegel* (London, 1865); McTaggart, *Absolute Relativism* (London, 1887).

IV. The following include psychology and epistemology in Metaphysics: Hamilton, *Lectures on Metaphysics* (4 vols., Edinburgh, 1859, London, 1861); Hodgson, *The Metaphysics of Experience* (4 vols., New York, 1898); Fullerton, *System of Metaphysics* (New York, 1904); Ladd, *Theory of Reality* (New York, 1899).

V. Various Tendencies:—Bowne, *Metaphysics* (New York, 1898); Taylor, *Elements of Metaphysics* (London, 1903); Day, *Ontological Science* (New York, 1878); Riehl, *Science and Metaphysics*, tr. Fairbanks (London, 1894); Lotze, *Metaphysik*, tr. Bosanquet (2 vols., London, 1887); James, *A Pluralistic Universe* (New York, 1909); Schiller, *Studies in Humanism* (London, 1903); Royce, *Philosophy of Loyalty* (New York, 1908). Consult also, the various "Introductions", for example, Külpe, *Introduction to Philosophy*, tr. Pillsbury and Titchner (London, 1901); Watson, *Outline of Philosophy*, 2nd ed. (Glasgow, 1898); Paulsen, *Introduction to Philosophy*, tr. Thilly (New York, 1898); Marvin, *Introduction to Systematic Philosophy* (New York, 1903); Ladd, *Introduction to Philosophy* (New York, 1901).

VI. History of Metaphysics:—Von Hartmann, *Gesch. der Metaphysik* (3 vols., Berlin, 1899–1900); Willmann, *Gesch. des Idealismus* (3 vols., Brunswick, 1894–97); and general histories of Philosophy, such as, Stöckl, *History of Philosophy*, tr. Finlay (Dublin, 1888–1903); Turner, *History of Philosophy* (Boston, 1903).

William Turner.

Metastasio, Pietro, Italian poet, b. at Rome, 1698; d. at Vienna, 1782. Of humble origin, his father, once a Papal soldier, was later a pork-butcher; Metastasio was placed in the shop of a goldsmith to learn his craft. By some chance he attracted the attention of the jurisconsult and littérateur, Vincenzo Gravina, who took him in charge, and Græcizing his name of Trapassi, into the synonymous Metastasio, gave him a solid education. At his death in 1718 he left to his protégé a considerable sum of money, which the latter soon dissipated. Then he was compelled to apprentice himself at Naples to a lawyer, who, however, found the apprentice more prone to write verses than to study legal codes. The beginning of Metastasio's real career is marked by the composition, at the request of the Viceroy of Naples, of his musical drama, the "Orti Esperidi", which had signal success. The leading part therein was played by the famous actress, la Romanina (Marianna Benti-Bulgarelli). She at once became attached to the young poet, commissioned him to write a new play, the "Didone abbandona", had him taught music by a noted teacher, and took him to Rome and to Venice with her on her professional tours.

Pietro Metastasio

At Vienna the Italian melodramatist, Apostolo Zeno, was about to relinquish his post as imperial poet, and in 1730 he recommended that Metastasio be appointed his successor. With this recommendation and with the aid of the Countess of Althann, who remained his patroness during her lifetime, he obtained the appointment. Thereafter, and especially during the decade between 1730 and 1740, Metastasio was engaged in the composition of his many melodramas (over seventy in number), his oratorios, cantate, canzonette, etc. Among the most noted of his melodramas—which announce the coming opera—are: "Endimione", "Orti Esperidi", "Galatea", "Angelica", "Didone", "Siroe", "Catone", "Artaserse", "Adriano", "Demetrio", "Issipile", "Demofoonte", "Clemenza di Tito", "Semiramide", "Olimpiade", "Temistocle", and the "Attilio Regolo". The last-named is regarded as his masterpiece. All the pieces of Metastasio took the popular fancy, chiefly because he sedulously avoided all unhappy dénouements, and, enlivening his efficacious dialogue with common sense aphorisms, he combined them with arias and arietas that appealed to the many. His Letters are important in connexion with any study of his artistic development.

The best edition of his works is that of Paris, 1780–82. Additions are found in the *Opere Postume*, Vienna, 1795. (See also the editions of Florence, 1820 and 1826). His letters were edited by Carducci (Bologna, 1883), and by Antona Traversi (Rome, 1886.)

J. M. D. Ford

Metcalfe, Edward, b. in Yorkshire, 1792; d. a martyr of charity at Leeds, 7 May, 1847. He entered the Benedictine monastery at Ampleforth in 1811, and was ordained five years later. He distinguished himself early as a linguist. From 1822 to 1824, he served on the mission at Kilvington. About this time, at the request of Bishop Baines, he and some other members of the community left Ampleforth to establish a monastery at Prior Park, near Bath. On 13 March, 1830, the Holy See authorized them to transfer their obedience to the vicar Apostolic; a little later, owing to some misunderstanding, they were secularized. In 1831 Father Metcalfe was made chaplain to Sir E. Mostyn, of Talacre, Flint, and soon acquired a knowledge of the Welsh language, so as to minister to the Welsh population. After five years he was transferred to Newport, and in 1844 to Bristol. Arrangements were almost completed for his re-admission into the Benedictines in 1847, when an outbreak of fever in Leeds, inspired him to offer his services to the bishop of that city; he hastened to the plague-stricken populace, and in a short time fell a victim to the epidemic. His principal works are: a Welsh translation of Challoner's two works, "Think well on't" and "The Garden of the Soul" (Llyfr Gweddi y Catholig); also "Crynoad o'r Athrawiæth Cristionogol" (Rhyl, 1866).

Gillow, *Biog. Dict. of Eng. Cath.*; *Dolman's Magazine*, V, 65; *The Tablet*, IV, 790; Shepherd, *Reminiscences of Prior Park*, passim.

A. A. MacErlean.

Metellopolis, a titular see of Phrygia Pacatiana, in Asia Minor. The inscriptions make known a Phrygian town named Motella, which name is connected with the Phrygian feminine proper name Motalis and the Cilician masculine Motales, as also with Mutalli, or Mutallu, the name of an ancient Hittite king of Northern Commagene. One of these inscriptions was found in the village of Medele, in the vilayet of Broussa, which evidently preserves the ancient name. Motella seems to be the town which Hierocles (Synecdemus, 668, 6) calls Pulcherianopolis; it may be supposed to have been raised to the rank of a bishopric by the Empress Pulcheria (414–53). Shortly before 553, perhaps in 535, Justinian raised Hierapolis to metropolitan rank, and attached to it a certain number of suffragan sees previously dependent on Laodicea. Among these the "Notitiæ Episcopatuum" mention, from the ninth to the twelfth or thirteenth century, this same Motella, which they call Metellopolis, and even once Metallopolis. An inscription informs us of Bishop Michael, in 556; and another, of Bishop Cyriacus, perhaps in 667. At the Council of Nicæa, 787, the see was represented by Eudoxius, a priest and monk. Bishop Michael attended the two councils of Constantinople in 869 and 879.

Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus*, I, 826 (very incomplete); Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, 109, 121, 141, 158, 541.

S. Pétridès.

Metempsychosis (Gr. *μετὰ ἔμψυχος*. Lat. *metempsychosis:* Fr. *metempsychose:* Ger. *seelenwanderung*), in other words the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, teaches that the same soul inhabits in succession the bodies of different beings, both men and animals. It was a tenet common to many systems of philosophic thought and religious belief widely separated from each other both geographically and historically. Although in modern times it is associated among civilized races almost exclusively with the countries of Asia and particularly with India, there is evidence that at one period or another it has flourished in almost every part of the world; and it still prevails in various forms among savage nations scattered over the globe. This universality seems to mark it as one of those spontaneous or instinctive beliefs by which man's nature responds to the deep and urgent problems of existence; whilst the numerous and richly-varied forms which it assumes in different systems, and the many-coloured mythology in which it has clothed itself, show it to be capable of powerfully appealing to the imagination, and of adapting itself with great versatility to widely different types of mind. The explanation of this success seems to lie partly in its being an expression of the fundamental belief in im-

mortality, partly in its comprehensiveness, binding together, as for the most part it seems to do, all individual existences in one single, unbroken scheme; partly also in the unrestrained liberty which it leaves to the mythologizing fancy.

HISTORY.—*Egypt.*—Herodotus tells us in a well-known passage that "the Egyptians were the first to assert the immortality of the soul, and that it passes on the death of the body into another animal; and that when it has gone the round of all forms of life on land, in water, and in air, then it once more enters a human body born for it; and this cycle of the soul takes place in three thousand years" (ii. 123). That the doctrine first originated with the Egyptians is unlikely. It almost certainly passed from Egypt into Greece, but the same belief had sprung up independently in many nations from a very early date. The accounts of Egyptian metempsychosis vary considerably: indeed such a doctrine was bound to undergo modifications according to changes in the national religion. In the "Book of the Dead", it is connected with the notion of a judgment after death, transmigration into infra-human forms being a punishment for sin. Certain animals were recognized by the Egyptians as the abode of specially wicked persons and were on this account, according to Plutarch, preferred for sacrificial purposes. In Herodotus' account given above, this ethical note is absent, and transmigration is a purely natural and necessary cosmic process. Plato's version mediates between these two views. He represents the Egyptians as teaching that ordinary mortals will, after a cycle of ten thousand years, return to the human form, but that an adept in philosophy may hope to accomplish the process in three thousand years. There was also a pantheistic form of Egyptian metempsychosis, the individual being regarded as an emanation from a single universal principle to which it was destined to return after having completed its "cycle of necessity". There are traces of this doctrine of a cosmic cycle in the Fourth Eclogue of Vergil. It has been thought that the custom of embalming the dead was connected with this form of the doctrine, the object being to preserve the body intact for the return of the soul. It is probable, indeed, that the belief in such a return helped to confirm the practice, but it can hardly have provided the sole motive, since we find that other animals were also frequently embalmed.

Greece, as already stated, probably borrowed the theory of transmigration from Egypt. According to tradition, it had been taught by Musæus and Orpheus, and it was an element of the Orphic and other mystic doctrines. Pindar represents it in this relation (cf. 2nd Ol. Ode). The introduction of metempsychosis as a philosophical doctrine is due to Pythagoras, who, we are told, gave himself out as identical with the Trojan hero Euphorbos, and added copious details of his subsequent soul-wanderings. Vegetarianism and a general regard for animals was the practical Pythagorean deduction from the doctrine. Plato's metempsychosis was learnt from the Pythagoreans. He gave the doctrine a philosophic standing such as it never before possessed; for Plato exhibits the most elaborate attempt in the history of philosophy to find in the facts of actual experience justification for the theory of the pre-existence of the soul. In particular, sundry arguments adopted later on to prove immortality were employed by him to establish pre-existence. Such were the proofs from universal cognitions and the natural attraction of the soul towards the One, the Permanent, and the Beautiful. Plato ascribes to these arguments a retrospective as well as a prospective force. He seeks to show that learning is but a form of reminiscence, and love but the desire for reunion with a once-possessed good. Man is a fallen spirit, "full of forgetfulness". His sole hope is, by means of education and philosophy, to recover his memory of himself and of truth, and thus free himself from the chains of irrationality that bind him. Thus only can he hasten his return to his "true fatherland" and his perfect assimilation to the Divine. Neglect of this will lead to further and perhaps permanent degradation in the world beyond. The wise man will have an advantageous transmigration because he has practised prudence, and the choice of his next life will be put into his own hands. The vicious, ignorant, and passion-blinded man will, for the contrary reason, find himself bound to a wretched existence in some lower form. Plato's scheme of metempsychosis is conspicuous for the scope it allows to human freedom. The transmigration of the individual soul is no mere episode of a universal world-movement, predestined and unchangeable. Its course is really influenced by character, and character in turn is determined by conduct. A main object of his theory was to guarantee personal continuity of the soul's life, the point in which most other systems of transmigration fail. Besides Plato and Pythagoras, the chief professors of this doctrine among the Greeks were Empedocles, Timæus of Locri, and the Neoplatonists, none of whom call for detailed notice. Apollonius of Tyana also taught it.

India.—The doctrine of transmigration is not found in the oldest of the sacred books of India, viz., the Rig-Veda; but in the later works it appears as an uncontested dogma, and as such it has been received by the two great religions of India. (1) Brahmanism.—In Brahmanism, we find the doctrine of world-cycles, of annihilations and restorations destined to recur at enormous intervals of time; and of this general movement the fortunes of the soul are but an incident. At the same time, transmigrations are determined by moral worth. Every act has its award in some future life. By irreversible law, evil deeds beget unhappiness, sooner or later; these, indeed, are nothing else but the slowly-ripened fruit of conduct, which every man must eat. Thus they explain the anomalies of experience presented in the misfortunes of the good and the prosperity of the wicked: each is "eating the fruit of his past actions", actions done perhaps in some far-remote existence. Such a belief may tend to patience and resignation in present suffering, but it has a distinctly unpleasant effect upon the Brahmanical outlook on the future. A pious Brahman cannot assure himself of happiness in his *next* incarnation; there may be the penalty of great unknown sin still to be faced. Beatitude is union with Brahma and emancipation from the series of births, but no degree of actual holiness can guarantee this, since one is always exposed to the danger of being thrown back either by sin past or sin to come, the fruit of which will have to be eaten, and so on, we might be tempted to imagine, *ad infinitum*. Hence a great fear of re-incarnation prevails.

(2) Buddhism.—Brahminism is bound up with caste, and is therefore strongly aristocratic, insisting much on innate superiorities. Buddhism, on the contrary, cuts through caste-divisions and asserts the paramount importance of "works", of individual effort, though always with a background of fatalism which the denial of a personal Providence entails. According to the Buddhist doctrine, the ambition to rise to the summit of existence must infallibly be fulfilled; and the mission of Guatama was to teach the way to its attainment, i. e., to Buddhaship and Nirvana. It is only through a long series of existences that this consummation can be reached. Guatama himself had as many as five hundred and fifty transmigrations in various forms of life.

The characteristic feature in Buddhistic metempsychosis is the doctrine of *Karma*, which is a subtle substitute for the conception of personal continuity. According to this view it is not the concrete individuality of the soul that survives, and migrates into a new life, but only the *karma*, or action, i. e., the sum of the man's deeds, his merits, the ethical resultant of his

previous life, its total value, stripped of its former individuation, which is regarded as accidental. As the *karma* is greater or less, so will the next transmigration be a promotion or a degradation. At times the degradation may be so extreme that *karma* is embodied in an inanimate form, as in the case of Guatama's disciple who, for negligence in his master's service, was reduced after death to the form of a broomstick.

Later Jewish Teaching.—The notion of soul-wandering is familiar to the Jewish Rabbins. They distinguish two kinds of transmigrations, (1) *Gilgul Neshameth*, in which the soul was tied down to a life-tenancy of a single body: (2) *Ibbur*, in which souls may inhabit bodies by temporary possession without passing through birth and death. Josephus tells us that transmigration was a doctrine of the Pharisees, who taught that the righteous should be allowed to return to life, while the wicked were to be doomed to eternal imprisonment. It was their gloomy conception of *Sheol*, like the gloomy Greek conception of Hades, that forced them to this shift for a compensation to virtue. On the other hand some of the Talmudists invoke endless transmigration as a penalty for crime. The descriptions of the soul's journeys over land and sea are elaborated with a wealth of imagination, frequently verging on the grotesque. The retributive purpose was rigorously maintained. "If a man hath committed one sin more than his good works, he is condemned to transformation into some shape of lower life." Not only so, but if his guilt had been extreme, he might be doomed to an inanimate existence. The following is a sample of what awaits the "guiltiest of the guilty". "The dark tormentors rush after them with goads and whips of fire; their chase is ceaseless; they hunt them from the plain to the mountain, from the mountain to the river, from the river to the ocean, from the ocean round the circle of the earth. Thus the tormented fly in terror, and the tormentors follow in vengeance until the time decreed is done. Then the doomed sink into dust and ashes. Another beginning of existence, the commencement of a second trial, awaits them. They become clay, they take the nature of the stone and the mineral; they are water, fire, air; they roll in the thunder; they float in the cloud; they rush in the whirlwind. They change again; they enter into the shapes of the vegetable tribes; they live in the shrub, the flower, the tree. Ages on ages pass. Another change comes. They enter into the shape of the beast, the bird, the fish, the insect. . . . Then at last they are suffered to enter into the rank of human beings once more." After still further probations in various grades of human life, the soul will at length come to inhabit a child of Israel. If in this state it should fall again, it is lost eternally.

How far these and such like descriptions were really believed, how far they were conscious fable, is difficult to determine. That there was a fairly widespread belief in the doctrine of pre-existence in some form, seems likely enough.

Christian Ages.—St. Jerome tells us that metempsychosis was a secret doctrine of certain sectaries in his day, but it was too evidently opposed to the Catholic doctrine of Redemption ever to obtain a settled footing. It was held, however, in a Platonic form by the Gnostics, and was so taught by Origen in his great work, Περὶ ἀρχῶν. Bodily existence, according to Origen, is a penal and unnatural condition, a punishment for sin committed in a previous state of bliss, the grossness of the sin being the measure of the fall. Another effect of that sin is inequality; all were created equal. He speaks only of *rational* creatures, viz., men and demons, the two classes of the fallen. He does not seem to have considered it necessary to extend his theory to include lower forms of life. Punishment for sin done in the body is not vindictive or eternal, but temporal and remedial. Indeed, Origen's theory excludes both eternal punishment and eternal bliss; for the soul which has been restored at last to union with God will again infallibly decline from its high state through satiety of the good, and be again relegated to material existence; and so on through endless cycles of apostasy, banishment, and return (see ORIGEN). The Manichæans (q. v.) combine metempsychosis with belief in eternal punishment. After death, the sinner is thrust into the place of punishment till partially cleansed. He is then reclaimed to the light and given another trial in this world. If after ten such experiments he is still unfit for bliss he is condemned forever. The Manichæan system of metempsychosis was extremely consistent and thorough-going; St. Augustine in his "De Moribus Manichæorum" ridicules the absurd observances to which it gave rise. For traces of the doctrine in the Middle Ages see articles on the Albigensians and the Cathari. These sects inherited many of the cardinal doctrines of Manichæanism, and may be considered, in fact, as Neo-Manichæans.

Advocates of metempsychosis have not been wanting in modern times, but there is none who speaks with much conviction. The greatest name is Lessing, and his critical mind seems to have been chiefly attracted to the doctrine by its illustrious history, the neglect into which it had fallen, and the inconclusiveness of the arguments used against it. It was also maintained by Fourier in France and Soame Jenyns in England. Leibnitz and others have maintained that all souls were created from the beginning of the world; but this does not involve migrations.

Savage Races.—It remains to touch very briefly on the abundant data furnished by modern anthropological research. Belief in transmigration has been found, as stated above, in every part of the globe and at every stage of culture. It must have been almost universal at one time among the tribes of North America, and it has been found also in Mexico, Brazil, and other parts of the American continent; likewise among the aborigines of Australia and New Zealand, in the Sandwich Islands and many parts of Africa. It often takes the form of a belief in the return of long-departed ancestors, and thus provides a simple explanation of the strange facts of heredity. On the birth of a child the parents eagerly examine it for traces of its identity, which, when discovered, will determine the name of the child and its place in their affections. Sometimes the mother is informed beforehand in a dream which ancestor of the house is about to be born of her. The belief in the soul as an independent reality is common among savage races. The departed soul was thought to hover round the place of burial at least for a time after death. Hence, e. g., among the Algonquins, if a speedy return was desired, as in the case of little children, the body was buried by the wayside that it might find a mother in some of the passers-by. A curious freak of superstition is the belief of many of the dark races, e. g., in Australia, that their fair-skinned brethren from Europe are re-incarnations of people of their own race. Among the uneducated classes of India, as Sir A. Lyall tells us, the notion that witches and sorcerers, living or dead, have the power of possessing the bodies of animals still prevails. A similar idea prompted the Sandwich Islanders to throw the bodies of their dead to the sharks in the hope of thus rendering them less hostile to mankind.

In the face of a belief at first sight so far-fetched and yet at the same time so widely diffused, we are led to anticipate some great general causes which have worked together to produce it. A few such causes may be mentioned: (1) The practically universal conviction that the soul is a real entity distinct from the body and that it survives death; (2) connected with this, there is the imperative moral demand for an equitable future retribution of rewards and punishments in accordance with good or ill conduct here.

The doctrine of transmigration satisfies in some degree both these virtually instinctive faiths. (3) As mentioned above, it offers a plausible explanation of the phenomena of heredity. (4) It also provides an explanation of some features of the infra-rational creation which seems to ape in so many points the good and evil qualities of human nature. It appears a natural account of such phenomena to say that these creatures are, in fact, nothing else than embodiments of the human characters which they typify. The world thus seems to become, through and through, moral and human. Indeed, where the belief in a personal Providence is unfamiliar or but feebly grasped, some form of metempsychosis, understood as a kind of ethical evolutionary process, is almost a necessary makeshift.

HARDY, *Manual of Buddhism* (London, 1853); BEAUSOBRE, *Histoire du Manichéisme* (Amsterdam, 1734–9); DUBOIS, *People of India;* BASNAGE, *History of the Jews*, tr. TAYLOR (London, 1883); *Traditions of the Rabbins* (*Quarterly Review*, April, 1833); MAX MÜLLER, *Chips from a German Workshop* (London, 1857); ALGER, *Doctrine of a Future Life* (New York, 1866); STÖCKL, *History of Philosophy*, tr. FINLAY (Dublin, 1887); TYLOR, *Primitive Culture* (London, 1871); WILKINSON, *Ancient Egyptians* (London, 1841); LYALL, *Asiatic Studies* (London, 1882); MACDONNELL, *The Ancient Indian Conception of the Soul* in *Journal of Theological Studies* (1900).

MICHAEL MAHER.

Metham, SIR THOMAS, knight, confessor of the Faith, d. in York Castle, 1573. He was eldest son of Thomas Metham, of Metham, Yorkshire, and Grace, daughter of Thomas Pudsey, of Barford, and was twice married; first, to Dorothy, daughter of George, Lord Darcy and Meinill, and then to Edith, daughter of Nicholas Palmes of Naburn. He was dubbed a knight of the carpet, 2 Oct., 1553, the day after Queen Mary's coronation. Through his second son by his first wife, George, he was grandfather of Father Thomas Metham, S.J., one of the *Dilati*. By 16 August, 1565, he and his second wife had been sent to gaol "for contempt of Her Majesty's ordinances concerning the administration of divine service and the sacraments". On 6 Feb. 1569–70 an unknown correspondent writes to Sir William Cecil from York—"We have here Sir Thomas Metham, a most wilful papist, who utterly refuses to come to service, receive the Communion or read any books except approved by the Church of Rome, or to be conferred with at all. He refuses to be tried before the Commissioners for causes ecclesiastical; he uses the corrupt Louvaine books, and maintains at Louvaine two of his sons, with whom he corresponds. It is four years since he and Dame Edith, his wife, were first committed to ward, since which he has daily grown more wealthy and wilful, and now seems utterly incorrigible. He does much hurt here, and is reverenced by the papists as a pillar of their faith. I caused him to be committed to the Castle, where he remains and does harm, yet would have done more if he had lived at large. If you would be a means of his removal, you would take away a great occasion of evil in these parts." In 1587 Lady Metham was still a recusant.

GREEN, *Cal. State Papers Dom. Add. 1547–65* (London etc., 1870), 571; *Cal. State Papers Dom. Add. 1566–79* (London etc., 1871), 224; FOSTER, *Glover's Visitation of Yorks* (London, privately printed, 1875), 253; STRYPE, *Memorials* (Oxford, 1822), III, ii, 181; IDEM, *Annals* (Oxford, 1824), III, ii, 597; POLLEN, *English Martyrs 1584–1603* (London, 1908, privately printed for *Cath. Rec. Soc.*), 193.

JOHN B. WAINEWRIGHT.

Methodism, a religious movement which was originated in 1739 by John Wesley in the Anglican Church, and subsequently gave rise to numerous separate denominations.

I. DOCTRINAL POSITION AND PECULIARITIES.—The fact that John Wesley and Methodism considered religion primarily as practical, not dogmatic, probably accounts for the absence of any formal Methodist creed. The "General Rules", issued by John and Charles Wesley on 1 May, 1743, stated the conditions of admission into the societies organized by them and known as the "United Societies". They bear an almost exclusively practical character, and require no doctrinal test of the candidates. Methodism, however, developed its own theological system as expressed in two principal standards of orthodoxy. The first is the "Twenty-five Articles" of religion. They are an abridgment and adaptation of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, and form the only doctrinal standard strictly binding on American Methodists. Twenty-four of these articles were prepared by John Wesley for the Church in America and adopted at the Conference of Baltimore in 1784. The article which recognizes the political independence of the United States (Art. XXIII) was added in 1804. The second standard is the first fifty-three of Wesley's published sermons and his "Notes on the New Testament". These writings were imposed by him on the British Methodists in his "Deed of Declaration" and accepted by the "Legal Hundred". The American Church, while not strictly bound to them, highly esteems and extensively uses them. More fundamental for all Methodists than these standards are the inspired Scriptures, which are declared by them to be the sole and sufficient rule of belief and practice. The dogmas of the Trinity and the Divinity of Jesus Christ are upheld. The universality of original sin and the consequent partial deterioration of human nature find their efficacious remedy in the universal distribution of grace. Man's free co-operation with this Divine gift is necessary for eternal salvation, which is offered to all, but may be freely rejected. There is no room in Methodism for the rigorous doctrine of predestination as understood by Calvinism. While the doctrine of justification by faith alone is taught, the performance of good works enjoined by God is commended, but the doctrine of works of supererogation is condemned.

Only two sacraments are admitted: Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Baptism does not produce sanctifying grace in the soul, but strengthens its faith, and is the sign of a regeneration which has already taken place in the recipient. Its administration to infants is commanded because they are already members of the Kingdom of God. The Eucharist is a memorial of the Passion and Death of Jesus Christ, who is not really present under the species of bread and wine, but is received in a spiritual manner by believers. The sacrament is administered under both kinds to the laity. The "witness of the Spirit" to the soul of the individual believer and the consequent assurance of salvation are distinctive doctrines of Methodism. This assurance is a certainty of present pardon, not of final perseverance. It is experienced independently of the sacraments through the immediate testimony of the Holy Spirit, and does not preclude the possibility of future transgressions. Transgressions of an involuntary character are also compatible with another characteristic doctrine of Methodism, that of perfection or complete sanctification. The Christian, it is maintained, may in this life reach a state of holiness which excludes all voluntary offence against God, but still admits of growth in grace. It is therefore a state of perfectibility rather than of stationary perfection. The invocation of saints and the veneration of relics and images are rejected. While the existence of purgatory is denied in the Twenty-five Articles (Art. XIV), an intermediate state of purification, for persons who never heard of Christ, is admitted to-day by some Methodists. In its work of conversion Methodism is aggressive and largely appeals to religious sentiment; camp-meetings and revivals are important forms of evangelization, at least in America. Among the practices which Wesley imposed upon his followers were the strict observance of the Lord's Day, the use of few words in buying and selling, and abstinence from all intoxicating drinks, from all purely worldly amusements, and from costly apparel. The church service which

he prepared for them was an abridgment and modification of the Book of Common Prayer, but it never came into universal use, sentiment among Methodists being rather unfavourable to any set form of liturgy. In America the ministry is divided into two orders; the deacons and the elders or presbyters; in Great Britain and her colonies only one order exists, the elders. The name of bishop used in the episcopal bodies is a title of office, not of order; it expresses superiority to elders not in ordination, but in the exercise of administrative functions. No Methodist denomination recognizes a difference of degree between episcopal and presbyterial ordination. A characteristic institution of Methodism are the love-feasts which recall the agape of Christian antiquity. In these gatherings of believers bread and water are handed round in token of brotherly union, and the time is devoted to singing and the relating of religious experiences.

II. Organization.—Admission to full membership in the Methodist bodies was until recently usually granted only after the successful termination of a six months' probationary period. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, has completely done away with this system. Both probationers and full members are divided into small bands known as "classes". These hold weekly meetings under the direction of the "class-leader". They secure for each member individual spiritual care and facilitate the collection of church funds. The financial contributions taken up by the class-leader are remitted to the "stewards" of the "society", which is the next administrative unit. The "society" corresponds to the parish or local church in other denominations. The appropriateness of the term will readily appear, if it be remembered that Methodism was originally a revival movement, and not a distinct denomination. Several societies (or at times only one) form a "circuit". Among the officially recognized officers of this twofold division are: (1) the "exhorters", who are commissioned to hold meetings for exhortation and prayer; (2) the "local preachers", laymen who, without renouncing their secular avocation, are licensed to preach; (3) the "itinerant preachers", who devote themselves exclusively to the ministry. At the head of the circuit is the superintendent. In some American Methodist branches the "circuit", in the sense described, does not exist. But they maintain the division into "districts", and the authority over each of these is vested in a "presiding elder", or "district superintendent". In the Methodist Episcopal Church his appointment is limited to a period not exceeding six years, and is in the hands of the bishop. The latter is the only church official who is named for life. The permanent character of his position is the more remarkable from the fact that "itinerancy" has from the very beginning been a distinctive feature of Methodism. This peculiarity denotes the missionary character of the Wesleyan movement, and calls for the frequent transfer of the ministers from one charge to another by the bishop or the stationing committee. In the English Wesleyan Church ministers cannot be continued for more than three years in the same charge. In the Methodist Episcopal Church the pastoral term, originally for one year in the same place, was successively extended to two years (1804), three years (1864), and five years (1888). In 1900 all limit was removed.

The administrative authority is mainly exercised by a system of assemblies, called meetings or conferences. Among English Methodists they are: (1) "the quarterly meeting of the circuit", composed of all the ministers, local preachers, class-leaders, stewards, Sunday-school superintendents of the circuit; (2) "the district meeting", consisting of all the ministers of the subordinate circuits, some lay delegates, and, for financial matters, the stewards and such officials; (3) the "Annual Conference", which in 1784 legally succeeded John Wesley in the direction of the Methodist movement and was originally composed of one hundred itinerant preachers (the "Legal Hundred"). At present it includes lay delegates and meets in two sections: (a) the "pastoral session", which settles pastoral and disciplinary questions, and from which laymen are excluded; (b) the "representative session", in which clergy and laity discuss financial affairs and external administrative questions. In the American Methodist Episcopal bodies the administrative system is organized as follows: (1) the "Quarterly Conference" similar in composition to the circuit-meeting. It controls the affairs of every individual church, and holds its deliberations under the direction of the "district superintendent" or his representative; (2) the "Annual Conference", at which several "districts" are represented by their itinerant preachers under the presidency of the bishop. It elects preachers, pronounces upon candidates for ordination, and enjoys disciplinary power; (3) the "Quadrennial General Conference", endowed with the highest legislative and judicial authority and the right of episcopal elections. In recent years the holding of Œcumenical Methodist conferences has been inaugurated. They are representative assemblies of the various Methodist denominations, but have no legislative authority. The first conference of this type convened in London in 1881, the second met in Washington in 1891, and the third again in London in 1901. Toronto, Canada, will be the meeting-place of the fourth conference in 1911.

III. History.—(1) *In the British Isles.*—The names of three ordained clergymen of the Anglican Church stand out prominently in the early history of the Methodist movement: John Wesley, its author and organizer, Charles Wesley, his brother, the hymn-writer, and George Whitefield, the eloquent preacher and revivalist. John and Charles Wesley were born at Epworth, Lincolnshire, the former on 17 June, 1703, and the latter on 18 December, 1707 (O. S.). In 1714 John entered the Charterhouse School in London, and in 1720 went to Oxford to continue his studies. He was ordained to the diaconate in 1725, and chosen fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, in the following year. His ordination on 22 September, 1728, was both preceded and followed by a period of ministerial activity in his father's parish at Epworth. On his return to Oxford (22 November, 1729) he joined the little band of students organized by his brother Charles for the purpose of studying the Scriptures, and practising their religious duties with greater fidelity. John became the leader of this group called in derision by fellow-students "the holy club", "the Methodists". It is to this that Methodism owes its name, but not its existence. When in 1735 the association disbanded, John and Charles Wesley proceeded to London where they received a call to repair as missionaries to the Colony of Georgia. They sailed from Gravesend on 21 October, 1735, and on 5 February, 1736, landed at Savannah. The deep religious impression made upon John by some Moravian fellow-voyagers and a meeting with their bishop (Spangenberg) in Georgia were not without influence on Methodism. Returning to England in 1738, whither his brother had preceded him, he openly declared that he who had tried to convert others was himself not yet converted. In London he met another Moravian, Peter Böhler, attended the meetings of the Moravian Fetter Lane Society, and was converted (i. e., obtained and experienced saving faith) on 24 May, 1738. He then proceeded to Herrnhut in Saxony to make a study of the chief settlement of the Moravians.

In 1739 Wesley organized the first Methodist Society, laid the foundation of the first separate place of worship at Bristol, and also opened a chapel (The Foundry) in London. As the pulpits of the Established Church were closed against the Wesleys and Whitefield, the latter took the decisive step of preach-

ing in the open air in the colliery district of Kingswood near Bristol. His success was enormous, and the Wesleys almost immediately followed his example. At the very inception of the Methodist movement an important doctrinal difference arose between Whitefield and John Wesley regarding predestination. The former held Calvinistic views, believing in limited election and salvation, while the latter emphasized the doctrine of universal redemption. This difference in opinion placed a permanent characteristic doctrinal difference between Arminian Methodism and the Calvinistic Lady Huntingdon Connexion. Whitefield gave his support to the latter movement which owed its name to the protection and liberal financial assistance of the Countess of Huntingdon (1707–91). Although Wesley always intended to remain within the Church of England, circumstances gradually led him to give his evangelistic movement a separate organization. The exclusion of his followers from the sacraments by the Anglican clergy in 1740 overcame his hesitation to administer them in his own meeting-rooms. The increase in the number of Societies led the following year to the institution of the lay preachers, who became an important factor in the success of the Methodist propaganda. The year 1742 saw the creation of the "class" system, and two years later the first annual conference was held. Desirous of ensuring the perpetuation of his work, he legally constituted it his successor in 1784. By a deed of declaration filed in the High Court of Chancery, he vested the right of appointing ministers and preachers in the conference composed of one hundred itinerant preachers. This "Legal Hundred" enjoyed, in respect to the conference, the power of filling vacancies and of expelling unworthy members. On the refusal of the Bishop of London to ordain two ministers and a superintendent for America, Wesley, convinced that bishop and presbyter enjoyed equal rights in the matter, performed the ordination himself (1784).

Important problems calling for solution arose immediately after Wesley's death. In the first place the want of his personal direction had to be supplied. This was effected in 1791 by the division of the country into districts and the institution of the district committees with full disciplinary and administrative power under the jurisdiction of the conference. As the administration of the sacraments by Methodist clergymen had not yet become the universal rule, the churches that did not enjoy this privilege insisted upon its concession. The question was permanently settled by the "Plan of Pacification" in 1795. It granted the right of administering the sacraments to all churches in which the majority of the trustees, stewards, and leaders pronounced in favour of such practice. The insistent demand of Alexander Kilham (1762–98) and his followers for more extensive rights for the laity received a temporary and partly favourable answer at the important conference of Leeds in 1797. Lay representation in the conference was, however, emphatically refused and Kilham seceded. Since 1878 they have been admitted as delegates.

The spread of liberal opinions was also at the bottom of several controversies, which were intensified by the dissatisfaction of some members with the preponderating influence of Dr. Jabez Bunting (1779–1858) in the denomination. The introduction of an organ in Brunswick Chapel at Leeds (1828) and the foundation of a theological school for the formation of young preachers (1834) were merely occasions which brought to a head the growing discontent with Bunting and the central authority. The controversies which resulted in these two cases were of but minor importance, when compared with the agitation of the years 1849–56. This period of strife witnessed the circulation of the so-called "Fly-Sheets", directed against Bunting's personal rule, the expulsion of the persons responsible for their publication, and the loss of at least 100,000 members to the Wesleyan Methodist Connexion. Some of these affiliated with minor branches, but the majority was lost to Methodism. These controversies were followed by a period of more peaceful evolution extending to our own day. The increase in the number of theological seminaries among British Methodists has emphasized the distinction between clergy and laity and points to more complete internal organization. A fact which reveals a similar tendency is the institution of deaconesses. They were introduced in the Wesleyan Methodist Church in 1890.

(2) *Methodism in the United States.*—The history of Methodism in the United States does not date back to the visit of John and Charles Wesley to Georgia, but begins only in 1766. In that year Philip Embury, a local preacher, at the request of Mrs. Barbara Heck, delivered his first sermon in his own house at New York. They had both come to America in 1760 from Ireland, whither their Palatine ancestors had fled from the devastating wars of Louis XIV. Only four persons were present at the first sermon, but the number soon increased, especially after the arrival of Captain Thomas Webb, another local preacher. The latter displayed a stirring zeal, and in 1768 the first Methodist chapel in America was dedicated. Almost simultaneous with this introduction of Methodism into New York was its planting in Maryland. Webb introduced it in Philadelphia, and it spread to New Jersey and Virginia. In 1769 Wesley, in response to repeated appeals for helpers, sent over two preachers, Joseph Pilmoor and Richard Boardman; others followed, among them Francis Asbury (1771) and Thomas Rankin (1772). The first conference convened at Philadelphia in 1773, recognized the authority of John Wesley, and prohibited the administration of the sacraments by Methodist preachers. The total membership reported was 1160. An increase was recorded in the two succeeding conferences, also held at Philadelphia, in 1774 and 1775 respectively. But the Revolution impeded the progress of Methodism. Owing to the nationality of most of its preachers and to the publication of Wesley's pamphlet against the independence of the colonies, it was looked upon as an English product and treated accordingly. When peace was restored, the need of a separate church organization made itself felt. Wesley now heeded Asbury's appeal for an independent ecclesiastical government and the administration of the sacraments by Methodist ministers. In 1784 he ordained the preachers Whatcoat and Vasey as elders, and Dr. Thomas Coke as superintendent for America.

Coke arrived in New York on 3 November, 1784, and that same year what has become known as the Christmas conference was convened at Baltimore. From it dates the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Wesley's plans and instructions were laid before this assembly, and his articles of faith and his liturgy adopted. As Asbury refused to be ordained without previous election he was unanimously chosen superintendent, a title for which, against Wesley's will, that of bishop was substituted in 1788. The rapid increase of the denomination about this time is indicated by the membership of 66,000 reported to the conference of 1792. The growth of the Church continued with the increase in population; but questions of expediency, race, and government caused secessions. The slavery agitation especially resulted in momentous consequences for the denomination. It began at a very early date, but reached a crisis only towards the middle of the nineteenth century. At the general conference held in New York in 1844, Bishop J. O. Andrew was suspended from the exercise of his office owing to his ownership of slaves. This decision met with the uncompromising opposition of the Southern delegates, but was just as stanchly upheld by its supporters. The withdrawal of the

slave-holding states from the general body now appeared unavoidable, and a "Plan of Separation" was elaborated and accepted. The Southern delegates held a convention at Louisville, Kentucky, in 1845, at which the "Methodist Episcopal Church, South" was formed. The new organization, after a period of progress, suffered heavily during the Civil War. Since then the relations between the Northern and Southern branches of Episcopal Methodism have assumed a very friendly character. There is a large measure of co-operation particularly in the foreign mission field. A joint commission on federation is in existence and in May, 1910, it recommended the creation of a federal council (i. e., a joint court of last resort) to the general conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

(3) *Methodism in Other Countries.*—(a) American.—The first apostle of Methodism in Newfoundland was Lawrence Coughlan, who began his work there in 1765. It was only in 1785, however, that the country received a regular preacher. The evangelization of Nova Scotia, where the first Methodists settled in 1771, was begun later (1781), but was carried on more systematically. In the year 1786 a provincial conference was held at Halifax. In spite of their early relations with American Methodism, Newfoundland and the eastern provinces of Canada were after 1799 supplied with preachers from England, and came under English jurisdiction. In 1855 they were constituted a separate conference, the Wesleyan Methodist Conference of Eastern British America. The Provinces of Ontario and Quebec received Methodism at an early date from the United States. Philip Embury and Barbara Heck moved to Montreal in 1774, and William Losee was in 1790 appointed preacher to these provinces by the New York Conference. The War of 1812–4 interrupted the work undertaken by the Methodist Episcopal Church in this section. The settlement of numerous English Methodists in these provinces after the restoration of peace brought about difficulties respecting allegiance and jurisdiction between the English and American branches. The result was that the Methodist Episcopal Church organized its congregations into a separate conference in 1824, and two years later granted them complete independence. Immigration also brought members of the minor Methodist bodies to Canada: the Wesleyan New Connexion, the Bible Christians, and the Primitive Methodists. But in 1874 the Wesleyan Methodist Church and the Wesleyan New Connexion combined. The other separate bodies joined the union a little later (1883–4), thus forming the "Methodist Church of Canada", which includes all the white congregations of the Dominion. The "British Methodist Episcopal Church", which still maintains a separate existence, has only coloured membership. It was formerly a part of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and gained complete independence in 1864. Bermuda, where George Whitefield preached in 1748 and J. Stephenson appeared as first regular preacher in 1799, forms at present a district of the Methodist Church of Canada. South America was entered in 1835, when the Rev. F. E. Pitts visited Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Ayres, and other places, and organized several societies. The special South American Conference was established in 1893, and supplemented in 1897 by the Western South American Mission Conference. Missionary work was inaugurated in Mexico in 1873 by William Butler.

(b) European.—Methodism was introduced into France in 1790, but it has never succeeded in getting a strong foothold there. In 1852 France was constituted a separate conference affiliated to British Methodism. In 1907 the American Church organized a mission there. From France Methodism spread to Italy in 1852. Some years later (1861) two missionaries, Green and Piggot, were sent from England to Florence and founded several stations in Northern Italy. The Methodist Episcopal Church started a missionary enterprise in Italy in 1871, but has never attained great success. The first Methodist missionary to Germany was G. Müller. He started his preaching in 1830 and gained some adherents mainly in Würtemberg. Methodist missions are maintained also in Switzerland, Scandinavia, Russia, Bulgaria, Spain, and Portugal.

(c) Australasian, Asiatic and African.—Methodism has had considerable success in Australasia. It appeared at an early date, not only on the Australian continent but also in some of the South Sea Islands. The first class was formed in Sydney in 1812, and the first missionary in the country was S. Leigh. Methodism spread to Tasmania in 1820, to Tonga in 1822, to New Zealand in 1823, and in 1835 Cargill and Cross began their evangelistic work in the Fiji Islands. In 1854 Australian Methodism was formed into an affiliated conference of England, and in 1876 became independent.

The foundation of the first Methodist missions in Asia (1814) was due to the initiative of Thomas Coke. Embarking on 30 December, 1813, at the head of a band of six missionaries, he died on the voyage, but the undertaking succeeded. The representatives of English Methodism were joined in 1856 by William Butler of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1847 this same Church sent J. D. Collins, M. C. White, and R. S. Maclay to China. Stations have also been founded in the Philippine Islands and in Japan, where the Methodist Church of Japan was organized in1907.

George Warren left England for Sierra Leone in 1811. The American Church entered the field in 1833. South Africa, where Methodism is particularly well represented, was erected in 1882 into an affiliated conference of the English Wesleyan Church.

IV. Other Methodist Bodies.—Secessions from the main bodies of Methodism followed almost immediately upon Wesley's death. The following originated in England:

(1) *The Methodist New Connexion* was founded at Leeds in 1797 by Alexander Kilham (1762–98); hence its members are also known as "Kilhamites". It was the first organized secession from the main body of English Methodism, and started its separate existence with 5000 members. Its foundation was occasioned by the conference's refusal to grant laymen the extensive rights in church government claimed for them by Kilham. The sect never acquired any considerable importance.

(2) *The Primitive Methodists*, who met with greater success than the New Connexion, were organized in 1810. Camp-meetings had been introduced into England from America, but in 1807 the conference pronounced against them. Two local preachers, Hugh Bourne and William Clowes, disregarding this decision, publicly advocated the holding of such meetings and were expelled. They then established this new body, characterized by the preponderating influence it grants laymen in church government, the admission of women to the pulpit, and great simplicity in ecclesiastical and private life. According to the "Methodist Year-book" (1910) it has 219,343 members.

The Irish Primitive Wesleyan Methodists must not be confounded with the "Primitive Methodists" just spoken of. The former were founded in 1816 by Adam Averell, and in 1878 again united with the Wesleyan Methodists.

(3) *The Bible Christians*, also called *Bryanites* from the name of their founder William O'Bryan, were organized as a separate sect in Cornwall in 1816. Like the Primitive Methodists, they grant extensive influence in church affairs to laymen and liberty of preaching to women. Although they spread from England to the colonies, their aggregate membership was never very large.

(4) *The Wesleyan Reform Union* grew out of the

great Methodist disruption of 1850–2, and numbers but 8489 members.

(5) *The United Methodist Free Churches* represent the combination of the Wesleyan Association, the Protestant Methodists, and a large quota of the secession from the main Methodist body caused by the unpopularity of Dr. Bunting's rule. The Wesleyan Methodist Association was organized in 1836 by Dr. Samuel Warren, whose opposition to the foundation of a theological seminary resulted in his secession from the parent body. At an earlier date opposition to the installation of an organ in a church at Leeds ended in the formation of the "Protestant Methodists" (1828). These were the first to join the Wesleyan Methodist Association, the opponents of Bunting following in 1857.

(6) *The Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church* is Methodist almost solely in name. As an evangelistic movement it chronologically preceded Methodism dating back to the preaching of Howell Harris and Daniel Rowlands in 1735–6; as an organization it was partly established in 1811 by Thomas Charles, and completed in 1864 by the union of the Churches of North and South Wales and the holding of the first General Assembly. Whitefield's influence on Welsh Methodism was not of primary importance. In doctrine the church is Calvinistic and in constitution largely Presbyterian. It is to-day frequently called the "Presbyterian Church of Wales".

In the United States, beside the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Primitive Methodists, which have been spoken of above, the following denominations exist:—

(1) *The Methodist Protestant Church* was founded on 2 November, 1830, at Baltimore by members of the Methodist Episcopal Church who had been expelled or had freely withdrawn from that body. The separation was due to the refusal to extend the governmental rights of laymen. The Methodist Protestant Church has no bishops. It divided in 1858 on the slavery question, but the two branches reunited in 1877 (number of communicants, 188,122). This figure is given by Dr. Carroll (Christian Advocate, 27 January, New York, 1910), whose statistics we shall quote for all the Methodist bodies of the United States.

(2) *The Wesleyan Methodist Connexion of America* was organized in 1843 at Utica, New York, by advocates of a more radical attitude against slavery in the Methodist Episcopal Church. It has neither episcopate nor itinerancy, and debars members of secret societies (communicants, 19,485).

(3) *The Congregational Methodist Church* dates back to 1852; it sprang from the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and is Methodist in doctrine and congregational in polity (membership, 15,529).

(4) *The Free Methodist Church* was organized in 1860 at Pekin, New York, as a protest against the alleged abandonment of the ideals of ancient Methodism by the Methodist Episcopal Church. There are no bishops; members of secret societies are excluded; the use of tobacco and the wearing of rich apparel are prohibited (membership, 32,166).

(5) *The New Congregational Methodists* originated in Georgia in 1881 and in doctrine and organization closely resemble the Congregational Methodist Church (membership, 1782).

(6) *The Independent Methodists* maintain no central government. Each congregation among them, enjoys supreme control over its affairs (communicants, 1161).

(7) *The African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church*, with which we begin the treatment of the following exclusively coloured denominations, may be traced back to the year 1796. Some coloured Methodists in New York organized themselves at that date into a separate congregation and built a church which they called "Zion". They remained for a time under the pastoral supervision of the Methodist Episcopal Church, but in 1820 formed an independent Church differing but little from the parent body (communicants, 545,681).

(8) *The Union American Methodist Episcopal Church*, organized in 1813 at Wilmington, Delaware, had for its founder the coloured preacher, Peter Spencer (membership, 18,500).

(9) *The African Methodist Episcopal Church* has existed as an independent organization since 1816. Its foundation was due to a desire for more extensive privileges and greater freedom of action among a number of coloured Methodists of Philadelphia. It does not differ in important points from the Methodist Episcopal Church (membership, 452,126).

(10) *The African Union Methodist Protestant Church* also dates back to 1816; it rejects the episcopacy, itinerancy, and a paid ministry (membership, 4000).

(11) *The Zion Union Apostolic Church* was founded in Virginia in 1869. In its organization it closely resembles the Methodist Episcopal Church (communicants, 3059).

(12) *The Coloured Methodist Episcopal Church* is merely a branch of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, organized independently in 1870 for negroes (membership, 233,911).

(13) *The Congregational Methodists, Coloured*, differ only in race from the Congregational Methodists (communicants, 319).

(14) *The Evangelist Missionary Church* was organized in 1886 in Ohio by members of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. It has no creed but the Bible, and inclines to the admission of only one person in God, that of Jesus Christ.

V. Educational and Social Activities.—The founders of Methodism had enjoyed the advantages of a university training, and must have realized the priceless value of education. The fact, however, that John Wesley laid almost exclusive stress on the practical element in religion tended to make a deep and extensive knowledge of doctrinal principles seem superfluous. The extraordinary success of his preaching which urgently demanded ministers for the ever-increasing number of his followers, led to the appointment, in the early history of Methodism, of preachers more commendable for their religious zeal than remarkable for their theological learning. Indeed, for a comparatively long period, the opposition of Methodists to schools of theology was pronounced. The establishment of the first institution of the kind in 1834 at Haxton, England, caused a split in the denomination. At the present day, however, the need of theological training is universally recognized and supplied by numerous schools. In England the chief institutions are located at Richmond, Didsbury, Headingley, and Handsworth. American Methodists founded their first theological school in 1841 at Newbury, Vermont. It was removed to Concord, New Hampshire, in 1847, and has formed since 1867 part of Boston University. Numerous other foundations were subsequently added, among them Garrett Biblical Institute (1854) at Evanston, Illinois, and Drew Theological Seminary (1867) at Madison, New Jersey. While Methodism has no parochial school system, its first denominational institution of learning dates back to 1740, when John Wesley took over a school at Kingswood. It was not until the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, that a vigorous educational movement set in to continue up to the present day. An idea of the efforts made in this direction by Methodists may be gained by a reference to the statistics published in the "Methodist Year-Book" (1910), pp. 108–13. According to the reports there given, the Methodist Episcopal Church alone (the other branches also support their schools) maintains 197 educational institutions, including 50 colleges and universities, 47 classical seminaries, 8 institutions ex-

clusively for women, 23 theological institutions (some of them forming part of the universities already mentioned), 63 foreign mission schools, and 4 missionary institutes and Bible training schools. An educational project which appeals for support and sympathy to all branches of American Methodism, is the exclusively post-graduate "American University". A site of ninety-two acres was purchased in 1890 in the suburbs of Washington, D. C., and the university was organized the following year. It is not to be opened in any of its departments until its endowment "be not less than $5,000,000 over and above its present real estate". The dissemination of religious literature is obtained by the foundation of "Book Concerns" (located at New York and Cincinnati for the Methodist Episcopal Church; at Nashville, Tennessee, for the Methodist Episcopal Church South) and a periodical press, for the publications of which the title of "Advocates" is particularly popular. The young people are banded together for the promotion of personal piety and charitable work in the prosperous Epworth League founded in 1889 at Cleveland, Ohio, for the Methodist Episcopal Church, and organized in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in 1891. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the denomination extended its social work considerably by the foundation of orphanages and homes for the aged. Hospitals were introduced in 1881 with the incorporation of the Methodist Episcopal Hospital at Brooklyn.

VI. General Statistics.—According to the "Methodist Year-book" (New York, 1910) the Wesleyan Methodists have 520,868 church members (including probationers) in Great Britain, 29,531 in Ireland, 143,467 in their foreign missions, and 117,146 in South Africa. The Australasian Methodist Church has a membership of 150,751, and the Church of Canada one of 333,692. In the United States Methodism (all branches) numbers, according to Dr. Carroll, 6,477,224 communicants. Of these 3,159,913 belong to the Methodist Episcopal Church and 1,780,778 to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

SCHAFF, *Creeds of Christendom* (New York, 1877), I, 882–904; III, 807–13; STEVENS, *Hist. of Methodism* (New York, 1858–61); IDEM, *Hist. of the Meth. Episc. Church* (New York, 1864); SMITH, *Hist. of Wesleyan Methodism* (London, 1857–62); CARROLL, *The Religious Forces of the U. S.* in *Amer. Church Hist. Series*, I (New York, 1893); BUCKLEY, *Hist. of Methodists in the U. S.*, *ibid.*, V (6th ed., New York, 1907); FAULKNER, *The Methodists* in the *Story of the Churches Series* (New York, 1903); ALEXANDER, *Hist. of the Methodist Episcopal Church South* in *Amer. Church Hist. Series*, XI (New York, 1894); DRINKHOUSE, *Hist. of Methodist Reform* (Baltimore, 1899); SUTHERLAND, *Methodism in Canada* (London, 1903).

N. A. WEBER.

Methodius, SAINT. See CYRIL AND METHODIUS, SAINTS.

Methodius I, Patriarch of Constantinople (842–846), defender of images during the second Iconoclast persecution, b. at Syracuse, towards the end of the eighth century; d. at Constantinople, 14 June, 846. The son of a rich family, he came, as a young man, to Constantinople intending to obtain a place at Court. But a monk persuaded him to change his mind and he entered a monastery. Under the Emperor Leo V (the Armenian, 813–820) the Iconoclast persecution broke out for the second time. The monks were nearly all staunch defenders of the images; Methodius stood by his order and distinguished himself by his opposition to the Government. In 815 the Patriarch Nicephorus I (806–815) was deposed and banished for his resistance to the Iconoclast laws; in his place Theodotus I (815–821) was intruded. In the same year Methodius went to Rome, apparently sent by the deposed patriarch, to report the matter to the pope (Paschal I, 817–824). He stayed in Rome till Leo V was murdered in 820 and succeeded by Michael II (820–829). Hoping for better things from the new emperor, Methodius then went back to Constantinople bearing a letter in which the pope tried to persuade Michael to change the policy of the Government and restore the Patriarch Nicephorus. But Michael only increased the fierceness of the persecution. As soon as Methodius had delivered his letter and exhorted the emperor to act according to it, he was severely scourged (with 70 stripes), taken to the island Antigoni in the Propontis, and there imprisoned in a disused tomb. The tomb must be conceived as a building of a certain size; Methodius lived seven years in it. In 828 Michael II, not long before his death, mitigated the persecution and proclaimed a general amnesty. Profiting by this, Methodius came out of his prison and returned to Constantinople almost worn out by his privations. His spirit was unbroken and he took up the defence of the holy images as zealously as before.

Michael II was succeeded by his son Theophilus (829–842), who caused the last and fiercest persecution of image-worshippers. Methodius again withstood the emperor to his face, was again scourged and imprisoned under the palace. But the same night he escaped, helped by his friends in the city, who hid him in their house and bound up his wounds. For this the Government confiscated their property. But seeing that Methodius was not to be overcome by punishment, the emperor tried to convince him by argument. The result of their discussion was that Methodius to some extent persuaded the emperor. At any rate towards the end of the reign the persecution was mitigated. Theophilus died in 842 and at once the whole situation was changed. His wife, Theodora, became regent for her son Michael III (the Drunkard, 842–867). She had always been an image-worshipper in secret; now that she had the power she at once began to restore images, set free the confessors in prison and bring back everything to the conditions of the Second Nicene Council (787). The Patriarch of Constantinople, John VII (832–842), was an Iconoclast set up by the late Government. As he persisted in his heresy he was deposed and Methodius was made patriarch in his place (842–846). Methodius then helped the empress-regent in her restoration. He summoned a synod at Constantinople (842) that approved of John VII's deposition and his own succession. It had no new laws to make about images. The decrees of Nicæa II that had received the assent of the pope and the whole Church as those of an Œcumenical Council were put in force again. On 19 Feb., 842, the images were brought in solemn procession back to the churches. This was the first "Feast of Orthodoxy", kept again in memory of that event on the first Sunday of Lent every year throughout the Byzantine Church. Methodius then proceeded to depose Iconoclast bishops throughout his patriarchate, replacing them by image-worshippers. In doing so he seems to have acted severely. An opposition formed itself against him that nearly became an organized schism. The patriarch was accused of rape; but the woman in question admitted on examination that she had been bought by his enemies.

On 13 March, 842, Methodius brought the relics of his predecessor Nicephorus (who had died in exile) with great honour to Constantinople. They were exposed for a time in the church of the Holy Wisdom, then buried in that of the Apostles. Methodius was succeeded by Ignatius, under whom the great schism of Photius broke out. Methodius is a saint to Catholics and Orthodox. He is named in the Roman Martyrology (14 June), on which day the Byzantine Church keeps his feast together with that of the Prophet Eliseus. He is acclaimed with the other patriarchs, defenders of images, in the service of the feast of Orthodoxy: "To Germanus, Tarasius, Nicephorus and Methodius, true high priests of God and defenders and teachers of Orthodoxy, R. Eternal memory (thrice)." The Uniate Syrians have his feast on the same day. The Orthodox have a curious legend, that his prayers and those of Theodora saved

Theophilus out of hell. It is told in the Synaxarion for the feast of Orthodoxy.

St. Methodius is reputed to have written many works. Of these only a few sermons and letters are extant (in Migne, P. G., C, 1272–1325). An account of the martyrdom of Denis the Areopagite by him is in Migne, P. G., IV, 669–682, two sermons on St. Nicholas in N. C. Falconius, "S. Nicolai acta primigenia" (Naples, 1751), 39–74. For other fragments and scholia, see Krumbacher, "Byzantinische Litteratur" (Munich, 2nd ed., 1897), 167.

Anonymous Life of Methodius in *P. G.*, C, 1244–1261; Logoteta, *Commentarius critico-theologicus de Methodio Syracusano* (Catania, 1786); Leo Allatius, *De Methodiorum scriptis diatriba* in *S. Hippolyti opera* (Hamburg, 1718), pp. 89–95; Cavel, *Scriptorum eccles. historia literaria*, II (London, 1688), 30; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, VII (Hamburg, 1790–1806), 273–274.

Adrian Fortescue.

Methodius of Olympus, Saint, bishop and ecclesiastical author, date of birth unknown; d. a martyr, probably in 311. Concerning the life of this first scientific opponent of Origen very few reports have been handed down; and even these short accounts present many difficulties. Eusebius has not mentioned him in his "Church History", probably because he opposed various theories of Origen. We are indebted to St. Jerome for the earliest accounts of him (De viris illustribus, lxxxiii). According to him, Methodius was Bishop of Olympus in Lycia and afterwards Bishop of Tyre. But the latter statement is not reliable; no later Greek author knows anything of his being Bishop of Tyre; and according to Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., VIII, xiii), Tyrannio was Bishop of Tyre during the Diocletian persecution and died a martyr; after the persecution Paulinus was elected bishop of the city. Jerome further states that Methodius suffered martyrdom at the end of the last persecution, i. e., under Maximinus Daja (311). Although he then adds, "that some assert", that this may have happened under Decius and Valerian at Chalcis, this statement (*ut alii affirmant*), adduced even by him as uncertain, is not to be accepted. Various attempts have been made to clear up the error concerning the mention of Tyre as a subsequent bishopric of Methodius; it is possible that he was transported to Tyre during the persecution and died there.

Methodius had a very comprehensive philosophical education, and was an important theologian as well as a prolific and polished author. Chronologically, his works can only be assigned in a general way to the end of the third and the beginning of the fourth century. He became of special importance in the history of theological literature, in that he successfully combated various erroneous views of the great Alexandrian, Origen. He particularly attacked his doctrine that man's body at the resurrection is not the same body as he had in life; also his idea of the world's eternity and the erroneous notions it involved. Nevertheless he recognized the great services of Origen in ecclesiastical theology. Like him, he is strongly influenced by Plato's philosophy, and uses to a great extent the allegorical explanation of Scripture. Of his numerous works only one has come down to us complete in a Greek text, viz., the dialogue on virginity, under the title: "Symposium, or on Virginity" (Συμπόσιον ἢ περὶ ἁγνείας) in P. G., XVIII, 27–220. In the dialogue, composed with reference to Plato's "Banquet", he depicts a festive meal of ten virgins in the garden of Arete (virtue), at which each of the participators extols Christian virginity and its sublime excellence. It concludes with a hymn on Christ as the Bridegroom of the Church. Larger fragments are preserved of several other writings in Greek; we know of other works from old versions in Slavonian, though some are abbreviated.

The following works are in the form of dialogue: (1) "On Free Will" (περὶ τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου), an important treatise attacking the Gnostic view of the origin of evil and in proof of the freedom of the human will; (2) "On the Resurrection" (Ἀγλαοφῶν ἢ περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως), in which the doctrine that the same body that man has in life will be awakened to incorruptibility at the resurrection is specially put forward in opposition to Origen. While large portions of the original Greek text of both these writings are preserved, we have only Slavonian versions of the four following shorter treatises: (3) "De vita", on life and rational action, which exhorts in particular to contentedness in this life and to the hope of the life to come; (4) "De cibis", on the discrimination of foods (among the Jews), and on the young cow, which is mentioned in Leviticus, with allegorical explanation of the Old-Testament food-legislation and the red cow (Num., xix); (5) "De lepra", on Leprosy, to Sistelius, a dialogue between Eubulius (Methodius) and Sistelius on the mystic sense of the Old-Testament references to lepers (Lev., xiii); (6) "De sanguisuga", on the leech in Proverbs (Prov., xxx, 15 sq.) and on the text, "the heavens show forth the glory of God" (Ps. xviii, 2). Of other writings, no longer extant, Jerome mentions (loc. cit.) a voluminous work against Porphyrius, the Neoplatonist who had published a book against Christianity; a treatise on the "Pythonissa" directed against Origen, commentaries on Genesis and the Canticle of Canticles. By other later authors a work "On the Martyrs", and a dialogue "Xenon" are attributed to Methodius; in the latter he opposes the doctrine of Origen on the eternity of the world. New editions of his works are: P. G., XVIII; Jahn, "S. Methodii opera et S. Methodius platonizans" (Halle, 1865); Bonwetsch, "Methodius von Olympus: I, Schriften" (Leipzig, 1891).

Pankow, *Methodius, Bischof von Olympus* in the *Katholik* (1887; issued in book form, Mainz, 1888); Bonwetsch, *Die Theologie des Methodius von Olympus* (Berlin, 1903); Fritschel, *Methodius von Olympus und seine Philosophie* (Leipzig, 1879); Fendt, *Sünde und Busse in den Schriften des Methodius von Olympus* in the *Katholik*, I (1905), 24 sqq.; Atzberger, *Geschichte der christl. Eschatologie* (Freiburg i. B., 1896), 469 sqq.; Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristl. Literatur*, I, 468 sqq.; II, 147 sqq.; Bardenhewer, *Patrology*, tr. Shahan (Freiburg and St. Louis, 1908), 175–8; Kihn, *Patrologie*, I (Paderborn, 1904), 341–351.

J. P. Kirsch.

Methuselah. See Mathusala.

Methymna, a titular see in the island of Lesbos. It was once the second city of the island, and enjoyed great prosperity. In the Peloponnesian War it played an important rôle (Thucydides, III, ii, 18; vi, 85; vii, 57; Xenophon, Hellen., I, vi, 14), and in Christian times it similarly distinguished itself in its resistance to the Turks. The ancient poets praise the excellent wine of Methymna (Virgil, Georgics, II, 90; Ovid, Ars Am., I, 57; Horace, Sat., II, 8, 50; Odes, I, 17, 21). Methymna was the birthplace of the poet Arion and probably also of the historian Myrsilus. For a list of the bishops of Methymna see Le Quien, "Oriens Christ.", I, 961–64. One of them, Gabriel, in the seventeenth century united with Rome (Allatius, "De perpetua consensione", II, 7). In 640 it is mentioned by the "Ecthesis" of pseudo-Epiphanius as an autocephalous archdiocese, and about 1084 was made a metropolitan see under Alexius I Comnenus. It has retained this rank in the Orthodox Church, though for Catholics it is now a mere titular archdiocese. To-day it bears the name of Molivo, and with the places dependent upon it numbers 37,000 inhabitants, of whom 29,000 are Orthodox Greeks, 9000 Mussulmans, and 40 Catholics. The last named are dependent on the Diocese of Smyrna. Molivo is a kaza of the sanjak of Metelin in the vilayet of Rhodes. Situated at the southern extremity of the island of Mitylene, nearly thirty miles from Metelin and five naval miles from the Asiatic continent, Molivo occupies a delightful marine site on the slope of a hill formed of basaltic rocks.

Le Quien, *Oriens Christ.*, I, 961–64; Gams, *Series episcoporum*, 449; Cuinet, *La Turquie d'Asie*, I (Paris, 1872), 469.

S. Salaville.

Metrophanes of Smyrna, leader of the faithful Ignatian bishops at the time of the Photian schism (867). Baronius (Ann. Eccl., ad an. 843, I) says that his mother was the woman who was bribed to bring a false accusation of rape against the Patriarch Methodius I (842–846) during the Iconoclast troubles. If this be true he was a native of Constantinople. In 857, when Ignatius was deposed, Metrophanes was already Metropolitan of Smyrna. He was strongly opposed to Photius. For a short time he wavered, as Photius promised not to attack Ignatius' rights, but, as soon as he found how little the intruder kept his word, he went back to his former attitude, from which nothing could make him waver again. Metrophanes was the leader of the bishops who excommunicated Photius in 858; they declared themselves excommunicate if ever they recognized him. This somewhat rash pledge explains his attitude later. He was chained and imprisoned, then sent into exile by the Government. After Photius' first fall (867) Metrophanes came back to his see. He was present at the eighth general council (Constantinople, IV, 869), opened the sixth session with a speech and was one of the judges who condemned Photius. When Ignatius died in 877 and Photius succeeded lawfully with the consent of John VIII, Metrophanes still refused to recognize him, for which conduct he was again banished. At the Photian Synod of 879 a certain Nicetas appears as Metropolitan of Smyrna; meanwhile Metrophanes lay sick at Constantinople. In 880 as he still refused to have anything to do with Photius he was excommunicated by the papal legates. After that he disappears. It is uncertain whether he returned to his see at Photius' second fall or whether he died in exile. A letter of his to a patrician, Manuel, is extant, written in 870, in which he gives his reasons for his opposition to Photius (in Mansi, XIV, 414). Other works attributed to him but strongly Photian in tone ("Against the new Manicheans", i. e., the Latins, and "On the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone") are certainly spurious. See Fabricius-Harles, Bibliotheca Græca (Hamburg, 1790–1809), XI, 700.

HERGENRÖTHER, *Photius* (Regensburg, 1867), vols. I and II, *passim*.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Metropolis, a titular episcopal see and suffragan of Ephesus. Strabo (XIV, 1, 2; XIV, 1, 15), who speaks of its celebrated wines, places this city between Ephesus and Smyrna, at one hundred and twenty stadia (nearly fourteen miles) from the former. It is likewise mentioned in Pliny, "Historia naturalis", V, 29, and in Ptolemy (V, ii, 14) unless here the reference be to Metropolis in Phrygia. A similar allusion is made in "Corpus inscript. Latin." (III, 79, Additam., 59). Le Quien (Oriens chr., I, 709) indicates only two of its bishops: Marcellinus at the Council of Chalcedon in 451 and John at the pseudo-Council of Photius in 878, but from the "Notitiæ episcopatuum" we know that in the fourteenth century the diocese was still in existence. Metropolis is now completely destroyed, its ruins being visible in a place called Tratsa in the nahié of Torbali and the vilayet (Turkish province) of Smyrna, quite close to the river Caystrus. The neighbouring village of Torbali has been built up with stone once used in the structures of ancient Metropolis and, at Tratsa, there may still be seen a portion of its wall, also its theatre and acropolis, the latter formed of huge blocks, while the olive groves are dotted with architectural ruins. This Metropolis, however, must not be confounded with two cities of the same name, one of which was in Phrygia and the other in Thessaly.

SMITH, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography* (London, 1870), s. v.; TEXIER, *Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1862), 358.

S. VAILHÉ.

Metropolitan, in ecclesiastical language whatever relates to the metropolis, the principal city, or see, of an ecclesiastical province; thus we speak of a metropolitan church, a metropolitan chapter, a metropolitan official, etc. The word metropolitan, used without any qualificative, means the bishop of the metropolitan see, now usually styled archbishop. The term metropolite (Μητροπολίτης, Metropolita) is also employed, especially in the Eastern Churches (see ARCHBISHOP). The entire body of rights and duties which canon law attributes to the metropolitan, or archbishop as such, i. e., not for his own diocese, but for those suffragan to him and forming his ecclesiastical province, is called the metropoliticum. The effective authority of metropolitans over their provinces has gradually diminished in the course of centuries, and they do not now exercise even so much as was accorded them by the Council of Trent; every bishop being more strongly and more directly bound to Rome is so much the less bound to his province and its metropolitan. The jurisdiction of the latter over his suffragan dioceses is in a sense ordinary, being established by law; but it is mediate and restricted to the objects provided for by the canons. Since the Council of Trent the rights of the metropolitan have been reduced to the following:

(1) He convokes and presides at the provincial council, at which all his suffragans must appear, saving legitimate excuse, and which must be held every three years (Conc. Trid., Sess. XXIV, c. ii, De ref.). The same holds for other provincial meetings of bishops.

(2) He retains, in theory, the right of canonical visitation of his suffragan dioceses, but on two conditions which make the right practically inoperative: he must first finish the visitation of his own diocese, and the visitation must be authorized by the provincial council. In the course of this visitation, the metropolitan, like the bishop, has the right of "procuration", i. e., he and his retinue must be received and entertained at the expense of the churches visited. Moreover, he can absolve "in foro conscientiæ" (ibid., iii).

(3) He is charged with special vigilance over his suffragans in the matter of residence; he must denounce to the pope those who have been twice absent for six months each time, without due cause or permission (Conc. Trid. Sess., vi, c. i). And similarly for the prescriptions relating to seminaries (Sess. XXIII, c. xviii).

(4) The metropolitan has no judicial authority over his suffragans, major criminal causes of bishops being reserved to the Holy See, and minor ones to the provincial council (Sess. XXIV, c. v.); but he is still the judge of second instance for causes, civil or criminal, adjudicated in the first instance by the officials of his suffragans and appealed to his tribunal. Hence results a certain inequality for matters adjudicated in the first instance in the archdiocese, and to remedy this various concessions have now been provided. But the nomination of two officials by the archbishop, one diocesan, the other metropolitan, with appeal from the one to the other, is not admissible. This practice was used in France under the old regime, but was not general, and even the Gallicans held it to be at variance with canon law (Héricourt, "Les Lois ecclésiastiques de France", E. V, 13). On this principle the nullity of Napoleon's marriage was decided by the diocesan and the metropolitan officials of Paris, 1810 (Schnitzer, "Kathol. Eherecht", Freiburg, 1898, 660). The metropolitan tribunal may also try as at first instance causes not terminated within two years by a bishop's tribunal (Sess. XXIV, c. xx).

In regard to devolution (q. v.), the metropolitan may nominate the vicar capitular of a vacant diocese, if the chapter has failed to nominate within eight days (Sess. xxiv, c. xvi). In like manner he has the right to fill open benefices (i. e., those of free collation) which his suffragans have left unfilled after six months; also to canonically institute candidates presented by patrons if the bishop allows two months to pass without instituting.

(6) Lastly, in the matter of honorific rights and privileges the metropolitan has the pallium (q. v.) as the ensign of his jurisdiction; he takes precedence of all bishops; he may have the archiepiscopal cross (crux gestatoria) borne before him anywhere within his province, except in the presence of a papal legate; he may celebrate pontifically (saving such acts as constitute an exercise of jurisdiction, e. g., ordination), may wear his rochet and mozetta uncovered (not hidden under the mantelletta, like a bishop of another diocese); may bless publicly, and may grant an indulgence of 100 days (S. C. Indulg., 8 Aug., 1903). He ensigns his arms with the double archiepiscopal cross and the hat with ten tassels on either side.

FERRARIS, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, s. v. *Archiepiscopus;* SÄGMÜLLER, *Lehrbuch des kathol. Kirchenrechts* (Freiburg, 1909), 391; BOUIX, *De Episcopo*, I (Paris, 1859), 441.

A. BOUDINHON.

Metropoliticum. See METROPOLITAN.

Metternich, KLEMENS LOTHAR WENZEL, PRINCE VON, statesman; b. at Coblenz, 15 May, 1773; d. at Vienna, 11 June, 1859; son of Count Georg, Austrian envoy of the Court of Vienna at Coblenz, and Maria Beatrix, *née* Countess von Kageneck. He studied philosophy at the University of Strasburg, and law and diplomacy at Mainz. A journey to England completed his education. Metternich began his public career in 1801 as Austrian ambassador to the Court of Dresden. Though he had for several years prepared himself for a diplomatic career, he was especially fortunate in being immediately appointed to so prominent a position. Only two years later he was made ambassador to Berlin. The emperor considered it very important to have a minister at Berlin who could gain the favour of the Court and the principal Prussian statesmen, and who knew how to combine "great powers of observation with a moderate and agreeable manner". Metternich had already proved that he possessed these qualities. Napoleon was then emperor with the new empire at the zenith of its power. The Emperor Francis needed his ablest ambassador at Napoleon's Court, and in May, 1806, he sent Metternich to Paris. Metternich found himself in the difficult position of representing Austria in the face of the overweening threats and ambitious plans of Napoleon at the height of his power. He did so with dignity and firmness, as his report of his important audience with Napoleon on 15 August, 1808, shows. The year 1809 is marked by the great war between Austria and France. The German States were called upon to join her, but only the Tyrol responded. On 13 May Vienna was besieged by the French, but eight days later Napoleon was defeated by the Archduke Charles at Aspern. Metternich, treated as a prisoner of state by Napoleon, was finally released in July in exchange for members of the French embassy. After the battle of Wagram Austria's position was hopeless. Its army was cut off from Hungary and compelled to retreat to Moravia and Bohemia. A great statesman was needed to save the situation. On 4 August the Emperor Francis appointed Metternich as minister of state to confer with Napoleon, and on 8 October, minister of the imperial house and of foreign affairs. By the treaty of Schönbrunn (14 October), Austria was greatly reduced in size, and reached the greatest depths of its humiliation. But the moment of its degradation saw the beginning of its rise. The two-headed eagle soared to the loftiest heights, and it was Metternich who gave it the strength for its flight. For nearly forty years he directed Austria's policy. His first concern was to establish tolerable relations with the French Emperor. Napoleon desired by means of a new marriage to ally himself with one of the old European dynasties in the hope to raise himself and to provide an heir for the imperial throne. He obtained a divorce from Josephine Beauharnais, and through the mediation of Metternich married Maria Louise, daughter of the Emperor Frances of Austria. Though at present it seems to become more and more probable that Napoleon's union with Josephine was a valid marriage, nevertheless it is certain that when Napoleon wedded Maria Louise (11 March, 1810) the Court of Vienna and the Papal Curia were absolutely convinced of the unlawfulness of Napoleon's first alliance.

Napoleon's connexion with the imperial family of Austria had no influence on politics. Fate led the French Emperor, after ruining so many others, to ruin himself. At Schönbrunn he pronounced the temporal sovereignty of the Roman See to be at an end, and in reply to the pope's excommunication he remarked: "This will not cause the arms to drop from the hands of my grenadiers." Although he imprisoned the pope, in the Russian campaign on the Beresina the arms did drop from the frozen hands of his grenadiers. As the crisis approached the decision lay with Austria. From a quarter past eleven in the morning until half past eight in the evening Metternich was closeted with Napoleon (Dresden, 26 June, 1813). "Our conference consisted of the strangest farrago of heterogeneous subjects, characterized now by extreme friendliness, now by the most violent outbursts of fury". Napoleon raged, threatened, and leaped up like a chafed lion. Metternich remained calm. Napoleon let his hat, which he was holding under his arm, drop to the floor. Metternich did not stoop to pick it up. The emperor also tried persuasion. "Your sovereigns", he said, "who were born to their thrones cannot comprehend the feelings that move me. To them it is nothing to return to their capitals defeated. But I am a soldier. I need honour and glory. I cannot reappear among my people devoid of prestige. I must remain great, admired, covered with glory." For that reason, he said, he could not accept the proposed conditions of peace. Metternich replied, "But when will this condition of things cease, in which defeat and victory are alike reasons for continuing these dismal wars? If victorious, you insist upon the fruits of your victory; if defeated, you are determined to rise again." Napoleon made various offers for Austria's neutrality, but Metternich declined all bargaining, and Napoleon's oft-repeated threat, "We shall meet in Vienna", was his farewell to Metternich. Metternich gave the signal for war, and Schwarzenberg led the decisive battle of Leipzig. The Emperor Francis raised his "beloved Count Metternich" to the rank of Austrian prince. "Your able efforts in conducting the department with which I entrusted you in difficult times are now, at a moment highly decisive in the world's destiny, happily crowned with success."

KLEMENS LOTHAR WENZEL VON METTERNICH
Painting by Sir Thomas Lawrence

Metternich reached the height of his power and renown at the Congress of Vienna (1814–1815). No idea can be had of the difficulty of the problems that were to be solved. The very first conference of the representatives of the powers previously allied against France (Austria, Prussia, Russia, and England), held on 19 September, 1814, at Metternich's villa on the Rennweg, ended in a discord over the Polish question.

It constantly required all of Metternich's most brilliant qualities to preserve harmony. One of his favourite means was to provide festivities of all sorts. They have often been criticized as if they had been the object of the congress, and not a means to attain its ends. Metternich succeeded finally in bridging over every difficulty. The Emperor Francis expressed his satisfaction with Metternich's services in securing peace and order in Europe, and especially in restoring to Austria its ancient pre-eminence. The rearrangement of German and Italian affairs gave but little satisfaction to either side, but henceforth Metternich was the leading statesman of Europe. For the settlement of questions still pending and other difficulties that arose, the following congresses were held: Aix-la-Chapelle, 1818; Karlsbad (a conference of ministers), 1819; Vienna, 1820; Troppau, 1820; Laibach, 1821; and Verona, 1822. The Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, at which the monarchs of Austria, Prussia, and Russia were personally present, devoted its attention to the adjustment of the relations of the powers to France, though Metternich also emphasized the dangers arising from demagogic agitation, and expressed his suspicions that its focus was in Germany. When, not long after, the Russian councillor, Kotzebue, was assassinated by the student, Sand, Metternich in twenty-four conferences of German ministers at Karlsbad took measures to put an end to the political troubles in Germany. All publications of less than twenty folios were to be subject to censorship; government officers were to be placed at the universities to supervise them; in the several states the constitutions providing for diets in accordance with ancient usage were to be retained; representative constitutions were to be suppressed. Despite England's and Russia's resistance, Metternich at the two succeeding congresses successfully carried his proposition to intervene in behalf of the Italian states, which were threatened and hard pressed by the revolution. This measure brought upon Austria the hatred of the Italian people. Finally Austria and Russia split on the question of freeing Greece from the Turkish yoke, Austria showing herself to be a decided friend of the Turks. The result was a blow to Metternich's policy. He had dropped from the high-water mark of his influence. Thereafter Russia's influence increased.

Since the death of Prince Kaunitz (1794) the position of house, court, and state chancellor had been vacant, but in 1821 Metternich was invested with that office. "Your deserts have been increased by the uninterrupted zeal, the ability and fearlessness with which, especially in the last two years, you devoted yourself to the preservation of general order and the triumph of law over the disorderly doings of disturbers of the peace in the states at home and abroad." Under the Emperor Ferdinand I after 1835, the direction of affairs, after the emperor himself, was in the hands of a council consisting of the Archduke Ludwig (uncle of the emperor), the state chancellor Metternich, and the court chancellor Kolowrat. Metternich's influence over Austria's internal affairs was less than is generally supposed. Count Hartig, who was well informed, declares (Geschichte der Revolution, p. 19): "In matters of internal administration the prince was seldom heard, and was purposely kept away from them." In this department after 1826, it was the minister Count Kolowrat whose influence was decisive. Many envied Metternich his pre-eminence. The aristocracy always saw the foreigner in him, and others looked with resentment upon the preference shown foreigners in the state chancery (Friedrich Gentz, Adam Müller, Friedrich Schlegel, Jarke). Grillparzer, director of archives in the Hofkammer, expressed himself very harshly on that point in 1839, though it must be noted that Grillparzer had been highly incensed. In all these matters Kolowrat had the advantage of Metternich. He was even considered capable of granting, or, at least, of preparing a constitution, and was thought to be inclined to do so.

As time passed "the Metternich system" came to be held more and more responsible for everything unpleasant, and its author to be hated and attacked. His own acts show the injustice done the prince in this regard. To quote from his "Political Testament": "To me the word freedom has not the value of a starting-point, but of an actual goal to be striven for. The word order designates the starting-point. It is only on order that freedom can be based. Without order as a foundation the cry for freedom is nothing more than the endeavour of some party or other for an end it has in view. When actually carried out in practice, that cry for freedom will inevitably express itself in tyranny. At all times and in all situations I was a man of order, yet my endeavour was always for true and not for pretended liberty." These words are the key to the understanding and appreciation of Metternich's actions.

Two more passages characteristic of the great statesman's temper of mind may be cited: "Admirers of the press honour it with the title, 'representative of public opinion', though everything written in the papers is nothing but the expression of those who write. Will the value of being the expression of public opinion ever be attributed to the publications of a Government, even of a Republican Government? Surely not! Yet every obscure journalist claims this value for his own products. What a confusion of ideas!" No less just and important a remark is the following on state religion: "The downfall of empires always directly depends upon the spread of unbelief. For this very reason religious belief, the first of virtues, is the strongest power. It alone curbs attack and makes resistance irresistible. Religion cannot decline in a nation without causing that nation's strength also to decline, and the fall of states does not proceed in arithmetical progression according to the law of falling bodies, but rapidly leads to destruction." When on 13 March, 1848, the storm of the revolution raged in Vienna, the state chancellor, who preferred to sacrifice himself rather than others, immediately resigned his position. He went to England, Brussels, and Schloss Johannisberg. From the last place he returned to Vienna in 1851, and eight years later died in his palace on the Rennweg at the age of eighty-six.

In Europe Napoleon, Metternich, and Bismarck set their stamp upon the nineteenth century. All three of them lived to see their own fall. Metternich remained the longest in the leading position of "coachman of Europe". Nothing better characterizes the great statesman than what he repeatedly said, proud and aristocratic as always, to Baron A. von Hübner a few weeks before his death: "I was a rock of order" (*un rocher d'ordre*). Metternich married three times: in 1795 Maria Eleonora, granddaughter of Princess Kaunitz, by whom he had seven children; in 1827 Maria Antonia, Baroness von Leykam, by whom he had a son, Richard Klemens; and in 1831 Countess Melanie Zichy, by whom he had three children. The only one of his sons that survived him was Richard Klemens, who published: "Aus Metternichs nachgelassenen Papieren" (8 vols., Vienna, 1880–84). The first two volumes contain Metternich's biography. In the third volume begins the "Schriften-Sammlung" arranged according to years as follows: vol. III, 1816–22; vol. IV, 1823–29; vol. V, 1830–35; vol. VI, 1835–43; vol. VII, 1844–48. Vol. VII contains "Mein Rücktritt", pp. 617–32, "Mein politisches Testament", pp. 633–42, and "Ehren, Würden, und Auszeichnungen", pp. 643–58. Vol. VIII, 1848–59, contains: "Aus dem Tagebuch der Fürstin Melanie" (pp. 3–141), Metternich's letters to his daughter Leontine (1848–58) (pp. 142–282), letters to Baron Koller in London, Count Buol in Vienna, and others (1849–58) (pp. 283–420), supplements to the Princess Melanie's diary, a collec-

tion of Metternich's writings (1848–53) (pp. 421–586), and the year of his death (1859) (pp. 589–627).

Fürst Clemens von Metternich in *Der Katholik*, I (1870), 726–50; GUGLIA, *Friedrich von Gentz* (Vienna, 1901); VON RAVELSBERG, *Metternich und seine Zeit, 1773–1859*, II (Vienna and Leipzig, 1906—); WURZBACH, *Biographisches Lexikon des Kaisertums Oesterreich*, XVIII (1868), 23–62.

C. WOLFSGRUBER.

Metz, town and bishopric in Lorraine.

I. THE TOWN OF METZ.—In ancient times Metz, then known as Divodurum, was the capital of the Celtic Mediomatrici, and at the beginning of the Christian era was already occupied by the Romans. As the junction of several military roads, and as a well-fortified town, it soon became of great importance. One of the last strongholds to surrender to the Germans, it survived the attacks of the Huns, and finally passed, about the end of the fifth century, through peaceful negotiations into the hands of the Franks. Theodorick of Austrasia chose it in 511 as his residence; the reign of Queen Brunhild reflected great splendour on the town. Though the first Christian churches were to be found outside the city, the existence in the fifth century of the oratory of St. Stephen within the city walls has been fully proved. In the beginning of the seventh century the oldest monastic establishments were those of St. Glossinde and St. Peter. Under the Carlovingians the town preserved the good-will of the rulers, whose family seat was near by; Charles the Bald was crowned in the Basilica, and here Louis the Pious and his son Drogo are buried. In 843 Metz became the capital of the Kingdom of Lorraine, and several diets and councils were held there. Numerous books of Holy Writ, the product of the Metz schools of writing and painting, such as the famous "Trier Ada" manuscript and the Sacramentary of Drogo (now at Paris), are evidence of the active intellectual lives that were led.

In 870 the town became part of the East Frank kingdom, and belonged (911–25) as part of Lorraine to France. The increasing influence of the bishops in the city became greater when Adalbert I (928–62) obtained a share of the privileges of the counts; until the twelfth century, therefore, the history of the town is practically identical with that of the bishops (see below). In 1039 a splendid edifice was built to take the place of the old church of St. Stephen.

In the twelfth century began the efforts of the burgesses to free themselves from the domination of the bishops. In 1180 the burgesses for the first time formed themselves into a close corporation, and in 1207 the *Tredecem jurati* were appointed as municipal representatives, but they were still nominated directly by the bishop, who had also a controlling influence in the selection of the presiding officer of the board of aldermen, which first appears in the eleventh century. The twenty-five representatives sent by the various parishes held an independent position; in judicial matters they helped the *Tredecem jurati* and formed the democratic element of the system of government. The other municipal authorities were chosen by the town aristocracy, the so-called Paraiges, i. e. the five associations whose members were selected from distinguished families to protect the interests of their relatives. The other body of burgesses, called a Commune, also appears as a Paraige from the year 1297; in the individual offices it was represented by double the number of members that each of the older five Paraiges had. Making common cause, the older family unions and the Commune found it advantageous to gradually increase the powers of the city as opposed to the bishops, and also to keep the control of the municipal government fully in their hands and out of that of the powerful growing guilds, so that until the sixteenth century Metz remained a purely aristocratic organization. In 1300 the Paraiges gained the right to fill the office of head-alderman, during the fourteenth century the right to elect the *Tredecem jurati*, and in 1383 the right of coining. The guilds, which during the fourteenth century had attained great independence, were completely suppressed (1383), and the last revolutionary attempt of the artisans to seize control of the city government (1405) was put down with much bloodshed.

The city had often to fight for its freedom; from 1324–27 against the Dukes of Luxemburg and Lorraine, as well as against the Archbishop of Trier; in 1363 and 1365 against the band of English mercenaries under Arnold of Cervola, in the fifteenth century against France and the Dukes of Burgundy, who sought to annex Metz to their lands or at least wanted to exercise a protectorate. Nevertheless it maintained its independence, even though at great cost, and remained, outwardly at least, part of the German Empire, whose ruler, however, concerned himself very little with this important frontier stronghold. Charles IV in 1354 and 1356 held brilliant diets here, at the latter of which was promulgated the famous statute known as the "Golden Bull". The town therefore felt that it occupied an almost independent position between France and Germany, and wanted most of all to evade the obligation of imperial taxes and attendance at the diet. The estrangement between it and the German States daily became wider, and finally affairs came to such a pass that in the religious and political troubles of 1552 the Protestant party in Germany betrayed Metz to France. By an agreement of the German princes, Moritz of Saxony, William of Hesse, John Albrecht of Mecklenburg, and George Frederick of Brandenburg, with Henry II of France, ratified by the French king at Chambord (15 January), Metz was formally transferred to France, the gates of the city were opened (10 April), and Henry took possession as *vicarius sacri imperii et urbis protector* (18 April). The Duke of Guise, commander of the garrison, restored the old fortifications and added new ones, and successfully resisted the attacks of the emperor from October to December, 1552; Metz remained French. The recognition by the empire of the illegal surrender came at the conclusion of the Peace of Westphalia. By the construction of the citadel (1555–62) the new government secured itself against the citizens, who were discontented with the turn of events. Important internal changes soon took place. In place of the Paraiges stood the authority of the French king, whose representative was the governor. The head-alderman, now appointed by the governor, was replaced (1640) by a Royalist Mayor. The aldermen were also appointed by the governor and henceforth drawn from the whole body of burgesses; in 1633 the judgeship passed to the Parliament. The powers of the *Tredecem jurati* were also restricted, in 1634 totally abolished, and replaced by the *Bailliage royal*.

Among the cities of Lorraine, Metz held a prominent position during the French occupation for two reasons: in the first place it became one of the most important fortresses through the work of Vauban (1674) and Cormontaigne (1730); secondly, it became the capital of the temporal province of the three bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun, which France had seized (1552) and, by the Peace of Westphalia, retained. In 1633 there was created for this "Province des trois évêchés" (also called "Généralité des trois évêchés" or "Intendance de Metz") a supreme court of justice and court of administration, the Metz Parliament. In 1681 the Chambre Royale, the notorious Assembly chamber, whose business it was to decide what fiefs belonged to the three bishoprics which Louis XIV claimed for France, was made a part of this Parliament, which lasted, after a temporary dissolution (1771–75), until the final settlement by the National Assembly in 1789, whereupon the division of the land into departments and districts followed.

Metz became the capital of the Department of Moselle, created in 1790. The revolution brought great calamities upon the city. In the campaigns of 1814 and 1815 the allied armies twice besieged the city, but were unable to take it. During the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–71 Metz was the headquarters and rendezvous of the third French Army Corps under Bazaine. Through the operations of the German army, Bazaine, after the battles of Colombey, Mars-la-Tour, and Gravelotte (14–18 August) was besieged in Metz. The German army of investment was commanded by Prince Frederick Charles of Prussia; as the few sorties of the garrison were unable to break the German lines, Metz was forced to surrender (27 October), with the result that 6000 French officers and 170,000 men were taken prisoners. By the Treaty of Frankfort, Metz became once more a German city, and since then has been made a most important garrison and a first-class fortress. The city, after the levelling of the fortifications on the south and east (1898), secured space for growth and development. In 1905 the city had 60,419 inhabitants, of whom 43,082 were Catholics, 15,556 Protestants, and 1691 Jews; by 1910 the number of inhabitants, through the absorption of several villages, has increased to 68,100.

II. The See of Metz.—The first fully authenticated bishop is Sperus or Hesperus, who took part in the Synod of Clermont (535). The most important of the early bishops is the holy Arnulf (611–27), founder of the race of the Carlovingians. His remains were transferred in 643 by his successor Abbo (627–42) to the church of St. John outside the city and henceforth known as St. Arnulf's church. The bishops were usually abbots of the monastery of St. Arnulf. The boundaries of the diocese stretched originally to the Rhine, but after the See of Strasburg was founded, only to the Vosges mountains; from the top of the northern Vosges mountains the diocese embraced the upper Saar and adjoining districts, and extended to the Moselle and a little beyond Diedenhofen; the southern boundary followed the left tributary of the Moselle, Rupt de Mad, then up the Moselle to the mouth of the Meurthe, and in a slight curve to the upper Meurthe. This district, which is not to be confounded with the temporal province, comprised practically the diocese up to the nineteenth century. Prominent bishops of the eighth century included Chrodegang (742–46), who founded the Abbey of Gorze and gave to his clergy a special rule for a canonical life, modelled after the Benedictine rule, the basis of the *vita communis* of the regular clergy. Then followed Angilram (768–91), the friend of Charles the Great, who, like his predecessor, received the pallium. Yet the archiepiscopal dignity was not transferred to the see itself; Metz was always regarded as being a suffragan of Trier. Bishop Drogo (823–55), son of the Emperor Charles, remained loyal to his brother Louis the Pious, and exerted considerable influence. In the administration of the dioceses, the suffragan bishops Amalarius and Lantfried supported him. In the important position Metz assumed after the division of the Frankish dominions into West and East Franconia, the German rulers took care that only men who would be loyal to them were appointed to the episcopal see. After the unworthy Wigerich or Witger of Lorraine (917–27), Henry I appointed the Swabian Bruno, who, in the second year of his administration, blinded by the inhabitants of Metz, returned to his hermitage. Adalbert (928–62), although at first an opponent of Otto I, received on the death of the Duke of Metz (945) a portion of the privileges of count, a fact which went far to increase the secular power of the bishops; in 959, through the division of the Duchy of Lorraine into Upper and Lower Lorraine, the diocese was withdrawn from the ducal authority and placed immediately under the imperial. After the death of Adalbert, Otto's brother, Bruno of Cologne, governed the see; then Dietrich II (964–84), a cousin of Otto; Adalbert II (984–1005); Adalbert III (1006); Dietrich III (1006–47), brother of the Empress Kunigunde; Adalbert IV (1047–72), all closely related to the reigning house. In spite of this, however, the choice of bishops was generally an excellent one. The first church reform movement, of which the monasteries of St. Clement, St. Arnulf, and St. Glossinde were the focus, originated with Adalbert I and Bruno; under Dietrich I the monastery of St. Symphorus was again restored, and the new cathedral of St. Stephen built by Dietrich III in 1039.

This friendly relation received a serious set-back through the investiture controversy, which many bishops carried on with the assistance of the emperor's adversaries. The Saxon Herman (1073–90) appealed to the pope and was in consequence deposed by the emperor, and two other bishops appointed in his stead. Until the conclusion of the Concordat of Worms a papal and an imperial bishop were continually opposed to each other. Even Stephen of Bar (1120–63), appointed by Calixtus II, only obtained possession of his see after this Concordat. In an endeavour to free themselves from the episcopal power, the inhabitants of Metz sought to make use of these quarrels between the emperor and the bishop, but Stephen once more restored the sovereignty of the bishops. Bishop Bertrand (1179–1212) gave the city the system of government described above. Under his successor Conrad I of Scharfenberg (1212–24) the first settlements of the new orders of Mendicant Friars, the Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinians, and Carmelites, were made in the diocese. With John of Aspremont (1224–38), the first bishop to be elected solely by cathedral chapter, and Jacob of Lorraine (1239–60), who once more upheld the rights of the bishops against the city, the development of the temporal possessions of the bishopric came to a halt. These temporal possessions were obtained through the gifts of the Carlovingians, always friendly to Metz. In 770 it received full rights over the property of the Senones Abbey under Drogo, over the Maursmünster Abbey, in 923 over Zabern, in 931 over Saarburg, and many others. On the dissolution of the old countships in the tenth century, the bishopric, subject only to the imperial government, enlarged its possessions and acquired sovereignty in the old District of Moselle, in the Saar District, and in the Blies District. The most important acquisitions at that time and later were Rémilly (984), Saarbrücken (998), the lordship of Püttlingen (1135), and Lützelburg (1143), the fiefs of the countship of Dagsburg (1225), the lordship of Briey (1225), Rixingen and Mörsberg (1255). Throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries began the decline of these possessions, principally on account of the quarrels of almost all the bishops; namely, Rainald of Bar (1302–16), Adhemer of Monteil (1327–61), under whom the present cathedral was begun, Dietrich IV Bayer of Boppard (1365–84) with the Dukes of Lorraine and the Counts of Bar and Luxemburg. During the thirteenth century sovereignty over the city of Metz and its environs (the *pays* Messin) was lost; the continual need of money by the bishops and the cathedral chapter forced them to pledge the title deeds of their domains, fiefs, and taxes to the Dukes of Lorraine, the Counts of Bar, the city of Metz, and even to the burgesses.

Another element was the fact that during the great Western Schism, for a long time two bishops had made the diocese a scene of strife, until Rudolf of Coucy received general recognition (1387–1415). His successors Conrad II Bayer of Boppard (1415–59), and George I of Bavaria (1459–84) were the last German bishops of the old see to once more work for the maintenance of a loyal sentiment in the city and see. With Henry II of Lorraine (1484–1505) began and continued during the next one hundred and twenty years,

the long line of bishops of the ducal house of Lorraine which had incessantly aimed to increase its domains at the expense of the bishopric and was well supported therein by the kindred bishops through the transfer of numerous enfeoffments and mortgages. One benefit, derived through the bishops, was that the Catholic faith was preserved in their diocese and in this they had the powerful support of their house. In this way, Cardinal John IV of Lorraine (1518–43 and 1548–50), who exercised authority over no less than twelve bishoprics withstood the Reformation. Charles I of Guise, appointed by the Cardinal of Lorraine, retained only the temporal administration of the bishopric, and appointed in succession as bishops for the spiritual government, Cardinal Robert of Lenoncourt (1551–55) who after the reversion of the city of Metz to France tried to enforce the bishops' claim to sovereignty over the city and declared himself *Prince et Seigneur de la ville*, Francis de Beauquerre de Péguillon (1555–68), and Cardinal Louis of Lorraine (1568–78). Others who also worked conscientiously, by furthering the internal reforms in conformity with the decrees of the Council of Trent, were Charles II of Lorraine (1578—1607); Cardinal Annas von Givry (1608–12), and Henry of Bourbon, Marquis of Verneuil (1612–52). Under the last bishop the see was transferred to France in accordance with the Peace of Westphalia. Through sales, mortgages, and loans, the temporal property had become very much dismembered; but France wanted as far as possible, to re-establish a complete district out of the transferred *districtus Metensis*. The Assembly Chamber decided what enfeoffment and dependancies had belonged to the newly acquired district, and confiscated a considerable number owing to the frivolous Assembly quarrel. The *Province des Trois évêches* (see above) was formed out of the temporal provinces of the bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun, also out of lands relinquished by the Spaniards.

Under French rule the conflict over the right of filling the episcopal see at once broke out, which right Louis XIV claimed and in 1664 obtained from Alexander VII. As a general rule the crown nominated worthy prelates for the bishopric: George II of Aubusson (1668–97), Henri Charles du Cambout (1697-1732) and Claude de Rouvray Saint-Simon (1733–60) who in 1736 assumed the title of prince bishop. The last prince bishop, Cardinal Louis de Montmorency-Laval (1761–1802) fled to Germany on the outbreak of the French revolution (d. 1808 at Altona). The Revolution and the Constitution civile du clergé broke up the old organization of the dioceses and installed a constitutional bishop, who, however, in 1793, was thrown into jail. The Concordat between the pope and Napoleon (1801) restored the bishopric with a different diocese, the three Departments of Moselle, Ardennes, and Forêts were allotted to it, and it was placed under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Besançon. Peter Francis Bienaimé (1802-06), the first bishop of the new diocese, divided the territory into 90 proper and 1251 auxiliary parishes. In 1817 that portion of the Departments of Ardennes and Forêts which became Prussian territory was separated (the bishop was Joseph Jauffret, 1806–23) and in 1821 the remainder of Ardennes and Forêts, so that Metz had only 30 parishes and 418 subordinate parishes. After Jauffret, who instituted the yearly diocesan synod, followed Jacob Francis Besson (1824–42), then Paul George Maria Dupont des Loges (1843–86), founder of the boys' training school in Montigny near Metz. In 1871 the diocese became part of the German Empire, and the new boundaries of Lorraine became also the boundaries of the bishopric. In 1874 it was separated from the Metropolitanate of Besançon and placed immediately under the Holy See. The Kulturkampf destroyed many institutions in Metz founded by the Catholics and bishops of that city. On the death of Dupont des Loges, who on account of his outspoken French opinions, was always at loggerheads with the German Government, succeeded in 1886 Ludwig Fleck, coadjutor bishop from 1881, and after him the Benedictine Willibord Benzler, former Abbot of Maria-Laach (b. 16 October, 1853).

The present Diocese of Metz comprising the District of Lorraine covers an area of 2400 square miles and on 1 December, 1905, numbered 533,389 Catholics, 74,167 Protestants, 1060 Dissenters, and 7165 Jews. The see is divided into 4 archdiaconates, and 36 archpresbyterates; in 1910 it contained 641 parishes besides 73 missions; 893 secular, and 36 regular, priests. The bishop has 3 vicars-general. The Cathedral Chapter consists of 9 titular and 24 honorary canons. The diocesan institutions are the seminary for priests at Metz with 10 professors, the small seminary at Montigny near Metz, the cathedral school of St. Arnulf at Metz, and St. Augustine's Institute at Bitsch. The following orders and congregations had houses in 1910 in the diocese: the Conventuals, 1 house with 7 fathers, and 7 brothers; the Franciscans, 1 house, 4 fathers, and 6 brothers; the Redemptorists, 1 house, 11 fathers, and 4 brothers; the Fathers of the Holy Ghost, 1 house, 5 fathers, and 13 brothers; the Christian Brothers, 2 houses, and 20 brothers; the Brothers of Mercy, 3 houses, and 13 brothers. Orders of nuns: the Benedictine Abbey at Oriocourt, 36 sisters; 21 Barefoot Carmelites of Metz; 37 Sisters of the Visitation of Metz; 554 Sisters of Sainte Chrétienne, the mother-house at Metz, and 25 convents; 715 Sisters of Providence, with the mother-house at Peltre, and 140 branches; 508 Sisters of Divine Providence with the mother-house at Metz, and 116 convents; 96 Sisters of Christian Doctrine, 4 convents; 40 Sisters of Compassion with 1 branch; 62 Sisters of the Good Shepherd, 2 houses; 25 Sisters of the Poor Child Jesus at Plappeville; 14 Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Mary at Vic; 47 Dominicans, 5 houses; 124 Sisters of the Maternity, 6 houses; 144 Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul, 17 branches; 77 Sisters of Charity, the mother-house at Strasburg, 11 houses; 81 Borromeans, 9 convents; 20 Little Sisters of the Poor at Metz; 23 Sisters of Hope at Metz; 18 Sisters of the Divine Saviour, 3 houses; 80 Servants of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, 5 branches; 73 Franciscans of the Holy Hearts of Jesus and Mary, 3 convents; 4 Franciscans from the mother-house at Luxemburg in Rettel; 13 Tertiaries of St. Francis, 3 houses, 2 servants of Mary from the mother-house of St. Firmin at Nancy, 1 house. The most important churches of the dioceses are the cathedral of St. Stephen, a magnificent Gothic structure, the main parts of which were built in the fourteenth century; it was completed in 1546, and in 1875 it was completely restored; the Gothic churches of Metz, St. Vincent (thirteenth and fourteenth centuries), St. Martin (twelfth and thirteenth centuries), St. Segolana (thirteenth and fourteenth centuries), the collegiate church at Gorze (twelfth century), the late Gothic parish church at Mörchingin, the church of St. Peter at Finstingen, etc.

Histoire Générale de Metz par des religieux Bénédictins (6 vols., Metz, 1709-90); D'HANNONCELLES, *Metz ancien* (2 vols., Metz, 1856); WESTPHAL, *Gesch. der Stadt Metz* (3 vols., Metz, 1876-78); SAUERLAND, *Die Immunität von Metz* (Metz, 1887); KRAUS, *Kunst und Altertum in Lothringen* (Strasburg, 1889); *Technischer Führer durch Metz* (Metz, 1894); KEUNE, *Metz, seine Geschichte und Sammlungen* (Metz, 1907). Histories: *L'Austrasie* (Metz, 1837-67): *Mémoires de l'Académie de Metz* (Metz, 1819–); *Jahrbücher der Gesellschaft für lothringische Geschichte und Altertumskunde* (Metz, 1888); *Gallia Christiana*, XIII; LEPAGE, *L'Ancien Diocèse de Metz et Pouillés de ce diocèse* (Nancy, 1872); DOERING, *Beiträge zur ältesten Geschichte des Bisthums Metz* (Innsbruck, 1886); *Revue ecclésiastique de Metz* (Metz, 1890—especially 1890 and 1891); FRITSCH, s. v., in *Die katholische Kirche unserer Zeit und ihre Diener*, II (Münich, 1900), 198–205; *Die alten Territorien des Bezirks Lothringen*, II, ed. DU PREL (Strasburg, 1909).

JOSEPH LINS.

Meuleman, BRICE. See CALCUTTA, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

Meun (or MEUNG), JEAN CLOPINEL DE, French poet, b. c. 1260 in the little city of Meung-sur-Loire; d. at Paris between 1305 and 1320. He took the name of his native city, but received from his contemporaries the nickname Clopinel (*clopiner*, to limp) because he was lame. Such nicknames were very common in the Middle Ages and were used in lieu of patronymics, the custom of which was not yet established. Jean de Meun's social condition has been a much debated question. It seems certain to-day that he was born of well-to-do parents, received a very good education, and, about 1300, was a wealthy burgess of Paris, a steady and pious man who enjoyed the esteem of his fellow citizens and the friendship of many a noble lord. He translated the "De re militari" of Vegetius, the "De consolatione philosophiæ" of Boethius and composed in French verses a Testament in which he reproves women and the friars. His fame rests on a work of his earlier years, the completion of the "Roman de la Rose", which had been left unfinished by Guillaume de Lorris. As it stood, the latter's work was a sort of didactic poem in which he used allegorical characters to describe the forms, the phases, and the progress of love. His aim seemed to have been to compose a treatise on the art of loving for the use of the noble lords and ladies of the thirteenth century. To the 4669 verses of his predecessor, Jean de Meun added more than 18,000 and made the poem a sort of cyclopedia of all the knowledge of the time. He quoted, translated, and imitated all the writers then known: Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Virgil, Ovid, Augustine, Juvenal, Livy, Abelard, Roger Bacon. Of the 18,000 verses which he has written, it has been possible to assign 12,000 to their authors. All the characters became so many pedants who discoursed on all sorts of topics, however remote they might be from the subject: the origin of the state, the origin of the royal power, instinct, justice, the nature of evil, marriage, property, the conflict between the regular and the secular clergy, between the friars and the university, etc. The book is full of attacks on all classes and duties of society: the magistrates, the soldiers, the nobles, the monks, tithes, feudal rights, property. De Meun's talent is vigorous, but his style is often cynical and reminds the reader of the worst pages of Rabelais.

PARIS, *Jean de Meun* in *Hist. littéraire de la France*, XXVIII (Paris, 1888), 391–429; QUICHERAT, *Jean de Meun et sa Maison à Paris* in *Bibl. de l'école des chartes* (Paris, 1860); LANGLOIS, *Origines et sources du Roman de la Rose* (Paris, 1890).

PIERRE MARIQUE.

Mexico.—GEOGRAPHY.—The Republic of Mexico is situated at the extreme point of the North American continent, bounded on the north by the United States, on the east by the Gulf of Mexico, the Caribbean Sea, British Honduras, and Guatemala, and on the south and west by the Pacific Ocean. It comprises an area of 767,005 square miles, with a population of 13,604,000, of whom 2,062,000 are whites or creoles, 7,380,000 half-breeds or mestizos, 4,082,000 Indians, and about 80,000 negroes. Among the whites there are approximately 60,000 foreigners, the greater number being North Americans, Central Americans, Spaniards, French, Italians, etc. The form of government is republican; its head is a president, who is elected every six years; the legislature consists of two bodies, senate and chamber of deputies; and there is a supreme court. The republic is composed of twenty-seven states, three territories, and a federal district. The territory of Quintana Roo, created in 1902, was a part of the State of Yucatan. The names of the states, with population, area in square miles, capitals and number of people, are given in the accompanying table.

STATE	POPULATION	AREA	CAPITAL	POPULATION
Jalisco	1,153,891	33,496	Guadalajara	101,208
Guanajuato	1,068,724	10,948	Guanajuato	63,263
Puebla	1,021,133	12,203	Puebla	93,521
Vera Cruz	983,030	29,283	Jalapa	20,388
Oaxaca	948,633	35,382	Oaxaca	35,049
Mexico	934,643	8,849	Toluca	25,904
Michoacan	930,033	22,656	Morelia	37,278
Hidalgo	605,051	8,575	Pachuca	37,487
S. Luis Potosí	575,432	24,000	San Luis Potosí	61,019
Federal District	541,516	579	Mexico	344,721
Guerrero	479,205	24,995	Chilpancingo	7,497
Zacatecas	462,150	24,457	Zacatecas	32,856
Durango	370,304	42,265	Durango	31,092
Chiapas	360,799	27,222	Tuxtla Gutierrez	10,982
Nuevo León	327,937	23,678	Monterey	62,266
Chihuahua	327,784	89,974	Chihuahua	30,405
Yucatan	314,087	17,204	Merida	43,630
Coahuila	296,938	63,728	Saltillo	23,996
Sinaloa	296,701	27,552	Culiacan	10,380
Querétaro	232,389	4,492	Querétaro	33,152
Sonora	221,682	76,619	Hermosillo	10,613
Tamaulipas	218,948	31,758	Ciudad Victoria	10,086
Tlaxcala	172,315	1,594	Tlaxcala	2,715
Morelos	160,115	2,733	Cuernavaca	9,584
Tabasco	159,834	10,072	San Juan Bautista	10,543
Ter. of Tepic	150,098	10,951	Tepic	15,488
Aguascalientes	102,416	2,964	Aguascalientes	35,052
Campeche	86,111	18,086	Campeche	17,109
Colima	65,115	2,172	Colima	20,692
Ter. of Low.Cal.	47,624	58,328	La Paz	5,046
Ter. Quintana Roo	40,000	18,000	Santa Cruz de Bravo	1,500

The Cordillera of the Andes which crosses the narrow isthmus that unites the Americas, branches out into two ranges when it reaches the peak of Zempoaltepec over (10,000 feet), in the State of Oaxaca; the eastern branch terminates at the Rio Bravo (or Rio Grande), in the State of Coahuila, and the western branch extends through the States of Chihuahua and Sonora and merges into the Rocky Mountain system in the United States. In the Mexican territory the two ranges are so closely united as to form almost a compact whole, occupying nearly all the region from ocean to ocean, forming the vast tablelands that extend from Oaxaca to Chihuahua and Coahuila, and leaving but a narrow strip of land along the coast line. On the eastern coast the land slopes almost imperceptibly to the Gulf, whereas on the western the descent is sharp and abrupt. This accounts for the few good ports on the Gulf side, and the abundance of harbours and sheltered bays on the Pacific shore. The highest peaks of these vast mountain ranges are: Popocatepetl (17,800 feet), Citlaltepetl, or Peak of Orizaba (17,000 feet), Ixtacihuatl (16,100 feet). To this physical configuration of the land, the absence in Mexico of any water systems of importance, is to be attributed. The principal rivers, none of which carries a great volume of water, are the Bravo, Pánuco, and Grijalva, emptying into the Gulf of Mexico, and the Mexcala, Santiago, Mayo, and Yaqui, emptying into the Pacific. Very few islands are to be found on the eastern coast of Mexico, quite unlike the Pacific shore, which along the coast of the peninsula of Lower California is dotted with small islands. The four seasons of the year, common to most countries, are unknown in Mexico, owing to the entirely different climatic conditions. Common usage has divided the year into two distinct seasons, the rainy and the dry season, the former extending from May to October. During this entire time there are daily showers, which not infrequently are heavy downpours. The other six months are dry, not a drop of rain falling, at least on the tablelands. The climate of the coast regions is always very warm, while that of the tablelands is temperate. The phenomenon of frost in December and January on the tablelands of Mexico, Puebla, and Toluca, situated at an altitude of more than 6000 feet above the sea level, is due not so much to extremes of climate as to the rarity of the air causing a rapid condensation of the vapours.

Many of the native races which inhabited Mexico at the time of the Conquest are still in existence; the principal ones are: the Mexicana, Aztaca, or Nahoa, in the States of Mexico, Morelos, Jalisco; the Tarasca, or Michoacana, in the State of Michoacan; the Otomí in San Luis Potosí, in Guanajuato and Querétaro; the Opata-Pima, in Sonora, Chihauhua, and Durango; the

CATHEDRAL, CITY OF MEXICO

Mixteco-Tzapoteca in Oaxaca; the Mijea, or Zoque, in parts of Oaxaca, Vera Cruz, and Chiapas; the Chontal and Huave, in Tabasco, Oaxaca, and Chiapas; the Maya in Yucatan. Among the less important races are the Huaxteca in the north of Vera Cruz and Southern Tamaulipas, the Totonaca in the centre of the State of Vera Cruz, the Matlalzinca in the State of Mexico, and the Guaycures and Laimones in Lower California. Remarkable ruins, found in many parts of the republic, bear witness to the degree of civilization to which these nations had attained. Chief among these may be mentioned the ruins of Uxmal and Chichen-Itza in Yucatan (Maya nation), those of Palenque and Mitla in Oaxaca (Tzapotec nation), the baths of Netzahuacoyotl in Texcoco (Chichimeca-Nahoa nation), and the pyramids of Teotihuacan (Toltec nation). The separation of Church and State has been established by law, but the religion of the country is Catholic, there being actually very few who profess any other. Railroads, 14,857 miles; telegraph lines, 40,640 miles. In 1907 the product of the mines amounted to $83,078,500, $42,723,500 of this being gold, $19,048,000 silver, and $12,400,000 copper. In 1908 $12,001,000, $8,300,000 gold and $3,701,800 silver, was minted. The principal products besides minerals are corn, cotton, agave plant (henequen), wheat, sugar, coffee, cabinet woods, tobacco, petroleum, etc.

History.—*Pre-Cortés Period.*—The chronology and historical documents of the Aztecs give us a more or less clear account of their history for eight centuries prior to the conquest, but these refer only to their own history and that of the tribes living in close proximity to them, little or nothing being said of the origin of the Otomies, Olenques, Cuitlatecos, and Michoacanos. According to Clavijero the Toltecs came to Mexico about A. D. 648, the Chichimecs in 1170, and the Aztecs in 1196. That their ancestors came from other lands, is asserted by all these tribes in their traditions, and the north is generally the direction from which they claim to have come. It seems probable that these first immigrants to Mexico came from Asia, either by way of Behring Strait, or across the Pacific Ocean. The theory that these people had some close connexion with the Egyptians and other peoples of Asia and Africa has some substantiating evidence in the ruins still extant, the pyramids, the exact and complicated method of computing time, the hieroglyphics, and the costumes (almost identical with those of the ancient Egyptians), seen in the mural paintings in the ruins of Chichen-Itza. It seems that the Otomies were one of the oldest nations of Anahuac, and the Itzaes of Yucatan. These were followed by the Mayas in Yucatan, and in Anahuac the Toltecs, the Chichimicas, and Nahoas, with their seven tribes, the Xochimilcas, Chalcas, Tecpanecs, Acolhuas, Tlahuicas, Tlaxcaltecs, and Aztecs. The last-named founded the city of Tenochtitlan, or Mexitli, in 1325, and gradually, overpowering the other tribes, extended their empire north as far as the Kingdom of Michoacan, and the domain of the savage Otomies, east to the Gulf, west to the Pacific, and south to Nicaragua. This was the extent of the Aztec empire at the time of the Spanish invasion in 1519.

Language and religion.—Nahuatl, or Aztec, somewhat modified in the region of the central tableland, was the official language of the empire, but many other dialects were in use in other sections. The principal ones were: Tarascan in Michoacan, Mayan in Yucatan, Otomian in the northern limits of the empire, Mixteco-Tzapotecan and Chontal in Oaxaca, and Chiapanecan and Tzendal in Chiapas and Tabasco. The religion of all these nations was a monstrous polytheism. Human sacrifice was a feature of the worship of nearly all the tribes, but in none did it assume the gigantic proportions that it did among the Aztecs in their great teocalli, or temple, at the capital. Father Motolinia in his letter of 2 January, 1553, to the Emperor Charles V, speaking of the human sacrifices with which the Emperor Ahuitzotl (1486–1502) celebrated the opening of the great temple in Mexico, says: "In a sacrificial service lasting three or four days 80,400 men were sacrificed. They were brought through four streets walking single file until they reached the idols." Father Durán, speaking of this same sacrifice and of the great number of victims, adds: "Which to me seemed so incredible, that, if history and the fact that I found it recorded in many places outside of history, both in writing and pictorially represented, did not compel me to believe it, I should not dare to assert it". The Vatican and Tellerian manuscripts give the number of victims as 20,000; this number seems more probable.

Upon this occasion victims were simultaneously sacrificed in fourteen principal temples of the city. In the great teocalli, there were four groups of sacrifices, and the same was probably the case in other places; the time for the sacrifices was from sunrise to sunset, about thirteen hours, each victim required about five minutes, so that computing by this standard the number of victims might easily reach the above-mentioned number. Father Mendieta, as well as Father Motolinia and other authorities, agree in affirming that the number of victims annually sacrificed to Huitzilopozotli and other Aztec deities reached the number of 15,000 to 20,000. To the student of Aztec history this will not appear unlikely, for they kept up a continuous warfare with their neighbours, not so much to extend their empire as for the avowed purpose of securing victims for the sacrifices. In battle their idea was not so much to kill as to take their enemies prisoners. To this, in very great measure, the Kingdom of Michoacan and the Republic of Tlaxcala, situated in the very heart of the Aztec empire, only a few miles from the capital, owed their independence, and the Spaniards many of their victories. Hernán Cortés may for this reason have escaped death at the hands of the Indians in the numerous battles of the siege of the capital. Notwithstanding the hideous form of worship and the bloody sacrifices, the peoples of ancient Mexico preserved a series of traditions which may be classified as Biblical and Christian; the Biblical traditions are undoubtedly the remnants of the religious beliefs of the first races who migrated to these shores; the probable origin of the Christian traditions will be explained later.

Biblical Traditions.—(1) Idea of the Unity of God. —The Aztecs gave the name of *Teotl* to a supreme, invisible, eternal being, whom they never attempted to portray in visible form, and whom they called Tolque-Nahuaque, Creator of all things, Ipalneomani, He by whom we live. The Mayas called this same supreme being, Hunab-ku, and neither does this tribe seem to have ever attempted to give form and personality to their deity. The Michoacans adored Tucupacha, one god and creator of all things. (2) Creation.— Among the Aztecs the idea of the creation had been preserved. They believed that Tloque-Nahuaque had created a man and a woman in a delightful garden; the woman was called Cihuacohuatl, the snake woman. (3) Deluge.—Among the Michoacans we find traditions of the Deluge. Tezpi, to escape from drowning in a terrible deluge that occurred, embarked in a boat shaped like a box, with his wife and children, many species of animals, and provisions of grain and seeds. When the rain had abated, and the flood subsided, he liberated a bird called an aura, a water bird, which did not return. Then others were released, and all but the humming bird failed to return. The illustration on the following page of an Aztec hieroglyphic taken from the Vatican manuscript represents the Deluge as conceived by the Aztecs. The symbol Calli is seen in the water, a house with the head and hand of a woman projecting to signify the submersion of all dwellings and their in-

habitants. The two fish swimming in the water signify, besides the fact that they were saved, that all men were transformed into Tlacamichin, fish-people, according to the Aztec tradition. In the midst of the waters floats a hollow wooden canoe, Acalli, occupied by a man and a woman, the only privileged pair to escape the disaster. The goddess Chalchiuhtlique, as though descending from the heavens in a flash of lightning, surrounded by her symbols of rain and water, presides over the scene. The date of the Deluge is marked at the right with the sign Matlactliatl of the month Atemoztli (3 January); the duration of the flood is marked by the sign to the left. Each major circle finished with a feathered end, equals 400, and each minor circle indicates a unit, so that together they equal 4008 years.

(4) Tower of Babel.—In the commentary on the Vatican manuscript mention is made of the epoch after Atonatiuh, that is the Deluge, when giants inhabited the earth, and of the giant Xelhua, who, after the waters had subsided, went to Cholollan, where he began to build the great pyramid out of huge bricks of sun-baked clay (adobes), made in Tlalmanalco at the base of the Cocotl mountain, and conveyed to the site of the pyramids by hand. A line of men extended from place to place, and the bricks were passed from hand to hand. The gods, seeing that the pyramid threatened to touch the sky, were displeased and rained down fire from the heavens, destroying many and dispersing the rest. (5) Confusion of Tongues.—Teocipactli and Yochiquetzal, the man and woman who were saved from the flood, according to the Aztec tradition, landed on the mountain of Colhuacan. They had many children, but they were all dumb until a dove from the branches of a tree taught them to speak. Their tongues, however, were so diverse that they could not understand one another.

TESCIPACTLI AND YOCHIQUETZAL SAVED FROM THE FLOOD
Hieroglyphic from Vatican Aztec Codex

Christian Traditions.—In the history of the nations of ancient Mexico the coming of Quetzalcoatl marks a distinct era. He was said to have come from the Province of Pánuco, a white man, of great stature, broad brow, large eyes, long black hair, rounded beard, and dressed in a tunic covered with black and red crosses. Chaste, intelligent, and just, a lover of peace, versed in the sciences and arts, he preached by his example and doctrine a new religion which inculcated fasting and penance, love and reverence for the Divinity, practise of virtue, and hatred of vice. He predicted that in the course of time white men with beards, like himself, would come from the East, would take possession of their country, overthrow their idols, and establish a new religion. Expelled from Tollan, he sought refuge in Cholollan, but, being pursued even here by the Tollans, he passed on to Yucatan, where, under the name of Kukulcan, he repeated the predictions he had made in Anahuac, introduced the veneration of the Cross, and preached Christian doctrine. Later he set sail from the Gulf of Mexico, going towards the east, to his own land, as he himself said. The opinion of ancient writers that this person was the Apostle Saint Thomas is now universally rejected, and the most probable explanation of the identity of Quetzalcoatl is that he was an Icelandic or Norse priest of the tenth or eleventh century, who, on one of their bold voyages of adventure, accidentally discovered this new land or, shipwrecked in the Gulf, drifted to the coast of Pánuco. Christian traditions, above all that of the veneration of the Cross, date in Anahuac and Yucatan from the coming of Quetzalcoatl. In Yucatan the followers of Francisco Hernández de Córdoba found crosses which were the object of adoration. With regard to the Cross of Cozumel, the Indians said that a man more resplendent than the sun had died upon it. The Mayas preserved a rite suggestive of baptism and confession, and among the Totonacos an imitation of communion was practised, the bread which was used was called Toyolliaitlacual, i. e., food of our soul. Crosses were also found in Querétaro, Tepic, Tianguistepec, and Metztitlan.

No better authority can be cited, in connexion with the famous Cross of Palenque, which is herewith reproduced than the learned archæologist, Orozco y Berra. He says: "The civilization indicated by the ruins of Palenque and of Yucatan, differs in every respect, language, writing, architecture, dress, customs, habits, and theogony, from that of the Aztecs. If there are some points of resemblance they can be traced to the epoch of Kukulcan, when there was some intercourse between the two nations. There is also historical proof that the Cross of Palenque is of much more ancient origin than that of the Toltecs. From this it may be inferred that the Cross of Palenque does not owe its origin to the same source as the crosses of Mexico and Cozumel, that is, to the coming of Kukulcan, or Quetzalcoatl, and consequently has no Christian significance such as those had. It seems to be of Buddhistic origin." Among the Tzapotecs and Mijes of the State of Oaxaca there is also a very distinct tradition about Pecocha, who came from the West, landing in Huatulco about the sixth century. He is said to have planted a cross there, and to have taught the Indians the veneration they should have for this symbol. This cross is still preserved in the cathedral of Oaxaca, the claims for its authenticity resting on the most thoroughly respectable tradition, and upon documents that have legal as well as canonical weight.

It may not be out of place here to make some mention of the songs and prophecies which existed among the Indians before the coming of the Spaniards. Quetzalcoatl had predicted the coming of a strange race, and when the Spaniards landed the natives received them as the long expected messengers whose coming had been predicted to them. In Yucatan, long before the coming of the Spaniards, the poet Patzin-Yaxun-Chan had thus addressed the people: "O Itzalanos! hate your gods, forget them for they are finite, adore the God of truth, who is omnipotent, and the creator of all things." The high priest of Tixcacayon, Cauch, said: "There shall come the sign of a god who dwells on high, and the cross which illumined the world shall be made manifest; the worship of false gods shall cease. Your father comes, O Itzalanos! your brother comes, O Itzalanos! receive your bearded guests from the East, who come to bring the sign of God. God it is who comes to us, meek and holy."

Colonial Period.—(1) Conquerors and Conquered.—With the capture of Cuahutemotzin, 13 August, 1521, the Aztec empire came to an end, and with it Nahoa civilization, if such may be called the attainments of a nation which, although preserving in some of the branches of human knowledge remnants of an ancient culture, lacked nevertheless many of the essentials of civilization, practised human sacrifice, polygamy, and slavery, and kept up an incessant warfare with their neighbours for the avowed purpose of providing victims to be sacrificed in a fruitless endeavour to satiate the thirst for blood of their false gods. Most historians attribute the victories of the Spanish conquerors to the firearms they carried, the horses they rode, the horse being entirely unknown to the Indians, the steel armour they wore, and the help of the Indian allies. No doubt all these contributed in a measure, but not as much as is represented. Of the 500 or 600 men that composed the first expedition, only thirteen carried firearms, and these were heavy cumbersome pieces, hard to manage as were all the firearms of that time. The artillery train was primitive, and its capacity limited, and always accompanied the main column. The detachments which were sent out to subjugate or pacify the villages, and which had sharp encounters, could not hamper their movements in this way. The horsemen were but sixteen in all, and after their first astonishment, not unmixed with awe, the natives soon learned that they could be felled by a single blow. Except officers, few of the Spaniards wore armour, the majority had quilted cotton suits, and for arms the sword and buckler; the horsemen were armed with lances.

As to weapons, the Indians were quite as well provided as the Spaniards; thick wooden helmets covered with leather protected the head, and all carried the *chimalli*, a strong shield large enough to almost cover the entire breast. The allies no doubt helped, but in the stubbornly fought battles with the Tlaxcaltecs, the Spaniards won singlehanded; their Indian allies in the very heat of battle thinking more of pillage than of fighting, during the siege, when the Spanish cause seemed doomed, the allies forsook them. When later they returned they were such a hindrance on the narrow causeways, that in order to fight freely, the Spaniards were obliged to send them to the rear. The Spanish victories were due more to the mode of Indian warfare and in some cases, as in that of Otumba, to Cortés's indomitable courage and strategy. As has already been said, the Indians did not fight to conquer but to take their enemies prisoners, and the battles after the first assault became a series of confused hand-to-hand fights without order or harmony on the part of the Indians, whereas the Spaniards preserved their unity and fought under the direction of their leader. Valour was not wanting on either side, but the Indians yielded to the temptation of an easy flight, while the Spaniards fought with the courage of desperation; knowing well that the sacrificial stone was the fate that awaited the prisoner, with them it was to conquer or to die. Historians have been so carried away with the military exploits of Cortés that the men who fought with him, sharing all his dangers, have been overlooked. Greed for gold was not the sole dominant motive of their actions, as has been so persistently asserted; it was a strange mixture of indomitable courage, harshness, tireless energy, cupidity, licentiousness, Spanish loyalty, and religious spirit. Some of those who had fought most valiantly and who received their share of the spoils, judging their gains ill gotten, laid aside their worldly possessions acquired at such a high price, and embraced the religious life. Later they emerged from the cloister transformed into missionaries, full of zeal and bringing to the arduous task of evangelizing the Indians, the same valour, disregard of fatigue, and untiring energy they had previously displayed in the army of discovery and conquest.



Pre-Christian Cross of Palenque
Of Buddhistic origin according to Orozco y Berra

With the fall of the great Tenochtitlan, the first period may be said to close. This was followed by many expeditions of discovery and conquest, ending for the most part in the founding of colonies. Alvarado penetrated as far as Guatemala; Cristóbal de Olid reached Honduras, Montejo, father and son, accomplished the conquest of Yucatan; Cortés went as far as Lower California. Nuño de Guzmán, the conqueror of Michoaican (or Tarasco Kingdom) and the founder of the city of Guadalajara, whose career might have been so distinguished for glory, allowed his cruel, avaricious disposition to overrule all his actions. Fleeing from Mexico to avoid the storm that his evil deeds had brought upon him, he encountered Tango-

axan II, *alias* Caltzontzin, the King of Michoacan; he seized him, plundered his train, tortured and finally put him to death. Pursuing his way he left a trail of ashes and blood through the whole Tarasco Kingdom. The saintly Vasco de Quiroga, first Bishop of Michoacan, with difficulty effaced the traces of this bloody march. Nuño penetrated beyond Sinaloa, suppressing with an iron hand the discontent in his mixed troop. Retracing his steps, he founded the city of Guadalajara. At enmity with Cortés, unrecognized by the Audiencia and the viceroy, cursed by his victims, he returned to Mexico, to be seized, imprisoned, and transported to Spain, where he died in poverty and want. Nuño was succeeded by the mild, winning Cristóbal de Oñate. By the close of the sixteenth century the conquest from Guatemala to New Mexico had been practically accomplished.

In New Spain, no Sayri Tupac nor Tupac Amaru ever arose to attempt to overthrow the Spaniards, as in Peru. The Indians conquered by Cortés and the commanders who followed him remained submissive. There were occasional uprisings among the Northern Indians, but never serious enough to affect the peace of the colony in general. Neither had the Government to contend with any disloyalty among its own subjects; the Spaniards of New Spain never belied the proverbial Spanish loyalty. The king received from the hands of Cortés and those who continued his work a vast empire almost free of expense to the royal exchequer. All that was required seemed to be to take possession of the new territories added to the Crown; but the situation was not without its difficulties. For the conquest a military commander had been sufficient; the new empire would require a Government. In the methods employed to organize this new empire, Spain has frequently been charged with cruelty: that there was cruelty, and at times extreme cruelty, cannot be denied. The execution of Cuahutemotzin and the horrible death of Tangoaxan II will ever disgrace the memory of Cortés and Nuño de Guzmán. The slavery to which the Indians were reduced during the early years of the conquest, their distribution among the plantations, the contemptuous disregard of the conquerors for the lives of Indians, looking upon them at first as irrational beings, are blots which can hardly be effaced from the history of the Spanish conquest in America. But the impartial historian may well call attention to certain facts and thus enable the reader, viewing the question from every aspect, to form a correct historical opinion.

General view of the Pyramid of San Juan Teotihuacán known as "El Sol"

Neither the home Government nor the Spanish nation was ever an accomplice in these deeds of cruelty of the Spaniards in New Spain. Spain, it is true, rewarded the conquerors of Mexico just as nations to-day honour the victorious generals who have left in their wake devastated lands and battlefields strewn with the dead. These expeditions of conquest were the natural outcome of circumstances; they were carried out under royal command, and were no more piratical expeditions then than they would be now. Spain did not fail to demand a strict account from all who, after the submission of the people, exceeded the limits of their authority, and she used every measure within her reach, though not always successfully, to obtain fair treatment for the conquered Indians. Innumerable royal decrees and laws enjoining just and equitable treatment for the Indians, were issued to the viceroys and governors of America. Through the aid of the missionaries, the Spanish Government obtained from Paul III (17 June, 1537), the Bull which gave to the Indians equal rights with the white man, and proclaimed them capable of receiving the Christian faith and its sacraments, thus destroying the pernicious opinion that they were irrational beings. Severe laws were promulgated against those who should attempt to enslave the Indians, and the Government ordered that slaves should be brought from Africa (as was the custom of the period), rather than that Spanish subjects should become slaves.

With regard to *encomiendas* (a system of patents involving virtual enslavement of the Indians) no one who has read the life of Fray Bartolomé de las Casas can be ignorant of the earnest effort made by the Government to do away with them, but, as this was impossible, and as the attempt was creating disorder (see Motolinia), the Government tried by every means to alleviate the condition of the Indians, and to save them as much as possible from harsh treatment by their masters. If the excesses of some of the conquerors stand out in such bold relief, it is because of the unceasing protests of the many Spaniards who were not their partisans. The most vehement accusers of the Spaniards base their assertions on the writings of Spaniards themselves, particularly those of the fiery Las Casas, to whom the Government appears to have allowed free speech. The missionaries were equally vehement, often making unreasonable demands, and showing themselves more bitter towards their own countrymen than a stranger would have been. Even Philip II suffered in silence this torrent of complaint and abuse of his Government, and tolerated charges which, in similar circumstances, in the realm of the haughty Elizabeth would have been dearly paid by those complaining. A laudable sentiment of fairness and compassion towards the vanquished race inspired these writings, and their very nature and purpose precluded all mention of any deeds of kindness and humanity. The gruesome picture that has resulted from this makes it appear that in that army of conquerors and colonizers there was not a single one who was a Christian and a man. In their zeal for justice the Spaniards have really cast dishonour on their country, and this must ever redound to their glory.

(2) Evangelization and Conversion of the Indians.—In the ranks of the Spaniards there were several priests, but little could be done during the first stormy period. When the conquest had been effected, and order restored, the Franciscans were the first to offer themselves for the work. Three Flemish Franciscans, among them the famous lay brother Peter of Ghent (Pedro de Gante), kinsman of the Emperor Charles V, had preceded the first twelve Franciscans who formally took possession of the missions in 1524. Upon the arrival of the latter, they joined their ranks, and

the superior, Fray Martín de Valencia, appointed them to various places near the City of Mexico, where they began at once, as best they could, to teach and preach. At first, especially among the adults, little could be accomplished, as they did not know the language, so they turned their attention to the children. There their zeal was rewarded with more success, the children being more docile and less imbued with the effects of idolatrous worship. By degrees they gained ground, and before long adults were asking for baptism, the number increasing daily until within a few years the greater portion of the inhabitants of the newly conquered territory had received baptism. The apparition, in 1531, of Our Lady of Guadalupe to the Indian Juan Diego had a powerful effect, the increase in conversions being very noticeable after that time.

The fact that they had found the territory conquered, and the inhabitants pacified and submissive, had greatly aided the missionaries; they could, moreover, count on the support of the Government, and the new converts on its favour and protection. It must, however, be borne in mind that there was no coercion; the Indians did not see in baptism an ægis that would protect them from cruelty and persecution, otherwise they surely would have hastened to be baptized in those early years when the unsettled state of the government exposed them to greater oppression and outrage. The motive must be sought deeper. The Aztec religion, with its human sacrifices, draining constantly the life of the mass of the people, must surely have inclined them to a religion which freed them from such a yoke. Moreover, their religion, though recognizing the immortality of the soul, assigned future happiness, not according to the merits, but according to the worldly condition, of the individual, his profession, and the fortuitous manner of death. This contrasted strongly with the Christian dogma of the immortality of the soul and the power of all, however lowly, to acquire by their merits the right to possess it. Some have questioned whether or not the lives of the missionaries were a contributing influence in the conversion of the Indians. It is true that the ancient Aztec priests practised severe penances and austerities, but their harshness, haughtiness, and aloofness from the poor formed a sharp contrast with the conduct of the missionaries, who, on the contrary, sought, sheltered, taught, and defended them. The fact that the haughty conquerors, whom the Indians so much admired, showed the missionaries so much outward deference and respect, even kneeling at their feet, raised them at once to a higher level.

One of the most eminent Franciscans of this mission, Fr. Sahagún, charges the first missionaries with a lack of worldly sagacity (*prudencia serpentina*), and says that they did not see that the Indians were deceiving them, to all appearances embracing the Faith, yet holding in secret to their idolatrous practices. This accusation in a measure attacks the memory of these first holy missionaries, and it seems almost outside the range of possibilities that such a multitude could have been in accord to deceive them. The examples of virtuous lives led by several of the caciques (Indian chiefs), prominent personages, and by many of the poor plebeians, the sincere and upright manner in which they received and carried out the severe condition of abandoning their polygamous practices, bear witness to the fact that not all these conversions were feigned. Of course, it does not follow from this that every Indian without exception who embraced Christianity, did so in all sincerity. Doubtless there were not many among them who attained a perfect understanding of the new dogmas, but nearly all preferred the new religion because of the evident advantages it possessed over the ancient doctrines and worship. Their knowledge may not have extended to judging the fixed limits between what was allowed and what was forbidden, but this does not justify the statement that the conversion of the Indians was not sincere. The most notable apostasies occurred at the end of the sixteenth century, when Cosijopii, formerly King of Tehuantepec, was surprised, surrounded by his ancient courtiers and a great number of people, taking part in an idolatrous ceremony, and in the seventeenth century, when the priests of the Province of Oaxaca heard that great numbers of Indians congregated secretly at night to worship their idols. But this occurred when the influence of the missionaries over the Indians had greatly diminished, whether owing to the abandonment of some of the parishes, to disputes with the secular clergy, or because to some extent religious discipline had been relaxed.

In this connexion it may not be without interest to note the particular bias which the religion of the Indians

Aztec Calendar Stone
National Museum, City of Mexico

assumed in some respects. Thus, for example, the Christianity of the Indian is essentially sad and sombre. This has been attributed to the occasion on which Christianity was introduced among them, to racial traits, to the impression indelibly imprinted upon them by their ancient rites, and to the fact that the Indian sees in the crucifix the actual evidences of insult and abuse, of suffering and dejection. The crucifixes in the Indian churches are repulsive, and only in rare instances have the priests succeeded in improving or changing these images. Devotion to some particular saint, above all to the Apostle St. James, may also be noted. Their ancient polytheism had taught them that the favour of each god who possessed special prerogatives was to be sought, which explains the many and varied propitiatory sacrifices of their religion, and the new converts probably did not at first understand the relative position of the saints, nor the distinction between the adoration due to God and the reverence due to the saints. Hearing the Spaniards speak constantly of the Apostle St. James, they became convinced that he was some sort of divine protector of the conquerors, to be justly feared by their enemies, and that it was therefore necessary to gain his favour. Hence the great devotion that the Indians had for St. James, the numerous churches dedicated to him, and the statues of him in so many churches, mounted on a white horse, with drawn sword, in the act of charging.

A much debated question at that time was whether conquest should precede conversion, or whether the

efforts of the missionaries alone would suffice to subjugate and bring the Indians to a Christian and civilized mode of life. The former theory had been applied to the first nations, which the missionaries found conquered and pacified when they began their work among them. The question presented itself when expeditions against the Indians of the northern part of Mexico were being planned. The independent state of these tribes was a constant menace to the peace and progress of the colony in the south, and the rich mines known to exist there were also an inducement. The system adopted, which seems to have been enjoined by royal mandate, was to send armed expeditions, accompanied always by several missionaries, to take possession of the territory and to establish garrisons and forts to hold it. By this arrangement the cross and the sword went hand in hand, but the missionaries of

Aztec Sacrificial Stone
National Museum, City of Mexico

the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, especially the Jesuits, were not satisfied with this method, and attempted the conversion of these tribes without the aid of arms. They left the fortified headquarters occupied by the Spaniards to visit and convert other tribes, and often found among them the martyr's crown. The Tarahumares, Tepehuanes, Papigochic, and the tribes of Sonora and Sinaloa put many Jesuit missionaries to death, but each one who fell was quickly replaced by another, even the horrible spectacle of the bloody and mutilated remains of their companions lying unburied in the smoking ruins of the mission chapel did not daunt their courage. At times formidable rebellions broke out, as in New Mexico in 1680, when, in the general massacre, twenty-one Franciscans perished, and Christianity was all but exterminated.

Towards the middle of the eighteenth century the tribes of the Eastern Coast, inhabiting what is now Tamaulipas, Nuevo León, Coahuila, and Texas, were under the Franciscans; those of the West, the present limits of Durango, Chihuahua, Sinaloa, Sonora, and Lower California, were under the Jesuits. Lower California was acquired for the Spanish Government through the efforts of Father Salvatierra, and to him and the famous Father Kino is due the discovery that Lower California was a peninsula, and not an island, as had been supposed for a century and a half. When the Jesuits were expelled from all the Spanish colonies by Charles III, many of their missions were abandoned, others were taken in charge by the missionaries of the College of Our Lady of Guadalupe in Zacatecas. Towards the close of the eighteenth century the Franciscans, handicapped for so many years by disadvantages and dissensions, returned with renewed life and vigour to the work of the missions, and took charge of many of the deserted missions of California. They sent many worthy successors of the first Franciscans, among them the well-known Fray Junípero Serra, founder of the missions of Upper California.

(3) The Destruction of the Aztec Hieroglyphics.—The general opinion of the ordinary student of Mexican history, after reading the works of Prescott, Bancroft, Robertson, and others, is that the first missionaries and the first Bishop of Mexico, Juan de Zumárraga, were responsible for the destruction of the hieroglyphic annals of the Aztecs. Expressions such as the following, occur frequently: "Ignorance and fanaticism of the first missionaries"; "the Omar of the new continent". If we look carefully into the sources from which these opinions have been taken we shall see that these charges are entirely unfounded or, at least, greatly exaggerated. To make this point clear, we shall at the beginning set aside such writers as Prescott, H. H. Bancroft, Lucas Alamán, Humboldt, Cavo, Clavijero, Robertson, Gemelli, Siguenza, Herrera, and others, who, although learned men, from the very circumstances of having written at a time far removed from the era of the conquest and evangelization of Mexico, perhaps never having visited the country itself, have necessarily confined themselves to repeating tales which others have written before them. Setting aside these, there still remain thirteen writers, some of them contemporary with the conquest and others practically contemporaneous, who have seen the work of the missionaries and witnessed the events immediately following the conquest. Of these thirteen, six may still be eliminated as treating purely of the destruction of idols and *teocallis*, or temples, not having concerned themselves with manuscripts and hieroglyphics. These are Fray Martín de Valencia, Superior of the first Franciscans, Fray Pedro de Gante, Fray Toribio de Benavante, Fray Jerónimo de Mendieta, the letter of the bishops to the Emperor Charles V (1537), and his reply. Of the seven remaining authors five wrote at the end of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth, such as Sahagún (1550–80), Torquemada (his works were published in 1615), Durán (1519–80), Ixtlilxochitl (1600–15), and J. B. Pomar (1582). Two authorities of the time of the conquest are the codex called "Libro de Oro" (Golden Book), 1530–34, and the letter of Bishop Zumárraga to the General Chapter of Tolosa, written at the end of the year 1531.

Before treating each of these authorities separately it may be as well to establish some important facts. According to Sahagún, in the time of the native Mexican King Itzocoatl (1427–40) a number of paintings had been burnt to keep them from falling into the hands of the vulgar, who might have treated them with disrespect. This may be called the first destruction. Ixtlilxochitl (Fernando de Alba) asserts that when the Tlaxcaltecs entered Texcoco in company with Cortés (31 December, 1520) they "set fire to everything belonging to King Netzahualpilli, and thus burnt the royal archives of all New Spain" (second destruction). Mendieta says that at the time of the coming of the Spaniards many paintings were hidden and locked up, to save them from the ravages of war; the owners dying or moving away, these papers were

lost (third destruction). Hernán Cortés, in order to take the City of Mexico, had to demolish almost the whole of it, including the *teocallis;* many writings must have been destroyed then (fourth destruction).

All this was previous to the coming of the first missionaries. No evidence is to be found in any of the writers of the period that either the missionaries or Bishop Zumárraga burnt anything in Mexico, Texcoco, or Atzcapotzalco, that might even remotely be called a literary monument. On the contrary, Fray Jerónimo de Mendieta, one of the first Franciscans, in the prologue of the second volume of his "Historia Eclesiástica Indiana" states that far from the first friars destroying Indian manuscripts, their superior, Fray Martín de Valencia, and the president of the Second Audiencia, D. Sebastian Ramírez de Fuen Leal, commissioned Fray Andrés del Olmo, in 1533, to write a book on Indian antiquities. This he did having seen "all the pictures representing ancient rites and customs, owned by the caciques and other persons of importance in these provinces", and having received ready answers and explanations from all the oldest inhabitants whom he questioned. Moreover, in 1533 or 1534, the painting to which the name of Codex Zumárraga has been given was being studied and explained, notwithstanding the horror it must have inspired from being stained with human blood. As Bishop Zumárraga did not reach Mexico until 1528, he cannot be blamed or held responsible for what had happened previous to this. In the years 1529 and 1530 he had more than enough to do in opposing the excesses of the First Audiencia, and anyone who is familiar with the history of this period will know that he had other matters than the burning of manuscripts—to say nothing of entire archives, as some writers assert—to occupy him. At the close of the year 1531 he was recalled to Spain, and did not return until late in the year 1534. At this time no hieroglyphic records were destroyed, but, as we have already stated, they were being collected and interpreted. This being the case, let us now examine the texts which are quoted against the missionaries and Bishop Zumárraga.

Battles of Cortés in Mexico
After an Aztec drawing in the "Lienzo de Tlazcala"

J. B. Pomar, who, like Ixtlilxochitl, was a descendant of the kings of Texcoco, may be set aside at once. He states that in Texcoco the Indians themselves burnt the paintings that had earlier escaped the incendiarism of the Tlaxcaltecs, for fear Bishop Zumárraga might attribute to them idolatrous worship, because at that time D. Carlos Ometochtzin, son of Netzahualpilli, was accused of idolatry. It was not, therefore, a question of an act of Bishop Zumárrage, but of a fear, well or ill-founded, on the part of the Indians. The Texcocanos, seeing that their lord was indicted for idolatry, and fearing that the investigations might incriminate others, not altogether faultless, hastened to shield themselves by burning some paintings, the character of which is not known. They may in reality have been representations of idolatrous and superstitious rites, and not annals of historic value. As regards other authors who were almost contemporary with the conquest, it must be noted that within a few years they began investigations concerning Indian antiquities and naturally turned to the hieroglyphics that had been preserved, seeking explanations from the Indians who were most versed in deciphering these. But they had already lost in great part the knowledge of the meaning of these figures, which had been transmitted by tradition only. Ixtlilxochitl asserts that out of a gathering of the principal Indians of New Spain, who had a reputation for knowing their history, he found only two who had full knowledge and understanding of the paintings and signs. Urged by the interpreters to explain certain points which they did not understand, they felt great repugnance in confessing their ignorance, and in order to dissimulate it had recourse to the convenient alternative of laying the blame on the scarcity of pictures. Their desire to shield their ancestors for their failure to record some facts of importance induced them to exaggerate the part taken by Bishop Zumárraga and the missionaries.

Fray Durán, the cautious Fray Sahagún, and Ixtlilxochitl do not accuse Bishop Zumárraga, but attribute everything to the missionaries. Fray Torquemada blames the missionaries and Bishop Zumárraga, pointing to the archives of Atzcapotzalco as destroyed by him. This, however, appears utterly unlikely as no former writer ever mentioned the archives of Atzcapotzalco, and it is quite possible no such archives ever existed. Moreover, had there been any truth in this accusation, Ixtlilxochitl, who was in search of these proofs, would have related it in his works; as it is, he does not even mention it. Finally, it must be borne in mind that Torquemada only gathered together the writings of the early missionaries, and interwove his works with fragments of these writings. He could not find such a charge against Bishop Zumárraga because it was not there. As regards the first missionaries, we have already mentioned the value they placed upon the pictures and the use they made of the hieroglyphics. Two documents of the time of the Conquest may be cited in this connexion: the "Libro de Oro" (Golden Book) and the letter of Bishop Zumárraga to the Chapter of Tolosa. In the "Libro de Oro", which is the work of the first Franciscans, and which has been very badly edited, some phrases being almost unintelligible, we find the following words: "As we have destroyed and burnt the books and all that pertains to ceremonial or is suspect, and threatened them if they do not reveal them, now when we ask for books, if any have them they tell us they are burnt, and ask why we want them. There are books among them that are not prohibited, such as give the computation of the years, months, and days, and annals, although there is always something that is suspect. Besides, there are others which are prohibited, treating of idolatry and dreams." The only thing that can be

proved as certain from this document is that the missionaries burnt books of heathenish and idolatrous ceremonies; the distinction between these and books of annals being clearly drawn; the one prohibited, the other not. As the accusation is principally based on the burning of historical hieroglyphics, we see from this document that there is no foundation for it.

There remains the famous letter of Bishop Zumárraga to the Chapter of Tolosa, written in 1531. As there have been twenty-one editions of this celebrated letter, there are some variations; the quotation is given as it is found in the oldest edition, which says: "Baptizata sunt plusquam ducenta quinquaginta millia hominum, quingenta deorum templa sunt destructa, et plusquam vicesies mille figuræ dæmonum, quas adorabant, fractæ et combustæ." The accusation

IRRIGATION AQUEDUCT NEAR TEPOTZOTLAN
Built by Jesuits (XVII or XVIII Century)

turns on the words *figuræ dæmonum combustæ*, i. e., burnt. Critics say that the word *burnt* should be applied to books and Indian writings which the missionaries took for idols or objects of adoration. Sane criticism, however, induces us to the contrary belief, or at least to attribute less importance to this word *burnt*. From the "Libro de Oro", it is evident that the missionaries distinguished from the beginning between prohibited and non-prohibited books; they did not, therefore, take every hieroglyphic for an idol. No writer of that period, and there were many, ever said that the Indians adored the writings, nor did the missionaries believe such a thing, for they clearly distinguished between idols and writings. Fray Mendieta mentions certain idols of paper, but he does not call them writings. Dávila Padilla (1596) speaks of another very large idol of paper, filled with smaller idols, but he does not say that these were writings. Besides, there were idols of wood that could be burned, the stone ones could be covered with clothing and so burned, and in the chronicles of the time mention is continually made of the burning of idols. When these were made of stone they were cast into the flames first, as a mark of indignity, and then broken up. This, in all probability, is the meaning of the words in Bishop Zumárraga's letter.

Briefly, then, the preceding facts show: (a) That before the coming of the first missionaries many hieroglyphic paintings had been destroyed. (b) That the missionaries who came in 1524, and who wrote histories, speak of idols and temples destroyed, but say nothing of writings being burnt, and as early as 1530 they began to distinguish between prohibited and non-prohibited paintings; in 1533, by order of the superior, they collected these writings to compile a history of the Indians. (c) That the charge of having destroyed the historical hieroglyphics of the Indians, practically null in the beginning, has grown in proportion as the writers are farther removed from the time of the conquest. (d) That, even granting that there ever was such a destruction, it could not have been so great, for from 1568 to 1580 the viceroy D. Martín Enríquez ordered that the paintings of the Indians be brought together in order to rewrite their history, and many were brought from Tula, Texcoco, and Mexico, and in the eighteenth century the celebrated writer and collector Boturini found many more.

(4) Public Instruction During the Earliest Colonial Period.—When the first band of twelve Franciscans arrived at Tlaxcala in 1524 they found there Father Tecto, who had come two years before. Seeing that he and his companions had not made much progress in the conversion of the natives, Fray Martín de Valencia asked the reason, and what they had been doing in the time they had been in the colony: "Learning a theology unknown to St. Augustine (namely), the language of these Indians", replied Father Tecto. Once established, the missionaries devoted themselves to building churches and convents to which a school was always attached. In the large court of the convent catechism was taught early in the morning to the adults and to the children of the *macehuales* (workmen), in order that they might then go to their work. The school was reserved for the children of the nobles and persons of prominence. As the Indians did not at first realize the importance of this instruction, the schools were not well attended, and the missionaries had to ask the aid of the civil authorities to compel parents to send their children to be instructed. Many of the nobles, not wishing to entrust their children to the new apostles, but not daring to disobey, sent as substitutes the children of some former dependent, passing them off as their own, but soon seeing the advantages of the education imparted by the friars sent their own children, insisting on their being admitted to the schools. Some of these schools were so large that they accommodated from 800 to 1000 children. The older and more advanced pupils taught the labourers, who came in large numbers in their free hours to be instructed.

At first, when the missionaries were not fully conversant with the language, they taught by means of pictures, and the Indians, accustomed to their own hieroglyphic figures, understood readily. In making copies the Indians inserted Aztec words written in European characters, originating a curious mixed writing of which some examples are still preserved. As soon as the missionaries mastered the language they turned their attention more especially to the children of the nobles, since the children of the working class did not need so thorough an education. According to the custom of the times, they would not be called to rule, and the sooner their course of instruction was completed the sooner they would be free to help their parents. The same reasons did not hold for the girls, and no distinction was made among them, all being taught together, at first in the *patios* and later in the homes built for them. Bishop Zumárraga founded eight or nine schools for girls in his diocese, and at his urgent solicitation, in 1530, the empress sent

six women teachers, and in 1534 he himself brought six more. Later on, the viceroy, D. Antonio de Mendoza, founded an asylum for half-caste girls, which at first was hampered by lack of funds, but the king endowed it and directed that all those who wished to marry the girls should be provided with employment.

When the missionaries landed, in 1524, they did not find a single Indian who could read; nothing had been done in this direction for them by the army of conquest. Twenty years later, 1544, Bishop Zumárraga wanted to have the catechism of Fray Pedro de Córdoba translated into the Indian tongue, which was finally done, as he believed so much good would result from it, "for", as he said, "there are so many who know how to read". Contemporary writers bear witness to the rapid progress of the Indians in writing, music, and even in Latin. The one who distinguished himself most in teaching the Indians was the lay brother Pedro de Gante, kinsman of the Emperor Charles V. He gathered together about a thousand children in the convent of San Francisco of Mexico and taught them, besides their religion, music, singing, and Latin. He also started a school for adults and founded a school of fine arts and crafts. With no resources but his indomitable energy, born of his ardent charity, he raised from the foundations and sustained for many years, a magnificent church, a hospital, and a great establishment which was at one and the same time a primary school, a college for higher studies, and an academy of fine arts and crafts—in short, a centre of civilization. The missionaries spared nothing to unite secular learning with religious instruction, and, having in mind the fondness of the Indians for the frequent solemnities of their bloody worship, introduced religious dramas. Ancient chronicles have preserved excellent accounts of the skill displayed by the Indians acting these dramas.

Our Lady of Guadalupe, Aguas Calientes
Showing wall-belfry and double dome

Bishop Zumárraga, who aspired always to higher things for the Indian, managed to open for them the famous college of Santa Cruz, at Tlaltelolco, on 6 January, 1534. This foundation began with sixty students, the number rapidly increasing. Besides religion and good habits, they were taught reading, writing, Latin grammar, rhetoric, philosophy, music, and Mexican medicine. The college of Tlaltelolco sent forth native governors and mayors for the Indian towns, teachers for the Indians, and at times for the young Spaniards and creoles. Some of them were a great help to the missionaries in their philological work. In 1553 there were in Mexico three principal colleges: the one at Tlaltelolco for the Indians, San Juan de Letrán for the mestizos, both under the care of the Franciscans, and another for the Spaniards and creoles who did not wish to mingle with the others. This last was under teachers with bachelor degrees from Spain, until the Augustinians founded their great college of San Pablo, 1575. They were the first to establish a school to be frequented by both creoles and Spaniards. Shortly afterwards the Jesuits founded the college of San Ildefonso in Mexico with the same idea in view. For all higher studies, however, students had to go to the universities of Spain, as the Mexican schools afforded no facilities for taking university courses. To remedy this the colonial authorities determined to establish a local university.

University of Mexico.—The viceroy, D. Antonio de Mendoza (1535–50), to whom New Spain owed so much for his interest in public instruction, petitioned the Emperor Charles V for the establishment of a university suitably endowed. The petition, supported by the city, the prelates, and the religious orders, was favourably received, and although the project was not carried out until after D. Antonio de Mendoza had resigned the governorship of New Spain, in 1550, to assume that of Peru, the credit of having begun the work is due to him. The university was founded during the term of his successor, D. Luis de Velasco (1550–64). The decree of foundation signed by the prince who later reigned as Philip II, was issued by the emperor at Toro on 21 August, 1551, and the university was opened 3 June, 1553. A yearly endowment of one thousand dollars in gold from the mines was conferred upon it, and all the faculties and privileges of the University of Salamanca. The first chairs founded, with their respective professors, were as follows: Theology, Fray Pedro de la Peña, Dominican, afterwards Bishop of Quito, whose successor in the Faculty was the learned Juan Negrete, professor of the University of Paris: Sacred Scripture, Fray Alonso de la Veracruz; Canon Law, Dr. Morones, fiscal of the Audiencia; Civil Law, Dr. Melgarejo; Institutes and Law, Licentiate Frias de Albornoz; Arts, Canon Juan García; Rhetoric, Dr. Cervantes Salazar; Grammar, Blas de Bustamante. Some years later the chairs of medicine and of the Otomic and Mexican languages were added. At first there was only one chair of medicine, but towards the close of the sixteenth century the division known as *prima* and *vísperas* was introduced, the former including anatomy and physiology, the latter, pathology and therapeutics.

The title of Royal and Pontifical was conferred on the new university and all the doctors then in Mexico, including Archbishop Montúfar, were attached to it. The professorships were divided into temporary and perpetual; the first were for four years and were competitive, the second were affected only by the death or resignation of the incumbent. When a chair was won by competiton the recipient paid the fees or dues, swore to fulfil his duties well, and promised to take no part in balls, theatres, or public demonstrations. According to the instructions left by the Duque de Linares to his successor the Marqués de Valero, the award of professorships was voted on by the senior auditor representing the Audiencia, the dean as representative of the Church, an official of the Inquisition, the dean and the rector of the university, the *magister scholarum* and the archbishop, who presided and in whose house the voting took place. So much stress was laid upon the study of the Indian language that in the private instructions which the Marqués de las Amarillas brought from Madrid he was directed to consider the

advisability of adding to the statutes of the university a clause to the effect that the degree of theology should not be conferred on those who did not know the Mexican language, and fixing a special hour for its study by the students of philosophy, either before or while they were studying classics.

In the famous instruction which the second Conde de Revillagigedo left to his successor the Marqués de Branciforte, we find that by a royal decree of 11 June, 1792, all members of the university were obliged to obtain the viceroy's permission to marry. The viceroy, who was the vice-patron of the university, was to appoint the rector in case the election did not give a decisive plurality to any candidate. Towards the end of the eighteenth century a course of botany was introduced. The viceroy, Conde de Revillagigedo, declared that reforms were needed in the methods of study and in the manner of conferring degrees, that little attention was given to the classics, that there was no apparatus for the study of modern experimental physics, and that there were few modern works in the library. We know, however, that D. Manuel Ignacio Beye de Cisneros, who was rector in 1760, built the library and drew up regulations for it, which were confirmed by the king in 1761. It contained more than 10,000 volumes, many of them rare and valuable, especially regarding the history of Mexico, and it was open to the public morning and afternoon, two librarians with the degree of doctor being in charge.

Jesuit Church, Tepotzotlan
(XVII or XVIII Century)

At first the university was governed by provisional statutes drawn up by the viceroy and the Audiencia, modifying those of Salamanca as the circumstances of the country required. The Auditor Farfan amended these in 1580, and in 1583 still further revision was made by Archbishop Moya de Contreras. In 1645, D. Juan de Palafox, who was appointed visitor, compiled new statutes which, when approved by the king, were to supersede all previous enactments. Nevertheless, in the instructions left by the viceroy D. Antonio Sebastian de Toledo, Marqués de Mancera, to his successor, D. Pedro Nuño de Colón, Duque de Veragua, 22 Oct., 1673, we find the following: "The royal University of Mexico, though richly endowed with brilliant and learned professors in all the branches, was greatly hampered by the multiplicity of statutes by which it was governed. I was informed that the viceroy D. Juan de Palafox had overcome this difficulty by compiling new statutes, and that these were being withheld by some malicious person interested in continuing the disorder. I took the necessary means to have these traced and brought to light, together with the royal decrẽe of 1 May, 1649, confirming them. These were laid before the university, 26 Sept., 1668, were accepted without any difficulty, and since then have been observed with signal benefit to the schools, securing the approbation of his majesty (decree of 17 Jan., 1671), and affording relief to the viceroys who were frequently confronted by doubts and disputes which it was difficult to settle."

The university continued its work until 1833, when it was closed by President Gómez Farias. President Santa Anna re-established it in 1834, with some modifications of the statutes; but during the following years it began gradually to deteriorate, owing chiefly to the instability of its laws, and to the fact that public sentiment was against it. President Comonfort suppressed it in 1857. Zuloaga reopened it on 5 May, 1858, but it was once more closed on 23 Jan., 1861, by Juárez. During the regency of 1863 it revived for a time until the Emperor Maximilian suppressed it definitively on 30 November, 1865.

(5) The Royal Patronage and the Clergy.—It is not possible to proceed very far in the history of New Spain, whether civil or ecclesiastical, without taking into account what has been called the royal patronage of the Spanish monarchs. In fact it is hardly possible to conceive a more absolute system of control than that exercised by the kings of Spain, whether in person or through the Council of the Indies and the viceroys and governors in all the ecclesiastical affairs of the Indies. A detailed account of these privileges, which were general throughout all Spanish America, will be given with examples of the practical application of the *patronato* theory in the colony of New Spain. By the provisions of the Bull of 4 July, 1508, "Universalis Ecclesiæ regimini", no churches, monasteries, or religious foundations could be erected, in territory already discovered or that should be subsequently discovered, without the consent of the Spanish monarch. It conferred also on the Spanish monarch the power of nominating suitable candidates for the metropolitan and other sees, and any that might be erected in the future. Bishops were obliged to confer canonical institution to ecclesiastical benefices ten days after the royal notification had been made, and in case opposition were offered without legitimate cause any other bishop chosen by the candidate could and should confer such canonical institution. The Bull also conferred the right to present candidates for all the abbacies and prelacies of the regulars and, indeed for every ecclesiastical benefice, large or small.

Besides these privileges the king also had the right of designating the boundaries of all new dioceses, of sending religious to the Indies, of determining their stay there and their removal from one province to another. Religious establishments were under the supervision of the Council of the Indies, and, in order that this might be exercised with all possible thoroughness, the office of commissioner general, for which Father Mendieta worked so earnestly, was established. The provincial or custodian of the regulars was named by their general, but he had to notify the commissioner general of Spain, who communicated with the Council of the Indies, and without its permission the nomination was suspended. All decrees suppressing prov-

inces or creating new ones, founding of new convents, sending visitors general or provincials, journeys of the religious, naming of presidents for chapters, any instructions given by the superiors not directly connected with the ordinary government of the order, as well as the patents which revoked any concessions previously granted, had to be presented to the Council of the Indies. All Bulls and Briefs from Rome, instructions from generals and other religious superiors, had to go through the Council of the Indies, and without its seal no use could be made of them. The records of provincial councils and synods in the colonies, their constitutions and decrees, and those of the chapters and assemblies of the regulars, could not be published until revised and examined by the Council. The Briefs of the Congregation of the Propaganda appointing missionaries for the Indies carried no weight whatever if unaccompanied by permission from the king or the Council of the Indies.

In order to form a new mission, province, or seminary for missionaries it was necessary to go through all these proceedings. The province or house soliciting this permission appointed a commissioner who personally or through his superiors made his request to the viceroy or governor, to the Audiencia of the place, and to the bishop, all of whom were obliged to submit their respective reports. The commissioner, supplied with the necessary permits of the viceroy or governor and of his superiors, sailed for Spain, and at the Court the matter was laid before the commissioner general of the Indies. When all this was done, and not before, the petition could be presented to the Supreme Council of the Indies, together with the documents which certified to the necessity for the new foundation. The permission having been obtained, the Council named the provinces from which the religious should be drawn, and if the Council failed to do so the commissioner general did it, sometimes leaving it to the choice of the aforesaid religious commissioner. The selection having been made and the new missionaries gathered together, he could now embark with all the necessary authorization of superiors and council, and go to his destination, whence he was obliged to report to the authorities who had given him permission to go to Spain. If a religious wished to leave the Indies and return to Spain, the permission of the father general, the commissioner general, or of the pope himself (royal decree of 29 July, 1564) did not suffice, it was necessary to obtain the consent of the king or the Council of the Indies. Sometimes the permission of the bishops of the province was sufficient, the viceroy, president, or governor having been first consulted; they were obliged to report to the council the reasons for giving the permission.

When the chapters of the religious orders were held in places where the viceroys or governors did not reside, the latter had to write to the assembled religious admonishing them to the strict observance of their rule and constitution; and if the chapter met where the viceroy or governor lived, he was obliged to be present, and in case he noted disorders, relaxation, monopolies, and partnerships indicative of simony and abuse, and fraternal correction proved insufficient to restore order, the culpable ones were sent to Spain. Any visitor, provincial, prior, guardian, or prelate who might be named or elected in the Indies, was obliged before exercising his office to notify the viceroy, president, Audiencia, or governor then in supreme power in the province, showing his letters of nomination and election, in order to obtain the protection and help necessary for the exercise of the duties of his office in the province (royal decree, 1 June, 1654). In the same decree it was ordered that "the provincials of all orders residing in the Indies shall each and every one have always ready a list of the monasteries and houses under their control and the control of their subjects in the province, also all the religious, giving each one's name, age, qualifications, the office or ministry each one exercises; and this shall be given each year to our viceroy, Audiencia, or governor, or to the person who exercises the supreme government of the province, adding or subtracting the names of the religious who have been added to the communities or who have left. The provincials of the orders, each and every one, shall make a list of the religious who are engaged in the work of teaching catechism to the Indians, administering the sacraments, and acting as parish priests where the principal monasteries are situated, and this shall be given each year to our viceroy, Audiencia, or governor, who will give it to the bishop, so that he may know what persons are engaged in administering the sacraments and doing the work of parish priests . . . . ."

Our Lady of Guadalupe, Ciudad Juárez
Style of Franciscan mission building

From this and much more that might be added if space permitted it may be seen that the civil power had almost absolute control in the religious affairs of the colonies, including those of New Spain. Some of these privileges had been usurped by the kings, and others had been granted by the Holy See. To have a proper understanding of the reason of these concessions, which now seem to us excessive, we must bear in mind all that the Spanish kings did for the cause of religion in America. They erected and endowed nearly all the churches in the New World, defrayed the travelling expenses of the religious and bishops until they reached their posts; they had assigned different amounts, by way of alms, to churches of religious orders, in order that these might be supplied with oil, lights, wine, altar breads, and other requisites for Divine worship. The building of new churches and cathedrals, the foundation of missions, depended largely on the royal bounty. When some church, especially in the Indian towns, needed repairing, the citizens could easily, on application, be freed from the tribute which was paid to the king, in order to devote the money to the needs of the church. Although the Bull of Alexander VI conferred the tithes of all the Indies on the king on condition that he should endow the churches and provide an adequate maintenance for their ministers, the kings nevertheless rarely availed themselves

of the grant, but donated to the bishops, dioceses, clergy, churches, and hospitals in the Indies a great part of what was due them from this source.

In so far as the royal patronage in New Spain is concerned, it must be admitted, in deference to the truth, that if in some instances royal decisions were oppressive and little in accordance with the liberty of the Church; the royal supervision in many other respects was beneficial. In illustration of the first may be cited the case of the bishop who, without reflecting that he had not the authorization of the Council of the Indies, and that he ought to advise the viceroy, solemnly promulgated the decree which Clement X issued when he ascended the pontifical throne, granting a general jubilee to all the faithful who should pray to the Divine Majesty that he might be granted the

Church of San Juan de los Llanos, Jalisco, Mexico

light to govern wisely the universal Church. For this the bishop was reproved by the royal decree of 10 June, 1652. As regards the second, it must be admitted that, in the beginning at least, the Spanish monarch made wise selection of the men appointed to the episcopal sees of Mexico. It suffices to mention such men as Fray Julian Garces, first Bishop of Tlaxcala, Fray Juan de Zumárraga, first Bishop of Mexico, D. Vasco de Quiroga, first Bishop of Michoacan; in general, with few exceptions, the bishops of New Spain were scholarly men, zealous for the salvation of souls. Notwithstanding the many formalities attending the establishment of religious houses in Mexico, there were very many, both men and women, belonging to the contemplative and active orders who succeeded in securing the necessary authorization. Among the religious orders of men established in Mexico during the Spanish occupation may be mentioned the Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinians, Carmelites, Brothers of St. James (*Dieguinos*), Jesuits, Mercedarians, Bethlehemites, Benedictines, Oratorians, and Brothers of St. John of God; among the women, the Poor Clares, Capuchines, Carmelites, Conceptionists, Cistercians, Augustinians, Dominicans. In another section of this article an account will be given of all the dioceses erected during the colonial period. If, also, account is taken of the almost innumerable hospitals, churches, convents, and monasteries that were built in New Spain, it will be seen that the kings, instead of using their royal prerogatives to hinder these foundations, did all in their power to spread and encourage them.

The much vexed question of alternate rule, which caused much dissension in the religious orders, moved Pope Innocent XI to decree that in the provinces of such religious in America as had Europeans and creoles in the communities, the prelacies should be conferred alternately, some years on the one and some on the others. When the king heard that the papal order was not being carried out in Mexico, he required the viceroy, D. Antonio Sebastian de Toledo, Marqués de Mancera, by official decree of 28 November, 1667, to investigate the matter thoroughly, and to have the orders of the Holy Father carried out. Although at first owing to the scarcity of secular priests, the kings permitted religious to hold parishes, later, learning that it was the cause of relaxed discipline among them, of exemption from episcopal visitation, and sometimes of unfairness and abuse of the Indians, they did everything within their power to have these religious replaced by secular priests. As to the intervention of the viceroys in the chapters of the religious orders, it is known that the part taken by the Conde de Revillagigedo, viceroy from 1746–55, in the chapter of the Carmelites, to settle the question of admitting a visitor, was most beneficial, as well as other regulations among the Franciscans, Augustinians, and Brothers of St. John of God. In the instructions given by Ferdinand VI, in 1755, to D. Agustín de Ahumada y Villalón, Marqués de las Amarillas, who was leaving for his post as Viceroy of New Spain, the following is found: "See that the bishops, the secular and religious clergy, receive all the support they need from the civil courts, to uproot idolatry; that those having Indians, negroes, or mulattoes in their homes as servants send them daily to the Christian doctrine classes, and that those working in the fields be given the same opportunity on Sunday and other days of precept, not occupying them in other things until they have learned the catechism; and if they do not comply they shall be fined. All priests who are to work among the Indians should know their languages, and it is necessary that they should study these languages. The condition of the Indians in all New Spain should be investigated to see if they are oppressed by those whose duty it is to teach them, and in case such conditions are found to exist, they are to be reported to the bishop, and with his help measures must be taken to eradicate the evil."

(6) The Inquisition in New Spain.—For some writers the Spanish Inquisition in Mexico has always been a particularly alarming subject, the exaggerated accounts of its atrocities and the number of its victims verging on the ridiculous. It has even been said that if the Spaniards abolished the human sacrifices of the ancient Aztec régime, they more than replaced them with the bonfires of the Inquisition. Fray Martín de Valencia, when he arrived in Mexico in 1524, bore the title of Commissioner General of the Inquisition in New Spain, but judgment of offences of a grave nature was reserved to the Inquisitor of the Islas y Tierra Firme, who resided in the Island of San Domingo. Fray Martín was to hold this office until some Dominican on whom the official charge of inquisitor had been conferred should arrive in Mexico. And in fact, when the first Dominicans reached Mexico in 1526, their superior, Fray Tomás Ortiz, became commissioner of the Inquisition. He returned almost immediately to Spain, and Fray Domingo de Betanzos succeeded him. In 1528 the new superior of the Dominicans, Fray Vicente de Santa María, succeeded to the title. At the time of the second Audiencia, of which the eminent D. Sebastian de Fuen Leal was president, a meeting was held, attended by Bishop Zumárraga, Cortés, and several of the most influential men of the

capital, at which it was decided "that on account of the intercourse with foreigners, and because the many privateers that cruised along the coasts might introduce evil customs and habits among the natives and the Spaniards, who by the grace of God had been preserved from the taint of heresy, it was necessary to establish the Holy Office of the Inquisition".

It was no doubt in consequence of this resolution that on 27 June, 1535, Bishop Zumárraga was appointed inquisitor, with ample faculties, including that of turning over the offender to the secular arm and of establishing the Holy Office. He did not establish the tribunal, but it is known that he tried and condemned to be burnt a Texcocan noble accused of having sacrificed human beings. After this it was forbidden by the royal decree of Charles V, of 15 October, 1538, to try cases against the Indians before the Holy Office, and that in matters of faith the bishop should be their judge. Since then there is no record of a single Indian having been tried before the tribunal of the Inquisition. In 1554, Archbishop Montúfar, a Dominican and qualificator of the Inquisition in Granada, though not bearing the title of inquisitor, proceeded as though thus empowered, no doubt because of the ordinary jurisdiction possessed by the bishop in matters of faith, and passed the *autos* of 1555 and 1558. Cardinal Diego de Espinosa, Bishop of Sigüenza, and Grand Inquisitor of Spain, appointed as inquisitor for Mexico D. Pedro Moya de Contreras, also two lawyers, Juan Cervantes and Alonso Fernández de Bonilla. Their jurisdiction extended over all of New Spain, Guatemala, and the Philippines. The royal decree of 16 August, 1570, commanded that the City of Mexico was to aid and respect the inquisitors, and on 2 November, 1571, the tribunal was established with all due solemnity. It exercised its authority in Mexico until 8 June, 1813, when the decree of the Spanish Cortes suppressing it was published. On 21 January, 1814, it was re-established, and in 1820 definitively abolished.

In New Spain the Tribunal of the Inquisition was composed of three Apostolic inquisitors and a treasurer, each with a salary of three thousand pesos, paid three times a year in advance by the canonries of the cathedrals of their respective districts. There was also a head constable, a trustee, treasurer, three secretaries, several consultors, qualificators, and lay officials. The tribunal had authority to pass general and particular *autos de fe*. What the viceroys of Mexico thought of this tribunal may be gathered from the many instructions which by order of the king each viceroy had to leave for his successor in the government of the colony. And it may be noted that these instructions, coming from men who were laying down the reins of government, speak with perfect freedom, not hesitating to censure what was considered worthy of censure. From these instructions it is evident that the authority of the tribunal was not as absolute as is generally supposed. The Marqués de Mancera, in the instructions left 22 Oct., 1673, for his successor the Duque de Veragua, after saying that the Tribunal of the Inquisition "has been and is feared and respected with all due reverence in these provinces, knowing full well that, owing to its uprightness and vigilance, they find themselves by the grace of God free from the errors and abominations which at different times the common enemy has sought to sow in their midst", adds, "but, as its jurisdiction is so absolute, the tribunal does not always keep as it should within its proper limits, nor do the viceroys, governors, or Audiencias take it upon themselves to hold it within bounds, except in cases of the most urgent necessity; nevertheless, when the excesses are notably prejudicial to the respect due the royal representation, to its jurisdiction, or its exchequer, or when the delay causes irreparable damage, there is special authority for applying a suitable remedy, and I made use of this faculty at the close of the year 1666", etc. The Duque de Linares says in his instruction to the Marqués de Valero, in 1716, speaking of the inquisitors of his time: "Of the inquisitors I should inform Your Excellency that I am indebted to them not only for a just respect, esteem, and appreciation for my official character, but their mildness and prudence have been such that when the apparent zeal of some of the ministers has attempted to enkindle some sparks, I have been able to extinguish them owing to the consultations and the mutual confidence which have always existed between us".

For the sake of clearness, the persons condemned by the Inquisition may be placed under three heads: *relajados* (delivered to the secular arm for execution of sentence) in person or effigy, *reconciliados* (reconciled), and *penitentes* (penitents). The *relajados* in

Cathedral of Chihuahua
Begun 1711; completed 1789

person were burnt, either alive or first garroted. On the way to the place of execution they were clothed in the *samarra*, a sort of scapular of cloth or cotton, yellow or red, upon which dragons, demons, and flames were painted, among which could be seen the picture of the criminal. The head was covered with a species of mitre called *coroza*, covered with the same devices. The *relajados* in effigy were those who, having escaped or died, were burned in effigy, sometimes together with their bones and bodies. This was done with those who died or who committed suicide during the process. It sometimes happened that a criminal attempted to commit suicide; if before dying he begged pardon and retracted his errors, he was reconciled in effigy. Such was the case of the French physician, Etienne Morel, whose *auto de fe* was carried out 9 August, 1795. The *reconciliados* were those who, recognizing their offences and errors, retracted and asked pardon. They were not condemned to death, but were obliged to submit to various punishments. One was, to wear the *San Benito*, called *fuego revolto* or *revuelto*, a garment similar to that worn by the *relajados*, with a corresponding *coroza*, only that in this the flames pointed downwards to show that by their repentance they had escaped the capital punishment. Other forms of punishment were inflicted according to the gravity of the offence—exile, the galleys, whipping, imprisonment, certain

prayers and psalms to be recited on certain days of the year, carrying green candles, confiscation of property, etc.

The ordinary penitents were those whose faults did not merit the death sentence. They wore the plain San Benito, that is, similar in form to the other, but decorated with the cross of St. Andrew, and they wore no *coroza*. Various punishments were imposed on them, always less than those of the *reconciliados*, and at times almost grotesque, e. g., the case of the criminal condemned on 7 December, 1664, of whom it is recorded, "The sentence having been read, he was taken out into the court of the convent, placed on a scaffold, and stripped to the waist. Indians then smeared him with honey, feathered him, and left him in the sun for four hours." From the list made by D. José Pichardo of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri, who copied every tablet in the transept of Mexico cathedral, we see that the crimes usually condemned by the Inquisition were heresy and Judaism. Many were condemned for blasphemy, bigamy, perjury, forgery, and witchcraft, as idolators, Illuminati, Freemasons, and apostates; for having heard confessions and said Mass without Holy orders, for having, with intent to deceive, received Holy orders before attaining the prescribed canonical age, for rebaptizing, abetting polygamy, and feigning revelations (*autos de fe* 21 June, 1789 and 8 August, 1795).

A résumé of the *autos de fe* from the figures of Fr. Pichardo, supplemented by others, gives the following result:—

	RECONCILED	RELAJADOS IN PERSON	RELAJADOS IN EFFIGY
Auto of Fray Martín de Valencia	2	1	0
Fray Juan de Zumárraga	2	1	0
Fray Alonso de Montúfar (1555–62)	12	0	0
The Inquisition (1574–1803)	774	49	109
Total	790	51	109

The list published by J. García Icazbalceta, including only the *autos* providing for capital punishment, is somewhat different:—

	RELAJADOS IN PERSON	RELAJADOS IN EFFIGY
Fray Martín de Valencia	1	0
Fray Juan de Zumárraga	1	0
Inquisition Auto of 1574	5	0
" " " 1596	8	10
" " " 1601	3	16
" " " 1635	0	5
" " " 1649	13	65
" " " 1659	7	1
" " " 1678	1	0
" " " 1688	0	1
" " " 1699	1	0
" " " 1715	1	0
" " " 1795	0	1
Total in 277 years	41	99

This number can be increased, as the *autos* from 1703 to 1728 (except 1715) are not included, although during this period cases were rarely turned over to the secular arm. And even allowing for this it is evident that the number of victims commonly attributed to the Inquisition of New Spain is greatly exaggerated.

From this it may be seen how erroneous it is to denounce the Inquisition as one of the greatest blots of the Spanish domination in Mexico. The Inquisition existed in Spain, and it was natural that it should be established in the new colonies. As the Indians were exempt from its jurisdiction, the full measure of its severity fell upon the Spaniards and heretics, pirates or otherwise, of other nations who infested the coasts of New Spain. In fact, in the *autos de fe* the greater number of the condemned were Portuguese, for Judaizing, and then, in order, Englishmen, Frenchmen, Germans, Spaniards, Mexican creoles, and Swedes. To say that the victims of the Inquisition in New Spain exceeded the number sacrificed by the Aztecs is a gross perversion of the facts. The Aztecs sacrificed thousands of victims in one festival alone; the Inquisition, covering a period of three hundred years, and extending its jurisdiction far beyond the confines of the Aztec empire, barely reached fifty victims. The Inquisition pardoned readily, and those who recognized their errors and repented it easily reconciled. When it found or thought it found (for this tribunal like every other human tribunal made its mistakes) a criminal, he was turned over to the secular courts of justice, which passed and executed the sentence. In fact the Inquisition did no more nor less than the jury of to-day. It is true that it made use of the torture, but this was a practice common to all tribunals of that time. It also made use of the secret process—a method not unlikely to be productive of error—but it was easy to set aside the punishment or at least to mitigate it by repenting if one were guilty, or by frankly professing the Catholic Faith if one were not.

Nor can the Inquisition be blamed for judging heresy a crime punishable by death; it was so held by all the civil courts of the times, and not without reason, because the heretics of those days were the initiators of rebellion in Catholic countries. At that time in England to be a Catholic was a crime punishable by death (see PENAL LAWS). Judged impartially, the Inquisition in New Spain appears as a tribunal which shares, it is true, the defects of contemporary methods, subject to mistakes like all other human institutions, more merciful than any other court under similar circumstances, above all if the relatively small number of death sentences and the large number of reconciled be taken into consideration, as well as the glory of having accomplished at the cost of a small number of lives, what the nations of Europe could not achieve even through the medium of long, bloody, fratricidal wars, the unity of religion and the preservation of the faith. As regards the *auto de fe* of 27 November, 1815, which condemned D. José María Morelos, the principal leader of the war of independence, see MORELOS.

(7) The Spanish Government and the Colony.—Mexico having been conquered, Cortés, in virtue of the famous election of Vera Cruz and through force of circumstances, became the ruler. When, however, Charles V realized the importance of the conquest, without deposing Cortés, he began sending over other officials who, it may be said, were not very wisely chosen. Cortés, though outwardly complying, did not receive them well, doubtless because he foresaw that they would be a disturbing element in the recently conquered territories. When, however, he started on his famous expedition of the Hibueras, he showed equally little tact in selecting the men he left to fill his place. In the selection of the first Audiencia (1528–31), composed of Nuño de Guzmán, Juan Ortiz Matienzo, and Diego Degadillo, the emperor was even more tactless. The excesses and injustices of these judges were innumerable, and the entire colony suffered. Everything changed under the government of the second Audiencia (1531–35), composed of Bishop Sebastian Ramírez de Fuen Leal, D. Vasco de Quiroga, D. Francisco Ceinos, and D. Juan Salmerón. Beginning the work of reconstruction with zeal and perfect integrity, they met at the very outset with an obstacle that greatly hampered them. The ancient legislation destroyed by the conquest had not been replaced by any other, while the Spanish code was entirely inadequate for the new dominions. To meet this situation, Spanish kings began formulating and

sending over a multitude of royal decrees, applicable sometimes to only one province or relating to some particular question, frequently conflicting and contradictory because the sovereigns were working in the dark, deciding questions as they presented themselves, often without having formed an exact opinion of the matters involved. So numerous were the decrees that the collection formed a library of documents, notwithstanding which many cases remained unprovided for, and could only be settled by special decisions. These, however, ran the risk of royal disapproval, and the viceroys and governors rarely cared to assume the responsibility. To understand the baneful effects of such a system it is only necessary to picture a people ruled by the changeable mind of a sovereign 2000 leagues away, and requiring years to investigate and report on questions submitted. When reference is made to the famous "Recopilación de Indias", many imagine that it was some code of very early date, probably of the sixteenth century, whereas it did not go into effect until the end of the seventeenth century, about midway in the period of Spanish domination. Whatever honour redounds to Spain from this code is diminished by the tardiness of its execution.

The Spanish Government is reproached for having isolated Mexico and hindered foreign commerce. The immense extent of the colony of New Spain, the extensive sea coasts on both sides, the scanty population, the fatal and insupportable climate in certain sections, the deserts, the impenetrable forests, the gigantic mountain ranges, made communication and defence against foreign aggression extremely difficult. The envy and covetousness of other nations, chafing under the sting of having rejected the offer of the discovery, were a constant source of menace to these over-sea possessions. Strangers could select her weakest point of attack; Spain had to defend all sides. Means of communication, established with difficulty, were constantly being interrupted; foreign nations, without distinguishing between times of war and times of peace, kept up a continuous piratical warfare, sacked the coasts, and seized the cargoes of the ships. While this state of continual aggression and menace delayed and impeded the development of the colony, those responsible for it were the very ones to bring forward this charge against Spain. To allow such people to enter freely, even under the pretext of trade, was very dangerous. A foothold once established, it would not have taken long to spread over the entire country, and it was precisely to avoid this that it was necessary to wage incessant war. This is amply proved by the results attending the concession granted the English to cut timber in Yucatan, which ended in the absorption by the English Government of the entire strip of Mexican territory now known as British Honduras. It was therefore imperative to isolate the colony in order to keep it, without, however, for this reason oppressing it.

One cannot brand as stupid and blind a state policy that without any great armed force maintained for three hundred years, submissive and peaceful, extensive distant territories, the object of universal envy. It is true that during the colonial period there was no liberty of the press, but this was the case also in many European countries, and notwithstanding this, in Spain as well as in Mexico and through all America, the writings of Las Casas, which almost questioned the legitimacy of the conquest of the Indies, circulated freely. The first printing machine was brought to the New World not through the personal interest or for the personal advantage of any individual, but through the paternal solicitude of Bishop Zumárraga and the Viceroy D. Antonio de Mendoza. Public instruction, good or bad, according to individual opinion, was on an equality with that of Spain, and to the universities founded in Mexico, which were of the same rank as those of Spain, many noted professors were sent. The taxes were not onerous, and if at times these were excessive it did not arise from insupportable exactions, but from the methods of administration. Many of the mistakes noted to-day, and so easily censured, were due to the impossibility of one man alone attending to all the details of so complicated a piece of machinery, above all to the great distance of the central government. Scattered through all the ancient documents may be found complaints attributing many of the troubles affecting the Indies to "the cursed distance that prevents their enjoying the presence of their king". The truth, though sought in all earnestness, came to the royal knowledge late and after many difficulties; it was therefore natural that the remedies for evils should be almost always late.

The motives and intentions of the Spanish kings

Cathedral of Chihuahua
Showing transept door

could not have been better; at times they bordered on the Utopian, but it was humanly impossible that among so many officials all should have been exemplary. As the king was obliged to act through them, it was unavoidable that his wishes should often be either intentionally or unintentionally ignored. The wealth of the country excited envy; and its great distance mitigated fear. The Juicio de Residencia, totally unknown to-day, did not always prove efficacious, yet its establishment shows the earnest desire of restricting the prerogatives of the administration, and at times it proved a strong controlling force that made itself felt. It is, therefore, a vulgar error to believe that the Spanish Government was merciless towards the Colony of Mexico. Like all nations, Spain sought revenue from her colony (disinterestedness and charity are not governmental virtues), but she did not exhaust its resources. If at times special restrictions were imposed, they were the outcome of circumstances and of the not unnatural desire to retain possession of the colony.

Foremost among the public works undertaken by the vice-regal Government was the draining of the Valley of Mexico. The decree authorizing this work is dated 23 October, 1607, and the funds for the work were raised by a tax of 1 per cent. levied on all the

residences of the city, seeing that their owners would profit most directly by the improvement. The Indians engaged upon this work were paid 5 reales (63 cents) and an almud (7 quarts) of corn per week, and a daily ration of 1 pound of meat, peppers, wood, and other provisions. A hospital was founded at Huehuetoca for the benefit of disabled workmen, ground being broken on 28 November, 1607, by the Viceroy D. Luis de Valasco, who dug the first sod, after Mass had been said in the village of Nochistongo. Father Juan Sánchez, S. J., and the cosmographer, Enrique Martín (Martínez), were placed in charge of the work. Later Father Sánchez retired, leaving Martín in full charge. This vast work employed the labour of 471,154 men. The Nochistongo tunnel measured over four miles long, with a section measuring 11 feet 6 inches by 13 feet 7 inches. The work was finished on 7 May, 1608, and in a report made by order of the Viceroy Velasco it is stated that only 50 of the workmen had died, and of these 10 were accidentally killed. It is true that this great work did not give the expected results, but it nevertheless remains to the credit of the Government that undertook it for the welfare of the people. Finally, it may be noted that in examining the list of the viceroys who governed Mexico, the desire of the Spanish monarchs that the persons entrusted with this charge should be persons of importance, is very evident, and if there were some who proved unworthy of the duty entrusted to them, oppressing the people and furthering their own private interests, there were many others, like Mendoza, Velasco, Payo de Rivera, Juan de Acuña, Bucareli, the second Conde de Revillagigedo, and others who proved themselves upright and prudent governors, and merited the gratitude of the colony.

Independent Mexico.—The revolt of the English colonies in America, the principles of the French Revolution, the proclamation of Joseph Bonaparte as King of Spain, the uprising of the Spaniards against Napoleon, and old racial antipathies, are the causes to which the independence of Mexico is usually attributed. This was doubtless precipitated by the fact that Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, parish priest of Dolores, discovered that his plot was on the point of being betrayed, and on 16 September, 1810, raised the standard of revolt against Spain. From the little city of Dolores he marched with an ill-assorted, badly armed company of Indians to the very capital itself, but, not daring to attack it, retraced his steps to Guadalajara. At the bridge of Calderón he was defeated, and pursued as he fled through Acatita de Bajan; he was captured and executed at Chihuahua, 30 July, 1811. His work was taken up and continued by José María Morelos, parish priest of Carácuaro, and upon his death by the Spaniard Mina. When Mina was captured and put to death, almost all hope of gaining independence seemed lost. D. Vicente Guerrero, entrenched in the mountains, kept up a desultory warfare until negotiations were opened with the royalist general, D. Agustín de Iturbide, who had been sent to subdue the insurgents. These negotiations issued in the plan of Iguala, by which Mexico was to be independent, its government a constitutional monarchy, and the Roman Catholic religion the only one recognized and tolerated. Ferdinand VII was chosen as sovereign or, in his default, one of his brothers or some member of the reigning house who should be chosen by the Congress. The secular and regular clergy were to be maintained in all their former privileges and pre-eminence.

Gradually both royalists and insurgents began to support this plan, and on 24 August, 1821, by the Treaty of Cordoba, even the Viceroy D. Juan O'Donoju, who had just landed at Vera Cruz, signified his concurrence. On 27 September of the same year the army of *las tres garantías* (three guarantees), as it was called, entered the City of Mexico. At the beginning of 1822 it became known that the Spanish Government refused to ratify the treaty, and the partisans of Iturbide, taking advantage of this, proclaimed him emperor. Owing, however, to the difficulties and the opposition he encountered, he resigned the following year, and withdrew to Leghorn, Italy. In 1824, hoping once more to be of service to his country, and without knowing that he was under sentence of death by the Government, he returned to Mexico. He was arrested on his arrival, condemned, and put to death on 19 July, 1824. Freemasonry, so actively promoted in Mexico by the first minister from the United States, Joel R. Poinsset, began gradually to lessen the loyalty which, in accordance with the plan of Iguala, both the rulers and the governed had manifested towards the Church. Little by little laws were enacted against the Church, curtailing her rights, as, for example, in 1833, the exclusion of the clergy from the public schools, notwithstanding the fact that at the time the president, D. Valentín Gómez Farias, claimed for the Republican Government all the privileges of the royal patronage, with the power of filling vacant sees and other ecclesiastical benefices.

General Antonio López de Santa Anna dominated the scene for almost fifty years, but he was a man without principle, and his policy was weak and vacillating. Whatever services he rendered his country were more than outweighed by the many evils of his administration. From 1824 to 1846 the nation was embroiled in an interminable series of revolutions, having to face at the same time some serious national issues. Guatemala, which had cast in her lot with Mexico, separated from her forever; the French invaded the country; Yucatan separated from the central government for several years, and the independence of Texas brought on the war with the United States. The North American troops were in possession of the capital, and to establish peace it was necessary to cede to the conquerors all the territory situated north of the Rio Grande, besides California, Arizona, and New Mexico. And then, when peace was most necessary for the healing of the nation's wounds, there came, instead, civil wars and bloodshed. In 1851, Pius IX sent Monsignor Luis Clementi to settle some religious questions. He was officially received by the president, Señor Arista, but was finally obliged to withdraw and return to Rome without having accomplished anything. Dissensions continued, and in 1857 the famous Constitution, which is still in force in the republic, was promulgated by the president, Ignacio Comonfort. His successor, Benito Juárez, issued a series of laws against the Catholic religion. At this time an attempt was made to carry a schismatical movement into effect. Plans were made by the secret societies, as well as other anti-Catholic associations of reformers, to induce President Juárez to declare that the Mexican nation separated herself from communion with Rome, and establish a national religion whose first pontiff, named by the Government, should be Sr. Pardio, formerly parish priest of Zotuta in Yucatan, who had fraudulently obtained a Bull from Gregory XVI consecrating him titular Bishop of Germanicopolis and auxiliary to D. Jose María Guerra, Bishop of Yucatan. The sudden death of Sr. Pardio, in May, 1861, ended this absurd attempt.

This was followed by the French intervention, the empire, and the tragedy of Cerrode Las Campanas in June, 1867. In 1864, while Maximilian was emperor, the papal nuncio, Monsignor Meglia, visited Mexico, but he did not obtain anything from the emperor, as Maximilian declared that the "Reform Laws", with regard to laicization of church property, would be upheld. Juárez died in 1872, and was succeeded by D. Sebastian Lerdo de Tejada. The latter was overthrown by Porfirio Díaz, who became president. He has filled this office until the present time (1910), with the exception of one term from 1880 to 1884. His concilia-

tory policy, the encouragement, protection, and support of industries, the opening of ways of communication, have developed the rich resources of the country, and given Mexico an epoch of much needed peace.

CONSTITUTION OF 1857 AND LAWS OF REFORM.—From 4 July, 1822, when the law was issued permitting the Government to take possession of the Philippine mission property, and of revenues from pious foundations which were not to be spent within the limits of the Mexican Republic, to the law of 23 November, 1855, Article 42 of which abolished all ecclesiastical jurisdiction in civil matters, a series of laws were enacted by Congress and the legislatures of the states clearly showing the anti-religious spirit of those who framed them. This spirit was at its height from 1857 to 1874. During the presidency of D. Ignacio Comonfort the famous Constitution of 1857, decreeing the separation of Church and State, was promulgated, and in the years following Benito Juárez framed innumerable laws systematizing the provisions of the Constitution and enforcing the separation, and in 1874 President D. Sebastian Lerdo de Tejada raised many of the Reform Laws framed by Juárez to constitutional statutes.

(A) *The Church and her Privileges.*—Law of 11 August, 1859, Art. 3.—All laws, circulars, and ordinances of any kind whatsoever, established by public authority, by last will and testament, or by custom, which require officials to attend public religious functions, in a body are hereby repealed. Law of 4 December, 1860: Art. 8.—Right of asylum in churches is abolished, and force may and should be employed in whatever measure it may be deemed necessary to arrest and remove according to law a declared or suspected criminal, without the ecclesiastical authorities having a right to intervene. Art. 17.—Official recognition formerly given to various ecclesiastical persons and corporations is withdrawn. Art. 18.—The use of church bells is to be regulated by police ordinance. Art. 24.—Public officials are forbidden in their official capacity to assist at any religious ceremony, or entertainment in honour of a clergyman, however high in rank he may be. Troops of soldiers are included in the foregoing prohibition.

MEXICAN LABOURER'S BRUSH-SHACK
In the *tierras calientes* of the coast

Law of 13 May, 1873, only article.—No religious rite or demonstration of any kind whatsoever may take place outside of the church building in any part of the republic. Law of 14 December, 1874, Art. 3.—No official, official corporation, or body of troops may attend in an official capacity religious services of any kind whatsoever, nor shall the Government recognize in any manner whatsoever religious solemnities. All days, therefore, that do not commemorate some exclusively civil event cease to be holidays. Sundays are set apart as days of rest for offices and public institutions. Art. 5.—No religious rite may take place outside the church building, neither shall the ministers of religion or any individual of either sex, of any denomination whatsoever, wear in public a special dress or insignia which would characterize him in any way, under penalty of a fine of ten to two hundred dollars.

(B) *Religious Orders.*—Constitution of 1857, Art. 5.—The State cannot allow any contract, pact, or agreement to go into effect that has for its object the impairment, loss, or irrevocable sacrifice of a man's liberty, whatever the cause may be, work, education, or religious vow. Consequently the law does not recognize monastic orders, nor can it permit their establishment, whatever be their designation or object. Art. 27.—Religious institutions or corporations, whatever their character, name, period of existence, and object, and such civil institutions as are under the patronage, direction, or administration of these, or of the ministers of any religious denomination, shall have no legal right to acquire title to or administer any property, but such buildings as are destined for the immediate and direct use of said corporations and institutions. Neither shall they have the right to acquire or manage revenues derived from real estate.

Law of 12 July, 1859, Art. 5.—All the male religious orders which exist throughout the republic, whatever their name or the purpose of their existence, are hereby suppressed throughout the whole republic, as also all archconfraternities, confraternities, congregations, or sisterhoods annexed to the religious communities, cathedrals, parishes, or any other churches. Art. 6.—The foundation or erection of new convents of regulars, archconfraternities, confraternities, congregations, or sisterhoods, under whatever form or name is given them, is prohibited, likewise the wearing of the garb or habit of the suppressed orders. Art. 7.—By this law the ecclesiastics of the suppressed orders are reduced to the condition of secular clergy, and shall, like these, be subject as regards the exercise of their ministry to the ordinaries of their respective dioceses. Art. 12.—All books, printed or manuscript, paintings, antiquities, and other articles belonging to the suppressed religious communities shall be given to museums, lyceums, libraries, and other public establishments. Art. 13.—All members of the suppressed orders who fifteen days after the publication of this law in their respective localities shall continue to wear the habit or live in community shall forfeit the right to collect their quota as assigned by Article 8, and if after the term of 15 days designated by this Article they should reunite in any place and appear to follow their community life, they shall immediately be expelled from the country. Art. 21.—All novitiates for women are perpetually closed. Those at present in novitiates cannot be professed.

Law of 26 Feb., 1863, Art. 1.—All religious communities of women are suppressed throughout the republic. Law of 25 September, 1873, Art 5.—The law does not recognize monastic orders, nor can it permit their establishment, whatever their name or the object for which they are founded. Law of 4 Dec., 1873, Art. 19.—The State does not recognize monastic orders nor can it permit their establishment, whatever their name or the object for which they are founded. Any orders that may be secretly established shall be considered unlawful assemblies which the authorities may dissolve should the members attempt to live in community, and in all such cases the superiors or heads shall be judged criminals, infringing on individual rights according to Article 973 of the Penal Code of the District, which is declared in force in all the republic.

(C) *Church Property.*—Law of 12 July, 1859, Art. 1.—All property which under different titles has been administered by the secular and regular clergy, whatever kind of property it may be, taxes, shares, or stocks, or the name or purpose it may have had, becomes the property of the State. Law of 5 February, 1861, Art. 100.—The Government hands over all parochial residences, episcopal palaces, and dwellings of the heads of any denomination, declaring them inalienable and free from taxation as long as they are reserved for their own specific purpose. Law of 25 September, 1873, Art. 3.—No religious institution may acquire property nor the revenue derived from property. Law of 10 Oct., 1874, Art. 16.—The direct ownership of the churches nationalized according to the law of 12 July, 1859, and left for the maintenance of Catholic worship, as well as those which have since been turned over to any other institution, continues to reside in the nation; but their exclusive use, preservation, and improvement, as long as no decree of consolidation is issued, remains with the religious institutions to which they have been granted. Art. 17.—The buildings mentioned in the preceding article will be exempt from taxation, except when they have actually or nominally passed into the hands of one or more private individuals who hold the title without transmitting it to a religious society; in such cases the property shall be subject to the common law.

(D) *Legacies and Wills.*—Law of 14 December, 1874, Art. 8.—Legacies made in favour of ministers of religion, of their relatives to the fourth degree, or of persons living with said ministers when they have rendered any spiritual aid to the testators in their last illness, or when they have been their spiritual directors, are null and void.

(E) *Civil Marriage and Divorce.*—Law of 23 July, 1859, Art. 1.—Marriage is a civil contract that can licitly and validly be contracted before the civil authority. It suffices for its validity that the contracting parties, having complied with the formalities of the law, present themselves before the proper authority, and freely express their desire of being united in marriage. Law of 4 December, 1860, Art. 20.—The civil authorities shall not interfere in the religious rites and practices concerning marriage, but the contract from which this union proceeds remains exclusively subject to the laws. Any other marriage that is contracted in the republic without observing the formalities prescribed by these laws is null, and therefore ineffectual to produce any of the civil ends which the law grants only to a lawfully contracted marriage. Law of 10 December, 1874, Art. 23.—All decisions regarding nullity, validity, divorce, and other questions relative to the marriage state, must be tried before the civil tribunals which will determine the law without taking into consideration any resolutions on this subject that may have been provided by the ministers of religion.

(F) *Cemeteries and Graves.*—Law of 31 July, 1859, Art. 1.—The intervention of the clergy, secular or regular, in the management of cemeteries, vaults, and crypts, which up to the present time has been in force, ceases throughout the republic. Law of 4 December, 1860, Art. 21.—The governors of states, districts, and territories shall exercise the strictest vigilance for the enforcement of the laws in regard to cemeteries and burial grounds, and in no place shall decent burial be refused the dead no matter what may be the decision of the priests or their respective churches.

(G) *Hospitals and Charitable Institutions.*—Law of 2 February, 1861, Art. 1.—All hospitals and charitable institutions which up to the present time have been under ecclesiastical authority and managed by religious corporations are secularized. Law of 5 February, 1861, Art 67.—Charitable institutions that were managed by ecclesiastical corporations or committees independent of the Government are secularized and placed under the immediate supervision of the civil authorities. Law of 28 February, 1861, Art. 1.—All hospitals, asylums, houses of correction, and charitable institutions which exist at the present time, and which shall be founded in the Federal District, shall be under the protection of the Government. Law of 27 August, 1904, Art. 25.—The ministers of any form of religion cannot act as the directors, administrators, or patrons of private charity; neither can officials, dignitaries, or religious corporations, nor anyone, delegated by them, act in the same capacity.

(H) *Oaths.*—Law of 25 September, 1873, Art. 21.—The simple promise to speak the truth and to fulfil the obligations it entails, shall take the place of the religious oath with its consequences and penalties.

(I) *Instruction.*—Law of 4 December, 1874, Art. 4.—Religious instruction and the exercises of any form of religion are prohibited in all federal, state, and municipal schools. Morality will be taught in any of the schools when the nature of their constitutions permits it, but without reference to any form of religion. The infraction of this article will be punished by a fine of from 25 to 200 pesos, and dismissal from office if the offence is repeated.

(J) *Military Service.*—Law of 4 December, 1860, Art. 19.—The ministers of all forms of religion are exempt from military and coercive personal service, but not from the taxes which the law imposes for this privilege of exemption.

(K) *Public Office.*—Constitution of 1857, Art. 56.—No member of the ecclesiastical body can be elected a congressman. Law of 13 November, 1874, Art. 58.—Nominations for senator are subject to the same conditions as those for congressman.

Ecclesiastical Organization.—There is no doubt that the See of Yucatan, with the title of *Carolensis*, under the patronage of Nuestra Señora de los Remedios, was the first bishopric erected in Mexico; the Bull of Leo X, "Sacri Apostolatus ministerio", issued January, 1518, proves this. The erection of this diocese followed the first reports of the discovery of the peninsula, and by the Bull we see that Yucatan was still thought to be an island. However, as soon as more definite information was received concerning Mexico after the conquest, establishing the fact that Yucatan was part of the mainland, the proceedings for the erection of the diocese were suspended, especially as the Spaniards, diverted by other enterprises, gave little thought to Yucatan, and when it was abandoned by D. Francisco de Montejo, in 1527, they did not return until 1542. It may also be noted that when Clement VII named Fray Julian de Garces first Bishop of New Spain in 1526, the title *Episcopus Carolensis* was still used, and the Emperor Charles V, using the faculties granted him by the popes of assigning the limits of new dioceses, says in the royal decree which accompanied the Bull: "We declare, assign, and determine as the limits of the Bishopric of Yucatan and Santa María de los Remedios the following lands and provinces; first, the Province of Tlaxcala, inclusive, and S. Juan de Ulúa", etc. As Tlaxcala had a greater population and was nearer the capital, Bishop Garces established the episcopal residence there, from whence it was afterwards moved to Puebla.

Up to 1544 the dioceses in New Spain were:—Puebla, erected in 1526 at Tlaxcala, translated to Puebla, 1539; Mexico, 1530; Guatemala, 1534; Oaxaca, erected with the title of Antequera in 1535; Michoacan, erected in 1536 at Tzintzuntzan, translated later to Patzcuaro, and from there to the new city of Valladolid, now Morelia; Chiapas, 1546. They were all suffragans of the Archdiocese of Seville in Spain. Yucatan, though erected first, never had any resident bishop until 1561. On 31 January, 1545, at the solicitation of Charles V, the Holy Father, Paul III, separated these dioceses from the metropolitan See of Seville and erected the Archdiocese of Mexico, with

Los Angeles
S.Pedro
S.Bernardino
CALIFORNIA
Santa Catalina
S.Avalon
San Clemente
S.Diego
Los Coronados
Guadalupe
Real Castillo
Ensenada de Todos Santos
S.Carlos
I.Montague
S.Tomas
Sal Catalina
S.Domingo
Trinidad
I.S.Martin
B.S.Quentin
S.Quentin
S.Fernando
S.Maria
S.Francisco
I.Guadalupe
I.Angel de la Guarda
Bahia Vizcaino
P.S.Eugenio
S.Maria
B.S.Cristobal
I.Cedros
S.Borja
Rosarito
Calamahi
S.Juan
S.Gertrudis
Sa.Rosalia
S.Ignacio
Mulegé
S.Agueda
Purisima Vieja
Comondu
S.Francisco
Loreto
Carmen
Animas
S.Domingo
Soledad
Moctezuma
Colonia
B.Magdalena
I.S.Margarita
Agua Colorado
Conejo
Todos Santos
C.S.Lucas
S.Jacinto
S.Antonio
Santiago
S.Jose
S.Lucas
La Paz
I.Espiritu Santo
I.Cerralvo
I.San Jose
S.Hilario
I.Altamura
Altata
Navitas
Cabla
Culiacan
Cosala
Imala
Tamazula
Pajasquiaro
Rodeo
Cuencame
Durango
Guadalupe
Canatlan
S.Juan Guadalupe del Rio
S.Jose de Gracia
Mezquital
Nieves
Corpus
Nombre de Dios
Sain Alto
Rio Grande
Quelite
Norja
Mesquital
Condordia
Mazatlan
Union
Rosario
Matatan
Sombrerete
Fresnillo
S.Andres del Teul
Calera
Valparaiso
Zacatecas
Huejuquilla
Garcia
Mezquital
Villan
Escuinapa
Acaponeta
TEPIC
Rio S.Pedro
Santiago
Acatan
Las Tres Marias
San Blas
Tepic
Compostela
Nuchistlan
Hostotipaquillo
Tequila
Ameca
Navidad
Ipala
B.Banderas
Cocula
Chapala
Tonalpa
Tizapan
Autlan
Purificacion
Sayula
Guzman
Charmela
Tuxcacuesco
Tenacatita
Colima
COLIMA
Manzanillo
Cayutlan
Coalcoman
Aguililla
Maruata
Revilla Gigedo Islands
to Diocese of Colima
I.S.Benedicto
Roca Partida
I.Socorro
I.Clarion
Socorro
Phoenix
Globe
Roswell
Yuma
R. Gila
Colorado
Solomonsville
Silver City
Rincon
Carlsbad
Tucson
Deming
Tombstone
El Paso
Palomas
Paso del Norte
Rio Grande del Norte
Pecos
Ft.Davis
Ft.Stockton
Marfa
Presidio del Norte
Ojo de Agua
Sauz
S.Carlos
Aldama
Chihuahua
Guerrero
Cosihuiriachic
Meoqui
Rosales
La Cruz
Sta.Rosalia
Satevo
Jesus Maria
Batopilillas
Caricbic
Guazapares
Sierra Mojada
Cuarto Cieneg
Nonoava
Arteaga
Pilar
Conchos
Jimenez
Satevo
Rosario
Parral
Balleza
Allende
Escalon
Morelos
S.Isidro
Delicias
Peronal
Cerro Gordo
Guadalupe y Calvo
Mapimi
El Oro
Cuanacevi
Lerdo
Matamoros
Jimulco
Cuencame
Nazas
Rodeo
Pajasquiaro
Tamazula
Imala
Cosala
Altata
Culiacan
Navitas
Cabla
Pericos
Mocorito
Badiraguato
Soyatita
Topia
Nio
Agiobampo
Ocoroni
Guadalupe y Calvo
Cerro Gordo
Peronal
Delicias
Sinaloa
Alamos
Camoa
Macoyagui
Batopilillas
Baco
Chiox
Arteaga
Nonoava
Pilar
Conchos
Jimenez
Sonora
Hermosillo
Nacori
Spaqui
Yepomera
Sauz
S.Carlos
Chihuahua
Trinidad
Onavas
Pesqueria
S.Antonio
Aldama
Guerrero
Cosihuiriachic
Meoqui
Rosales
Jesus Maria
Moyas
Buenavista
Torim
Guaymas
Tortuga
Rio Yaqui
Mayos
Rio Fuerte
Rio Sinaloa
Rio Mayo
Rio Yaqui
Seris
Opatas
Pimas
Sonora
Rio Sonora
Rio Concho
Rio Conchos
Rio Grande del Norte
Basura
Nogales
Perrenate
Tubutama
Nicaray
Altar
Imuris
Batepito
Janos
Baccachic
Cucurpe
Querobabi
Opodepe
Baserac
Arispe
Terrazas
Casas Grandes
Corralitos
Carrizal
Moctezuma
S.Ignacio
Galena
Buenaventura
Sahuaripa
Guazavas
Moctezuma
Aconchi
Libertad
Caborca
Tepoca
S.Antonio
I.Angel de la Guarda
Tonuaco
Tiburon
Rosario
Calamahi
Gertrudis
Sa.Rosalia
S.Agueda
Mulegé
Purisima Vieja
Comondu
Loreto
Carmen
Animas
Piedras
Oguira
Topolobampo
Soyatita
Topia
Nio
Mocorito
Badiraguato
Playa Colorada
Pericos
Altamura

ARKANSAS
LOUISIANA
MISSISSIPPI
ALABAMA
GEORGIA
FLORIDA
TEXAS
Wichita Falls
Sherman
Paris
Texarkana
Dallas
Fort Worth
Abilene
Corsicana
Tyler
Shreveport
Vicksburg
Jackson
Meridian
Montgomery
Mobile
Pensacola
Palestine
Waco
Alexandria
Baton Rouge
Lake Charles
New Orleans
Austin
Bastrop
Beaumont
Houston
Port Arthur
Columbus
Richmond
Galveston
Sabine Pass
Mouths of the Mississippi River
San Antonio
Eagle Pass
Indianola
Matagorda
Rockport
Corpus Christi
Laredo
Rio Grande
Hidalgo
Brownsville
Bagdad
Matamoros
Monterrey
NUEVO LEON
Cadereyta
Montemorelos
Mendez
Burgos
Lag. de S. Fernando
Laguna de la Madre
S. Nicholas
Jimenez
Victoria
Casas
Soto la Marina
Padilla
Palmillas
Llera
Tula
Xicotencatl
Ocampo
Aldama
Magiscatzin
Altamira
Tampico
R. Panuco
Pueblo Viejo
Tancasnequi
Barbarita
Tancas
Valles
Panuco
Laguna de Tamiahua
Ozuluama
Tamiahua
Tamalipas
Tamazunchale
Tantoyuca
Tuxpan
Cazones
Nautla
Papantla
Huauchinango
Huachinango
Tetela
Tlalancingo
Pachuca
HIDALGO
Zacualtipan
Jalpan
Chicontepec
Toliman
Ahuacatlan
Guanajuato
Querétaro
Salvatierra
Acambaro
Morelia
Jilotepec
El Oro
Otumba
Tlaxcala
Mexico
Puebla
Cholula
Tejupilco
Cuernavaca
MORELOS
Izucar
Cordoba
Orizaba
Tuxtla
Vera Cruz
Alvarado
Coatzacoalcos
Tonala
Tehuacan
Cosamaloapan
Tuxtepec
Cuicatlan
Acayuca
Minatitlan
Jalapa
Tacotalpa
Palenque
Sacluc
Tical
Belize
Turneffe I.
Huajuapam
Silacayoapam
Chiapam
Isthmus of Tehuantepec
Hidalgo
Pichucalco
Sayula
Chilon
Ocosingo
Flores
Chilpancingo
Tlapa
Chilapa
Tlaxiaco
Teposcolula
Ixtlan
Abasolotitlan
Oaxaca
Sa. Maria
Simojovel
S. Cristobal
Petapa
Tehuantepec
Juchitan
Gutierrez
Comitan
Zapatula
Tonala
Constancia
Punta Gorda
Gulf of Honduras
Puerto Cortez
Ejutla
S. Carlos
Juquila
S. Cruz
Pochutla
Acapulco
S. Marcos
Nexpa
Tecoanapa
Omiltemi
Jamiltepec
Mixtepec
Pto. Angeles
Salina Cruz
S. Maria del Mar
S. Francisco
Gulf of Tehuantepec
Concordia
Mazapa
Tuxtla
Pijijiapan
Escuintla
Huixtla
San Benito
Ocos
Champerico
S. Cruz Quiche
Salama
Zacapa
R. Motagua
Quezaltenango
Amatitlan
Retalhuleu
Guatemala
Cobán
S. Tomas
Sta. Rosa
Gracias
Intibuca
Comayagua
Jutiapa
Sta. Ana
Escuintla
S. Miguel
S. Salvador
S. Vicente
Usulatan
La Union
Amapala
Realejo
NICARAGUA
HONDURAS
Progreso
Sisal
Celestun
El Real
Hampolol
Campeche
Champoton
Sabancuy
Carmen
Laguna de Terminos
Gulf of Campeche
Lagartos
C. Catoche
I. Holbox
Sa. Clara
St. Felipe
Honhom
Loche
Panaba
Tizimin
Labcah
Pole
Temax
Merida
YUCATAN
Maxcanu
Sotuta
S. Miguel
I. Cozumel
Calkini
Tenabo
Tekax
Valladolid
Peto
Tihosuco
Sacalum
Hopelchen
Chansantacruz
Tsibalchen
Pustunich
TERRITORIO DE QUINTANA ROO
Tzucox
Peninsula Chetumal
Bacalar
Lubusil
CAMPECHE
Mamantel
Corosal
Chinchanha
Balzada
Tenabalanca
Tabasco
Frontera
Chontalpa
Comalcalco
Chiltepec
S. Juan Bautista
S. Pedro
Tonala
Jalapa
Acayuca
Minatitlan
Hidalgo
Pichucalco
Sayula
Chilon
Ocosingo
Flores
Tacotalpa
Palenque
Sacluc
Tical
Belize
Turneffe I.
Gulf of Honduras
Puerto Cortez
S. Pedro
Punta Gorda
Constancia
Comitan
Zapatula
Tonala
Gutierrez
Juchitan
Tehuantepec
Petapa
Sa. Maria
Simojovel
S. Cristobal
Ocosingo
Flores
Chilon

the above-mentioned dioceses for suffragans. Before the end of the sixteenth century the ecclesiastical Province of Mexico included, besides those already mentioned, the Diocese of Comayagua in Honduras, erected 1539; Guadalajara, 1548; Verapaz in Guatemala, erected in 1556, suppressed 1605; Manila in the Philippine Islands, erected 1581.

At the close of the eighteenth century all the dioceses situated outside Mexican territory had been separated to form new ecclesiastical provinces, and Chiapas, which from 1743 had belonged to the Archdiocese of Guatemala, was not reunited to the ecclesiastical Province of Mexico until the middle of the nineteenth century. Other new dioceses had been founded: Durango, 1620; Monterey, with the title of Linares, 1777; Sonora, 1779 (the episcopal residence in different cities at various epochs, Arispe, Alamos, Culiacan, and at Hermosillo when the Diocese of Sinaloa was erected). In the nineteenth century, Mexico being still the only archdiocese, the Dioceses of S. Francisco de California, erected 1840, and S. Luis Potosí, erected 1854, were added. Pius IX, in the secret consistory of 16 March, 1863, established the Dioceses of Chilapa, Tulancingo, Vera Cruz, Zacatecas, León, Querétaro, Zamora, and the Vicariate Apostolic of Tamaulipas (created a bishopric in 1869), and raised to archiepiscopal rank the episcopal Sees of Guadalajara and Michoacan. From 1869 to 1891 the Vicariate Apostolic of Lower California (1872), the Dioceses of Tabasco (1880) and Colima (1881), were established. In 1891, Leo XIII, by the Bull "Illud in primis", erected the new Dioceses of Cuernavaca, Tepic, Tehuantepec, Saltillo, and Chihuahua, and raised the Sees of Oaxaca, Monterey, and Durango to archiepiscopal rank. In 1895 the Diocese of Campeche was erected, and in 1899 that of Aguas Calientes. In 1903 the new Diocese of Huajuápan was created, and Puebla raised to the rank of an archdiocese, and in 1907 Yucatan was made an archdiocese. At the present time the ecclesiastical provinces of Mexico are constituted as follows:—

Provinces	Sees
Mexico	Mexico, Vera Cruz (epis. residence, Jalapa), Tulancingo, Chilapa, Cuernavaca.
Guadalajara	Guadalajara, Zacatecas, Tepic, Colima, Aguascalientes.
Michoacan	Michoacan (epis. residence, Morelia), Zamora, Leon, Querétaro.
Antequera	Antequera (epis. residence, Oaxaca), Chiapas (epis. residence, S. Cristobal las Casas), Tehuantepec.
Linares	Linares (epis. res., Monterey), S. Luis Potosí, Saltillo, Tamaulipas (epis. res., Ciudad Victoria).
Durango	Durango, Sonora (epis. res., Hermosillo), Sinaloa (epis. res., Culiacan), Chihuahua, Vic. Apos. of Lower California (res., La Paz)
Yucatan	Yucatan (epis. res., Merida), Campeche, with the Territory of Quintana Roo, Tabasco (epis. res., S. Juan Bautista).
Puebla	Puebla, Huajuápan.

Boletín de la oficina internacional de las Repúblicas Americanas (Washington, 1909); Schulz, *Curso general de Geografía* (Mexico, 1905); Noriega, *Atlas miniatura de la República mexicana* (Mexico, 1907); Clavijero, *Historia antigua de México* (London, 1826); Orozco y Berra, *Historia antigua y de la Conquista de México* (Mexico, 1880); Rivera, *Los Gobernantes de México* (Mexico, 1872); Icazbalceta, *Obras* (Mexico, 1898); *México á través de los siglos* (Barcelona, —); Sahagún, *Historia general de las cosas de Nueva España* (Mexico, 1829); Durán, *Historia de las Indias de Nueva España y Islas de Tierra-Firme* (Mexico, 1867); *Instrucción que los Virreyes de Nueva España dejaron á sus sucesores* (Mexico, 1873); Obregón, *Epoca colonial, México viejo* (Mexico, 1900); Gillow, *Apuntes históricos* (Mexico, 1889); Verdia, *Compendio de la historia de México* (Mexico, 1906); Prieto, *Lecciones de historia patria* (Mexico, 1893); Menéndez y Pelayo, *Historia de los Heterodoxos españoles* (Madrid, 1881); Parras, *Gobierno de los Regulares de la América* (Madrid, 1783); *Código de la Reforma* (Mexico, 1903); *Manual práctico de la Constitución y de la Reforma* (Mexico, 1906); Vera, *Catecismo geográfico-histórico-estadístico de la Iglesia mexicana* (Amecameca, 1881); Basurto, *El arzobispado de México* (Mexico, 1901); Sotomayor, *Historia del Apostólico Colegio de Ntra. Sra. de Zacatecas;* Carrillo, *El Obispado de Yucatán* (Merida, 1895); Alamán, *Historia de México* (Mexico, 1850); Idem, *Disertaciones sobre la historia de la República mexicana* (Mexico, 1844); Zamacois, *Historia de México desde los tiempos más remotos hasta nuestros dias* (Mexico, 1878); Romero, *Noticias para formar la historia y estadística del Obispado de Michoacán* (Mexico, 1862); Recasens, *El primer Obispo de Tlaxcala* (Mexico, 1884); Mendieta, *Historia eclesiástica indiana* (Mexico, 1870); *Colección de documentos para la historia de México* (Mexico, 1858); Arrangoiz, *México desde 1808 hasta 1867* (Madrid, 1872); *Apuntes para la historia del Gobierno del General D. Antonio López de Santa Anna* (Mexico, 1845); García Cubas, *El libro de mis recuerdos* (Mexico, 1904); Lefevre, *Historia de la intervención francesa en México* (Brussels, 1869); Ixtlilxochitl, *Obras históricas* (Mexico, 1891); León, *El Illmo. Sr. D. Vasco de Quiroga, primer Obispo de Michoacán, México;* Davis, *Memories of the Revolution in Mexico* (London, 1824); H. H. Bancroft, *Life of Porfirio Diaz* (San Francisco, 1887); Bulnes, *Juárez y las revoluciones de Ayutla y de Reforma* (Mexico, 1905); Idem, *El verdadero Juárez y la verdad sobre la intervención y el imperio* (Mexico, 1904); García, *La Inquisición de México* (Mexico, 1906); Idem, *Autos de fe de la Inquisición de México con extracto de sus causas 1646–1648* (Mexico, 1910).

Camillus Crivelli.

Mexico, Archdiocese of (Mexicana). — The boundaries of the Diocese of Mexico were at first not well defined. When Cuba was discovered three sees were erected, but when the prelates arrived, their episcopal sees had been destroyed, and the inhabitants had fled. In order to avoid such mistakes, the Holy See allowed the kings of Spain to fix the boundaries of the new dioceses erected on the American continent, still considered a part of Asia. From 1500 to 1863 the Diocese of Mexico extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific, namely from Tampico to Acapulco. At present it is confined to the Federal District, the States of Morelos, Mexico, and part of Hidalgo. The first bishop, Zumarraga, came to Mexico when Clement VII had just been released from the prison in Castel Sant' Angelo, where he was kept by Charles V for several months after the sack of Rome by Bourbon's army. Strange as it may seem, he was allowed, and even obliged to come with only the emperor's nomination, governed the diocese without any papal appointment, and styled himself "Omnimoda potestate Antistes". He returned to Spain, received his Bulls, and was consecrated six years after his first arrival on the American continent. He has been falsely accused of having destroyed most valuable monuments; he ought not to be blamed for having burnt the idols, temples, and hieroglyphics which prevented the conversion of the aborigines. In his time the Blessed Virgin, according to Mexican tradition, appeared to the neophyte Juan Diego, and became the patroness of America. He introduced the first printing office in the New World, published many books, founded many schools and colleges, and was a saintly man, a faithful follower of St. Francis of Assisi, to whose order he belonged. He ruled over the diocese, raised before he died to the rank of an archdiocese, from 1528 to 1548.

Five provincial councils have been held in the city of Mexico. The first and second under the second archbishop, Alonso de Montufar. The third was presided over by the third archbishop, Pedro Moya de Contreras. The twenty-fourth archbishop, Francisco Antonio de Lorenzana assembled and presided over the fourth provincial council in 1770. Prospero Alarcon, thirty-second archbishop, was the president of the fifth and last provincial council in 1896. The most important of all was the third council, which has been for centuries the code of ecclesiastical law for the Mexican Church. Archbishops Moya de Contreras, García Guerra, Palafox, Osorio, Ortega, Haro y Peralta, and Lizana y Beaumont were also viceroys and captains-general of New Spain, and were as able to brandish the sword as to wield the crosier. Archbishop Labastida was regent of the short lived empire of Maximilian. He was the last prelate to be invested with any political authority. The most distinguished of the line was Francisco Antonio de Lorenzana, transferred to Toledo, and created cardinal by Clement XIV. He published several important books,

founded many institutions both in New and Old Spain, helped with his own means Pius VI when he was sent to France as a prisoner by Napoleon, and largely contributed to the support of the cardinals assembled in Venice, in the conclave that elected Pius VII. A few years after the conquest, viz., in the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Archdiocese of Mexico already possessed over fifty convents of nuns, a university, equal to that of Salamanca, several colleges, and numberless schools. Their number went on increasing, until all religious progress was stopped by the War of Independence and the civil wars that followed. All were destroyed by law and in reality under President Juárez. President Diaz has treated the Church better; but the penal laws have not been repealed. The present archbishop, Mgr Mora y del Rio was born at Pajuacarán, 24 Feb., 1854; studied at Zamora and Rome; was ordained, 22 Dec., 1877; consecrated Bishop of Tehuantepec, 19 Jan., 1893; and promoted to the See of Mexico, 2 Dec., 1908 in succession to Mgr Alarcon. The population almost entirely Catholic is about 780,000.

Galeria de retratos en la Catedral de México; Icazbalceta, *Primer Obispo y Azobispo de México;* Sosa, *Episcopada Mexicano: Cardinal Lorenzana,* passim; Balbuena, *Grandeza Mexicana.*

J. Montes de Oca y Obregon.

Mezger, Francis, Joseph, and Paul, three brothers, learned Benedictines of the monastery of St. Peter in Salzburg, and professors at the University of Salzburg.

Francis, the oldest of the three, b. at Ingolstadt, 25 October, 1632; d. at Salzburg, 11 December, 1701. He took vows in 1651; was ordained priest in 1657; taught philosophy at the University of Salzburg in 1659; became regent of the convictus and secretary of the university in 1661; taught philosophy again from 1663 to 1665; and then moral theology until 1668. From 1669 to 1688 he taught various branches at the Bavarian monastery of Ettal and at his own monastery. From 1688 until his death he was master of novices and director of clerics at his monastery. He wrote the following philosophical treatises: "Philosophia rationalis rationibus explicata" (Salzburg, 1660); "Anima rationibus philosophicis animata et explicata" (ib., 1661); "Philosophia naturalis rationibus naturalibus elucidata" (ib., 1661); "Manuale philosophicum" (ib., 1665); "Homomicrocosmus" (ib., 1665). The following are some of his translations: "Philosophia sacra" (ib., 1678), from the French of the Parisian Capuchin Ivo; "Heiliges Benediktiner-Jahr" (2 volumes, Munich, 1690), from the Latin; "Dioptra politices religiosæ" (Salzburg, 1694), and "Exercitia spiritualia" (ib., 1693), both from the French of the Maurist Le Contat; "Succinctæ meditationes christianæ" (4 vols., ib., 1695), from the French of the Maurist Claude Martin; "Via regia studiosæ juventutis ad veram sapientiam" (Frankfort, 1699), from the Italian; and a few others of less importance.

Joseph, b. 5 September, 1635, at Eichstädt; d. 26 October, 1683, at the monastery of St. Gall, while on a pilgrimage to Einsiedeln. He took vows at the same time with his brother Francis in 1651; was ordained priest in 1659; taught poetry in the gymnasium of Salzburg in 1660; was master of novices and sub-prior in his monastery in 1661; taught philosophy at the University of Salzburg, 1662–4; apologetics and polemics, 1665–7; canon law, 1668–73; he was prior of his monastery and taught hermeneutics and polemics, 1673–8, when he was appointed vice-chancellor of the university. He was an intimate friend of Mabillon, with whom he kept up a constant correspondence and who in his "Iter Germanicum" calls him "Universitatis Salisburgensis præcipuum ornamentum" (Vetera Analecta, I, xi). His chief work is "Historia Salisburgensis" covering the period from 582 to 1687, of which work he, however, had written only the first four books (582–1555) when he died, leaving the remainder to be completed by his two brothers. In 1664 he published at Salzburg his four philosophical treatises: (1) "Considerationes de scientiis et de modis sciendi in genere"; (2) "Axiomata physica quæstionibus problematicis distincta"; (3) "Quatuor gradus naturæ: esse, vivere, sentire, intelligere"; (4) "Unitas et distinctio rerum quæstionibus philosophicis explicata". His other works are: "Tabula bipartita successionis ecclesiasticæ tam ex testamento quam ab intestato" (Salzburg, 1670); "Panacæa juris" (ib., 1673); "Lapis mysticus et cornu parvulum Danielis" (ib., 1677, 1682); "Institutiones in sacram scripturam" (ib., 1680); "Assertio antiquitatis ecclesiæ metropolitanæ Salisburgensis et monasterii S. Petri, O. S. Ben." (ib., 1682).

Paul, the most celebrated of the three brothers, b. 23 November, 1637, at Eichstädt; d. 12 April, 1702, at Salzburg. He took vows in 1653; was ordained priest in 1660; taught at the gymnasium of Salzburg, 1660–4; was master of novices and director of clerics, 1664–6; taught philosophy, first at the University of Salzburg, 1668–70; then at the monastery of Göttweig, 1671–2. Returning to the University of Salzburg, he taught theology, 1673–88; exegesis and polemics, 1689–1700. In 1683 he had succeeded his deceased brother Joseph as vice-chancellor. His chief production is: "Theologia scholastica secundum viam et doctrinam D. Thomae" (4 volumes, Augsburg, 1695, 1719), probably the best work on dogmatic theology that has been produced by a German Benedictine. It is especially noteworthy that the author's treatment of the immaculate conception and of papal infallibility is in exact accordance with the definitions of 1854 and 1870. His other works are: "Somnia philosophorum de possibilibus et impossibilibus" (Salzburg, 1670); "Contemplationes philosophicæ magnæ urbis cœlestis et elementaris" (ib., 1670); "Mercurius logicus" (ib., 1671); "De gratia Dei" (ib., 1675); "Allocutiones de mediis pietatis Marianæ" (ib., 1677); "Orationes partheniæ, miscellaneæ, sacro-profanæ, problemata inauguralia seu orationes academicæ" (ib., 1699–1700); "Sacra historia de gentis hebraicæ ortu" (Dillingen, 1700; Augsburg, 1715).

Concerning all three see Sattler, *Collect.-Blätter zur Gesch. der ehemaligen Benedictiner-Universität Salzburg* (Kempten, 1890), 212–218; Lindner, *Professbuch der Benedictiner Abtei S. Peter in Salzburg* (Salzburg, 1906), 53–58, 65–68. For Joseph and Paul see Straus, *Viri scriptis, eruditione ac pietate insignes, quos genuit vel aluit Eichstadium* (Eichstädt, 1790), 326–331.

Michael Ott.

Mezzofanti, Giuseppe, cardinal, the greatest of polyglots, b. 19 September, 1774; d. 15 March, 1849. He was the son of a poor carpenter of Bologna. In the Scuole Pie, besides the classical languages, he learned Spanish, German, Mexican, and some South American dialects from ex-Jesuits who had been exiled from America. To his great love of study he added a prodigious memory, so that at the age of twelve years he was able to begin the three years course of philosophy, which he closed with a public disputation. His theological studies were completed with no less distinction, at an age at which he could not yet be ordained; consequently he devoted himself to the study of Oriental languages; and in 1797 he was appointed to the chair of Hebrew at the University of Bologna, and ordained a priest. When the Cisalpine Republic was established, he refused to take the oath of allegiance to it, lost his chair at the university, and was compelled to give private lessons in order to support himself. After the battles of 1799 and of 1800, the hospitals of Bologna were crowded with wounded and sick of almost all the nationalities of Europe, and Mezzofanti in giving religious assistance to the unfortunate seized the opportunity of perfecting his knowledge of the languages which he had already studied, as well as of learning new ones. In 1803 he was appointed assistant in the library of the Institute, and later, professor of Hebrew and of Greek at

the university, which relieved him financially. In 1806, he refused an invitation of Napoleon to establish himself at Paris. In 1808, the chair of Oriental languages was suppressed, and Mezzofanti received, in compensation, a pension of 1000 lire; but, in 1815, he became librarian of the university, and occupied his chair once more. Besides the study of languages, to which he gave many hours of the day and night, he devoted himself to the study of ethnology, archæology, numismatics, and astronomy. Moreover, he performed the offices of his holy ministry, and was commonly called the confessor of foreigners. In 1831 he was among the deputies who went to ask the pope's forgiveness, in the name of the city of Bologna, for the rebellion of that year, and the pope, repeating Pius VII's invitation of 1814, requested Mezzofanti to remain at Rome and place his learning directly at the service of the Holy See, an invitation which the modest priest, this time, accepted, after long resistance; soon he received the title of Domestic Prelate, and a canonry at Santa Maria Maggiore, which was changed, later, for one at St. Peter's. At Rome, also, he took advantage of opportunities to practice the languages that he had acquired, and to master new ones and in order to learn Chinese he went to the Capodimonte college for foreign missions, at Naples. In 1833, he was named Custodian-in-Chief of the Vatican Library, and Consultor of the Congregation for the correction of the Liturgical Books of Oriental Rites, of which he became Prefect. On 12 February, 1838, he was created cardinal under the title of St. Onofrio al Gianicolo; he was also a member of the congregations of the Propaganda, of Rites, of the Index, and of the Examination of Bishops. The events of 1848 undermined his already enfeebled health, and a combination of pneumonia and gastric fever put an end to his life. He was buried without pomp in a modest tomb of his titular church, over which a monument was raised in 1885.

According to Russell, Cardinal Mezzofanti spoke perfectly thirty-eight languages, among which were: biblical and rabbinic Hebrew, Arabic, Chaldean, Coptic, Armenian, ancient and modern, Persian, Turkish, Albanian, Maltese, Greek, ancient and modern, Latin, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, French, German, English, Illyrian, Russian, Polish, Bohemian, Magyar, Chinese, Syriac, Geez, Amharic, Hindustani, Guzerati, Basque, Wallachian, and Californian; he spoke thirty other languages, less perfectly, and fifty dialects of the languages mentioned above. His knowledge of these languages was intuitive, rather than analytic, and consequently he left no scientific works, although some studies in comparative linguistics are to be found among his manuscripts, which he left, in part, to the municipal library, and in part to the library of the University of Bologna.

MANAVITT, *Esquisse historique sur le cardinal Mezzofanti* (Paris, 1853); RUSSELL, *The Life of Cardinal Mezzofanti* (London, 1858).

U. BENIGNI.

Miami Indians, an important tribe of Algonquian stock formerly claiming prior dominion over the whole of what is now Indiana and western Ohio, including the territories drained by the Wabash, St. Joseph, Maumee, and Miami rivers. They were closely connected, both linguistically and politically, with their western neighbours, the Illinois, the two tribe-groups speaking dialects of the same language. The Miami, however, were of more independent and warlike character. The tribal name, properly pronounced as in Latin, Me-ah-me (whence Maumee), and in the full plural form Ou-miami-wek, is of uncertain meaning and derivation. They were called by the early English writers Twightwee, a corruption of their Iroquois name, intended to imitate the cry of a crane. About 1685 the French recognized six bands, or subtribes, in the tribe, consolidated at a later period into three, namely: Atchatchakangouen, "crane people", or Miami proper; Ouiatanon, "whirlpool people", or Wea; and Pianguichia, "separators" (?), or Piankishaw. By the United States Government these were recognized as three distinct tribes. Altogether they may have numbered originally over 4000 souls. It is possible that Nicolet in 1634, and Radisson and Groseilliers in 1658–60 may have met in their Wisconsin journeyings the Miami, but this is not known. They are first mentioned by the Jesuit Dreuillettes in 1658 as a tribe recently discovered, under the name of Oumamik, living south-west from Green Bay, Wis. The estimate of 24,000 souls is an evident exaggeration. About 1668 and again in 1670 they were visited by Perrot. In the latter year the Jesuit Father Claude Allouez found them, or a part of the tribe, living with the Mascoutens in a palisaded town, in which he established the mission of Saint-Jacques, about the head of Fox river in south-east Wisconsin (see MASCOUTENS). He describes them as gentle, affable, and sedate, while Dablon, his companion, calls them more civilized than the lake tribes. Apparently these were only a part of the tribe, the main body being farther south, although all the bands were represented. They listened eagerly to the missionary's instruction and to satisfy them Allouez was obliged to set up a large cross in their section of the village as well as in that occupied by the Mascoutens.

In 1673 Allouez, who had learned the language, reports good progress, and that they now hung their offerings upon the cross instead of sacrificing to their heathen gods, chief among which was the Sun. There was however a strong opposition party. In June of this same year the noted Fr. Jacques Marquette stopped at the village and procured Miami guides for his voyage down the Mississippi. He describes the Miami as the most civilized, liberal, and shapely of the three tribes then assembled in the town. They wore their hair in two long braids down their breasts, were accounted brave and generally successful warriors, lived in cabins covered with rush mats, and were so eager to listen to Fr. Allouez that they left him little rest even at night. The cross was decorated with Indian offerings, and one chief who had recently died at a distance had asked to have his bones brought for interment beside it, which was done. But despite their willingness the mission languished and was soon afterwards abandoned, partly on account of lack of missionaries and partly on account of the disturbed conditions growing out of the inroads of the Iroquois, who, having destroyed the Hurons and others in the east, had now turned upon the Illinois and others of the west, and latterly (1682) upon the Miami. The missionary Lamberville, then stationed at Onondaga, gives a graphic account of the wholesale butcheries and horrible tortures of prisoners of which he was witness. The Iroquois, it must be remembered, were well armed with guns from Dutch and English traders, while the remote western tribes had only the bow. Shortly after the building of La Salle's temporary fort on the St. Joseph river, near the present South Bend, Ind., a band of Miami moved down and formed a village near to the same spot, while some Potawatomi also settled near them. Allouez followed them and, probably about 1685, established the mission of Saint Joseph, where he continued until his death in 1689. In 1692–3 Fr. Gravier wintered with the Miami, probably in Illinois. In 1694 we find the Wea in a village where Chicago now is. In 1721 Fr. Charlevoix visited the St. Joseph village, where he found nearly all of both tribes nominally Christian, but, from long absence of a missionary, "fallen into great disorders". Soon afterwards this matter was remedied and in 1750 the mission was in flourishing condition. At the same time Fr. Pierre du Jaunay was among the Wea, then residing at Wea creek on the Wabash, near the present Lafayette, Ind. A third Jesuit mission ex-

isted among the Piankishaw, who had their principal village lower down the Wabash, adjoining the present town of Vincennes, founded in 1702. After the suppression of the Jesuits in New France in 1762, the missionaries continued their work, as seculars, as well as was possible, until their deaths, Father Pierre Potier, "the last Jesuit in the west", dying at Detroit in 1781.

Through the influence of English traders a large part of the tribe had become hostile to the French and under the head chief "La Demoiselle" had removed about 1748 from the neighbourhood of the French post at the head of the Maumee (now Fort Wayne, Ind.) to a point on the Miami near the present Piqua, Ohio, and established there a town called Pickawilliny, which grew rapidly in size and importance and became a centre of English trading influence. After repeated refusals to return, a party of northern Indians, led by a French trader, Langlade, in June, 1752, attacked and burned the town, killing and eating La Demoiselle, and carrying the traders to Canada. By this time the whole tribe was settled along the Wabash and the upper Maumee. They generally sided with the French in the French and Indian and Pontiac's wars, and with the English against the Americans in the later wars. Their great chief, Mishikinakwa, or Little Turtle (1752–1812), led the allied Indian forces which defeated Harmar in 1790 and St. Clair in 1791, but was himself defeated by Wayne in 1794, resulting in the famous Treaty of Greenville in the next year, by which the Indians surrendered the greater part of Ohio. After the close of the war of 1812, in which again they fought on the English side, the Miami began a series of treaty sales culminating in 1840, by which they sold all their territory excepting a small tract of about ten square miles, agreeing to remove west of the Mississippi. The final removal to Kansas was made by the main Miami band under military pressure in 1846, the Wea and Piankishaw having preceded them by a number of years. The main emigration in 1846 numbered about 650. The small reserved tract in Indiana was allotted in severalty to its owners in 1872 and their tribal relations were dissolved. In 1854 the united Wea and Piankishaw were officially consolidated with the Peoria and Kaskaskia, the remnant of the ancient Illinois, and in 1867 they removed altogether to their present lands under the Quapaw agency in north-east Oklahoma (Indian Ter.). In 1873 the remnant of the emigrant Miami, having sold their lands in Kansas, followed their kindred to the same agency.

After the withdrawal of the Jesuits various secular priests ministered as best they could to the Indians within reach of the frontier settlements, notably Fr. Gibault about Detroit and Fort Wayne, and Father Rivet at Vincennes (1795–1804), the latter devoting himself particularly to the Piankishaw, Wea, and Kaskaskia. In 1804 the Friends established an industrial farm on the upper Wabash, where for several years they instructed Miami, Shawnee, and others until forced to withdraw to Ohio by the opposition of the Shawnee prophet, brother of Tecumtha. In 1818 the Baptist minister, Rev. Isaac McCoy, began a work among the Wea and Miami which continued for four years and was then discontinued. In 1833 another Baptist minister, Rev. Jotham Meeker, assisted by Rev. David Lykins, began work among the Wea and Piankishaw, already in Kansas for some years, and built up a flourishing school with corresponding good effect upon the tribe. The main body of the Miami in Indiana throughout this period and for some years after their removal in 1846 were entirely neglected; without either religious or educational work, they sank to the lowest depths through dissipation, and were rapidly and constantly diminishing by intemperance and drunken murders. In 1841 their agent reports that "more than half the adults who die perish by the hands of their fellow Indians." A notable exception was their chief, Richardville, of mixed blood, who died in the same year, a consistent Catholic, whose "stern honesty and strict punctuality, as well as dignified bearing, commanded universal respect". In the meantime the restored Jesuits had again taken up the western mission work in 1824. In 1836 Frs. Charles F. van Quickenborne and Hoecken began a series of missionary visits among the Kickapoo, Wea, Piankishaw, Potawatomi, and other removed and native tribes in Kansas which resulted in the establishment of a successful mission among the Potawatomi (St. Mary's) to which the other tribes were contributors. In 1847 a mission was started among the removed Miami, who had made official request for Catholic teachers, but it was discontinued two years later, probably because of the utter unworthiness of the Indians, who are officially described in the same year as "a miserable race of beings, considering nothing but what contributes to the pernicious indulgence of their depraved appetites for whiskey". The picture in 1849 is in even darker colors—"destroying themselves by liquor and extensively murdering one another", the lowest in condition of all the removed tribes, and reduced in three years by more than one half. In 1855 we hear of the first improvement, through the temperance efforts of the French half-breeds in the tribe. The Quapaw mission of St. Mary's, Okla., in charge of a secular priest assisted by five Sisters of Divine Providence now cares for 276 Indians of the associated remnant tribes, including about 40 of Miami kinship. Of an original 4000 or more there are left now only about 400, namely—Indiana, 243; Miami in Okla., 128; Wea and Piankishaw, with Peoria, in Okla., about 40.

Very little has been recorded of the customs or general ethnology of the Miami. They were organized upon the clan system, with, according to Morgan, ten *gentes*. One of their dances has been described, the feather dance, in which the performers, carrying feathered wands, imitated the movements of birds. They had a cannibal society—or possibly a clan—upon which devolved the obligation of eating the body of a prisoner upon occasion of certain great victories. Such ceremonial cannibalism was almost universal among the northern and eastern tribes. Their chief deities seem to have been the Sun and Thunder. They buried in the ground, under small log structures upon the surface of the ground, or in large logs split and hollowed out for the purpose. Of the language nothing of importance has been published beyond a Wea Primer, by the Baptist mission in 1837, although considerable manuscript exists with the Bureau of American Ethnology. It is still spoken by a large proportion of the survivors.

MARGRY, *Découvertes*, I–VI (Paris, 1879–1886); SHEA, *Cath. Ind. Miss.* (N. Y., 1854); *Jesuit Relations*, ed. THWAITES, especially XLIV, LIV, LVIII, LIX, LXII (Cleveland, 1896–1901); PARKMAN, *Montcalm and Wolfe* (2 vols., Boston, 1884); MORGAN, *Ancient Society* (New York, 1877); COMSNER. OF IND. AFFAIRS, *Annual Repts.* (Washington); *Director Cath. Ind Miss., Annual Reports* (Washington); KAPPLER, *Ind. Affairs: Laws and Treaties* (2 vols., Washington, 1904); CRAIG, *Ouiatanon* in *Ind. Hist. Soc. Pubs.*, II (Indianapolis, 1893).

JAMES MOONEY.

Micah. See MICHEAS.

Michael, MILITARY ORDERS OF SAINT.—(1) A Bavarian order, founded in 1721 by Elector Joseph Clemens of Cologne, Duke of Bavaria, and confirmed by Maximilian Joseph, King of Bavaria, 11 Sept., 1808. Pius VII, 5 February, 1802, granted to priests decorated with this order all the privileges of domestic prelates. Under Louis I it was made an order of merit (1837), and under Otto I was reorganized (1887).

(2) An order founded in 1469 by Louis XI, the chief military order of France until the institution of the Knights of the Holy Ghost, after which the two together formed the *ordres du roi*, the reception of the

cross of the former being made a condition to membership in the latter. After the Revolution the order was revived, in 1816, as a distinction to be conferred on those who had accomplished notable work in art or science, or who had performed extraordinary services for the state. In 1825 there was a solemn reception into the *ordres du roi*, which did not, however, survive the Revolution of 1830.

(3) Knights of St. Michael's Wing, founded in the Cistercian monastery of Alcobaza, about 1171, by Alfonso I, King of Portugal, in commemoration of a victory over the Moors, in which, according to tradition, he was assisted by St. Michael in person. The knights were placed under the jurisdiction of the Abbot of Alcobaza and were pledged to recite the same prayers as Cistercian lay brothers. The order was in existence but a short time.

Hélyot, *Ordres religieux* (Paris, 1859).

Florence Rudge McGahan.

Michael Cærularius (Κηρουλάριος), Patriarch of Constantinople (1043–58), author of the second and final schism of the Byzantine Church, date of birth unknown; d. 1058. After the reconciliation following the schism of Photius (d. 891), there remained at Constantinople an anti-Latin party that gloried in the work of that patriarch, honoured him as the great defender of the Orthodox Church, and waited for a chance of renewing his quarrel. The only explanation of Michael Cærularius's conduct is that he belonged from the beginning to the extreme wing of that party, and had always meant to break with the pope as soon as he could. Belonging to one of the great families of Constantinople, he held in his youth some place at the Court. He began his public career by plotting with Constantine Monomachus, the future emperor, to depose Emperor Michael IV (1034–1041). Both conspirators were banished, and, in their exile, formed the friendship to which Cærularius owed his later advancement. Cærularius was known as a dangerous person, so the Government tried to stop his political career by making him a monk. At first he refused; then suddenly the suicide of his brother caused his conversion, and he voluntarily entered a monastery. In 1042 Monomachus became emperor peaceably by marrying Zoe, a descendant of Basil the Macedonian (Basil I, 867–86) and widow of both Romanus III (1028–34) and Michael IV. He remembered his old friend and fellow-conspirator and gave him an ambiguous place at court, described as that of the emperor's "familiar friend and guest at meals" (Psellus, "Enkomion", I, 324). As Cærularius was a monk, any further advancement must be that of an ecclesiastical career. He was therefore next made syncellus (that is, secretary) of the patriarch, Alexius (1025–34). The syncellus was always a bishop, and held a place in the church second only to that of the patriarch himself. In 1034 Alexius died, and Constantine appointed Cærularius as his successor. There was no election; the emperor "went like an arrow to the target" (Psellus, ibid., p. 326). From this moment the story of Cærularius becomes that of the great schism.

The time was singularly unpropitious for a quarrel with the pope. The Normans were invading Sicily, enemies of both the papacy and the Eastern Empire, from whom they were conquering that island. There was every reason why the pope (St. Leo IX, 1048–54) and the emperor should keep friends and unite their forces against the common enemy. Both knew it, and tried throughout to prevent a quarrel. But it was forced on them by the outrageous conduct of the patriarch. Suddenly, after no kind of provocation, in the midst of what John Beccus describes as "perfect peace" between the two Churches (L. Allatius, "Græcia orthod.", I, 37), Cærularius sent a declaration of war against the pope and the Latins. His agent was Leo, Metropolitan of Achrida in Bulgaria. In 1053 this latter sent a letter to Bishop John of Tranum in Apulia, complaining of certain Latin customs, especially fasting on Saturday and the use of azyme (unleavened) bread for the Holy Eucharist. He says that the letter is meant for "all the bishops of the Franks and for the most venerable pope" (published by Will, "Acta et scripta", 56–60). There is no doubt that it was dictated by Cærularius. John of Tranum sent the letter on to Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida, who translated it and showed it to the pope. Cærularius then sent to the other patriarchs a treatise written by Nicetas Pectoratus (Niketas Stethatos in Greek), a monk of Studion, against azyme bread, fasting on Saturday, and celibacy. Because of these "horrible infirmities", Nicetas describes Latins as "dogs, bad workmen, schismatics, hypocrites, and liars" (Will, op. cit., 127–36). Cærularius's third move made it plain that he meant war to the knife. Still entirely unprovoked, he closed all the Latin churches at Constantinople, including that of the papal legate. His chancellor Nicephorus burst open the Latin tabernacles, and trampled on the Holy Eucharist because it was consecrated in azyme bread.

The pope then answered the letter of Leo of Achrida. Knowing well whence it came, he addressed his answer in the first place to Cærularius. It is a dignified defence of the customs attacked and of the rights of the Holy See. He points out that no one thought of attacking the many Byzantine monasteries and churches in the West (Will, op. cit., 65–85). For a moment Cærularius seems to have wavered in his plan because of the importance of the pope's help against the Normans. He writes to Peter III of Antioch, that he had for this reason proposed an alliance with Leo (Will, 174). Leo answered this proposal resenting the stupendous arrogance of Michael's tone, but still hoping for peace. At the same time he wrote a very friendly letter to the emperor, and sent both documents to Constantinople by three legates Cardinal Humbert, Cardinal Frederick (his own cousin and Chancellor of the Roman Church, afterwards Stephen IX, 1057–58), and Archbishop Peter of Amalfi. The emperor, who was exceedingly annoyed about the whole quarrel, received the legates with honour and lodged them in his palace. Cærularius, who had now quite given up the idea of his alliance, was very indignant that the legates did not give him precedence and prostrate before him, and wrote to Peter of Antioch that they are "insolent, boastful, rash, arrogant, and stupid" (Will, 177). Several weeks passed in discussion. Cardinal Humbert wrote defences of the Latin customs, and incidentally converted Nicetas Pectoratus (Will, 93–126, 136–50). Cærularius refused to see the legates or to hold any communication with them: he struck the pope's name from his diptychs, and so declared open schism. The legates then prepared the Bull of excommunication against him, Leo of Achrida, and their adherents, which they laid on the altar of Sancta Sophia on 16 July, 1054. Two days later they set out for Rome. The emperor was still on good terms with them and gave them presents for Monte Cassino. Hardly were they gone when Cærularius sent for them to come back, meaning to have them murdered (the evidence for this is given in Fortescue, "Orthodox Eastern Church", 186–7). Cærularius, when this attempt failed, sent an account of the whole story to the other patriarchs so full of lies that John of Antioch answered him: "I am covered with shame that your venerable letter should contain such things. Believe me, I do not know how to explain it for your own sake, especially if you have written like this to the other most blessed patriarchs" (Will, 190).

After the schism Cærularius became for a time the strongest man at Constantinople. He quarrelled with his former patron, Constantine IX, who appeased him

by abject apologies. He became a kind of king-maker. When Theodora succeeded (1055–6), he "tried to rule over the empress" (Psellus, "Enkomion", 357). Michael VI (1056–7) was not sufficiently submissive, so Cærularius worked up a revolution, deposed him, went himself to cut off his hair, and shut him up in a monastery. In his place he set up Isaac Comnenus (Isaac I, 1057–9). Isaac knew well to whom he owed his place and was at first very docile. At this time Cærularius reached the height of his power. He appointed all the officers of state, and was the real sovereign of the empire. So little did he disguise this fact that he began to wear the purple shoes that were always the prerogative of the emperor. "Losing all shame", says Psellus, "he joined royalty and priesthood in himself; in his hand he held the cross while imperial laws came from his mouth" (in Bréhier, op. cit., 275). Then Isaac got tired of being the patriarch's puppet and wanted to reign himself. So once again Cærularius worked up a revolution. This time he meant to have himself crowned emperor. But Isaac was too quick for him; he had him arrested at once and tried for high treason. Michael Psellus was employed to bring the charge against him. He was accused of treason, paganism, and magic; he was "impious, tyrannical, murderous, sacrilegious, unworthy". He was condemned to banishment at Madytus on the Hellespont. On the way there was a shipwreck from the effects of which he died (1059).

As soon as he was dead his apotheosis began. The emperor professed much regret for what had happened; his body was brought back to Constantinople and buried with great pomp in the church of the Holy Angels. Psellus, who had brought the charges against him, now preached a panegyric in his honour, describing him as the best, wisest, holiest, most misunderstood of men (this "Enkomion" is published by Sathas; see bibliography). It seems that, as soon as he was dead and therefore no longer dangerous, the Government found it more prudent to pretend to share the popular enthusiasm for him. From Psellus's two accounts (the indictment at the trial and the funeral oration) it is not difficult to form an opinion about Cærularius's character. He was by far the strongest man in the Eastern Empire during a time of its general degradation, far more capable than the contemptible emperors he set up and deposed. His life was austere. He had unbounded ambition, pride, and savage vindictiveness. It was said at the time that he never forgave an injury. He was not a scholar, nor in any way so great a man as his predecessor and model, Photius. It seems that his breach with Rome was a part of a general scheme. He wanted to make himself autocrat of at least Eastern Europe. He could easily cow the feeble emperors; he could and did dictate orders overweeningly to the other Eastern patriarchs, but he knew that he could not frighten nor persuade the pope to tolerate such a position. A breach with the West was thus the first necessary step in a career that was meant to end in a combination of patriarchate and empire in his own person. He did not succeed in that plan, but he did something much more momentous; he founded the schismatical Byzantine Church.

WILL, *Acta et Scripta quæ de controversiis ecclesiæ græcæ et latinæ sæculo XI composita extant* (Leipzig, 1861); PSELLUS, *History*, ed. SATHAS in *Byzantine Texts* (London, 1898); PSELLUS, *Enkomion* in SATHAS, *Bibl. medii ævi*, IV (1875), 326 sqq.; also in *P. G.*, CXXII, 477–1186; BRÉHIER, *Le schisme oriental du XI^e siècle* (Paris, 1899); HERGENRÖTHER, *Photius*, III (Ratisbon, 1869); PICHLER, *Gesch. der kirchl. Trennung zwischen dem Orient u. Occident* (Munich, 1864–5); NORDEN, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz* (Berlin, 1903); FORTESCUE, *The Orthodox Eastern Church* (London, 1907), chap. v, *The Schism of Cerularius*.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Michael de Sanctis (DE LOS SANTOS), SAINT, b. at Vich in Catalonia, 29 September, 1591; d. at Valladolid, 10 April, 1625. At the age of twelve years he came to Barcelona, and asked to be received into the monastery of the Trinitarians, in which order, after a three years' novitiate, he took vows in the monastery of St. Lambert at Saragossa, 5 Sept., 1607. When one day a Discalced Trinitarian came to St. Lambert's to receive Holy orders, Michael felt himself drawn to this more austere congregation. After mature deliberation, and with the permission of his superior, he entered the novitiate of the Discalced Trinitarians at Madrid, and took vows at Alcalá; he became priest and was twice elected superior of the monastery at Valladolid. He lived a life of prayer and great mortification, was especially devout towards the Holy Eucharist, and is said to have been rapt in ecstasy several times during Consecration. He was beatified by Pius VI, 24 May, 1779 and canonized by Pius IX, 8 June, 1862. His feast is celebrated on 5 July. He is generally represented kneeling before an altar where the Blessed Sacrament is exposed.

Vita e miracoli di S. Michele dei Santi, published anonymously (Rome, 1862); CARMICHAEL, *The Congregation of S. Michele dei Santi* in *The Catholic World*, LXXIV (New York, 1902), 629–41; GUÉRIN, *Vies des Saints*, 5 July; STADLER, *Heiligen-Lexikon* (Augsburg, 1858–82), 439–440.

MICHAEL OTT.

Michael of Cesena (MICHELE FUSCHI), Friar Minor, Minister General of the Franciscan Order, and theologian, b. at Cesena, a small town in Central Italy, near Forlì, about 1270; d. at Munich, 29 Nov., 1342. Of his early life little is known. Having entered the Franciscan Order, he studied at Paris and took the doctor's degree in theology. He taught theology at Bologna and wrote several commentaries on Holy Scripture and the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard. At the general chapter of Naples (31 May, 1316) he was elected minister general and went at once to Assisi, where he convoked a chapter to consider the revision of the Constitutions of the order. Returning to Bologna, he issued the document, "Gravi qua premor" (21 Aug., 1316), which, together with several other ordinances regarding the matter of poverty, induced John XXII to publish the Bull, "Quorumdam exigit" (7 Oct., 1317), whose purpose was to explain the decretals of Nicholas III, "Exiit qui seminat" (13 Aug., 1279), and of Clement V, "Exivi de paradiso" (6 May, 1312). As it concerned the principal chapter of the Franciscan Rule, this action caused no little disturbance within the order. The Bull was warmly opposed by Michael and his party, who claimed that in adopting the strict poverty upon which Michael had insisted in his letters, they were following the example and teaching of Christ and His Apostles. Thus the controversy finally shifted to a speculative theological question: whether or not it was consonant with Catholic Faith to hold that Christ and the Apostles had no property individually or in common; and while in the famous dispute at Narbonne in 1321 the inquisitor, John of Belna, claimed that it was heretical, Berengarius of Perpignan declared it a Catholic dogma in perfect accordance with the decretals of Nicholas III and Clement V. The matter having been brought before John XXII, a further attempt to settle the controversy was made by distinguishing between dominion and simple use, so that both propositions, Christ and the Apostles had no property, i. e., dominion of property, and Christ and the Apostles possessed property, i. e., the use of property, were true. In the Bull "Quia nonnunquam" (26 March, 1322) the pope declared that he intended merely to explain the decrees of his predecessors, and excommunicated anyone who attempted to misconstrue the meaning of the papal Constitution "Quorumdam exigit". In June of the same year a general chapter of the order was convoked at Perugia and decided that to assert that Christ and His Apostles possessed no earthly goods was not only not heretical, but sound and Catholic doctrine. At the same time Bonagratia of Bergamo was commis-

sioned to represent the chapter before the papal Curia at Avignon. The controversy continued unabated until, in 1327, Michael was summoned to appear before the pope. He feigned illness and delayed; but obeyed a subsequent summons and was forbidden by the pope under pain of grave censure to leave Avignon. He was thus unable to attend the chapter held at Bologna in May of the following year (1328); yet despite his absence and the protest of the papal legate, he was re-elected minister general, the chapter deeming the charges against him insufficient to deprive him of office. Several prelates and princes wrote to the pope in Michael's behalf; but before these letters or the result of the chapter could reach Avignon, Michael, with William of Occam and Bonagratia of Bergamo, who were also retained by the pope at Avignon, fled by night (25 May) to a galley sent them by Louis of Bavaria.

At Pisa, where they were triumphantly received by the party of Louis and were joined by a number of other schismatics, the deposed minister general published a solemn appeal from the pope to a council (12 Dec., 1328), posted it on the door of the cathedral, and the next day read to the assembled multitude a decree of the Emperor Louis deposing John XXII. The pope issued the Encyclical "Quia vir reprobus", warning the faithful against Michael; and the latter answered in his "Ad perpetuam rei memoriam innotescat quod ego, Fr. Michael" (25 Nov., 1330) and in "Christianæ fidei fundamentum", in which he accused the pope of heresy in the three Bulls, "Ad Conditorem Canonum", "Cum inter nonnullos", and "Quia quorumdam". These and "Litteras plurium magistrorum", and "Teste Solomone", which Michael wrote in his own defence, are contained in Occam's Dialogue. The general chapter of Paris (11 June, 1329), at which Cardinal Bertrand presided, condemned the conduct and writings of Michael and all who took part with him against John XXII; and elected Gerard Odon minister general of the order. The next year (1330) Michael and other schismatics followed Louis to Bavaria. The chapter of Perpignan (25 April, 1331) expelled Michael from the order and sentenced him to perpetual imprisonment. During the latter years of his life he was abandoned by nearly all his sympathizers, but it is probable that he died repentant. His remains, with those of his accomplices, William Occam and Bonagratia of Bergamo, lie buried in the Barfüsserkirche at Munich.

WADDING, *Annales Minorum*, ad an. 1316, nos. 3, 5, 10; ad an. 1328, nos. 6, 13, and passim; *Scriptores Ordinis Minorum*, 259; MARCOUR, *Antheil der Minoriten am Kampfe zwischen König Ludwig IV. von Bayern und Papst Johann XXII.* (Emmerich, 1874); GUDENATZ, *Michael von Cæsena* (Breslau, 1876); *Analecta Franciscana* (Quaracchi, 1897), IV, 470, 487, 488, 509, 617, 704, 705.

STEPHEN M. DONOVAN.

Michael Scotus (SCOTT or SCOT), a thirteenth-century mathematician, philosopher, and scholar. He was born in Scotland, about the year 1175. The contention that he was an Irishman seems to be disposed of by the fact that when, in 1223, he was offered the Archbishopric of Cashel, he declined on the ground that he was ignorant of the Irish language. It is not clear whether "Scotus" indicates merely a native of Scotland, or one of the clan Scott, or Scot, which was very numerous in the Scottish lowlands. There is a tradition to the effect that he studied first at the cathedral school of Durham, and afterwards at the Universities of Oxford and Paris. At the last mentioned place he was known as "the mathematician", which implies that he studied in the Faculty of Arts. It is probable that he studied theology also. At any rate, he was beyond doubt a cleric. It seems likely that, on leaving Paris, he visited the University of Bologna, before repairing to Sicily, to the Court of Frederick II. This occurred about 1200. At Palermo, he joined the circle of learned men who surrounded the emperor; by some, indeed, he is said to have been elevated to the rank of imperial tutor, although the MSS., as a rule, entitled him "*astrologer* to the Lord Emperor Frederick". In 1209 he went to Toledo, made the acquaintance of several distinguished Arabian scholars and wrote his "Abbreviatio Avicennæ", the MS., of which bears the date 1210. He also took up the study of astronomy and alchemy, and translated from the Arabic several works on those subjects. That he was interested in the philosophy of the Arabians is evident from the fact that he translated several philosophical commentaries of Averroes.

After his return to Palermo, about 1220, Michael devoted special attention to the science and practice of medicine. He received several signs of pontifical as well as imperial favour. By Pope Honorius III he was offered several ecclesiastical benefices, among them being the Archbishopric of Cashel, in Ireland. He was also offered the Archbishopric of Canterbury both by Honorius in 1223, and by Gregory IX in 1227. In this case, however, it was the unwillingness of the local clergy and not that of the candidate himself that stood in the way of Michael's preferment. His disappointment is, according to his latest biographer, reflected in the gloomy "prophecies" which he composed about this time, and which were so well known during the Middle Ages. According to Roger Bacon, Michael visited Oxford "about the year 1230", bearing with him "certain books of Aristotle and commentaries of learned men concerning physics, and mathematics". The date of his death is uncertain; it is generally given as 1234. The legend which grew up around the name of Michael Scot was due to his extraordinary reputation as a scholar and an adept in the secret arts. He figures as a magician in Dante's "Inferno", in Boccaccio's "Decamerone", in local Italian and Scottish folk-lore, and in Sir Walter Scott's "Lay of the Last Minstrel". The most important of his original works are (1) "Liber Physiognomiæ", first printed in 1477, and since then reprinted eighteen times in various languages; (2) "Astronomia", still in MS., in the Bodleian Library; (3) "Liber Introductorius", also in MS., ibid.; (4) "Liber Luminis Luminum", in a MS., of the Riciardi coll., Florence; (5) "De Alchimia", in MS. in Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Besides the translations mentioned above, a Latin version of Aristotle's "Ethics" made from the Greek text is sometimes attributed to Michael Scot.

BROWN, *Life and Legend of Michael Scot* (Edinburgh, 1897); JOURDAIN, *Recherches sur l'âge et l'origine des traductions latines d'Aristote* (Paris, 1843); MILMAN, *Michael Scot almost an Irish Archbishop*, pub. by Philobiblon Society, 1854; *Hist. littér. de la France*, XX, 43–51; HAURÉAU, *Notices et extraits*, XXI, pt. II, 204; IDEM, *Hist. de la phil. scol.* (Paris, 1880) II, pt. I, 124 sqq.; DENIFLE, *Chartul. Univ., Paris.*, I (Paris, 1889), 103.

WILLIAM TURNER.

Michael the Archangel (Hebr. מיכאל, "Who is like God?"), SAINT, one of the principal angels; his name was the war-cry of the good angels in the battle fought in heaven against Satan and his followers. Four times his name is recorded in Scripture: (a) Dan., x, 13 sqq., Gabriel says to Daniel, when he asks God to permit the Jews to return to Jerusalem: "The Angel [D. V. prince] of the kingdom of the Persians resisted me . . . and, behold Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me . . . and none is my helper in all these things, but Michael your prince"; (b), Dan., xii, the Angel speaking of the end of the world and the Antichrist says: "At that time shall Michael rise up, the great prince, who standeth for the children of thy people." (c) In the Catholic Epistle of St. Jude: "When Michael the archangel, disputing with the devil, contended about the body of Moses", etc. St. Jude alludes to an ancient Jewish tradition of a dispute between Michael and Satan over the body of Moses, an account of which is also found in the apocryphal book on the assump-

tion of Moses (Origen, "De principiis", III, 2, 1). St. Michael concealed the tomb of Moses; Satan, however, by disclosing it, tried to seduce the Jewish people to the sin of hero-worship. St. Michael also guards the body of Eve, according to the "Revelation of Moses" ("Apocryphal Gospels", etc., ed. A. Walker, Edinburgh, p. 647). (d) Apocalypse, xii, 7, "And there was a great battle in heaven, Michael and his angels fought with the dragon." St. John speaks of the great conflict at the end of time, which reflects also the battle in heaven at the beginning of time. According to the Fathers there is often question of St. Michael in Scripture where his name is not mentioned. They say he was the cherub who stood at the gate of paradise, "to keep the way of the tree of life" (Gen., iii, 24), the angel through whom God published the Decalogue to his chosen people, the angel who stood in the way against Balaam (Numbers, xxii, 22 sqq.), the angel who routed the army of Sennacherib (IV Kings, xix, 35), etc. Cf. P. Bonaventura da Sorrento ("Micha-el", Naples, 1892).

Following these Scriptural passages, Christian tradition gives to St. Michael four offices: (1) To fight against Satan. (2) To rescue the souls of the faithful from the power of the devil, especially at the hour of death. (3) To be the champion of God's people, the Jews in the Old Law, the Christians in the New Testament; therefore he was the patron of the Church, and of the order of knights during the Middle Ages. (4) To call away from earth and bring men's souls to judgment ("signifer S. Michael repræsentet eas in lucem sanctam", Offert. Miss. Defunct. "Constituit eum principem super animas suscipiendas", Antiph. off. Cf. "Hermas", Pastor, I, 3, Simil. VIII, 3). Regarding his rank in the celestial hierarchy opinions vary; St. Basil (Hom. de angelis) and other Greek Fathers, also Salmeron, Bellarmine, etc., place St. Michael over all the angels; they say he is called "archangel" because he is the prince of the other angels; others (cf. P. Bonaventura, op. cit.) believe that he is the prince of the seraphim, the first of the nine angelic choirs. But according to St. Thomas (Summa, I, Q. cxiii, a. 3) he is the prince of the last and lowest choir, the angels. The Roman Liturgy seems to follow the Greek Fathers; it calls him "Princeps militiæ cœlestis quem honorificant angelorum cives". The hymn of the Mozarabic Breviary places St. Michael even above the Twenty-four Elders. The Greek Liturgy styles him Ἀρχιστράτηγος, "highest general" (cf. Menæa, 8 Nov. and 6 Sept.).

Veneration.—It would have been natural to St. Michael, the champion of the Jewish people, to be the champion also of Christians, giving victory in war to his clients. The early Christians, however, regarded some of the martyrs as their military patrons: St. George, St. Theodore, St. Demetrius, St. Sergius, St. Procopius, St. Mercurius, etc.; but to St. Michael they gave the care of their sick. At the place where he was first venerated, in Phrygia, his prestige as angelic healer obscured his interposition in military affairs. It was from early times the centre of the true cult of the holy angels, particularly of St. Michael. Tradition relates that St. Michael in the earliest ages caused a medicinal spring to spout at Chairotopa near Colossæ, where all the sick who bathed there, invoking the Blessed Trinity and St. Michael, were cured. Still more famous are the springs which St. Michael is said to have drawn from the rock at Colossæ (Chonæ, the present Khonas, on the Lycus). The pagans directed a stream against the sanctuary of St. Michael to destroy it, but the archangel split the rock by lightning to give a new bed to the stream, and sanctified forever the waters which came from the gorge. The Greeks claim that this apparition took place about the middle of the first century and celebrate a feast in commemoration of it on 6 September (Analecta Bolland., VIII, 285–328). Also at Pythia in Bithynia and elsewhere in Asia the hot springs were dedicated to St. Michael. At Constantinople likewise, St. Michael was the great heavenly physician. His principal sanctuary, the Michaelion, was at Sosthenion, some fifty miles south of Constantinople; there the archangel is said to have appeared to the Emperor Constantine. The sick slept in this church at night to wait for a manifestation of St. Michael; his feast was kept there 9 June. Another famous church was within the walls of the city, at the thermal baths of the Emperor Arcadius; there the synaxis of the archangel was celebrated 8 Nov. This feast spread over the entire Greek Church, and the Syrian, Armenian, and Coptic Churches adopted it also; it is now the principal feast of St. Michael in the Orient. It may have originated in Phrygia, but its station at Constantinople was the Thermæ of Arcadius (Martinow, "Annus Græco-slavicus", 8 Nov.). Other feasts of St. Michael at Constantinople were: 27 Oct., in the "Promotu" church; 18 June, in the Church of St. Julian at the Forum; 10 Dec., at Athæa (Maximilian, Liturgia Orientalis, Freiburg, 1908).

The Christians of Egypt placed their life-giving river, the Nile under the protection of St. Michael; they adopted the Greek feast and keep it 12 Nov.; on the twelfth of every month they celebrate a special commemoration of the archangel, but 12 June, when the river commences to rise, they keep as a holiday of obligation the feast of St. Michael "for the rising of the Nile", *εὐχὴ εἰς τὴν σύμμετρον ἀνάβασιν τῶν ποταμίων ὑδάτων* (N. Nilles, "Kal. man.", II, 702, Innsbruck).

At Rome the Leonine Sacramentary (sixth cent.) has the "Natale Basilicæ Angeli via Salaria", 30 Sept.; of the five Masses for the feast three mention St. Michael. The Gelasian Sacramentary (seventh cent.) gives the feast "S. Michaelis Archangeli", and the Gregorian Sacramentary (eighth cent.), "Dedicatio Basilionis S. Angeli Michaelis", 29 Sept. A manuscript also here adds "via Salaria" (Ebner, "Miss. Rom. Iter Italicum", 127). This church of the Via Salaria was six miles to the north of the city: in the ninth century it was called *Basilica Archangeli in Septimo* (Armellini, "Chiese di Roma", p. 855). It disappeared a thousand years ago. At Rome also the part of heavenly physician was given to St. Michael. According to an (apocryphal?) legend of the tenth century he appeared over the Moles Hadriani (Castel di S. Angelo), in 950, during the procession which St. Gregory held against the pestilence, putting an end to the plague. Boniface IV (608–15) built on the Moles Hadriani in honour of him, a church, which was styled *St. Michaelis inter nubes* (*in summitate circi*).

Well known is the apparition of St. Michael (a. 494 or 530–40), as related in the Roman Breviary, 8 May, at his renowned sanctuary on Monte Gargano, where his original glory as patron in war was restored to him. To his intercession the Lombards of Sipontum (Manfredonia) attributed their victory over the Greek Neapolitans, 8 May, 663. In commemoration of this victory the church of Sipontum instituted a special feast in honour of the archangel, on 8 May, which has spread over the entire Latin Church and is now called (since the time of Pius V) "Apparitio S. Michaelis", although it originally did not commemorate the apparition, but the victory.

In Normandy St. Michael is the patron of mariners in his famous sanctuary at Mont-Saint-Michel in the Diocese of Coutances. He is said to have appeared there, in 708, to St. Aubert, Bishop of Avranches. In Normandy his feast "S. Michaelis in periculo maris" or "in Monte Tumba" was universally celebrated on 18 Oct., the anniversary of the dedication of the first church, 16 Oct., 710; the feast is now confined to the Diocese of Coutances. In Germany, after its evangelization, St. Michael replaced for the Christians the pagan god Wotan, to whom many mountains were

Typogravure Goupil of Paris (France).

ST. MICHAEL AND THE DRAGON

GUIDO RENI, CAPUCHIN CHURCH, ROME

sacred, hence the numerous mountain chapels of St. Michael all over Germany.

The hymns of the Roman Office are said to have been composed by St. Rabanus Maurus of Fulda (d. 856). In art St. Michael is represented as an angelic warrior, fully armed with helmet, sword, and shield (often the shield bears the Latin inscription: *Quis ut Deus*), standing over the dragon, whom he sometimes pierces with a lance. He also holds a pair of scales in which he weighs the souls of the departed (cf. Rock, "The Church of Our Fathers", III, 160), or the book of life, to show that he takes part in the judgment. His feast (29 Sept.) in the Middle Ages was celebrated as a holy day of obligation, but along with several other feasts it was gradually abolished since the eighteenth century (see FEASTS). Michaelmas Day, in England and other countries, is one of the regular quarter-days for settling rents and accounts; but it is no longer remarkable for the hospitality with which it was formerly celebrated. Stubble-geese being esteemed in perfection about this time, most families had one dressed on Michaelmas Day. In some parishes (Isle of Skye) they had a procession on this day and baked a cake, called St. Michael's bannock. (Hampson, "Medii Ævi Calendarium", London, 1841, I, 348 sqq.)

BONAVENTURA DA SORRENTO, *Mi-cha-el* (Naples, 1892); KELLNER, *Heortology* (St. Louis, 1908), 328 sqq.; LUCIUS-ANRICH, *Anfänge des Heiligenkultus* (Tübingen, 1904), 266 sqq.; GROSBY, *Michael und Gabriel* in *Kunst, Staatsanz. f. Würtemberg* (1904); GERLACH, *Der deutsche Michel* (Hamm, 1906); PROBST, *Die ältröm. Sacramentarien* (Münster, 1892), 118; *Acta SS.*, 8 May; 29 Sept.; *Pastoralblatt* (St. Louis, July, 1910); *Homiletic Review* (1890); DUCHESNE, *Origines du Culte chrétien* (1889), 264.

FREDERICK G. HOLWECK.

Michas. See MICHEAS.

Michaud, JOSEPH-FRANÇOIS, historian, b. at Albens, Savoy, 1767; d. at Passy, 30 Sept., 1839. He belonged to an ancient family of Savoy. Educated at the College of Bourg at Gresse, in 1786 he entered a publishing house at Lyons, but left it after a few years to take up journalistic work at Paris, where, during the Revolution, he defended warmly and not without risk the royal cause. Arrested on 13 Vendémiaire, 1795, he succeeded in escaping and resumed the journalistic war. Under the Consulate he wrote several pamphlets in which appeared criticisms of Napoleon that led to his imprisonment in the Temple for a time. After his release from prison he decided to abandon politics for literature. In 1808 he published the first volume of the "History of the Crusades". In the same year he founded with his brother the "Biographie Universelle". Elected to the French Academy in 1814, he was, under the Restoration, deputy editor of "La Quotidienne", and then lecturer to Charles X. In May, 1830, he undertook a voyage to the East and the Holy Land in order to study phases of Eastern life and thus impart more realistic colour to the accounts of his "History of the Crusades". He was unable to complete the final edition.

JOSEPH-FRANÇOIS MICHAUD

Michaud's most important work is his "History of the Crusades" (1st ed., 3 vols., Paris, 1812–17; 6th ed., Poujoulat, 6 vols., Paris, 1841). In his choice of the subject and the manner in which he treated it Michaud was an innovator; his work was one of the first productions of the historical school which, inspired by the works of Chateaubriand, restored the Middle Ages to a place of honour. To-day the value of this work seems open to question; the information appears insufficient and the romantic colour is often false. It was none the less the starting point of studies relating to the Crusades, and it was under the influence of this publication that the Academy of Inscriptions in 1841 decided to publish the collection of Historians of the Crusades. Michaud had accompanied his work with a "Bibliothèque des Croisades" (Paris, 1829, 4 vols., 12°), which contained French translations of the European and Arabic chronicles relating to the Crusades. Besides, he directed the publication of the "Biographie Universelle" (2nd ed., 45 vols., Paris, 1843), and in collaboration with Poujoulat that of the "Collection des Mémoires pour servir a l'histoire de France depuis le 13e siècle jusqu'au 18e" (32 vols., Paris, 1836–44).

SAINTE-BEUVE, *Causeries du lundi*, VII, 20–41.

LOUIS BRÉHIER.

Micheas (MICHAS).—In Hebrew the complete form of the name is Mîkhāyāhû or Mîkhāyehû (contracted into Mîkhēhû? II Paral., xviii, 8, *kethîbh*) or Mîkhāyah (who is like Yāhû, Yehû, Yah?); the shortened form is Mîkhah. Among the O.-T. bearers of this name three especially deserve notice.

I. The Book of Judges (xvii–xviii) contains the history of a certain Michas (Hebr., xvii, 1 and 4: Mîkhāyehû; elsewhere Mîkhah), a resident of the hill-country of Ephraim who founded an idolatrous sanctuary. As he restored to his mother the 1100 pieces of silver which he had stolen from her, she devoted 200 wherewith to make an idol which was set up in the house of Michas. In addition, Michas made an *ephod* and *teraphîm*. He first appointed as priest his son, but afterwards engaged a Levite of Bethlehem, Jonathan, a descendant of Moses by Gersam. The Danites, passing by whilst on a migration, took with them the Levite Jonathan and the objects of the idolatrous worship belonging to Michas, in spite of the latter's protests, and set them up in the sanctuary which they established in the town of Dan, so called after their name. See the commentaries on Book of Judges, by G. F. Moore (Edinburgh, 1903); Budde (Tübingen, 1897); Hummelauer (Paris, 1888); Lagrange (Paris, 1903); etc.; cf. A. Van Hoonacker, "Le Sacerdoce Lévitique" (London and Louvain, 1899), 225, 227, 230, 239, 244, and 372.

II. Micheas, son of Jemla (Hebr. Mîkhāyehû; II Paral., xviii, 14: Mîkhah; *ibid.*, verse 8: Mîkhēhû? *keth.*), a prophet of the Kingdom of Samaria, contemporary with Elias and Eliseus. It is related in III Kings, xxii (cf. II Paral., xviii), that Achab, King of Israel (c. 873–852 B. C.), allied to Josaphat, King of Juda, having obtained from 400 prophets an assurance that his intended expedition against Ramoth-Galaad, a town which he wished to recover from the Syrians, would succeed, summoned at the earnest request of Josaphat the Prophet Micheas, son of Jemla, although the latter, he asserted, had always proved to him a prophet of evil. Micheas, in his first answer, foretold the success of the enterprise, but his words were probably spoken in an ironical tone, for Achab adjured him in the name of the Lord to speak the truth. Micheas then announced the defeat of the two kings. He added that he had seen in a vision a spirit promise Yahweh to deceive Achab by his prophets. Whereupon one of these prophets, Sedecias, son of Chanaana, struck him on the face. Achab ordered the imprisonment of Micheas till the day when he should return in peace. "If thou return in peace", said Micheas, "the Lord hath not spoken by

me." In the ensuing battle Achab was severely wounded by a chance arrow and died the same day. See the commentaries on the Books of Kings by Skinner in "Edinburgh Century Bible"; W. E. Barnes (Cambridge, 1908); Kittel (Göttingen, 1900); Klostermann (Munich, 1887); cf. W. R. Harper, "Comm. on Amos and Hosea" (Edinburgh, 1905), lv sq.

III. Micheas (Hebr. Mîkhah; Jer., xxvi, 18: Mîkhāyah *keth.*), the author of the book which holds the sixth place in the collection of the Twelve Minor Prophets, was born at Môrésheth (Mich., i, 1; Jer., xxvi, 18), a locality not far from the town of Geth (Mich., i, 14). Jerusalem was the scene of his ministry, and it occurred, as we learn from the title of his book, under the Kings Joathan (c. 740–735 B. C.), Achaz (735–727?), and Ezechias (727–698?). We do not, however, appear to possess any of his addresses prior to the reign of Ezechias. He was thus a contemporary of the Prophet Isaias. His book falls into three parts: (1) The first part consists of chapters i–iii. Micheas begins by announcing the impending destruction of Samaria as a punishment for its sins, and Jerusalem also is threatened. In chapter ii the prophet develops his threats against the Kingdom of Juda and gives his reasons for them. In chapter iii he utters his reproaches with greater distinctness against the chief culprits: the prophets, the priests, the princes, and the judges. Because of their transgressions, Sion shall be ploughed as a field, etc. (iii, 12). This passage was quoted by the defenders of Jeremias against those who wished to punish with death the boldness with which the latter had announced God's chastisements: Micheas of Morasthi was not punished with death, but, on the contrary, Ezechias and the people did penance and the Lord withdrew his threat against Jerusalem (Jer., xxvi, 18 sq.). There is a general consensus of opinion to attribute to the Prophet Micheas the authorship of this part of the book; serious doubts have been expressed only concerning ii, 11 and 12. Chapters i–iii must have been composed shortly before the destruction of the Kingdom of Samaria by the Assyrians (722 B. C.).

(2) In the second part (iv–v), we have a discourse announcing the future conversion of the nations to the law of Yahweh and describing the Messianic peace, an era to be inaugurated by the triumph of Israel over all its enemies, symbolized by the Assyrians. In v, 1 sq. (Hebr., 2 sq.), the prophet introduces the Messianic king whose place of origin is to be Bethlehem-Ephrata; Yahweh will only give up his people "till the time wherein she that travaileth shall bring forth", an allusion to the well-known passage of Is., vii, 14. Several recent critics have maintained that chapters iv–v, either wholly or in part, are of post-exilic origin. But their arguments, principally based on considerations inspired by certain theories on the history of the Messianic doctrine, are not convincing. Neither is it necessary to suppose that in iv, 8, the comparison of the citadel of Sion with the "tower of the flock" alludes to the ruinous condition of Judea and Jerusalem at the time of the composition of the address; this comparison merely refers to the moral situation held towards the rest of the country by the capital, whence Yahweh is presumed to keep watch. The connexion of ideas, it is true, is interrupted in iv, 10, and in v, 4–5 (Vulg. 5–6), both of which may be later additions. A characteristic trait of Micheas's style in chapter i is found in the puns on the names of localities, and it is noticeable that an entirely similar pun can be seen in v, i (Hebr., iv, 14), particularly when the LXX version is taken into account. The reading supposed by the LXX suggests a very satisfactory interpretation of this difficult passage: "And now, surround thyself with a wall (*gādhēr*), Beth-Gader." The difference of tone and contents clearly show that iv–v must have been composed in other circumstances than i–iii. They probably date from shortly after the fall of Samaria in 722 B. C. In i–iii Micheas had expressed the fear that after the conquest of Samaria the Assyrian army would invade Judea; but Yahweh withdrew His threat (Jer., xxvi, 19), and the enemy left Palestine without attacking Jerusalem. Chapters iv–v have preserved us an echo of the joy caused in Jerusalem by the removal of the danger.

(3) Chapters vi–vii, which form the third part, are cast in a dramatic shape. Yahweh interpellates the people and reproaches them with ingratitude (vi, 3–5). The people ask by what offerings they can expiate their sin (vi, 6–7). The prophet answers that Yahweh claims the observance of the moral law rather than sacrifices (vi, 8). But this law has been shamefully violated by the nation, which has thus brought on itself God's punishment (vi, 9 sqq.). The present writer has suggested ("Les Douze Petits Prophètes", Paris, 1908, 405) that the passage vii, 11b–13, be so transposed as to follow vii, 6; in this way the justification of the punishments assumes a connected form in vi, 9–vii, 6 + 11b–13. The rest of chapter vii (7–11a + 14 sqq.) contains a prayer in which the fallen city expresses hope in a coming restoration and confidence in God.

The opinions of critics are much divided on the composition of these chapters. Several consider them a mere collection of detached fragments of more or less recent origin; but the analysis just given shows that there is a satisfactory connexion between them. The chief reason why critics find it difficult to attribute to Micheas the authorship of chapters vi–vii, or at least of a large portion, is because they identify the fallen city of vii, 7 sqq., with Jerusalem. But the prophet never mentions Jerusalem, and there is no proof that Jerusalem is the city intended. On the contrary, certain traits are better explained on the supposition that the city in the prophet's mind is Samaria; see especially vi, 16, and vii, 14. According to this hypothesis, the prophet in vi–vii, 6 + 11b–13, casts a retrospective look at the causes which brought about the fall of Samaria, and in vii, 7–11a + 14 sqq., he expresses his desires for its return to the Lord's favour. As in the historical situation thus supposed there is nothing which does not exactly tally with the circumstances of Micheas's time, as there is no disagreement in ideas between Micheas i, sqq., and vi–vii, as on the contrary real affinities in style and vocabulary exist between Micheas i, sqq., and vi–vii, it seems unnecessary to deny to the Prophet Micheas the authorship of these two chapters.

CHEYNE, *Micah with notes and introduction* (Cambridge, 1902); REINKE, *Der Prophet Micha* (Giessen, 1874); RYSSEL, *Untersuchungen über die Textgestalt und die Echtheit des Buches Micha* (Leipzig, 1887); STADE, *Bemerkungen über d. Buch Micha* in *Zeitschrift für alttestamentl. Wissenschaft*, I (1881), 161 sq.; III (1883), 1 sqq.; HORTON in *Century Bible Commentaries on the Minor Prophets*, s. v. *Hosea-Micah*. See AGGEUS; MALACHIAS.

A. VAN HOONACKER.

Michel, JEAN, a French dramatic poet of the fifteenth century, who revised and enlarged the mystery of the Passion composed by Arnoul Gréban. There are three Michels mentioned in connexion with this work. Some consider Bishop Jean Michel of Angers as it author, but this opinion can hardly be maintained. None of his biographers speak of his contributions to the mystery of the Passion; moreover, he died in 1447 and therefore could not have revised the work of Gréban, which first appeared about 1450. A catalogue containing the names of the counsellors of the Paris Parliament mentions a "Maistre Jehan Michel", first physician of King Charles VIII, who was made a counsellor in 1491. We also read in "Le Verger d'Honneur" by André de La Vigne, a contemporary poet, "On 23 August, 1495, there died at Chieri (Piedmont) Maistre Jehan Michel, first physician of the king, most excellent doctor in medicine". The third Jean Michel, also a doctor, was the physician

of the young dauphin, son of Charles VIII. His name appears several times in the cartulary of the University of Angers, and in the books of the medical faculty in that city. He died in 1501. Since the Passion was produced for the first time in its new shape at Angers in 1486, it is probable that its author was the third Jean Michel, but the fact has not been proved.

Besides his contributions to Gréban's Passion, Jean Michel composed another mystery, a Resurrection, which was played at Angers on the occasion of King René's visit to that city. Jean Michel has not the dryness of his predecessor; on the other hand he lacks his accuracy. He incorporates into his mysteries the most extravagant legends and the fantastic information found in the apocryphal writers. He delights in pictures of low city life in the fifteenth century, and his language is often realistic in the extreme.

PETIT DE JULLEVILLE, *Les mystères* (Paris, 1880); CREIZENACH, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas* (Halle, 1893); JUBINAL, *Mystères inédits* (Paris, 1837).

P. J. MARIQUE.

Michelangelo Buonarroti. See BUONARROTI.

Michelians, a German Protestant sect which derives its name from "Michel", the popular designation of its founder Johann Michael Hahn, b. of peasant parentage, 2 February, 1758, at Altorf near Stuttgart; d. at Sindlingen near Herrenberg in Würtemberg, 20 January, 1819. Naturally of a deeply religious disposition, he claimed to have been favoured at the age of seventeen with a vision lasting for the space of three hours. From that time on he led a strictly retired life and was a regular attendant at the meetings of the Pietists. His peculiarities drew forth the energetic disapproval of his father, who even resorted to physical violence against him. But as parental opposition resulted in driving the son from home without changing his manner of life, it was soon abandoned as useless. After a seven weeks' vision, alleged to have occurred in 1780, Hahn began to proclaim his beliefs through speech and writing. Large audiences flocked to his preaching and both the ecclesiastical and the civil authorities instituted proceedings against him. He sought quiet in foreign lands, notably in Switzerland, where he met Lavater. From 1794 until his death, he devoted his time, undisturbed, to religious propaganda, living on the estate of Duchess Frances at Sindlingen. While he entertained for some time the idea of establishing a distinct community, a plan which was realized at Kornthal near Stuttgart, after his death, neither he nor his followers ever separated completely and permanently from the state Church. The Bible, interpreted not in a literal but a mystical, allegorical sense, occupies, in his religious system, the position of supreme guide in matters of faith. The Trinity of Persons in God is replaced by a threefold manifestation of one and the same deity. A double fall of man is admitted, for Adam fell first in seeking a consort for the multiplication of the human species, and again in yielding to her suggestion of disobedience. Hence the necessity of redemption by Jesus Christ, a redemption which is understood mainly in a physical sense, in as much as the Redeemer exudes, in his bloody sweat, the coarse, sensual elements in man to whom he restores a spiritualized body. A second and proximate advent of Christ is taught; also the ultimate universal salvation of all beings, the fallen angels included. Among the sources of his belief Hahn mentions only the Bible and special personal illumination; his ideas, however, are undoubtedly related to the views of the theosophists Böhme and Ötinger. His followers, found chiefly among the rural population, are scattered over Würtemberg, Baden, and the Palatinate. Their approximate number is 15,000 souls divided into 26 districts, each of which holds semi-annual conferences. The works of Hahn, comprising 15 volumes, were published posthumously at Tübingen, 1819 sqq.

STAUDENMEYER, *Michael Hahn* (Wilferdingen, 1893); PALMER, *Gemeinschaften und Sekten Württembergs* (Tübingen, 1877); FUNK in *Kirchenlex.*, VIII, 1501–03; KOLB in *New Schaff-Herzog Encycl.*, V (New York, 1909), 117.

N. A. WEBER.

Michelis, EDWARD, theologian, b. in St. Mauritz, 6 Feb., 1813; d. in Luxemburg, 8 June, 1855. After his ordination, in 1836, he was appointed private secretary to the Archbishop of Cologne, Clemens August von Droste-Vischering, whose imprisonment he shared, first in the fortress of Minden (1837), and later at Magdeburg and Erfurt. On his release in 1841 he returned to St. Mauritz, where, the following year, he established the Sisters of Divine Providence, whom he placed in charge of an orphanage he had also founded. In 1844 he was made professor of dogmatic theology in the seminary at Luxemburg, where he remained until his death. Among his published writings are: "Völker der Südsee u. die Geschichte der protestantischen und katholischen Missionen unter denselben" (Munster, 1847); "Lieder aus Westfalen", edited by his brother Friedrich in 1857; "Das heilige Messopfer und das Frohnleichnamsfest in ihrer welthistorischen Bedeutung" (Erfurt, 1841). He was also the founder of the "Münstersche Sonntagsblatt" and co-founder and editor-in-chief of "Das Luxemburger Wort" (1848).

LAUCHERT in *Buchberger, Kirchliches Handlex.; Konversationslex.*

FLORENCE RUDGE MCGAHAN.

Michelozzo di Bartolommeo, architect and sculptor, b. at Florence c. 1391; d. 1472. He exercised a quiet, but far-reaching, influence during the early Renaissance, and for more than a decade worked with Donatello, to whom several of Michelozzo's works have been erroneously attributed. The Aragazzi monument in the cathedral at Montepulciano and the Brancacci tomb at Naples are the work of Michelozzo alone, whilst he assisted Donatello in the execution of the tomb of John XXIII. He also modelled several pieces in brass for Donatello, with whom he collaborated on a pulpit for the cathedral of Prato. Ghiberti received important assistance from him on his "Matthew" and on the bronze sacristy door of the cathedral of Florence. Later on, he made bronze casts of some of Luca della Robbia's designs. Among other works at Florence, a silver figure of St. John, a larger replica of which was afterwards made in clay, is certainly the work of Michelozzo alone, while others again are ascribed to him with more or less probability. In San Giorgio Maggiore, at Venice, there is still preserved a wooden crucifix by him. That Michelozzo was influenced by Donatello in his plastic work, cannot be denied; but his own style was not devoid of originality.

As an architect, it is sufficient to say of him that he was certainly worthy to be compared with Brunelleschi. Being court architect at Florence after 1435, he built the Medici chapel in the church of Santa Croce and undertook the rebuilding of the convent of San Marco, in which the cloister and the hall of the library are his work. He also built the façade of the church of Sant' Agostino in Montepulciano. In these buildings he manifested a certain preference for antique forms, though there are also traces of the Gothic influence which was then passing away. Probably his greatest work was the palace of the Medici (afterwards in the possession of the Riccardi), which lost much of its fine balance of mass when it was enlarged. Between this edifice and Brunelleschi's Pitti Palace there is a great resemblance, though the Pitti may be a work of later date. Still Brunelleschi retains the superiority by virtue of his Palazzo di Parte Guelfa. A peculiarity of the Riccardi (Medici) Palace is the gra-

dation of bossage from the base upwards through two stories, after which come smooth stone blocks. The plan, moreover, was afterwards generally imitated. Not very large, but imposing in effect, it presents, below, a colonnade, above, between bold cornices, a wall decorated with antique reliefs, and then an upper story with semicircular, double-light, windows similar to those of the façade. The composite capital used here was afterwards generally adopted as a decorative element. To Michelozzo are also due a court in the Palazzo Vecchio and another in the Corsi Palace, as well as a palace built for the Medici in Milan, of which only a small part has been preserved. In this, as also in a palace at Ragusa by the same master, the upper floor had windows with the pointed arches of an earlier style. At Milan his Portinari chapel is still to be seen in Sant' Eustorgio. As compared with Donatello and Brunelleschi, Michelozzo is given the higher place by some critics, though others rank him lower.

WOLFF, *Michelozzo di Bartolommeo* (Strasburg, 1900); PHILLIPPI, *Florenz* (Leipzig, 1903); WOERMANN, *Kunstgesch.*, II (Leipzig, 1905).

G. GIETMANN.

Michigan.—The State of Michigan is bounded on the north by Lake Superior, on the east by Canada, Lake Huron and Lake St. Clair, on the south by Ohio and Indiana, and on the west by Lake Michigan and the State of Wisconsin. It has an area of 58,915 square miles.

GEOGRAPHY.—Michigan consists of two distinct parts separated by the Strait of Mackinac and known respectively as the Lower and Upper Peninsula. The Lower Peninsula, the most important part, consists of agricultural lands including the "Fruit Belt" about thirty miles wide, extending along the shore of Lake Michigan, in which all fruits of the northern states flourish and all the general farming crops of the northern states are grown. Some large tracts, formerly covered with pine, are sandy and of small value, but the greater part of the land is fertile. There are salt works and gypsum mines and some coal fields in this section, as well as brick-clay. The Upper Peninsula is mountainous and rocky, interspersed with level tracts of good soil. It is rich in iron and copper, furnishing seventy per cent of all the iron produced in the United States and fourteen per cent of the copper of the world. There are still large tracts of virgin forest, and the land suitable for agriculture has not yet been fully settled.



SEAL OF MICHIGAN

STATISTICS.—The population as shown by the last State census taken in 1904 was 2,530,016, of which 2,253,938 were in the Lower Peninsula. It is estimated that the population has increased at least 20 per cent since that time. *Agriculture.*—The agricultural produce for the year 1908 is estimated at 60,420,000 bushels of corn, 15,732,000 bushels of wheat, 41,847,000 bushels of oats, besides large quantities of beans, sugar-beets, potatoes, and other crops. The value of its wool was $2,732,000. It had 2,130,000 sheep, 704,000 horses, 2,451,000 neat cattle, and 1,388,000 swine. *Mining.*—The value of the output of the mines is estimated at $106,514,000 for the year 1907. *Manufactures.*—The value of the manufactures for the last statistical year, 1905, is estimated at $429,039,778, consisting of iron works, furniture and other woodworks, salt works, automobiles, and manufactures of many other descriptions. *Fisheries.*—Michigan has the largest fresh water fisheries in the United States, the catch for the year amounting to $686,375 in the Great Lakes in the last statistical year 1903. *Commerce.*—Is carried on by water as well as by railroad, and its volume is very extensive. *Means of Communication.*—Steam vessels and vessels of all kinds navigate the Great Lakes, except during two or three of the winter months. There are 8723 miles of steam railroads and 930 miles of electric roads exclusive of city street railroads.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.—*University of Michigan.*—Founded at Detroit (1817) with Rev. John Monteith and Father Richard as its entire faculty. Its present organization and location at Ann Arbor, date from 1837. It has a collegiate staff of 409 professors, instructors, assistants, and administrative officers and (1908) had 5,188 enrolled students. Besides the classical course it has schools of medicine and law. Students of both sexes are admitted and residents of Michigan have tuition free. It is supported by three-eighths of a mill tax on all property in the state and interest on original endowment fund and students' fees and appropriations by legislature, and is governed by a board of eight regents, two being elected every second year who hold office eight years. *State Agricultural College*, founded in 1855, located at Lansing, besides scientific and practical agriculture has technological classes. It has 90 instructors, had 1191 students in 1908, and is supported by interest on endowment fund, one-tenth of a mill tax and appropriations from U. S. Treasury and by state Legislature, students' fees, and receipts for produce. *College of Mines*, opened in 1886, located at Houghton in the Upper Peninsula in the midst of copper mines, has 32 instructors, had 266 students in 1908, and is supported by legislative appropriations and students' fees.

Normal Schools.—There are four in the state, located at Ypsilanti, Mount Pleasant, Marquette, and Kalamazoo. They employ in all 170 instructors, have an average attendance of 6,281 pupils, and are supported by legislative appropriations and students' fees.

Special Schools.—A school for the deaf, established in 1854, located at Flint, has 48 instructors, an average attendance of 320 pupils, and is supported by legislative appropriations. A school for the blind was established (1881) at Lansing, and has 15 instructors, an average of 131 pupils, and is supported by legislative appropriations. The Employment Institute for the Blind, established 1903, located at Saginaw, has 7 instructors and 102 pupils, and is also supported by legislative appropriation. The State Public School for Destitute and Ill-treated Children was opened in 1874 at Coldwater. Instruction is given in manual labour and primary school grades. It has 5 teachers, 8 cottage managers, average of inmates 526, average age of children 6 $\frac{9}{10}$ years. Supported by legislative appropriation.

Public School System.—Each township and city is divided into school districts of convenient size, each of which has its school house and teacher or teachers. In cities, villages, and such townships as so determine by vote, graded and high schools are maintained as well as the primary schools, and all are supported by taxation of the property in each school district. There are 17,286 teachers in the public schools and 743,630 pupils, the total appropriation from all sources was $19,202,449.61 in the last fiscal year. This does not include the private or denominational schools. All children between the ages of seven and fifteen years are compelled by law to attend some school, either public, parochial, or private at least four months in each year, unless shown to be properly taught at home.

HISTORY.—The first settlers in Michigan (about 1641) were the hardy and adventurous French Canadians who established trading posts at Sault Ste. Marie and Michillimackinac (now "Mackinac"), which they reached by way of the Ottawa River, thence

by portage to Lake Nipissing and so by Georgian Bay to their destination. This route was evidently selected through fear of the Iroquois, usually hostile to Canada, on the shores of Lakes Erie and Ontario. These pioneers were soon followed and aided by the Jesuit Fathers Allouez, Marquette, and others. Detroit was first settled by Antoine De La Motte Cadillac (1701), and the French Canadians who followed him formed the earliest farming population, settling on the shores of Detroit River. Until the country fell into the hands of the British (1760) there were no settlers of any other nationality, and during the British occupation and afterward, until after the close of the war of 1812, there were but few. Indian troubles and the unsettled state caused by war were so prejudicial to immigration that when Michigan was organized as a territory (1805) its population did not exceed 4,000 persons. But when the public lands were offered for sale (1818) a tide of settlers at once set in from New England, New York, Ohio, and other states, besides emigrants from Ireland, Great Britain, and Germany. Later there was also large emigration from Holland, and later still from Poland, Sweden, Italy, and in short from every European nation, as well as some from Turkey, Syria, Armenia, and China. Michigan was admitted as the twenty-sixth state of the Union, 26 Jan., 1837. It adopted a constitution on being admitted as a state. In 1850 a second constitution materially changing the former one was framed and adopted, and (1909) a third constitution, better suited to the needs of the state, was prepared, adopted by popular vote, and went into effect Jan., 1910. Formal possession of the entire region was taken in the name of the King of France at Sault Ste. Marie (1672). In 1701 Antoine De La Motte Cadillac founded Detroit, naming it Fort Pontchartrain. In 1760 Michigan came under British rule. In 1796 the United States took possession, and Michigan became a part of the Northwest Territory. Michigan (without the Upper Peninsula) became an organized territory in 1805. Father Gabriel Richard of Detroit was elected territorial delegate to Congress (1823), being the only Catholic priest who ever had a seat in that assembly.

There arose a dispute with Ohio as to the boundary line near Toledo. Michigan adopted a constitution and took all necessary steps for admission into the Union, but was prevented from doing so by reason of the Ohio dispute, which was settled by the boundary line being determined in favour of Ohio, and by Michigan obtaining instead the Upper Peninsula. It was then allowed to enter the Union (1837). The capital was removed from Detroit to Lansing (1847), then a small village in a dense forest, now a city of 24,000 inhabitants. A colony of Mormons took possession of Beaver Island in Lake Michigan, from which they were forcibly expelled by armed fishermen from the mainland in 1856.

The Republican party was organized "under the oaks" at Jackson, Michigan. Up to that time the Democratic party had been in power in the state, but ever since the Republicans have had a large majority of the voters. This state sent 93,700 men to the Civil War, of whom 14,855 died in the service.

Michigan furnished five regiments, of 1026 officers and men each, for the Spanish War (1898), of which three regiments went to Cuba.

Laws and Religion.—The constitution provides that "Every person shall be at liberty to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. No person shall be compelled to attend, or against his consent, to contribute to the erection or support of any place of religious worship, or to pay tithes, taxes, or other rates for the support of any minister of the gospel or teachers of religion. No money shall be appropriated or drawn from the treasury for the benefit of any religious sect or society, theological or religious seminary; nor shall property belonging to the state be appropriated for any such purpose. The civil and political rights, privileges and capacities of no person shall be diminished or enlarged on account of his religious belief." The statutes prohibit under penalty of a fine of $10 the keeping open of any workshop or place of business; transaction of any business; all work and labour; attendance at dance, public diversion; show or entertainment; taking part in any sport, game, or play, on Sunday: works of necessity and charity are excepted. All persons are also prohibited from attending any public assembly, except for religious services or concerts of sacred music. The sale of intoxicating liquors on Sunday is made a misdemeanour, punishable by fine and imprisonment. Disturbing religious meetings on Sunday is made a misdemeanour, punishable by fine and imprisonment. Oaths are administered by the person who swears holding up his right hand, except in cases where the affiant has any particular mode which he considers more binding. The form in general use is "You do solemnly swear that . . . So help you God." Blasphemy and profanity are punished by fine and imprisonment. There are no laws concerning the use of prayer in the Legislature. The custom is that at the first session of each house some minister of the Gospel is invited to offer prayer. Christmas Day and New Year's Day are recognized as holidays, but business and work are not prohibited on those days, which are on a par with Independence Day, etc.

Seal of Confession.—"No minister of the Gospel or priest of any denomination whatsoever shall be allowed to disclose any confessions made to him in his professional character, in the course of discipline enjoined by the rules or practice of such denomination." And all ministers of the Gospel are exempt from serving on juries, and from military duty.

Church Property.—Any five adult persons may become incorporated as a religious society by executing and acknowledging Articles of Association in triplicate, stating the name and purpose of the corporation, the names and residences of the original incorporators, and the period for which it is incorporated. One of the triplicates must be filed with the Secretary of State, and one with the County Registrar of Deeds. Such corporation may make its own by-laws, which must be recorded by the Registrar of Deeds, and is entitled to receive and hold real and personal property by purchase, gift, or bequest and may sue or be sued. There is no restriction as to number or nomenclature of officers. Religious bodies such as dioceses, synods, conferences, and the like may obtain corporate powers to hold property, sue and be sued, etc., by electing not less than three or more than nine trustees and filing certificates of such election and the corporate name by which they are to be known with the Secretary of State and County Clerk. Religious corporations organized without capital stock are not limited as to duration of time. All houses of public worship with their furniture and pews and parsonages owned by religious societies are exempt. Also all property occupied by charitable, educational, and scientific institutions incorporated under laws of the state.

Sales of Liquor.—A tax of $500 per year is imposed. Dealers must furnish bonds in not less than $3000. Selling to minors, intoxicated persons, or habitual drunkards is prohibited, also selling on Sundays, holidays, and election days. Dealers and their bondsmen are liable to wives and families for injuries caused by intoxication by liquors furnished by them. Saloons must be closed at certain hours. Heavy penalties are provided for infraction of the law. Any county may by a majority vote absolutely prohibit the manufacture and sale of liquor within its limits.

Wills and Testaments may be made by any one of full age and sound mind, must be in writing and executed in presence of two witnesses who must sign at request and in presence of the testator. Bequests to a witness are void. A widow may elect to take her

statutory allowance and dower instead of a bequest. There is no limitation as to charitable bequests.

PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.—Aside from the state institutions already mentioned, there are four insane asylums, a home for the feeble-minded and epileptic, and a sanatorium for tuberculosis. Every county has its poor farm for the indigent, and all charities are under the supervision of the State Board of Corrections and Charities.

Prisons and Reformatories.—There are two state prisons, at Jackson and at Marquette, a reformatory for male offenders at Ionia, and a house of correction for males and females at Detroit. The Industrial School for Boys at Lansing and the Industrial School for Girls at Adrian are reformatories.

Cemeteries may be established by municipalities or by private corporations or private citizens. The only limitation as to locality is in cases where it would create a nuisance.

Marriage and Divorce.—Marriage is a civil contract in law; males of the age of eighteen and females of the age of sixteen are competent to contract. First cousins as well as nearer relatives are forbidden to marry. Females under eighteen must have the written consent of one parent or of a guardian. A licence is required which is issued by the county clerk. Marriages may be solemnized by justices of the peace, judges of probate and of municipal courts, and by resident ministers of the Gospel. All marriages must be recorded by the county clerk. No particular form is prescribed, but the parties must take each other as husband and wife. Two witnesses are required besides the magistrate or minister. Divorce from the bonds of matrimony is granted for adultery, impotency, imprisonment for three years or over, desertion for two years, habitual drunkenness. Divorce "from bed and board" is granted for extreme cruelty, and where the husband being of sufficient ability fails to provide a suitable maintenance for his wife; but the court may grant an absolute divorce for either of these causes. A sentence to the state prison for life dissolves the marriage without any judicial divorce.

ECCLESIASTICAL STATISTICS.—This state comprises the Dioceses of Detroit, Grand Rapids, Sault Sainte Marie, and Marquette. It has 3 bishops, 466 priests, 412 ecclesiastical students, 306 churches, 193 missions, 208 stations and chapels, 2 seminaries, 8 orphan asylums, 1 infant asylum, 48,059 young people under Catholic care as pupils, orphans and dependents, 2 industrial schools for girls, 13 hospitals, 1 home for feeble-minded, 1 home for aged poor, and a Catholic population of 489,451. Michigan was under the control of the See of Quebec until the formation of the Diocese of Baltimore (1789), under which it remained until it was included in the Diocese of Bardstown (1808), and later, when the new Diocese of Cincinnati was created, Michigan was made a part of its territory. The descendants of the original French Canadians are numerically inferior to the descendants of the later Irish immigrants, who form the largest part of the Catholic population. There are also many Germans, Poles, some Lithuanians, Bohemians, Flemings, Italians, Syrians, and a few Indians. When Bishop Fenwick of Cincinnati visited Michigan in 1832 he confirmed 142 Indians at L'Arbre Croche. These now belong to the Diocese of Grand Rapids, which contains in all eighteen Indian missions with a population of 378 families, and three schools, two of which are taught by religious, the third by a lay teacher. The Diocese of Sault Sainte Marie and Marquette contains about 2000 Catholic Indians in 12 Indian missions, attended by the Jesuit Fathers at Sault Sainte Marie, L'Anse, and elsewhere. There are few Catholic Indians left in the Diocese of Detroit. About thirty families of the once powerful Pottawatomies at Rush Lake in Berrien County are all that remain of the old mission of St. Joseph.

Catholics distinguished in Public Life.—Reverend Gabriel Richard and Timothy E. Tarsney were representatives in Congress. The following were members of the Territorial Legislative Council: Laurent Durocher, Henry Connor, John McDonell, Charles Moran.

State Senators: Edward Bradley, Laurent Durocher, John McDonell, Bernard O'Reilly. Circuit Judges: O'Brien J. Atkinson, James B. McMahon, and Robert J. Kelley.

Prominent Members of the State House of Representatives were: John Atkinson, Theodore J. Campau.

Catholics at present living who have distinguished themselves publicly are: Thomas Weadock and John Corliss, both of whom were members of Congress; James Caplis, Peter Doran, Joseph Nagel, and Michael Moriarty, state senators; Circuit Judge Alfred J. Murphy; members of the state House of Representatives John C. Donnelly, John Donovan, Nicholas Whelan; and William T. McGurrin, Brigadier General of the Michigan National Guards; also Judge of Recorder's Court in Detroit, James Phelan, and Probate Judge of Ottawa County, Edward P. Kirby.

CAMPBELL, *History of Michigan; Historical Records in State Library;* SHELDON, *Early History of Michigan;* COOLEY, *Michigan;* PATTENGILL, *Primer of Michigan History;* REZEK, *History of the Diocese of Sault Ste. Marie and Marquette; Official Catholic Directory* (1910); *Records of the Dioceses of Detroit and Grand Rapids.*

FRANCIS A. STACE.

Michoacan, ARCHDIOCESE OF (MICHOACANENSIS), in Mexico.—The Diocese of Michoacan was established in 1536 by Pope Paul III at the instance of the Emperor Charles V, its boundaries to coincide with those of the ancient Kingdom of Michoacan. In 1863 it became an archdiocese, with Léon, Querétaro, and Zamora for suffragans, its limits being at the same time greatly reduced. Its population is about one million, and the principal cities are Morelia, Zitácuaro, Maravatío, Pátzcuaro, Puruándiro, and Piedad in the State of Michoacan, and Acámbaro, Salvatierra, Celaya, Salamanca, and Pénjamo in the State of Guanajuato. The first bishop was the eminent Spaniard D. Vasco de Quiroga (1538–65), one of the greatest missionaries to the Mexican aborigines. Among other bishops of the Spanish period, the following were distinguished for their learning and virtue: Ramírez del Prado, who has been compared to St. Charles Borromeo; Sánchez de Tagle, who founded the conciliar seminary (*seminario tridentino*) for the diocese in 1770; Fray Antonio de San Miguel, builder of the great aqueduct of Morelia and commonly spoken of as the father of his people. Of the bishops who have governed the Diocese of Michoacan only two have been natives of Mexico, Portugal and Munguía. The latter was named archbishop in 1863. Portugal was the first American ecclesiastic to be named a cardinal by the pope, although he died before receiving the cardinal's hat. Munguía was the author of some very excellent books on law and philosophy, and lived up to his motto: "Lose wealth, but save principles". D. Ignacio Arciga and D. Atenogenes Silva succeeded Archbishop Munguía and, in the epoch of peace which the republic has since enjoyed, have achieved some notable results.

The library of the Seminary of Morelia numbers 76,000 volumes; there is also a physical laboratory and valuable astronomical apparatus. In every one of the 64 parishes and the 18 succursal parishes of the archdiocese there is at least one school for boys and another for girls. At Morelia the schools are very numerous, the attendance being over three thousand, boys and girls. Celaya, Salvatierra, and Piedad have four parochial schools each, and several other parishes have two. Several charitable institutions are admirably maintained by the clergy. In times of scarcity, when the price of corn goes up, the diocesan authorities follow the example of the great Bishop San Miguel, who, in 1785, with the consent of the cathedral chapter, expended

280,000 pesos for the relief of the people—an enormous sum for those days. During the two last episcopates the improvement has been notable, the number of priests increasing to 348. Hidalgo, Morelas, Iturbide, heroes of the war of Independence, the learned Munguía, the poet Navarrete, and the philosopher Abarca were all born within the limits of the Archdiocese of Michoacan. Morelia, the capital, has some notable buildings, among which may be mentioned the beautiful cathedral, the government buildings, the seminary, the art school (formerly a Jesuit college), and the college of the Teresianas. In the same city the Christian Brothers, the Salesians, and the Servants of Mary conduct institutions. The classes in the various schools are taught principally by French and Italian professors and Spanish nuns.

ROMERO, *Historia del Obispado de Michoacán;* LEÓN, *Fray Antonio de San Miguel; Diccionario de Geografía y Estadística;* MORENO, *Vasco de Quiroga; México á través de los siglos; Archivos de la Secretaría Arzobispal.*

FRANCISCO ELGUERO.

Mickiewicz, ADAM, b. near Novogrodek, Lithuania, 1798; d. at Constantinople, 1855. He studied at Novogrodek until 1815, when he entered Vilna University. Here he studied German and English romantic poetry with the greatest zeal. A thwarted passion for Marya Wereszczak roused rather than quenched his genius; and, soon after becoming a professor in Kovno (1819), he published his first poetical creations in two volumes (Vilna, 1822–3). These included: (a) "Dziady" (The Ancestors), which, besides its artistic lyricism, marks the first appearance of romanticism in Poland. His hero Gustav is rather of the morbid Werther type; (b) many ballads and romances, setting forth Lithuanian folk-lore with great power and skill; most, though not all, of these are visibly influenced by Goethe, Schiller, and Bürger; (c) "Grazyna", in form like the lyric epics of that period, but, unlike these, full of real epic simplicity, majesty, and objectivity. To the same period belongs his celebrated "Ode to Youth", though it appeared somewhat later. The current of his genius was then changed by persecution. While at the university he belonged to a society of students, with which he afterwards continued to correspond; he was now most unjustly thrown into prison with the other members, since none of them had ever dreamed of insurrection. The keynote of his poems was no longer disappointed love, but suffering patriotism. Sentenced to exile in Russia, he left Lithuania forever (1824), and went first to Odessa and thence to the Crimea, where he wrote his "Sonnets" (Moscow, 1826). These are gloomy but extremely picturesque, and most effective by the infinite sadness which repeatedly appears in them with striking unexpectedness. Sent afterwards to Moscow, Mickiewicz wrote there his famous "Konrad Wallenrod", published later in St. Petersburg (1828). This poem is unequal; its hero is too Byronesque, and it seems to preach revenge by treachery. But its wonderful patriotism, inspiration, and artistic finish raised it as a whole above anything he had yet written.

ADAM MICKIEWICZ

In 1829, after a stay at St. Petersburg, Mickiewicz obtained his great desire—leave to go abroad. On his way to Rome he passed through Weimar, and visited Goethe, who, we are told, was greatly impressed by him. When in Italy he wrote very little, but returned to the fervent practice of the Catholic religion, which he had before neglected. In 1831 the Polish insurrection broke out; Mickiewicz attempted to return to Poland, but was stopped at the Prussian frontier. He then went to Dresden, where he wrote the third part of the "Dziady". It deserves special notice as containing, besides the expression of that revolt against God which some Poles felt after the loss of their independence, a mistaken attempt to explain their country's fate as that of a Christ-like victim slain for the sins of other nations; it offers also a key to Mickiewicz's own spiritual life. In 1832 he went to Paris, and there wrote (in Biblical prose) his "Book of the Pilgrimage", in which he treats the Polish refugees as apostles and sowers of the Word among the nations. Later, in 1834, he published his long poem "Pan Tadeusz", a marvellously lively and faithful portrait of Lithuanian life in the first years of the nineteenth century. Plot, development, characters, episodes, every passage, and almost every line are excellent: it is a high-water mark in Polish poetry, one of the world's masterpieces. After this achievement Mickiewicz gave up poetry: his sole aim was henceforth to work out Poland's regeneration by serving God. "An order of Poles", he said, "was needed to bring the nation back to God." From this idea, which he advocated widely, the Order of the Resurrection may be said to have sprung.

In 1835 he married, and was afterwards in constant pecuniary straits. For some time he gave lessons in Latin literature at the Academy of Lausanne (1838–9); he was then named professor in the Collège de France, and his French work, "A Course of Slav Literature", is very good. But in the third year of his teaching he began to abandon literature for certain philosophical and religious ideas. Towianski had won him over to his wild theory of Messianism, already foreshadowed in several of Mickiewicz's poems. He eagerly embraced the idea of a faith that should be to Christianity what the latter was to Judaism. Such a change, though readily accounted for, had melancholy results. Messianism was condemned; Mickiewicz became the apostle of a false doctrine, and lost his chair of literature. He subsequently submitted (1848), but still continued to dream of a great regeneration of peoples, brought about by revolution. When the Crimean War came, he hoped for an invasion of Poland, and even went to Constantinople to form a Polish legion, but died there of cholera. His body was taken to Paris, and thence (1890) to the cathedral of Krakow, where it now reposes. Mickiewicz has much in common with Schiller; he is also like Byron, but above him both in moral tone and in objectivity, in which he recalls Goethe. But he rose superior to all of them as a fervent believer in Christ. Since Mickiewicz, Poland can boast of having one of the world's great literatures, while of all Polish poets he is the most talented, the most intensely patriotic, and the most potent factor in the national life of Poland.

His *Master Thaddeus,* tr. BIGGS, was published in 2 vols. (London, 1886). See the Lives by TRETIAK (3 vols., Lemberg, 1884); CHMIELOWSKI (2 vols., Cracow, 1898); MICKIEWICZ, Fr. tr. (Paris, 1888).

S. TARNOWSKI.

Micmacs (*Souriquois* of the early French), the easternmost of the Algonquin tribes and probably the first visited by a white man, formerly occupied what is now Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Cape Breton, as well as part of New Brunswick, Quebec, and south-western Newfoundland. According to their traditions they held third rank in the original distribution of land among the confederation of the

eastern Algonquins. The first place belonged to the "father" of that nation, namely, the Ottawa tribe, which received as its share the "land of origins"; the second, called Wapanakiag, the "country of the dawn", fell to the lot of the Abenakis, while the third province, known as Migmagig, was allotted to the Micmacs. Until the arrival of the white men, an annual

Who made you the Great God indeed made me
What for the Great God made you He wanted indeed that I know Him
I pray to Him I love Him I serve Him so that to Heaven
I will go were they created men(Indians) they were created
indeed all perhaps to Heaven will go such as
indeed are baptized are wise those only to Heaven
will go who then is wise he that indeed
greatly loves the Creator moreover also tries
to fulfil as he is commanded and his neighbour he loves him

Micmac Ideograms from Father Kauder's "Catechism"

ceremony long recalled this compact. There is a probability that the Micmacs were visited by Sebastian Cabot (1497) and by Cortereal (1501). They welcomed the French and their religion, preached to them by secular priests and Jesuits, as well as by Recollects and Capuchins. Father Biard (1611) has left us an interesting account of this tribe, which he characterized as mild and peaceful in temperament. He estimated its numbers at three thousand or three thousand five hundred. The Capuchins even opened for it and the white settlers the first high school within the limits of New France, and a report of the Micmac missions sent to Rome (1633) located one of them in Portu Regio. Father Leclercq, a French Recollect who did much for their instruction, called them Gaspesians, probably because he had first landed (1675) on the Gaspé peninsula, where he successfully laboured for about twelve years. It was not until 1693 that these aborigines became officially known under their true name. Quick to appreciate the religion of the French, the Micmacs were no less faithful to the flag which to them symbolized it. Though not given to the cruel practices of the Iroquois and other eastern tribes, they proved their bravery by their active share in the French and English wars, and their lasting hostility to the colonization schemes of England. The erection of forts on the coast, especially the one at Halifax, exasperated them, but on the fall of Canada, Abbé Maillard (1735–62) succeeded in reconciling them to the new order. Several chiefs made their formal submission (1761), and ever since, though more in sympathy with the French, the Micmacs have remained loyal to the British Crown. In 1778 the United States endeavoured to incite them to revolt, but Father Bourg, at the request of the colonial authorities, restrained them from the war-path.

The Micmacs originally dwelt in the ordinary conical wigwams common to most Algonquin tribes; their garments were of dressed leather and ornamented with an abundance of fringe; their government resembled that of the New England aborigines; and their main occupation was fishing. Except in the case of the chiefs, polygamy was not general. There is an old tradition, related by an Abenaki of Oldtown (Nicolar, "Life and Traditions of the Red Men", 1893), that the Indians came from the West while the white men originated in the East. The Micmacs are remarkable for the fact that they are the only Canadian tribe which ever used hieroglyphs, or ideograms, as a means of acquiring religious and secular knowledge. These were invented in 1677 by Father Leclercq, who took the idea from the rude signs he one day saw some children draw on birch bark with coal, in their attempt to memorize the prayers he had just taught them. They consisted of more or less fanciful characters, a few of which, such as a star for heaven and an orb for the earth, bore some resemblance to the object represented. A number of manuals were composed which remained in manuscript until 1866, when Father Kauder, a Redemptorist who for some time ministered to them, had type bearing the ideograms cast in Austria, with which he printed a catechism and prayer book. Though the hieroglyphics are still known by the Micmacs, for all general purposes Roman type has been substituted, in which a little newspaper is published monthly in their own language at Restigouche, Quebec. In the autumn of 1849 the Protestants formed a Micmac Missionary Society, which commenced work the following year and made a few proselytes in the vicinity of Charlottetown. Rev. Silas Rand, a great linguist and prolific writer, was the principal agent. The Indians, almost without exception, have remained steadfast in their fidelity to the Church of their first



Fort of Port Royal
Where the first Micmacs or Souriquois were baptized 24 June, 1610

missionaries. Another point for which the Micmacs may be said to be remarkable is the manner in which their population holds its own in spite of many difficulties, such as the bad example given by the whites and the facility with which they can procure intoxicants. In 1891 they had increased to 4108; and later, a careful census taken by one of the Capuchins, living among them since 1894, showed that they numbered 3850 in Canada and 200 in Newfoundland. The Blue Book of the Canadian Government for 1909 sets down their numbers at 3961 within the Dominion alone, practically all of whom are Catholics. All the

Indians of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island (respectively 2073 and 274) are Micmacs.

LECLERCQ, *Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspésie* (Paris, 1691); IDEM, *First Establishment of the Faith in New France*, II (New York, 1881); MAILLARD, *An Account of the Customs and Manners of the Mikmakis and Maricheets* (London, 1758); *Lettre de l'Abbé Maillard sur les missions de l'Acadie et particulièrement sur les missions micmaques* (Quebec, 1863); PACIFIQUE, *Quelques Traits caractéristiques de la Tribu des Micmacs* in *Congrès International des Américanistes*, 15th session (Quebec, 1907).

A. G. MORICE.

Micrologus either a "synopsis" or a "short explanation", and in the Middle Ages used as an equivalent for "Manual". The best known of several is "Micrologus de ecclesiasticis observationibus", an explanation of the liturgy of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and of the ecclesiastical year; first edited at Paris, in 1510, and handed down in a number of manuscripts (P. L., CLI sqq.). This comprehensive work, of importance for both the history and the adequate understanding of the liturgy of the Mass and of the ecclesiastical year, is divided into three parts. The author treats first of the Mass (chap. i–xxiii) in relation to its historical development; second, of the liturgy of the ember days (chap. xxiv–xxix); and third, of the whole of the ecclesiastical year, with observations of the offices of the feasts and holidays (chap. xxx–lxii). In chapters xxiv–xxv the writer emphasizes the authority of the Apostolic See in liturgical questions, and mentions Gregory VII in such a manner as to show that he was an adherent of that pope, although Gregory was dead at the time the author wrote; he also refers to Anselm of Lucca in such a way as to infer Anselm's being still alive at that time (chap. xvii), hence we may conclude the work to have been composed between 23 May, 1085, date of the death of Gregory VII, and March, 1086, the death of Anselm of Lucca. Ivo of Chartres was generally held to be the author of the "Micrologus", but investigations of Dom Morin and Dom Bäumer point to Bernold of Constance, a monk of the abbey of St. Blasien (d. 1100), as the author.

Another well-known treatise, edited under the title "Micrologus de disciplina artis musicæ", is by the famous Guido of Arezzo, and is one of the most important writings of that teacher of ecclesiastical music (P. L., CXLI, 379 sqq., ed. Hermersdorff, Trier—1876).

MORIN, *Que l'auteur du Micrologue est Bernold de Constance* in *Revue Bénédictine* (1891), 385–95; BÄUMER, *Der Micrologus, ein Werk Bernolds von Konstanz* in *Neues Archiv*, XVIII (1893), 429–46; THALHOFER, *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik*, I (2nd ed., Freiburg, 1894), 80–81.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Middendorp, JAKOB, theologian and historian; b. about 1537 at Oldenzaal, or, according to others, at Ootmarsum, Overyssel, Holland; d. at Cologne, 13 Jan., 1611. He calls himself Otmersensis on the title-page of his work, "De celebrioribus Academiis". He studied the humanities at the Fraterherren gymnasium of Zwolle, philosophy and jurisprudence at Cologne University, where he became doctor of philosophy and both branches of law, and also licentiate of theology; he also taught peripatetic philosophy at the Montanum gymnasium there. He remained in Westphalia during the troubles in the Archdiocese of Cologne in the time of Archbishop Gebhard Truchsess von Waldburg, and was professor at various foreign academies; afterwards he returned to Cologne, where he passed the greater part of his life. In 1580 he became dean of St. Maria ad gradus, Cologne, in 1596 dean of St. Andreas, and in 1601 canon of the cathedral chapter. Rector of Cologne University 1580–81 and 1602–04, he was appointed vice-chancellor by the coadjutor, Ferdinand of Bavaria, in 1602. He lies buried in the church of St. Andreas. As an author he was best known by his "De celebrioribus universi orbis Academiis, libri II" (Cologne, 1567, 1572, 1594, and lastly 1602), considerably enlarged, in two volumes, under the title "Academiarum celebrium universi terrarum orbis libri VIII locupletati". He also published: "Officiorum scholasticorum libri duo, quorum prior tam iuventutis quam populi Christiani magistrorum, qui divinas et humanas literas publice privatimque docent, munus edisserit, posterior vero præcipua auditorum populique officia complectitur" (Cologne, 1570); "Historiam Aristeæ versæ per LXX interpretes Scripturæ sacræ ex MS. codicibus Græcis et Latinis restituit et commentario illustravit" (Cologne, 1578); "Imperatorum, regum et principum clarissimorumque virorum quæstiones theologicæ, juridicæ et politicæ cum pulcherrimis responsionibus" (Cologne, 1603); "Historia monastica, quæ religiosæ et solitariæ vitæ originem, progressiones, incrementa et naturam ex Scriptura Sacra, ex pontificio et Cæsareo jure, ex antiquissimis historiis, ex veterum Patrum et librorum scriptis demonstrat" (Cologne, 1603).

FOPPENS, *Biblioth. Belgica* (Brussels, 1739), 529 sq.; HARTZHEIM, *Biblioth. Coloniensis* (Cologne, 1747), 150; PAQUOT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire littéraire des dix-sept Provinces des Pays-Bas*, III (Louvain, 1770), 26–29; BIANCO, *Die ehem. Univ. u. die Gymnasien zu Köln*, II, 2nd ed. (Cologne, 1850), 1386 sq.; *Allg. Deut. Biog.*, XXI, 711.

FRIEDRICH LAUCHERT.

Middle Ages.—A term commonly used to designate that period of European history between the Fall of the Roman Empire and about the middle of the fifteenth century. The precise dates of the beginning, culmination, and end of the Middle Ages are more or less arbitrarily assumed according to the point of view adopted. The period is usually considered to open with those migrations of the German Tribes which led to the destruction of the Roman Empire in the West in 375, when the Huns fell upon the Gothic tribes north of the Black Sea and forced the Visigoths over the boundaries of the Roman Empire on the lower Danube. A later date, however, is sometimes assumed, viz., when Odoacer deposed Romulus Augustulus, the last of the Roman Emperors of the West, in 476. Others, again, begin the Middle Ages with the opening years of the seventh century and the death (609) of Venantius Fortunatus, the last representative of classic Latin literature. The close of the Middle Ages is also variously fixed; some make it coincide with the rise of Humanism and the Renaissance in Italy, in the fourteenth century; with the Fall of Constantinople, in 1453; with the discovery of America by Columbus in 1492; or, again, with the great religious schism of the sixteenth century. Any hard and fast line drawn to designate either the beginning or close of the period in question is arbitrary. The widest limits given, viz., the irruption of the Visigoths over the boundaries of the Roman Empire, for the beginning, and the middle of the sixteenth century, for the close, may be taken as inclusively sufficient, and embrace, beyond dispute, every movement or phase of history that can be claimed as properly belonging to the Middle Ages.

A great part of THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA is devoted to the movements, ecclesiastical, intellectual, social, political, and artistic, which made up European history during this period so fertile in human activities, whether sacred or profane. Under the titles covering the political divisions of Europe, past and present (e. g., ALSACE-LORRAINE; ANHALT; AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN MONARCHY; BADEN; BAVARIA; BELGIUM; BOHEMIA; BREMEN; BULGARIA; CASTILE AND ARAGON; CROATIA; DENMARK; ENGLAND; FRANCE; GERMANY; GREECE; HAMBURG; HESSE; HUNGARY; IRELAND; ITALY; KARINTHIA; KRAIN; LEÓN; LIPPE; LÜBECK; LUXEMBURG; MECKLENBURG; MONACO; MONTENEGRO; NAVARRE; NETHERLANDS; NORWAY; OLDENBURG; PAPAL STATES; PORTUGAL; REUSS; ROME; RUMANIA; RUSSIA; SAXE-ALTENBURG; SAXE-COBURG AND GOTHA; SAXE-MEININGEN; SAXE-WEIMAR; SAXONY; SCHAUMBURG-LIPPE; SCHWARZBURG-RUDOLSTADT; SCHWARZBURG-SONDERSHAUSEN; SCOTLAND; SERVIA; SICILY; SPAIN; SWEDEN; SWITZ-

ERLAND; VENICE; WALDECK; WALES; WÜRTEMBERG), are given in detail their respective political and religious developments throughout the Middle Ages. Under articles of a wider scope (e. g., EUROPE; CHRISTENDOM; POPE) is found a more general and synthetic treatment. Particular aspects and movements peculiar to different portions of it are found in such articles as CHIVALRY; CRUSADES; ECCLESIASTICAL ART; FEUDALISM; GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE; INQUISITION; INVESTITURES, CONFLICT OF; LAND-TENURE IN THE CHRISTIAN ERA; MONASTICISM; MUSIC, ECCLESIASTICAL; PAINTING; PILGRIMAGES; SCULPTURE; in the articles upon the great religious orders, congregations, and institutions which then came into existence; in the biographies of the popes, rulers, historical personages, scholars, philosophers, poets, and scientists whose lives fall within this period; in the accounts of the universities, cities, and dioceses which were founded and developed throughout Europe from the fall of the Roman Empire to the time of the Reformation, and in innumerable minor articles throughout the work.

Middlesbrough, DIOCESE OF (MEDIOBURGENSIS).—In medieval history it was known as Myddilburga or Middilburga, with many other variations of form.

WHITBY ABBEY, YORKSHIRE, ENGLAND

There is an old tradition that a church in honour of St. Hilda was dedicated by St. Cuthbert at Middlesbrough about 686, but the earliest positive reference to Middlesbrough in ecclesiastical history goes to show that in the beginning of the twelfth century it was the site of a church dependent on the Abbey of St. Hilda at Whitby. At that time the church of "St. Hilda at Middlesburc" was given by Robert de Brus of Skelton Castle, founder of Guisborough Priory, to the Black Monks of St. Benedict at Whitby, on condition that there should always be some monks at Middlesbrough serving God and St. Hilda; and there seems to have been a clause binding the monks to distribute twelve pence per week in alms to the poor of Middlesbrough for the soul of the said Robert de Brus. In the plunder of the religious houses the "Cell of Middlesbrough" was granted by Queen Elizabeth to one Thomas Reeve on 4 February, 1563. From that date there is no evidence to show that Mass was ever celebrated there, until in 1848 a private room in North Street was used for this purpose. A little later a modest chapel was erected and a resident priest placed in charge. Two causes concurred in the formation of a large Catholic congregation, namely, the Irish immigration and the rapid development of the ironworks in the Cleveland region.

In 1872 Rev. Richard Lacy was entrusted with the charge of the Middlesbrough Mission. In August, 1878, St. Mary's church (replacing the original modest chapel) was opened with great solemnity by Cardinal Manning and Bishop Cornthwaite of Beverley. In December of the same year, St. Mary's became the cathedral of the new Diocese of Middlesbrough. The Diocese of Beverley, conterminous with Yorkshire, was, by Apostolic Letters of Leo XIII, dated 20 December, 1878, divided into the Dioceses of Leeds and Middlesbrough, Bishop Cornthwaite (formerly of Beverley, henceforth of Leeds) being *ad interim* named administrator of the new Diocese of Middlesbrough. It was not until 11 December, 1879, that the papal Brief was received notifying the appointment of the new bishop in the person of the Rev. Richard Lacy, whose consecration took place in his own cathedral on 18 December, 1879, at the hands of Cardinal Manning, assisted by Bishop Cornthwaite of Leeds and Bishop O'Reilly of Liverpool. The chapter of the new diocese, consisting of a provost and ten canons, was erected by a decree of Leo XIII on 13 February, 1881. Our Lady of Perpetual Succour is the chief patroness of the diocese and titular of the cathedral; Sts. Wilfrid and John of Beverley are its secondary patrons. Besides these there are many others who have shed the lustre of their sanctity on northern Yorkshire: St. Hilda, Abbess of Whitby (scene of the famous Synod of Whitby in 664); St. John of Bridlington; St. William of York; St. Everilda; Blessed John Fisher; Blessed Thomas Percy, Earl of Northumberland; the Venerable Nicholas Postgate, and many others.

Notwithstanding the fact that the ecclesiastical division of Yorkshire met with adverse criticism at the hands of several leading members of both clergy and laity, moved by sentiment rather than a profound knowledge of the needs of religion, the following statistics demonstrate both how groundless were the fears then entertained, and how accurately the situation had been gauged by the ecclesiastical authorities. In 1839 the Catholic population of Yorkshire was 13,000; in 1909 it was 167,027. In 1839 there could hardly be 3000 Catholics in what is now the Diocese of Middlesbrough; in 1909 they numbered 50,344. In 1879 the total number of priests in the Diocese of Middlesbrough was 54; in 1909 they numbered 113 (76 seculars and 37 regulars). In 1879 the churches and chapels were 38; in 1909 they were 67. In 1879 the school-children numbered 3135; in 1909 they numbered 10,060. In 1879 there were 17 elementary schools; in 1909 there were 43. There are 23 elementary schools and 14 middle-class schools conducted by religious; two orphanages, one for boys under the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul at Hull, and the other for girls under the Poor Sisters of Nazareth at Middlesbrough; one reformatory for boys under the Fathers of Charity at Market Weighton; two pupil teachers' centres, one under the Sisters of Mercy at Hull, and the other under the Faithful Companions of Jesus at Middlesbrough; one training college for teachers, under Sisters of Mercy, at Hull; two colleges for boys, one under the Marist Fathers, at Middlesbrough, the other under Benedictine monks, in connexion with the well-known Abbey of Ampleforth.

Bishop Lacy was born at Navan, Meath, Ireland, 16 January, 1841, studied at Ushaw College (Durham) and at the English College in Rome, where he was ordained 21 December, 1867.

KIRBY, *Ancient Middlesbrough;* YOUNG, *Whitby; Middlesbrough Diocesan Archives.*

RICHARD LACY.

Middleton, ANTHONY, VENERABLE. See JONES, EDWARD, VENERABLE.

Middleton, ROBERT, VENERABLE. See HUNT, THURSTON, VENERABLE.

Midianites. See MADIANITES.

Midrashim.—The term commonly designates ancient rabbinical commentaries on the Hebrew Scriptures. It is the plural form of the word מדרש, *Midrash* which is found only twice in the Old Testament (II Par. [Chronicles], xiii, 22; xxiv, 27), where it is rendered by *liber* (book) in the Vulgate, and by

"commentary" in the Revised Version. In rabbinical parlance, Midrash has the abstract and general sense of *study, exposition of Scripture*, while Midrashim are primarily the free and artificial explanations of the Sacred Text given by its ancient expositors, and secondarily the collections of such explanations in the shape of commentaries on Holy Writ.

ORIGIN AND KINDS OF MIDRASHIM.—After the return from Babylon, the Law was the centre of the life of the Jews at home and abroad. Henceforth, the one concern of the Jewish authorities was to make sure that the Mosaic precepts be accurately complied with by all, and under all circumstances, and it is from this practical standpoint that the Scribes and after them the Rabbis studied and expounded the contents of their sacred writings. A part of these contents, viz., the enactments of the Mosaic Law, made of course directly for the purpose of promoting legal righteousness in Israel; yet, as these laws had been framed in view of concrete circumstances of the past, they had to be explained in a more or less artificial way to make them fit the altered circumstances of Jewish life, or serve as a Scriptural basis or support of the various traditional observances which made up the oral law. All such artificial explanations of the terms of the Mosaic legislation are legal, or Halachic, Midrashim. Distinct from this general kind of Midrashim are those called homiletical, or Hagadic, which embrace the interpretation, illustration, or expansion, in a moralizing or edifying manner, of the non-legal portions of the Hebrew Bible. As the object of this latter kind of Midrashim was not to determine the precise requirements of the Law, but rather to confirm in a general manner Jewish hearers in their faith and its practice, Hagadic explanations of the non-legal parts of Scripture are characterized by a much greater freedom of exposition than the Halachic Midrashim; and it may be truly said that Hagadic expositors have availed themselves of whatever material—sayings of prominent Rabbis (e. g., philosophical or mystical disquisitions concerning angels, demons, paradise, hell, Messias, Satan, feasts and fasts, parables, legends, satirical assaults on the heathen and their rites, etc.)—could render their treatment of those portions of the Sacred Text more instructive or edifying. Both kinds of Midrashim were at first preserved only orally; but their writing down commenced with the second century of our era, and they now exist in the shape chiefly of exegetical or homiletical works on the whole or parts of the Hebrew Bible.

PRINCIPAL MIDRASHIM.—The three earliest and in several respects most important Midrashic collections are: (1) the *Mechilta*, on a portion of Exodus, and embodying the tradition mainly of the School of Rabbi Ishmael (first century); (2) the *Siphra*, on Leviticus, embodying the tradition of Rabbi Aqiba with additions from the School of Rabbi Ishmael; (3) the *Siphre*, on Numbers and Deuteronomy, going back mainly to the schools of the same two Rabbis. These three works are used in the Gemaras. (4) The *Rabboth* (great commentaries), a large collection of ten Midrashim on the Pentateuch and Megilloth, which bear the respective names of: (a) Bereshith Rabba, on Genesis (mainly from the sixth century); (b) Shemoth Rabba, on Exodus (eleventh or twelfth century); (c) Wayyiqra Rabba, on Leviticus (middle of seventh century); (d) Bamidbar Rabba, on Numbers (twelfth century); (e) Debharim Rabba, on Deuteronomy (tenth century); (f) Shir Ashshirim Rabba, on Canticle of Canticles (probably before middle of ninth century); (g) Ruth Rabba, on Ruth (same date as foregoing); (h) Echa Rabba, on Lamentations (seventh century); (i) Midrash Qoheleth, on Ecclesiastes (probably before middle of ninth century); (j) Midrash Esther, on Esther (A. D. 940). Of these Rabboth, the Midrashim on Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy are chiefly made up of homilies on the Scripture sections for the Sabbath or festival, while the others are rather of an exegetical nature. (5) The *Pesiqta*, a compilation of homilies on special Pentateuchal and Prophetic lessons (early eighth century); (6) *Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer* (not before eighth century), a Midrashic narrative of the more important events of the Pentateuch; (7) *Tanchuma* or *Yelammedenu* (ninth century) on the whole Pentateuch; its homilies consist of a Halachic introduction, followed by several proems, exposition of the opening verses, and the Messianic conclusion; (8) *Midrash Shemuel*, on the first two Books of Kings (I, II Samuel); (9) *Midrash Tehillim*, on the Psalms; (10) *Midrash Mishle*, on Proverbs; (11) *Yalqut Shimeoni*, a kind of *catena* extending over all the Hebrew Scriptures.

IMPORTANCE OF MIDRASHIM.—At first sight, one might think that such farrago as the Midrashic literature could be of interest and value only to a Jew as Jew, inasmuch as the Midrashim are thoroughly steeped in the spirit of Judaism, bear distinct witness to the laws, customs, doctrines, aspirations of the Jewish race, and record the noblest ideas, sayings, and teachings of the Jewish sages in early times. The more, however, he examines the contents of these ancient expository works, the more he discovers that they are an invaluable source of information to the Christian apologist, the Biblical student, and the general scholar as well. In this body of ancient literature, there is much in the line of ideas, expressions, reasonings, and descriptions, which can be used to illustrate and confirm the inspired records of Christianity and the traditional teachings of the Church, notably concerning the passages of the Old Testament to be regarded as Messianic. The Biblical student will at times notice in the oldest parts of the Midrashim, Scriptural readings anterior to those embodied in the Massoretic text. Again, "when it is borne in mind that the annotators and punctuators of the Hebrew text, and the translators of the [most] ancient versions, were Jews impregnated with the theological opinions of the nation, and prosecuted their Biblical labours in harmony with these opinions . . . the importance of the Halachic and Hagadic exegesis to the criticism of the Hebrew text, and to a right understanding of the Greek, Chaldee, Syriac, and other versions, can hardly be overrated" (Ginsburg, in Kitto's "Cyclop. of Biblical Liter.", III, 173). Lastly the philologist, the historian, the philosopher, the jurist, and the statesman, will easily find in the Midrashim remarks and discussions which have a direct bearing on their respective branches of study.

UGOLINI, *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrarum*, vols. XIV–XVI (Venice, 1752–1754); JELLINECK, *Bet Ha-Midrasch* (Leipzig, and Vienna, 1853–1877); SCHÜRER, *The Jewish People in the Time of Christ* (New York, 1891); ZUNZ, *die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge d. Jüden* (Frankfort, 1892); WÜNSCHE, *Bibliotheca Rabbinica* (Leipzig, 1880–1885; Trier, 1892, 1893); GRÜNHUT, *Sofer Ha-Likkutim* (Jerusalem, 1898–1901); STRACK, *Einl. i. d. Talmud* (Leipzig, 1900); OESTERLEY AND BOX, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue* (New York, 1907).

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Midwives come under the canon law of the Church in their relation towards two of the sacraments, baptism and matrimony. As regards marriage, their testimony is frequently required in cases *de non consummato matrimonio*, whether owing to the impediment of impotency or because a dispensation is asked *super matrimonio rato tantum*. In such cases, the testimony of three midwives is held sufficient in practice, since the number seven mentioned in the "Corpus Juris Canonici" (c. 4, de Probat.) is not considered to be obligatory in law, though some older canonists insisted on the necessity of having the testimony of seven midwives. As regards the sacrament of baptism the office of midwives is of the highest importance. On them frequently devolves the duty of conferring this sacrament, under circumstances where

no other person's ministration is possible. Hence, the Church has always been most solicitous concerning the character of midwives and their instruction in this religious duty. Canonists teach that women who undertake the office of midwife are bound under mortal sin to learn the methods and requirements of valid baptism, as in case of necessity this duty frequently devolves upon them. There has been much legislation on this subject in various diocesan synods, whose canons place special obligations on parish priests and midwives. The former are reminded that, as midwives in conferring baptism act in place of the parish priest, he is strictly bound to inform himself whether they have sufficient knowledge to administer the sacrament validly. Some diocesan synods require that midwives, before being approved for duty, take an oath that they will labour to procure the spiritual safety of infant and mother. When a new-born child has been baptized by a midwife, the parish priest must inquire carefully whether she had the proper intention and administered the rite according to the prescriptions of the Church. If there is any reason for doubt, the baptism is to be repeated conditionally (Catech. Rom., II, ii, § 43); but if it be certain that the sacrament was properly conferred it may not be repeated (c. Majores, 3 de bapt; Conc. Trid. Sess. VI, can. ix), and only the other ceremonies are to be supplied by the parish priest. Finally, it is likewise necessary that midwives be well informed on the Church's teaching concerning the performance of abortion.

FERRARIS, *Bibl. Can.*, V (Rome, 1889), s. v. *Obstetrices;* TAUNTON, *The Law of the Church* (London, 1906), s. v. *Baptism.*

WILLIAM H. W. FANNING.

Migazzi, CHRISTOPH ANTON, Cardinal, Prince Archbishop of Vienna, b. 1714, in the Tyrol, d. 14 April, 1803, at Vienna. At nine years of age he entered the school for pages at the residence of Prince Bishop Lamberg at Passau, who later proposed him for admittance to the Collegium Germanicum in Rome. At the age of twenty-two he returned to the Tyrol and devoted himself to the study of civil and canon law. Cardinal Lamberg took him as conclavist to the Conclave of 1740, whence Benedict XIV came forth pope, and to him Cardinal Lamberg earnestly recommended his favourite Migazzi. The latter remained at Rome "in order to quench my thirst for the best science at its very source". By this he meant philosophy as proved by his words spoken about this time; "Without a knowledge of philosophy wit is merely a light fragrance which is soon lost, and erudition a rude formless mass without life or movement, which rolls onward unable to leave any mark of its passage, consuming everything without itself deriving any benefit therefrom." In 1745 he was appointed auditor of the Rota for the German nation. Owing to the special friendship of Benedict XIV, he was able to conclude several difficult transactions to the entire satisfaction of the Empress Maria Theresa, who in return appointed him in 1751 coadjutor to the aged Archbishop of Mechlin. Thereupon consecrated bishop, he was soon removed to Madrid as ambassador. A treaty which he concluded pleased the empress so much that she appointed him coadjutor of Count Bishop Althan of Waitzen (1756); but as Althan died before his arrival, and six months later Prince Archbishop Trantson also died in Vienna, the empress named Migazzi his successor. In 1761 Maria Theresa made him administrator for life of the See of Waitzen, and at the same time obtained the purple for him from Clement XIII. It is true that Migazzi was now in possession of two sees, the revenues of which he applied to their improvement. In Waitzen he erected the cathedral and episcopal palace and founded the "Collegium pauperum nobilium" and the convent. Indeed he built almost an entire new quarter in that town; it was therefore, to say the least, hard and mortifying when, after twenty-five years of administration the "Concilium locum tenens regium" asked him if there was any priest in his diocese in possession of two benefices or offices, as in that case it was the emperor's pleasure (Joseph II) that one of them should be given up. Migazzi was forced to resign from Waitzen.

As Archbishop of Vienna time brought him many sorrows. Pious and devoted to the Church as Maria Theresa undoubtedly was, yet during her reign in Austria the so-called Enlightenment era (*Aufklärung*) developed inevitably. Its followers imagined that they could remedy all the evils of the time and promote in every way the prosperity of mankind. The representative and the literature of the new movement were everywhere in evidence. Its opponents were denounced as stupid obscurantists and simpletons. "The Masonic lodge of the Three Canons" was printed at Vienna in 1742, and at Prague in 1749 that of the "Three Crowned Stars and Honesty". In a memorial to the empress written in 1769 the archbishop designated as the primary causes of current evils the spirit of the times, atheistic literature, the pernicious influence of many professors, the condition of the censorship, contemporary literature, the contempt of the clergy, the bad example of the nobility, the conduct of affairs of state by irreligious persons, and neglect of the observance of holy days. Upon each of these disorders he spoke in noble terms of profound truth. The situation was all the more critical for the Church since while her means of resistance were diminished, her enemies were gaining adherents. Meanwhile Clement XIV suppressed the Society of Jesus, but Migazzi endeavoured to save it for Austria. He wrote to the empress, "If the members of the order are dispersed, how can their places be so easily supplied? What expense will be entailed and how many years must pass before the settled condition broken up by the departure of these priests can be restored?" Just twenty years later the cardinal wrote to Emperor Francis, "Even the French envoy who was last here, did not hesitate, as I can prove to your Majesty, to say that if the Jesuits had not been suppressed, France would not have experienced that Revolution so terrible in its consequences." The archbishop opposed as far as they were anticlerical, the government monopoly of educational matters, the "enlightened" theology, the "purified" law, the "enlightenment" literature, "tolerance", and encroachment on purely religious matters. He also founded the "Priesterseminar", an establishment for the better preparation of young priests for parochial work. At Rome he was influential enough to obtain for the Austrian monarch the privilege of being named in the Canon of the Mass. Migazzi lived to see the election of three popes. Maria Theresa and Kaunitz took a lively interest in his accounts of what transpired in the Conclave (23 Nov., 1775–16 Feb., 1776) which elected Pius VI, who subsequently visited Vienna during the reign of Joseph II. He owed his election to Migazzi, leader of the Royalist party. How the empress appreciated Migazzi is sufficiently proved in a letter she wrote to him during the Conclave, "I am as ill-humoured as though I had been three months in Conclave. I pray for you; but I am often amused to see you imprisoned."

When Frederick II heard of the death of the empress he wrote, "Maria Theresa is no more. A new order of things will now begin." Joseph II during his ten years' reign published 6200 laws, court ordinances, and decrees affecting the Church. Even what is judicious in them generally bears the stamp of haste. The first measures, levelled against ecclesiastical jurisdiction, created dissatisfaction as encroachments on the rights of the Church. The number of memorials addressed by Cardinal Migazzi to Joseph

II and the government was astonishingly large. He opposed all the Josephist reform decrees injurious to the Church. The "simplified and improved studies", the new methods of ecclesiastical education (general seminaries), interference with the constitutions of religious orders, the suppression of convents, and violations of her rights and interference with the matrimonial legislation of the Church, called for vigorous protests on the cardinal's part; but though he protested unceasingly, it was of no avail. To be sure, matters did not culminate in a rupture with Rome, and by his visit to Vienna Pius VI made some impression on the emperor, and the Holy See pronounced no solemn condemnation of Josephism. On 12 March, 1790, Leopold, Grand Duke of Tuscany, arrived in Vienna, as successor of his brother Joseph, and as early as 21 March, Migazzi presented him with a memorial concerning the sad condition of the Austrian Church. He mentioned thirteen "grievances" and pointed out for each the means of redress: laxity in monastic discipline, the general seminaries, marriage licenses, and the "Religious Commission", which assumed the position of judge of the bishops and their rights. Finding his wishes only partly fulfilled, Migazzi repeatedly expressed his dissatisfaction.

Emperor Francis II, a Christian whose faith and conscience were sincere, ruled his people with fatherly care. In spite of this he confirmed the Josephist system throughout his reign. For nearly a generation the French wars absorbed his attention, during which time the aforesaid "Religious Commission" paid little heed to the representations of the bishops. The cardinal insisted on its abolition. "I am in all things your Majesty's obedient subject, but in spiritual matters the shepherd must say fearlessly that it is a scandal to all Catholics to see such fetters laid upon the bishops. The scandal is even greater when such power is vested in worldly, questionable, even openly dangerous and disreputable men". Age did not diminish his interest even in matters apparently trivial, nor lessen the virile strength of his speech. "The dismal outlook of the Church in your Majesty's dominions is all the more grievous from the fact that one must stand by in idleness, while he realizes how easily the increasing evils could be remedied, how easily your Majesty's conscience could be calmed, the honour of Almighty God, respect for the Faith and the Church of God be secured, the rightful activities of the priesthood set free, and religion and virtue restored to the Catholic people. All this would follow at once, if only your Majesty, setting aside further indecision, would resolve generously and perseveringly to close once for all the sources of so great evils". The emperor in fact made henceforth greater and more numerous concessions, each of which was greeted by Migazzi with satisfaction. When the pilgrimage to Maria Zell, the most famous shrine in Austria, was once more permitted, the cardinal in person led the first procession. During his long life Migazzi strove with unceasing activity for the welfare of the Church; and he died full of years and of merits. He lies buried in the church of St. Stephen.

WOLFSGRUBER, *Cristoforo Antonio Cardinal Migazzi, Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. des Josephinismus*, with a portrait of Migazzi and a facsimile of his handwriting (2nd ed., Ratisbon, 1897); KOPALLIK, *Register zur Gesch. der Erzdiözese Wien*, II (Vienna, 1899), 389–661.

C. WOLFSGRUBER.

Mignard, PIERRE, French painter, b. at Troyes, 7 November, 1612; d. at Paris, 30 May, 1695. Though destined for the medical profession, Pierre gave early signs of his true vocation. For one year he studied at Bourges, under a teacher of the name of Boucher, then for two years at Fontainebleau, where, thanks to the works of Primatice and Rosso, and the collections formed there by Francis I, there had been for sixty years a sort of national school. The Marshal of Vitry, after Mignard had painted the chapel of his country seat at Coubert, took him to Paris and obtained for him admission to the most celebrated atelier of the time, that of Simon Vouet. But the one place which more than all others attracted painters was Rome, where a throng of foreign artists were at that time living, among them Poussin and Claude Lorrain, who had settled there for life. Mignard was a member of this colony for twenty-two years. Here he found Dufresnoy (1611–65), who had been his comrade at Vouet's and with whom he formed a close friendship, and together they copied Caracci's famous frescoes in the Farnese Palace. But Dufresnoy was before all things a critic, and his best known work is not a painting, but a book, "De arte graphica", a manual written in extremely elegant Latin verse, published after his death with notes by De Piles, and reprinted for a hundred years as a masterpiece. This rare amateur wielded a great educational influence over Mignard, and made him acquainted with Venice and its incomparable school, which our classic art had professed to despise. Mignard was above all an adroit, industrious workman, who knew well how to flatter public taste and thus secure his own advancement. He soon made for himself a position as portrait-painter unique in Roman society; his patrons were princes, cardinals, and three successive popes—Urban VIII, Innocent X, and Alexander VII.

At the same time he produced many religious works, countless oratory pictures, chiefly those Madonnas which came to be known as "mignardes". That name, intended at the time to be eulogistic, seems to us the best possible criticism of a type of work marked by a certain conscious grace and preciosity. One feels a delicacy about saying positively that these Madonnas are not devotional, since they satisfied the pious instincts of whole generations of devout persons; but it is impossible in our time not to perceive in them a singular meanness, artificiality, and puerility of feeling. But in the midst of all these labours, the artist found time for such large compositions as the frescoes in the church of S. Carlo alle quattro fontane. He thus attained an unquestionable eminence in fresco painting, that pre-eminently Italian medium so little employed by French painters.

Under these three forms his works were widely exhibited in Rome, where he was compared to Guido and to Pietro of Cortona. During his travels through Upper Italy (1654) he was everywhere received with the greatest distinction, and painted Cardinal Sforza's portrait and those of the Princesses Isabella and Maria of Modena. On his return to Rome (1655) he married Anna Avolara, an architect's daughter, whose beauty was perfect and who posed for his Madonnas. The reputation of "Mignard the Roman", as he was called, to distinguish him from his brother, "Mignard of Avignon", had spread to France, where Louis XIV was beginning his personal reign, inaugurating that system which relied upon the glory of the arts no less than the glory of arms for the exaltation of the monarchy. Mignard was summoned back to France,

and reached Paris (1658), where he met Molière, and formed his famous friendship with that poet.

He found awaiting him in France the same exceptional position that he had enjoyed in Italy. Hardly had he arrived when he executed portraits of Louis XIV and other members of the royal family. His reply to detractors, who questioned his talent for great works, was the decoration of the Hôtel d'Epernon, soon followed by that of the cupola of the Val-de-Grâce. The latter, said to be the largest frescoed surface in the world, comprising two hundred colossal figures, represents Paradise. In pursuance of a formula dear to the Roman decorator, the throng of celestial personages is here displayed around the Blessed Trinity—the Virgin, the Apostles, the Evangelists, virgins, and confessors, founders of orders, holy kings like Constantine, Charlemagne, and St. Louis, and, finally, Anne of Austria, kneeling, offering the model of the church dedicated by her to *Jesu Nascenti Virginique Matri*. This style of apotheosis, already trite in Italy, still possessed the merit of novelty in France. The immense composition, having cost its author only eight months' work, suffers the penalty of its hurried creation. The composition lacks inspiration, the colouring is feeble and neutral rather than bright, yet it was a very celebrated work in its time, because it flattered the megalomania and the chauvinism of the public; France no longer need envy Italy; Rome was no longer at Rome, it was in Paris. In this way Mignard's cupola took on the character of a national victory, as Molière said in his famous poem "La Gloire du Val de Grâce"; thus this very mediocre, though ambitious, piece of painting was honoured at its birth by the most popular and "national" of French writers. Whether from policy or from inclination, Mignard belonged to the social circle of Racine, Boileau, and La Fontaine, at a time when artists in France associated but little with any but their professional brethren. Thanks to these connections, he is the artist of whom seventeenth-century literature has most to say. Scarron and La Bruyère acclaimed his greatness, and as he had the knack of turning his literary friendships to good account, he was able to maintain for thirty years his curious squabble with the Academy. This body, after a series of difficulties, had been definitely organized by Colbert under the presidency of Le Brun, whose authority Mignard would not recognize. The whole of the court faction which opposed Colbert naturally took sides with Mignard, who, without any official position, was clever enough to keep up his reputation as "premier painter", and to add to it that spicy opposition which in France always serves to carry an artist's reputation farthest. The list of portraits executed by Mignard in the second period of his life includes all French society of that time. The young queen, the Duc d'Enghien, the Princess Palatine, Chancellor Séguier, the Duc de Beaufort, Bossuet, le Tellier, Turenne, Villacerf, la Reynie, the Comtesse de Grignan, the Duchesse de Châtillon, Molière, the famous Ninon de Lenclos, all sat to him. He painted Louis XIV ten times, and on the last occasion the king said to him, "Mignard, you find me changed". "True, sire", said the painter; "I see a few more campaigns on Your Majesty's brow". He used for his women models a rather gaudy style, in which the draperies were somewhat overdrawn, and a system of half-mythological emblems and allusions which faithfully reflect the ideals of the court of Louis XIV. Hence these portraits have the same historical value as those of Lely or Kneller at the court of James II, while some of them possess an unquestionable attractiveness. But this was only one part of Mignard's work. He decorated many residences, public buildings, and churches, but all that remains of these works is the "Apollo" ceiling in the castle of Balleroy (Manche). However, we know by engravings that these works were good, according to the taste of the period, imitated from Caraccio and from Guido's mythologies, artificial, pleasing, facile, somewhat heavy and weak in style. The best of his religious pictures is the "Visitation" in the Museum at Orleans.

At last, Le Brun having died (1691), Mignard, at the age of eighty, succeeded to all his offices, was solemnly received into the Academy, and in one session elected to all its degrees, including that of president. Louvois having consulted him on the project of decorating the cupola of the Invalides, the veteran painter saw an opportunity of crowning his career with an exceptional performance, but Louvois died, the work was delayed, and the artist lost all hope of realizing his last dream. He died, it may almost be said, with his brushes in his hand, at the age of eighty-four. His last work is a picture in which he himself appears as "St. Luke painting the Blessed Virgin".

De Monville, *Vie de M. Mignard* (Amsterdam, 1731;) Lepicié, *Notice* in *Mémoires inédits sur les Membres de l'Académie de Peinture*, II (Paris, 1854); Hulst, *Mémoires sur l'Académie de Peinture* (Paris, 1853); Courtalon-Delaistre, *Eloge de Mignard* (Troyes, 1781) ; Blanc, *Histoire des Peintres. Ecole française*, I (Paris) ; Le Brun-Dalbaune, *Etude sur P. Mignard* (Paris, 1878); Courajod, *Le Buste de P. Mignard au Louvre* (Paris, 1884).

Louis Gillet.

Migne, Jacques-Paul, priest, and publisher of theological works, b. at Saint-Flour, 25 October, 1800; d. at Paris, 24 October, 1875. After completing his college courses, he devoted himself to the study of theology in Orleans, and while a student there filled, for a time, the position of professor in the fourth class of the college of Châteaudun. He was ordained priest in 1824, and in the following year was made pastor of Puiseaux, in the Diocese of Orleans. He published a pamphlet: "De la liberté", which brought him into conflict with his bishop, Brunault de Beauregard, in consequence of which he resigned his parish, and went to Paris, where, in the same year, he founded "L'Univers Religieux", later "L'Univers"—a journal intended by him to be free from any political tendency, and concerned with Catholic interests alone. He edited this paper until 1836, and contributed to it a very great number of articles. Meanwhile, he had conceived the plan of publishing for the use of the clergy a series of important, older and newer, theological works, at so moderate a price that they might meet with a wide circulation, and thus further an earnest and scientific study in ecclesiastical circles. For this purpose he founded in the suburb Petit-Montrouge a large printing house, with all the necessary departments, the Imprimerie Catholique, where he employed more than three hundred workmen. From 1836 he devoted his energies exclusively to this great and important undertaking, which made him universally known. Within a relatively short time he succeeded in publishing many volumes of the older theological literature, and partly because of the moderate cost, he obtained for them a wide circulation. We may mention here: "Scripturæ Sacræ Cursus Completus" (28 vols., 1840–45), with excellent commentaries of older and newer writers on each of the Books of Scripture; "Theologiæ Cursus Completus" (28 vols., 1840–45), with treatises of many earlier writers supplementing the main articles; "Démonstrations Evangéliques" (20 vols., 1842–53), in which are gathered together the apologetic writings of over one hundred authors from every epoch of church history; "Collection Intégrale et Universelle des Orateurs Sacrés" in two series (102 vols., 1844–66), containing the works of the best pulpit orators of the preceding centuries; "Summa Aurea de Laudibus Beatæ Mariæ Virginis, coll. J. J. Bourassé" (13 vols., 1866–68); "Encyclopédie Théologique", an extensive collection of works of reference, alphabetically arranged, and not confined to theological matters

alone, but including a number of auxiliary sciences, such as philosophy, geography, history, natural history, bibliography, three series, containing altogether 171 vols., 1844–66. Several of the dictionaries of the collection are of unequal value, and may be considered as out of date.

The most important and meritorious of his publications is the "Patrologia", in two collections: "Patrologiæ Latinæ Cursus Completus", in two series (217 vols. in all, 1844–55), with four volumes of indexes (vols. 218–221, 1862–64), and "Patrologiæ Græcæ Cursus Completus", of which one series contains only Latin translations of the originals (81 vols., 1856–61). The second series contains the Greek text with a Latin translation (166 vols., 1857–66). To the Greek Patrology there was no index, but a Greek, D. Scholarios, added a list of the authors and subjects, (Athens, 1879) and began a complete table of contents (Athens, 1883). The Patrologia Latina contains all the attainable published writings of Latin ecclesiastical authors from the earliest known to Pope Innocent III (d. 1216). The Patrologia Græca includes the printed works of Greek Christian writers down to the Council of Florence (1438–39). The intention was to choose for the new issues the best editions of each author, with suitable introductions and critical additions, which plan, unfortunately, was not always realized. The printing, too, was frequently unsatisfactory, and in most of the Migne reprints we find a number of misprints and errata. The great value of the collection lies in the fact that at a moderate cost and in a handy form a great work of reference was produced, and a whole series of rare and scattered writings were gathered together, and made easily accessible to the learned world. The collections had a large circulation, and are widely used as works of reference. Besides these great collections, Migne printed a large number of the writings of single important theological authors, in complete editions, e. g. Saint Thomas Aquinas, Saint Teresa, Cardinal Bérulle; the great pulpit orators Bourdaloue, Bossuet, Massillon, Fléchier; the writers Lefranc de Pompignan, de Pressy, Régnier, Thiébault, du Voisin, de Maistre, and others. Up to 1856, Migne was also proprietor of a journal "La Vérité", which gathered articles from papers of every tendency, and republished them as aids to a comprehensive induction on current ideas and facts. In connexion with his Imprimerie Catholique were established workshops for the production of religious objects, such as pictures, statues, and organs. In 1868 a great conflagration broke out in the printing house, which extended to the entire Montrouge establishment, destroying almost entirely the work of years, and the valuable stereotype plates of the Patrologia. The loss was over six million francs, but Migne did not lose courage, and began at once to rebuild. But difficulties accumulated. The Archbishop of Paris was averse to the commercial elements in the work, forbade the continuance of the business, and, finally, suspended the publisher from his priestly functions. The Franco-German war of 1870 inflicted great losses; then from Rome came a decree condemning the misuse of Mass stipends for the purchase of books, and Migne was especially named in connexion with this abuse. He died without ever having regained his former prosperity, and his business passed into the hands of Garnier Frères.

VAPEREAU, *Dictionnaire universel des Contemporains*, 4th ed. (Paris, 1880), 1290; *Polybiblion, partie littéraire*, I (Paris, 1868), 59.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Migration.—The movement of populations from place to place is one of the earliest social phenomena history records. The earliest migration recorded in the Bible was when, after the confusion of tongues, men wandered over the face of the earth (Gen., xi, 8) under conditions only vaguely known to-day. The Book of Exodus more clearly describes the withdrawal of the Hebrew tribes from the land and rule of ancient Egypt. A typical illustration of tribal migration was the separation of Abraham and Lot, when the latter gathered his substance and set his face towards Sodom, while Abraham took his way to the plains, founded a nation, and went into history as the Father of the Mighty. Of the Greeks, too, it may be said that the dominant fact of their leading epoch was the wandering of the race, until its narrow borders widened out into Magna Græcia. Throughout early Latin literature runs the same story of the migrations and conquests of the Latin race, reaching a climax in the colossal structure of the Roman Empire. Modern writers have discussed the fall of that structure and the building of that strange conglomerate of Asiatic and European, of Germanic and Romance elements, till a new, and greater, Europe arose from the old.

General movements of population are termed *migrations*. It is a general term indicating a permanent change of habitat, i. e. a more or less serious intent to take up permanent residence in the new country. The terms *immigration* and *emigration* denote respectively the entry into and the departure from any given country. Generally speaking, immigration presents more serious problems than emigration, though certain dangers do arise from an excess of emigration. Many problems grow out of immigration, and to these, legislators and rulers have turned their attention.

Migrations have taken place under a variety of conditions. In general they have been voluntary: peoples have come and gone of their own free will. But forced migrations have not been unknown in history, as when a conquering people has expelled, killed, or sold the conquered into slavery. The rule, however, has been to leave the population on the soil under conditions more or less severe. The latest principle, dominant among Western nations, is to disturb the population as little as possible, either in their person or property. The right to exile a people has been abandoned, and the noted case when England transported the Acadians in 1755 marks the date when sentiment turned against it and practice rapidly followed; transferred to a new authority, as the Filipinos were, the people do not migrate. Indeed, in the treaties transferring territory to new hands, the inhabitants are sometimes expressly guaranteed against expulsion, as in the Louisiana Purchase Treaty of 1803. Enforced migration has taken other forms. It has shown itself in the organization of criminal colonies, as seen in Tasmania. It has been practised by Russia in the attempt to settle Siberia. While compulsory migration has not played a great part, assisted migration has been a large factor in either inducing or directing the movement of population. Assistance may be given either by the land which gives or that which receives the emigrant. An illustration of the former is the aid given to emigrants from Prussia to Argentine and to the Kamerun region. In times of colonial expansion this method has been especially effective. Prospective colonists have been given bonuses in the form of tax-exemptions and liberal grants of land; the last mode is best illustrated in the grants in the London charter of 1609–12. Liberation from civil and criminal prosecution was also an effective means to induce migration; this was used in England when the jails were emptied, and debtors flocked to Georgia, and when the courts offered the choice of self-imposed exile to accused and condemned persons. Cases are not wanting where countries have attracted immigrants to themselves in various ways. Conspicuous as an example was the United States, where for decades "contract labour" supplied the market and made it possible for absolutely impecunious labourers to migrate to America. So extensive had this assistance

become that Congress has for many years legislated with the view of preventing further aid of this kind.

Migration to-day differs in many important particulars from that of earlier times. Down to a quite recent date peoples moved as tribes, nations, or races, moving and settling *en masse*. Taking forceful possession of extended areas, they maintained their individuality either under colonial systems or as separate groups; they finally established nations. With these migrating groups went their own institutions, language, religion, industrial methods, and political and legal systems. Usually they moved into uninhabited or sparsely settled areas, where no question of amalgamation could arise. With certain exceptions, the Roman Empire being the most noted, migrations have entailed the settling of a highly cultured people among those of a lower culture. In all such cases of migration *en masse* the native habitat was forever abandoned, and the migrating tribes, thoroughly equipped, entered a new environment and yielded entirely to new influences. In these particulars different conditions now obtain: migration is effected by families and individuals. These go from dense and highly cultured populations where free opportunity is usually closed, taking few possessions with them; their language survives during their own generation, and in the succeeding one is exchanged for the language of the adopted country, though they usually retain their religion. They must fit into a new industrial system, however, unlike their own. As a rule, they renounce their natural political allegiance and assume a new political status, abandoning the relations attaching to their former status and assuming new political and contractual relations. Such migration means to the emigrants the death of a nation, so far as concerns them, while to their new country it brings a serious modification, the extent of which depends upon the relative virility of the newly added national element.

These characteristics of modern migrations have given rise to a threefold movement. In certain lands, as Germany, where migration to America means a loss to German citizenship, attempts have been made to colonize, and thus save the migrating persons to German citizenship and culture. Those nations, moreover, which they enter look with increasing caution and suspicion on the numbers and character of the incoming population. When once admitted, the problem presents itself of granting them citizenship. To what extent shall the immigrant assume the rights and duties of an acquired nationality? The problem of migration is thus inextricably bound up with a political one.

Causes of Migration.—The primary cause of the migration of peoples is the need for larger food supplies. From the time when nomadic peoples were constantly migrating down to the present westward movements, one principle has been uniformly followed—they have gone from areas of low, to areas of high food-supply. This has been a constant impelling and expelling power. In the last analysis, migration results when the forces of increasing population and decreasing food supply are not in equilibrium, and it tends to equilibration of forces among societies of men: equilibration of food in relation to population; equilibration of rights as related to authority; equilibration of industrial energy as between labour and capital. These express in the most general terms the meaning of migration. First came the tribal migrations, such as the exodus of Lot and Abraham towards Zoar and their subsequent separation in search of richer pastures. The nomad tribes on the steppes of Asia take up the journey to the waterways to find richer pastures for their herds. The migration of Germans, Slavs, and similar nations came later, and, pushed on by the same inexorable necessity, they moved south from the Caspian and Baltic regions, overrunning Rome, and taking possession of Gaul and Britain. With the industrial changes in England, when the modern age dawned, lessening supplies of food pushed men beyond the sea. In more modern times the hunger-stricken peoples of European lands have come to the new parts of the world, to America, North and South; to Australia and South Africa; from Russia they have pushed into Asia, while Japan lays hold of outlying islands where congested population may find room for expansion. Moreover, there are secondary causes which play back and forth with varying degrees of force and effectiveness. These causes operate temporarily though powerfully. They usually act reciprocally in the different countries, and, like the sun and moon affecting the tides, now oppose each other, now act in conjunction.

At the close of the eighteenth century a change in the attitude of the principal governments resulted in greater freedom for those who wished to migrate. During the first half of the nineteenth century the laws limiting or prohibiting emigration were gradually modified or repealed. At this time most countries, especially those of the Western world, favoured immigration, and few limitations existed checking the flow of population; free action was thus secured to social, political, and economic causes. The variations in the flow of immigrants to the United States illustrate with special clearness the operation of these causes. From 1820 to 1833 the number of immigrants gradually increased, but as hard times began here, culminating in the panic of 1837, immigration fell off. More marked still were the effects of economic conditions from 1846 till 1857. During this period unusual activity showed itself in the United States. Under the influence of Clay's tariff measures, manufactures had grown, creating an enlarged demand for labour, which was not forthcoming from the native population. The opening of Western lands absorbed much of the labour that otherwise would have gone into industry, and also drew on foreign sources for increased supply. The greatest impulse, however, was given by the discovery of gold in California in 1848. Not only was there a great demand for labour on the Pacific Coast; the effects of the discovery of gold were more far-reaching. Prices were high, money plentiful, business, so sensitive to these influences, was greatly stimulated, and a heavy demand for labour was created. By an interesting coincidence European economic conditions also favoured a heavy migration. With bad crops and sunless summers throughout Europe, the climax was reached in the potato famine of 1847 in Ireland. This destructive calamity occasioned a heavy migration from Ireland to the United States, where abundant and increasing opportunity was to be found. At the same time certain political causes operated in Europe. Notable among these causes was the overthrow of the attempted revolutions in the German states, especially Prussia; large numbers of the Liberal Party left Germany. The results of the Crimean War are less easily measured, though it probably sent a certain number to our shores. The operation of these causes may be read clearly in the following statistics: in 1844, 78,615 persons came to our shores; in 1845, 114,371; in 1846, 154,416; in 1847, 234,968; in 1848, 226,527; in 1854 the high-water mark was reached when 427,833 immigrants landed here.

Equally forceful were the causes of immigration which manifested themselves at the close of the Civil War. Checked by the war, industry advanced by leaps and bounds at its conclusion, and men and capital were in abnormal demand. Immigration increased from 72,183 in 1862, when the national disaster was at its worst, to 459,403 in 1873. During the misfortunes following the panic of 1873 the number fell (in 1878) to 138,469. In the eighties bad economic conditions again somewhat influenced migration to the United States, when it fell from 788,992 in 1882 to 334,203 in 1886. The panic of 1907 and the

subsequent hard times are clearly recorded in the attenuated immigration to this country in 1908; whereas in 1907 it had received nearly a million and a quarter, in 1908 and 1909 the figures amounted to only three quarters of a million.

Among the motives other than economic which prompt emigration is the desire to escape military service. This has been especially operative in such military countries as Germany. This cause is much more powerful during, or just after, a war. In 1872–73 there were 10,000 processes for desertion on this account alone and in great part due to emigration. Again migration because of religious persecution has been historically of great importance. In past centuries thousands went from the Continent to England, from Ireland and England to the Continent and to the New World, that they might enjoy freedom of worship. In recent years these influences have been most powerful in Russia and Turkey, whence persecutions affecting the Jews and the Greek Christians have sent large numbers of refugees, especially of the former class, to the United States. Another cause, difficult to measure, but of great influence, is the solicitation of relatives and friends. Once in the new country, in many instances relatives plan to bring those left behind, secure places for them, aid them in coming, and in general form a centre of attraction in the new land, drawing powerfully on those beyond the sea. Along with this is the fear, periodically recurring with the agitation for restriction, that further immigration may be cut off, and at such times considerable increase is seen. This was particularly noticeable before the American legislation of 1903.

A phase of this subject which cannot be overlooked and which is of increasing importance in the United States is the commercial. On the one hand is an employing class, eager for cheap foreign labour; on the other hand are various agencies whose business is the transportation of goods and people. As the main profits of, say, the steamship companies come from the immigrants who travel in the steerage, the reasoning is clear to the line of action which they follow. Everywhere, in lands where migration originates, is the ubiquitous immigration agent. His business is to induce people to migrate. Exaggerated reports, sometimes amounting to actual misrepresentation, are too often resorted to. On this legislation has had its important bearing. The greatest influence exerted by the employing class is by means of contract labour. At first generally desirable, when labour was scarce, this has since become most unpopular, and through law and adverse popular opinion is now of comparatively little importance.

Immigration to the United States.—The many varied problems of immigration are best illustrated by its history in the United States. Perhaps no more composite nation has existed since the Roman Empire engulfed the various nationalities of Western Europe. At a very early period in the history of the American Colonies, the Negro was introduced—a race so remote, anthropologically, from the first colonists as to be impossible of assimilation. The American Indians, isolated from the first, have ever since been tending to extinction, and hence need not be considered as a possibility in the problem of national and social composition. As time passed, other races came to still further complicate the problem. Besides these distinct racial elements must be reckoned an infinite number and variety of nationalities marked by lesser differences and capable of assimilation.

The settlers of the original Thirteen Colonies, while fairly homogeneous, yet presented some diversity. There were English, at first the dominant element, Irish, and Scotch, and persons of mixed British origin. There were a goodly number of Germans in Pennsylvania and remnants of the Dutch settlement in New York and New Jersey. A few Swedes had come to Delaware and a sprinkling of Finns. The French were represented by the Huguenots in Georgia and in the Carolinas. It has been estimated that the population of one million in 1750 had developed from an original migration of 80,000. Additional racial modification resulted from the annexation of new territories of alien population. In 1803, by the treaty with France, Louisiana was added, with some accession of population and a considerable effect upon the customs and ideas of the nation as a whole. This addition was chiefly French, though a few Spaniards were included. The acquisition of Florida in 1821 brought a few Spaniards, although their influence is negligible. The enlargement westward, from 1845, when Texas was admitted, till 1848, when the Mexican Treaty added an extensive cession, brought a number of Spaniards, Mexicans, and half-breeds. Following upon the Spanish War of 1898, which resulted in an accession of nearly 8,000,000 of alien, mainly Far-Eastern, races, the extension of American dominion into the Pacific has vastly complicated the problem of nationalization, at the same time rendering more difficult the control of immigration from the Orient.

The beginning of migration to the English Colonies in America was the Jamestown settlement of 1607. In New England the first real migration of any extent was the company that reached Salem, Massachusetts, under John Endicott in 1628. Figures on the subsequent arrivals, while not certainly accurate, are nevertheless very interesting. The diversity of religion was not so marked, though there was some variation. The early German immigrants were mostly Protestants. Maryland was settled by Catholics. Into the South drifted a large number of Huguenots. In New England there was a strong Separatist element. The formation of the State of Pennsylvania by Quakers gave them a stronghold in that commonwealth.

The beginning of immigration into the United States (i. e. of post-Revolution immigration) dates from 1789. Before that time it is more proper to speak of colonists than of immigrants. Statistics as to the aliens coming to, or returning from, the United States are inaccurate and incomplete from 1789 till 1820. Not only are the absolute figures unsatisfactory, but no distinction was made between newcomers and returning Americans; nor was any attention paid to the returning immigrant. Roughly speaking, about 250,000 immigrants landed here from 1789 to 1820. From the meagre figures recorded any analysis is imperfect. The dominant elements were English, Scotch, and Irish. There came to the United States as immigrants, from 1820 to 1910, a grand total of more than 28,000,000. The numbers by decades were as follows:—

1821–1830	143,439
1831–1840	599,125
1841–1850	1,713,251
1851–1860	2,598,214
1861–1870	2,314,824
1871–1880	2,812,191
1881–1890	5,246,613
1891–1900	3,682,864
1901–1910	8,938,470

The figures given for the last decade are, of course, partly conjectural. The statistics recently issued for the year ending 30 June, 1910, give a total of 1,041,570 immigrants to the United States for that year: 736,038 males, 305,532 females. These included 192,673 Italians; 128,348 Poles; 84,260 Jews; 71,380 Germans; 53,498 English. These are the largest numbers of immigrants known for any year so far, except the years 1907 (1,285,349) and 1906 (1,100,735). It will be seen, too, that the last decade shows a very large number of immigrants as contrasted with any previous decade. These figures are only absolute. It is in

relative statistics that meaning lies. From the standpoint of social significance the relation between the influx of population and the native population is the important concern. This is true, considered from the country giving or the country receiving the immigrants. The following figures show the percentages of the native and of the alien population for a series of decades:—

1850	native	90·3	alien	9·7
1860	"	86·8	"	13·2
1870	"	85·6	"	14·4
1880	"	86·7	"	13·3
1890	"	85·2	"	14·8
1900	"	86·3	"	13·7

In 1890 there were 17,314 foreign born to each 100,000 native; in 1900 the proportion was 15,886 to 100,000. The largest proportion of foreign-born is in North Dakota, which in 1890 had 42.7 per cent; in 1900, 35.4 per cent foreign-born. In 1900 there were seven states with more than 25 per cent foreign-born. North Carolina had in 1900 the lowest percentage of foreigners, two-tenths of one per cent, the average in the Southern States being below 5 per cent. From these relative figures it is clear that the effect of immigration is not materially changing.

So also as regards emigration. Not the absolute numbers leaving, but the migration relative to the total, and again to the annual excess of births over deaths, is significant. A very large migration from a country with a very high birth-rate probably has no effect, or only a slight effect. When a million a year leave a country like China, it merely means that famine, disease, infanticide, etc., are less important factors in keeping down population; the greater the migration, the less burden the remaining population must bear. In many Western countries this is not the case, and when heavy emigration takes place the nation may be materially weakened either for war or peace. The following figures illustrate this condition: out of every 1000 inhabitants of Italy 6·87 migrated in 1888; from Great Britain and Ireland, 7·46; from Scotland 8·88; from Ireland 15·06; from Sweden 9·86; from Germany only 2·10. Most remarkable has been the effect upon Ireland, where so great has been the emigration since the potato famine that the population is now little more than half what it then was, this being about the decrease which would be produced by an emigration of 15 in 1000 during a generation.

Statistics require analysis. Immigration statistics are no exception to the rule, and much meaning may be drawn from them by proper analysis. Immigrants are not merely so many units, so many homogeneous things to be blocked off in columns of hundreds, thousands, and millions, and then abandoned. Immigrants are human beings, statistics must be dealt with in the light of that fact, and careful account must be taken of all the conditions to which their lives are subject. These cover age, sex, training, traditions, and property. Of these the most obvious and significant are age and sex. As to age, immigration to the United States has always drawn heavily upon adult life, the mass of immigrants coming to the United States during their productive period. Of German immigrants up to 1894, upwards of 60 per cent were between the ages of fifteen and forty-five. Of all immigrants to the United States in 1887, 70·51 per cent were between fifteen and forty. In 1909, out of 751,786 immigrants admitted, 624,876 were between 14 and 44 years of age; 88,393 were under 14, and 18,517 were 45 or over. These figures indicate about the normal age conditions of immigrants coming to the United States, serving to emphasize the large amount of ready labour brought in, and the large addition to the labour force of the country at a very slight cost. Caution is needed, however, in calculating the value of this influx of foreign labour. Some have taken the average cost of raising a labourer to the productive stage; others have estimated what value of goods this foreign labour would produce. The better way is to reckon the profits attributable to immigrant labour in excess of their expense to the new country; this would give the actual value accruing from the immigration.

As regards sex among immigrants, males have always far exceeded females. This is illustrated by the statistics of 1909: out of the total arrivals of 751,786 during that year, 519,969 were males and 231,817 (somewhat less than one-third) were females; again, in 1910, out of 1,041,570 immigrants, 736,038 were males. This tends to destroy the equilibrium between the sexes in the countries concerned. It leads in many instances to a large withdrawal of money from the United States to the home land. It retains the interest of the immigrant in his native land, and leads many to return to families from which they have only temporarily separated. It increases that shifting population, especially in the large cities, and greatly augments the numbers of the "birds of passage". On the whole, the results are unfortunate. The condition is far more marked with certain nationalities. The characteristic feature of Chinese immigration to the United States has been the absence of women. The tendency among Italians to leave their families at home is strong. Of 165,248 immigrants from the South of Italy in 1909, there were 135,080 males and 30,168 females. From Northern Italy the proportion was less marked: 18,844 males to 6,306 females. From Ireland came 15,785 males and 15,400 females. In the case of the Japanese more women than men immigrated to the United States.

Statistics of departing emigrants have not been kept with accuracy and completeness; hence it is difficult, if not impossible, to know just how many foreigners actually reside in the United States. In 1908 there entered the country 782,870 immigrant aliens. The same year saw 395,072 depart. These figures for that year show a net gain of 387,797, a rather small number. Of course, this number of departures was exceptional—resulting from the panic of 1907. Out of a total of 751,786 landing in 1909, as many as 225,802 departed, leaving a net increase of 525,984.

The study of illiteracy in connexion with immigration reveals the foreigners to us, enlarges our knowledge of the countries from which they come, and helps to explain the conditions of literacy or illiteracy in the United States. Moreover, as it is strongly urged that illiteracy should exclude immigrants, existing conditions as to foreign education will help to set the limits to this form of regulation. The statistics on this phase of the subject are kept fairly constant by the shifting of the sources of migration from the north to the south of Europe. As education of the masses has not advanced as rapidly in the countries now supplying the immigrant as in countries farther north, so the percentage of illiteracy does not fall with the general advance of education. In 1909, out of a total immigration of 751,786, the totally illiterate numbered 191,049. This number takes in only those over 14 years of age; but, as the great majority of those coming are over 14, and those under that age are, probably, more generally educated, they may be neglected. The percentage of illiteracy of all over 14 years in 1909 was 29; in 1907 it was 30; in 1906 it was 28. There is, then, no general diminution in illiteracy among immigrants to the United States. The degree of illiteracy among those from Southern Europe is considerably above the average; among those from northern Europe a good deal below.

Migration as Affecting Other Countries.—The last quarter of the nineteenth century saw a large migration to South America. The Argentine Republic has presented interesting phases of the subject. For half a century immigration has been an object of public attention and statistical record. There are

about 200,000 immigrants annually, and about 80,000 emigrants. In 1907 there were 209,103 immigrants and 90,190 emigrants. Of the immigrants there were 90,282 Italians, 86,606 Spaniards, and sprinklings of other nationalities. In 1909 there entered Argentina 125,497 Spaniards and 93,479 Italians, with small numbers of Russians, Germans, etc. Since 1857 the balance of immigrants against emigrants has been 2,550,197. There have migrated to Brazil since the records were kept, 2,723,964. In 1908 Brazil received 94,695 immigrants. In 1909 there migrated from the German Empire 24,921, of whom 19,930 came to the United States. Italy in 1908 lost 486,674 emigrants and received back 281,000. Austria-Hungary sent out 386,528 in 1907, of whom 352,983 went to the United States. In 1902, 55,368 Russians emigrated to the United States; in 1903, 68,105; in 1904, 80,892; in 1905, 72,475; in 1906, 112,764.

Legal Control of Migration.—The legal control of migration began when it ceased to be collective and began to be individual. Laws have been passed preventing people from leaving their native land, and also, by the country of destination, forbidding or regulating entrance thereto. Extensive regulation has been found necessary applying to transportation companies and their agents, the means of transportation, treatment *en route* and at terminal points. The justification of public interference is to be found in the right of a nation to control the variations of its own population. The highest necessity is that arising from war: on this ground nations almost universally regulate very closely the movements of population, forbidding emigration, that they may not lose their soldiers, and guarding immigration as a military precaution. Restrictive measures are also justified on grounds of health and morals, and on the general ground that a national family has a right to say who shall join it. Historically speaking, the right of the individual to emigrate is of rather recent date. The old theory was that a man may not leave his native land without the consent of the ruler. This situation arose from a variety of causes. After the dissolution of the feudal system, the population carried some of the advantages and some of the incumbrances of that system over into the monarchic state. One of its leading principles was the fixedness of the mass of the people to the soil. Again, in England, after the ravages of the Great Plague in 1351, laws were enacted requiring people to remain in their own parish or town. As time passed, and the industrial revolution brought its changes, this legislation still farther limited freedom of movement. Furthermore, when the patriarchal idea of the State gave way to the military, the personal bond of national unity yielded to the impersonal, but the obligation of the subject as a member of this new national family did not weaken, the presumption being that no one could abrogate this allegiance. The opposition to emigration was based upon military necessity, upon the desire to maintain a strong industrial population at home, upon the jealousy existing among the nations, and upon the desire to keep the nation intact.

Gradually this attitude toward migration was abandoned. The Treaty of Westphalia extended the right to migrate for religious reasons. The great migrations westward, as discovery and the settlement of new lands became a dominant interest, did much to break the crust of conservatism and allow life to operate in all ways more freely. The development of means of transportation made trans-oceanic voyages possible, leading immigrants into new and unoccupied areas. The growth of a colonial system under which the mother country reaped large profits broke down the narrow policies and removed the old prejudices, and migration to the colonies was encouraged—in some instances enforced. Along with these changed conditions came the radical philosophy of the eighteenth century, the teaching of natural rights and an insistence upon the individual's privilege to go to, and remain in, that part of the world which best suited his fancy. Thus was a condition reached when limitations could be removed. In England, in 1824, the law limiting emigration was repealed. In Continental countries the same liberal policy has obtained. In Russia, in European Turkey, and in certain Oriental lands the old policy is still partially prevalent, though in these countries more liberal measures are being adopted. But, generally, there is no longer question of prohibiting emigration, but rather of encouraging it, and always of making regulations for the arrival and departure of emigrants. European governments have undertaken this control partly on their own account, partly in co-operation with the United States. The fortunate sentiment constantly grows stronger that joint action is necessary to successful regulation.

France is the country where emigration plays the smallest part. With a birth-rate in some years above, in others slightly below, the death-rate, she has no surplus population. It has been truly said that Germany has population to spare, but no territory; England has an excess of both people and territory; but France has no surplus people and little vacant land. The annual emigration from France is 6000. The total since 1860, probably not more than 300,000. The regulations in France deal almost exclusively with the means of transportation, the condition of ships, waiting-room inspection, the health and morals of the emigrant, etc. There are no general legal barriers to free migration. The same thing may be said of Belgium and Holland. The emigration law of Italy of 1901 is the most thorough enactment among the laws of the European states: it places matters concerning emigration under the Foreign Office; all persons leaving Italy must register with the Government; persons under 14 years may not leave alone; parents and guardians must leave their children or wards in competent hands. Strict care is taken that persons shall not take passage who will be liable to return under foreign immigration tests. A fund has been created with which to care for those who are forced to return.

These countries, constantly losing population, have so far had few problems connected with immigration. Immigration into them is practically unrestricted. In Germany, on the contrary, very minute and effective control is exercised. Besides its conformity to their general practice of close public regulation, certain special conditions urge such a course. Germany is, of all lands, most completely organized for military purposes; a vigorous attempt is constantly made, therefore, to prevent desertion from the military forces, whether with the colours or in the Reserves. Hence their laws touching the emigration of eligibles are very strict, and treaty rights for such persons who go to foreign countries are very uncertain and imperfect. Again, up to a recent date Germany has been of all lands the point of departure, not only of her own, but of the emigrants of other European states. This has been true, not merely because, geographically, she lies in the pathway of commerce, but also because for a long time the traffic went out from German ports and over German steamship lines. Germany has been compelled to guard, not only her own emigrants, but, what has perhaps been a more pressing necessity and more difficult task, the inspection of the alien emigrant. The many trans-German emigrants are subjected to two, and often to three, inspections before they finally embark. Of such persons the Russians are the most rigorously dealt with: they must have Russian passports and tickets through to their destination and their baggage must be examined and disinfected.

In the United States immigration problems have developed, demanding, and finally receiving, minute

and comprehensive regulation. As the subject has such important international bearings, the treaties covering the subject demand attention. The most noted of these, dealing with the immigration of Chinese, was the famous Burlingame Treaty of 1868, between the United States and China. In this treaty the contracting parties freely and fully recognize the inalienable right of people everywhere to migrate. They also recognize that migration should be voluntary, and they agree to allow such migration to their respective countries. In 1880 a second treaty between the United States and China reversed the previous policy, and allowed each country at its option to prohibit further immigration, a provision upon which the United States acted in 1882. The last treaty (upon which subsequent legislation touching Chinese immigration has been based) was signed in 1894. A treaty similar to the Burlingame Treaty was concluded between the United States and Japan in 1894. This agreement gives to the subjects of either contracting power the right to enter, and reside in, the country of the other power. A treaty granting privileges of immigration to Italians was signed by the United States and Italy in 1871. This treaty marks the beginning of extensive emigration from that country to the United States. Thus, through treaties a certain amount of control has been exercised over immigration. But the problem of controlling immigration into the United States has been complicated by the dual system of government, state and national. Until the adoption of the Constitution of 1787 the matter rested entirely with the state governments. In that instrument no direct grant of power is made to the Federal Congress for the exclusive control of immigration. It was only after considerable litigation, and several decisions by the Supreme Court, that Congress was, in 1876, given exclusive jurisdiction. Among the earlier attempts to regulate the matter were laws passed by some of the states, particularly New York and Massachusetts. In 1824 New York passed a law covering many details of registration, reports, head tax, etc. This act went on appeal to the Supreme Court, which voided the law as conflicting with the authority of Congress to control international relationships. Other acts touching certain phases of immigration were all declared null by the court, and the exclusive jurisdiction lies to-day in the Federal Congress.

The activity of the Federal Congress dates from 1819, and was called forth, not by any desire to limit the quantity or quality of the immigration, but by the necessity of checking the brutal agencies engaged in transportation. The first statute covering this was passed by Congress in 1819. It limited the number of persons any one ship could bring; at first only two persons per ton, and later only one person per two tons, of the ship's displacement. Subsequent acts made provision for more sanitary ships, better food, and more space to each immigrant. During the first half of the century no serious opposition arose to the immigrant as such. Beginning with 1844, at the rise of the Knownothing Party, a new attitude was taken by many. This party grew strong, especially in the South, and from 1844 to 1856 it carried many states. It elected members to Congress and to local assemblies, and governors of states. One of its tenets was opposition to immigration, and as a party strong in the Southern states it did much to determine that antipathy of the South to immigration which was maintained for many years. The close of the Civil War marks a new attitude towards the immigrant. It was a period of rapidly expanding industries and there was an increased, indeed an abnormal, demand for labour. An Act was passed by Congress, in 1864, which greatly encouraged the importation of labour, really authorizing contract labour. This Act was operative till 1868. Under its influence and other favourable conditions there was a vast increase in immigration by 1866. From 72,183 in 1862, the numbers sprang up to 332,577 in 1866.

In the early seventies sentiment began rapidly to form against certain types of immigrant. This was partly due to the organization of the labour movement. It was more largely due to a vast increase of Oriental migration. Acts were passed prohibiting the equipping of ships to carry on the trade in coolies. A system of coolie labour had developed amounting practically to slavery. In 1875 any person contracting for coolie labour was liable to indictment for felony. From 1877 on, an opposition, centred on the Pacific Coast, developed against the further immigration of Chinese labour, and this first took shape in the treaty of 1880 mentioned above. On 6 May, 1882, an Act was passed by Congress forbidding the admission of Chinese labour for ten years. This Act, with certain changes, has been continued to the present day. No Chinese labourer may now enter the United States. No Chinese may become a citizen unless he be born here, in which case citizenship is secured to him by the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution. These restrictions, both as to entry and naturalization, have been from time to time extended till they now apply to nearly all Orientals. The following table shows the growth of Chinese immigration to the United States in sixteen typical years:—

1857	4,524	1881	11,890
1858	7,183	1882	39,579
1859	3,215	1885	22
1860	6,117	1890	1,716
1865	3,702	1895	975
1870	15,714	1900	1,247
1875	16,437	1906	1,544
1880	5,502	1910	1,770

It will thus be seen that the Chinese Immigration Law has been fairly successful as a measure of exclusion.

The first statute covering the general question of immigration was enacted by Congress on 3 August, 1882. The purpose of this and subsequent legislation has been threefold. It was necessary to provide for a more effective administration of matters of immigration. This involved the concentration of authority in federal hands and the creation of a fund for this purpose. The Act of 1891 gave the control of immigration to the Federal Government exclusively, doing away with concurrent administration. The Act of 1882 had begun the formation of a fund by imposing a head-tax of 50 cents on each alien immigrant entering a port of the United States; this tax was afterwards (1903) raised to $2 per head, and it now produces enough to carry on the department and leave a slight surplus. The law of 1891 created the office of superintendent of immigration, later changed to commissioner-general of immigration. The Act of 1903 added much to the needed control. It created a number of excluded classes, which may be grouped under three general heads: those physically, those mentally, and those morally diseased. Under the general head of physically unsound are many excluded classes, the most stringent rules covering those having loathsome and contagious diseases, especially trachoma and tubercular affections. Idiots and lunatics are excluded. Among those regarded by the Act as morally unfit, or "the anti-social class", are Anarchists and those accused of plotting against government, all criminals and fugitives from justice, all women immigrating for immoral purposes, all prostitutes and procurers of girls or women for purposes of prostitution. There is provision excluding paupers and those who are likely to become a public charge. All those are excluded who have come under contract to labour, or who have their expenses paid by another, except that immi-

grants' relatives may send money to aid them. Certain of these cases are made criminal: importation of women for lewd purposes, prepaying passages under contract to labour, promising employment to aliens through advertising, bringing diseased aliens in by other than regular routes—all these are constituted criminal offences against the United States.

The Act of 20 February, 1907, is the latest statute of the United States dealing comprehensively with immigration. It constitutes the proceeds of the head-tax a permanent immigrant fund (changed by the Act of 1909), formed so that these moneys go to the general fund. This law of 1907 still further extends the limits of the excluded classes. It makes the prohibition of contract labour stricter, as well as the exclusion of lewd women and girls, and of the procurers of such. It forbids the advertising by anyone for purposes of securing labour to come to this country; limiting such advertisement to furnishing necessary data of sailing, rates, etc. This Act also requires that a list and full descriptions of the aliens coming with each ship shall be furnished. Provision is also made for deporting such persons as may be illegally landed, the time for legal deportation being extended from one year to three years. The Circuit and District Courts are given full jurisdiction in all matters arising under the immigration laws. The Act furthermore makes provision for the calling of an international conference to discuss matters relating to immigration. Some details are relegated to be dealt with by the Department of Commerce and Labor.

Effects of Legislation in the United States.—Restrictive legislation shows its results in three ways; the number of immigrants debarred and returned immediately on attempting to land; the number subsequently apprehended and deported; the number of those stopped at the port of departure. Figures are obtainable on the first and second of these classes; they are only conjectured as to the last. It is, however, unfair to measure the effects of legislation by these tests alone; the deterrent influences are also powerful. During the past seventeen years about one per cent of all those coming to the ports of the United States have been either debarred from or deported after, entering. The following table shows approximately the percentage of immigrants debarred or deported for all reasons in certain typical years during that period:—

Year	Gross Immigration	Debarred	Deported	Total Excluded	Percentage Excluded
1892	579,663	2,164	637	2,801	·483
1895	258,536	2,419	177	2,596	1·004
1900	448,572	4,246	356	4,602	1·025
1905	1,026,499	11,879	845	12,724	1·239
1906	1,100,735	12,432	676	13,108	1·190
1907	1,285,349	13,064	995	14,059	1·093
1908	782,870	10,902	2069	12,971	1·656
1909	751,786	10,411	2124	12,535	1·667

Of the 10,411 excluded in 1909, 4401 were likely to become public charges; 2084 had trachoma; 1172 were contract labourers, while 402 were sent back as immoral. Although a larger number of Chinese have been admitted in recent years, a larger number has also been deported. There are, of course, many obvious difficulties in the way of enforcement. Many of the reasons for debarring are difficult to establish—such as many forms of disease, various types of immorality, and weak physical condition with no real organic ailment. Again, the contract labour law is hard to enforce because of so many effective means of evasion. Among these the most serious has been the increased immigration through Canada, which results either in smuggling pure and simple—or by means of a year's residence in Canada—in the evasion of certain regulations—e. g. the head-tax. However, the laws as at present administered, especially with the co-operation of foreign governments, are at least pointing in the right direction and supplying the country with a better selected body of immigrants.

Distribution of Immigrants in the United States.—A. *As to Origin.*—There have been several changes in the origin of migration to the New World. From southern Europe—Italy, Spain, and Portugal—it began when the Americas were new, and migration was a hardy venture. It then shifted northward till the peoples of northern countries began to send many colonists out to America. After the formation of the Republic, its immigrant population came chiefly from northern Europe and so continued well into the nineteenth century. One of the most striking features of migration to America has been the latest change in the sources of the stream, which now flows more strongly from the South and East. This change has been very marked. From 1841 to 1850 45·57 per cent of the immigration to the United States was from Ireland; from 1871 to 1880 only 15·1 per cent. From Germany between 1841 and 1850 there came 25·37 per cent; from 1861 to 1870, 36·63 per cent; from 1871 to 1880, 25·74 per cent, while in 1909 Germany furnished only 8·5 per cent, and Ireland 4·3 per cent of the immigration. From 1820 to 1902 Germany sent 24·98 per cent of all the immigrants, and Italy had sent 66·6 per cent; in 1903 Italy sent 26·91 per cent. In 1907 Italy sent 285,731, while Germany, Scandinavia, and the United Kingdom combined sent 201,337. In 1910 Italy sent 223,431 immigrants; Germany, 71,380; England, 53,498; there were also 128,348 Poles and 52,037 Scandinavians. In 1880 Italy and Austria-Hungary sent 11,765 immigrants; in 1907 these two countries sent 624,184, about one-third more than the total immigration in 1880. From 1872 to 1890 there came to the United States 356,062 Italian immigrants; from 1890 to 1900, 655,888. These figures illustrate what might be much further amplified; the change in source of the immigration to the United States in the last few decades. Further analysis would show many minor divergencies. From Italy come two different types: northern Italy furnishes one; southern Italy and Sicily another. These vary widely in mental characteristics, in industrial habits, and in wealth. They furnish needed elements to our population, lending colour and vivacity to the American nationality. Equally clear are the types of Jews now coming in such numbers. In earlier times there were the Spanish and Portuguese Jews. Later, the migration of Jews had its origin in Germany, and the German Jew was the rule. The great majority of Jews who now migrate to the United States are of Russian origin. There has also been a change in the Irish immigrant. At first the Irish migration was largely from the North, contained a large admixture of Scotch blood, was Protestant in religion, and agricultural in pursuits. The centre of emigration has since then shifted to the South, the emigrants are more largely Catholic in religion, and they settle in the cities.

A variety of causes affecting both northern and southern Europe help to explain these changes. During the period of the greatest German migration the interests of that nation were changing from agrarian to industrial. During this transition a large number of persons were left without occupation, as the older order broke up, and many of these migrated. The stream of migration from Ireland was necessarily checked as that population became more and more seriously depleted, falling to about one-half its number in 1846. During this same time there was a marked increase of population in the southern and south-eastern countries, and owing to various causes a high birth-rate has been accompanied by a low death-rate. A surplus of population resulted, and migration from those countries was the consequence. Low industrial organization there, high industrial demand here, and labour naturally flowed into the area of high demand.

A feature less fundamental is the development of the means of transportation to and from southern ports. In interesting contrast to the earlier domination of the sea by the Romance nations was the transfer of maritime power in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries into Dutch and English, and, later, into German, hands. This led to a marked neglect of southern ports, and not till a generation ago did the merchantmen begin to reorganize the lines to tap southern countries and call at southern ports. The Italian lines sailing from southern ports doubled in tonnage, and the construction of ships in those ports, for Italian and Austrian trans-Atlantic traffic, became a flourishing industry. Gradually the southern harbours became active in a trade the most important item of which was the transportation of immigrants to the United States. Typical of this change was the growth of the cities of Genoa, Naples, and Trieste. The growth also of the German lines must also be considered. These, together with the extension of railway lines leading to the harbours, have done much to develop the migration from southern and south-eastern countries. From 1880 to 1890, Germany sent to the United States 1,452,977 persons; during the same period Italy sent but 307,309. In the year 1909 Germany sent 58,534, while Italy sent 190,498. Germany formerly supplied one-third of the immigration to the United States; now, less than one-tenth is from that source. Between 1860 and 1870, the British Isles, Germany, Scandinavia, and Canada together supplied 90 per cent of the total immigration to the United States; between 1890 and 1900, only 41 per cent. In 1869 Austria-Hungary, Italy, Poland, and Russia together supplied only 1 per cent; in 1902, the same group of countries supplied 70 per cent.

B. *As to Destination.*—The distribution of the immigrant population in the United States may be considered (1) Geographically, (2) As to Occupation.

(1) Geographically.—The most obvious distinction is between North and South. From the beginning of the Republic until 1866 there was practically no immigration into the southern States. While slavery existed, the South had no immigrant problem, the only foreigners entering that section being those brought in by the illicit slave trade. The North being considered as the home of the immigrant, the North Atlantic States stood first in percentage of foreign-born. In 1903, according to Dr. Hall, 22·6 per cent of the population in the North Atlantic States were aliens; 15·8 per cent in the North Central; 20·7 per cent in the Western; only 4·6 per cent in the South Central and South Atlantic. In 1909, more than 50 per cent of all the aliens in the country resided in the North Atlantic States; of these, New York was the choice of 220,865; Pennsylvania of 112,402; Massachusetts of 61,187; New Jersey of 41,907. New York received 75,988 Italians—somewhat less than one-half their total number; Pennsylvania took 33,000 Italians. The marked changes in percentages since 1850 are in the North Atlantic States, which received 59 per cent of the immigration then and now receive about 50 per cent; and in the Western States, which in 1850 had 1·2 per cent, 8·2 per cent in 1900, and in 1909 6·5 per cent of all the new arrivals. In 1900, one-eighth of the whole population was foreign-born; in 1909, aliens formed one-tenth of the rural and one-fourth of the urban population.

(2) As to Occupation.—The rapid development of industrialism in the United States has a marked selective effect on a population that is unsettled. That it should act with increasing power on a drifting immigrant population is to be expected; as the century advances, the effect is shown in a great increase of urban immigration. A corresponding lessened interest in agriculture is due partly to the growth of manufactures, partly to the changed nature of population. On the other hand, the important mining industries still draw very heavily on the immigrant for their labour. The tendency, therefore, is for an ever-increasing percentage of the immigrants to settle in the large cities. According to Professor Smith, in 1880 the cities took 45 per cent of the Irish immigrants; 38 per cent of the German, 30 per cent of the English and Scotch, and 60 per cent of the Italian. In Fall River 80 per cent of the population are foreigners; New Britain shows even a larger percentage. The figures for New York, Boston, Milwaukee, and Chicago show still more impressive contrasts. In 1900 the total population of the principal cities of the United States was 19,757,-618, leaving in the remainder of the country 56,541,-769. In 70 leading cities of the North Atlantic section there were 3,070,352 foreign-born; outside these cities were 1,685,544 foreign-born, or 30·5 per cent of the aliens were in the cities, and 15·4 per cent of all of the foreign-born lived outside the cities. In the South Atlantic States 9·2 per cent of the urban population and 1·1 per cent of the rural were foreign-born; in the North Central, 25·4 per cent of the urban and 12·9 per cent of the rural; in the Western, the percentages were 27·2 and 18·5 per cent. There are 86 cities in which at least 20 per cent of the population is foreign-born and 27 cities in which they form more than one-third of the total population.

The attitude of the United States at the present time (1910) towards foreign immigration is one of caution. Actual and projected legislation aims, not at exclusion, but at selection. It is recognized that the assimilative power, even of America, has its limits. Legislation must, by the application of rational principles, eliminate those incapable of assimilation to the general culture of the country. Great care is, of course, necessary in determining and applying these principles of selection: an educational test, for instance, while it would exclude much ignorance, would also exclude much honesty, frugality, industry, and solid worth. It is probable that a more vigorous system of inspection of immigrants at ports of entry will be put in force, while a stricter control will be exercised over the steamship companies. At the same time, the co-operation of foreign governments is needed, if the exclusive measures designed for the protection of the United States against undesirable immigration are to be made thoroughly effective.

Official Sources.—*Decennial Census of the United States, 1790–1900; Annual Reports of the Bureau of Immigration; Treaties in Force of the United States: 1904; Revised Statutes of the United States; Special Consular Report*, XXX.

Unofficial.—Commons, *Races and Immigrants in America* (New York, 1908); Coolidge, *Chinese Immigration* (New York, 1909); Brandenburg, *Imported Americans* (New York, 1904); Hall, *Immigration and its Effects on the United States* (New York, 1906); Hanna, *The Scotch Irish* (2 vols., New York, 1902); Kapp, *Immigration into the United States* (New York, 1870); Seward, *Chinese Immigration* (New York, 1881); Smith, *Emigration and Immigration* (New York, 1892); Steiner, *On the Trail of the Immigrant* (New York, 1906); Warne, *The Slav Invasion* (Philadelphia, 1904); Whelpley, *The Problem of the Immigrant* (London, 1905).

W. B. Guthrie.

Mijes. See Mixe.

Milan, Archdiocese of (Mediolanensis), in Lombardy, northern Italy. The city is situated on the Orona River, which, with three canals, the Naviglio Grande (1257–72), the Naviglio Martesana (1457), and the Naviglio di Pavia (1805–19), is the highway of the commerce of this great industrial centre, called the moral capital of Italy. The soil is very fertile and there is extensive cattle-raising and manufacturing throughout the province. The name of Milan is probably derived from the Celtic *met lan*, which means "in the middle of the plain". The city was founded in 396 B. C. by the Insubres, on the site of the ruined Melpum, and became the chief centre of the Cisalpine Gauls. After the defeat of the Gauls near Clastidium, Mediolanum was taken by the consul Lucius Scipio (221) and be-

came a Roman *municipium*. In 45 B. C. it obtained Roman citizenship, and under the emperors it had famous schools and was a flourishing city, the Emperor Adrian having made it the seat of the *præfectus Liguriæ* and Constantine, of the *vicarius Italiæ*. After A. D. 296 it was several times the capital of the emperors of the West (Maximian Herculius, Valentinian I, his son Honorius, and later, of Ricimer and of Odoacer). The edict of toleration of Constantine and Licinius (313) was agreed on and published at Milan. In 452 the town was besieged by Attila, and in 538 destroyed by Uraia, a nephew of Vitiges, King of the Goths, with a loss, according to Procopius, of 300,000 men. Perchance for this reason the Lombard kings did not thereafter select Milan for their capital, though Bertarius did so during the brief division of the kingdom between the sons of Gundobad (661). After Charlemagne, Milan was the seat of counts, whose authority however, was overshadowed by the prestige of the archbishops, foremost among whom was Ansperto da Biassono (869–81), who fortified the town and adorned it with beautiful buildings. In 896–97 it endured a severe siege by the Hungarians, and a century later Otto II transferred the title of count to the archbishops. The most distinguished of these was Ariberto (1018–45), who induced Conrad II to take the crown of Italy. With the assistance of the people he made war on Pavia and Lodi (1027), on which account he incurred the enmity of the greater feudal lords whom he exiled, but who, leagued together, defeated the archbishop at Campo Malo (1035), and returning to the city, called Conrad to their assistance; the latter, however, besieged Milan in vain (1037). Though the struggle continued, a noble, Lanzano, and no longer Ariberto, headed the popular party. Finally, nobles and burghers entered into compacts, and this intermingling of the classes brought the commune into existence. At the same time studies, the industries (especially wool), and commerce flourished.

As the power of the burghers grew, that of the archbishops waned, and with it the imperial authority which the prelate represented, so that Milan in 1110, refused to pay tribute to Henry V, who had come into Italy. In 1116 the public authority passed entirely into the hands of consuls elected by the people. Milan made war on cities faithful to the empire: Pavia, Cremona, Lodi (destroyed 1111), and Como (destroyed 1127). Frederick Barbarossa wished to remedy these evils, and in 1158 obliged Milan to swear allegiance to him and to receive an imperial podestà. This officer was soon driven from the city, but in 1162 after a long siege, Milan was again reduced to obedience, and in part destroyed. The battle of Legnano (1176) secured their rights to the Lombard cities, and to Milan its consular government; but on many occasions the authority of a foreign podestà was substituted for the native consuls. The long period of peace was favourable to agriculture (greatly furthered by the Cistercians), also to the wool and the silk industries, in the former of which, throughout Milanese territory, 60,000 men were employed, while the silk industry supported 40,000 persons. The struggle against the empire was renewed under Frederick II, who ignored the rights won at the peace of Constance. A second Lombard League was formed, which Frederick defeated at Cortenuova, though he did not succeed in his ulterior purpose. Thereafter Milan entered into further wars with Ghibelline cities, especially with Pavia. The nobility remained favourable to Frederick and to his successors, and this caused internal strife in Milan, and the creation of a new office, that of *capitano del popolo*. The first to hold it was Pagano della Torre, elected in 1240 by the *Credenza di San Ambrogio*, the executive branch of the city government, composed of twelve members representative of the three orders of citizens. The legislative power was exercised by the General Council, the number of whose members was variable. The *capitano del popolo* was hated by the nobles, and when Pagano della Torre was succeeded (1247) by his nephew Martino, under the title of *anziano della Credenza*, the nobility sought the assistance of Ezzelino da Romano; but Martino overcame the resistance of the nobles, and also defeated Ezzelino, introduced reforms into the public administration, and distributed the public offices with equity. A new civil war was prevented by the "peace of St. Ambrose" (1258), at which the equality of nobles and people was agreed on. As conflicts continued, Martino called to his assistance Oberto Pelavicino, a well-known soldier with whose help Martino had finally vanquished Ezzelino da Romano. In 1263 Filippo, brother of Martino, was real lord of Milan, though he carefully avoided any such title, and as other cities—Como, Lodi, Novara, Vercelli, also La Valtellina, were subject to Milan, he may be called the founder of the duchy. His nephew Napoleone, under the title of *anziano del popolo*, exercised supreme power (1265–77), and in his later years was imperial vicar for Italy, notwithstanding the fact that he was a Guelph. The archbishop Ottone Visconti, who since 1262 had been prevented from taking possession of his see, organized the nobles exiled from Milan, and after several battles, succeeded in capturing Napoleone and his relatives, whom he locked up in cages at Como.

The archbishop then caused himself to be proclaimed perpetual lord, thus putting an end to the Republic of Milan and founding the power of the Visconti, which aimed at the conquest of the entire peninsula, though its real domain was limited by the Alps, the river Sesia, and the Po, while the east extended as far as Brescia, conquered in 1337. From 1302 to 1311, the della Torre were again in power, Guido of that family having driven Matteo I Visconti from Milan. When the latter returned, he was made imperial vicar by Henry VII, and devoted himself to driving the leaders of the Guelph party from the Lombard cities. On this account John XXII declared war, and sent Cardinal Bertrand du Poyet against Matteo. Galeazzo, Matteo's son, continued the war against the legate and the Guelphs, and adhered to the party of Louis of Bavaria. His son Azzo (1329–59) contributed to the ruin of the Scaligers, obtained Brescia, and was succeeded by his sons Luchino (1339–49), famous for the refinement of his cruelty, and Giovanni II (1349–54), Archbishop of Milan, who obtained possession of Genoa and Bologna, though unable to hold either of these towns, or the cities of Asti, Parma, and Alexandria. At the death of Giovanni, Milan was divided between three brothers, his nephews: Matteo II, who died in 1355; Galeazzo II (1354–78), and Bernabò (1354–85) all patrons of literature and of the arts, but odious through their cruelty, misgovernment, and exorbitant taxes. Accordingly, a strong league was formed against them in 1367, by Pope Urban V, Charles IV, the towns of Florence, Ferrara, Mantua, and others, but it was prevented, by fortuitous circumstances, from destroying the power of the Visconti. Galeazzo was succeeded by his son Giovanni Galeazzo, who was forced into war, with his uncle Bernabò, and having taken him in ambush, cast him into prison, where he died in 1385. The state of the Visconti was thus united again and in 1395, Giovanni Galeazzo received the title of duke. In 1387 he had conquered Verona and Vicenza. During his reign the duchy of Milan was at the height of its power, and contained the following cities: Pavia, Bergamo, Brescia, Cremona, Como, Novara, Vercelli, Alexandria, Valenza, Tortona, Piacenza, Parma, Reggio, Verona, Vicenza, Belluno, Pisa, Siena, and Perugia. Giovanni Galeazzo was eminent, both for good and evil; the Carthusian monastery of Pavia is a witness of his religious sentiments and of his taste for the arts. He died in 1402, leaving two sons, minors, Giovanni Maria and Filippo Maria. During their minority, many conquered possessions were lost; but,

Giovanni Maria having been assassinated in 1412, Filippo Maria remained sole duke, and with the assistance of Carmagnola, retook a great portion of the lost territory. The offensive proceeding of Filippo Maria caused the house of Este, the Gonzagas, and Venice to form a league against him, which led to a long war; in the course of it, several famous battles were fought, among them that of Maclodio (1427), by which the Duke of Milan lost Bergamo and Brescia, and the naval battle of Portofino (1431) disastrous to the Genoese allies of Milan. The peace concluded in 1433 was favourable to Venice; but the war broke out again, and continued until the death of Filippo Maria, in 1447, when the Ambrosian Republic was proclaimed (1447–50).

For military reasons, Francesco Sforza was made *capitano del popolo*, and succeeded in taking possession of the fortress and in having himself recognized duke (1450). This event led to a new war with Venice and the King of Naples, closed by the peace of Lodi in 1454. Francesco was succeeded in 1466 by his son Galeazzo Maria, who, hated by his subjects, was stabbed to death in 1476. His son Giovanni Galeazzo had as regent, first his own mother, and then (1480), his ambitious uncle Ludovico il Moro, who succeeded his nephew, at the latter's death in 1494. Louis XII, who pretended to rights over Milan, entered into a compact with Venice for the division of the duchy. Ludovico il Moro attempted to resist them, but was constrained to seek refuge in Germany, and Milan came under the power of the French. In 1500, Duke Ludovico returned to his dominions for a time, but other French troops were sent against him, and he died a prisoner in France. The expulsion of the French from Italy ensued upon the death of Gaston de Foix, the victor of Ravenna (1512), and Milan was given to Maximilian Sforza, a son of Ludovico il Moro, although the Spaniards were its real masters. After the battle of Marignano, Maximilian surrendered Milan at the end of a brief siege, and remained a prisoner. The French had been definitively excluded from the peninsula by the battle of Pavia, when Francis II, a brother of Maximilian, became duke, and at his death Charles V took the Duchy of Milan for himself, and bequeathed it to his successors on the Spanish throne. The peace of Utrecht (1713) gave Milan to Austria, which power had occupied the duchy since 1706. During the war of the Austrian succession, Austria's dominion over Milan was interrupted for a time (1745), and France even offered the duchy to Savoy. Under Maria Theresa and Joseph II much was done for the prosperity of the Milanese, and civil and ecclesiastical reforms were also introduced. In 1796 Milan became the capital of the Cispadan Republic, soon transformed into the Cisalpine Republic, and (1805) into the Kingdom of Italy; the Cispadan Republic was supported entirely by French arms, which checked by Austria (1799), returned victorious, after Marengo. In 1814 the Austrian domination was re-established, and lasted until 1859. Encouraged by the revolution of Vienna in 1848, Milan revolted, in an effort to throw off the foreign yoke; and the five days (18 to 22 March of that year) remain famous; a provisional committee was formed and the Austrians were compelled to retreat; but the consequent war, Piedmont having taken up the cause of Italy, was disastrous to the insurgents; and Milan (with Lombardy) again became subject to Austria. The war of 1859, however, decided the final annexation of Lombardy to the Kingdom of Italy.

Milan is an archiepiscopal see. According to an eleventh-century legend the Gospel was brought there by St. Barnabas, and the first Bishop of Milan, St. Anathalon, was a disciple of that apostle. But a diocese cannot have been established there before 200, and possibly not till much later, for the list of the bishops of Milan names only five predecessors of Merocles, who was at the Council of Rome (313). During the persecutions several Christians suffered martyrdom at Milan; among them Saints Gervasius and Protasius (first persecution of Diocletian), St. Victor (304), Sts. Nabor and Felix, and Sts. Nazarius and Celsus. Among its bishops should be named St. Eustorgius, St. Protasius, and St. Dionysius, who firmly opposed the Arian emperor Constantius, and was exiled to Cappadocia (355), while the Arian Auxentius was put on the episcopal throne of Milan. But the people remained faithful to the Catholic religion. At the death of St. Dionysius, the great St. Ambrose was elected bishop (375–97), vanquished paganism and Arianism, and was the guide of those good princes Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosius. He was succeeded by St. Simplicianus (397), and Venerius (400); Lazarus (438–49) appears to have amplified the Ambrosian rite of Milan; Laurentius (490–512) presided over the Roman councils in the cause of Pope Symmachus; St. Datius (530–52), lived almost always in exile at Constantinople, on account of the Gothic War; Vitalis (552) adhered to the schism caused by the "Three Chapters", but Auxanus (556) re-established the union of the diocese with Rome. Honoratus (568) sought refuge in Genoa, with a great number of his clergy, during the siege of Milan by the Lombard Alboin, and at his death the Milanese at Genoa elected to succeed him Laurentius II, while Fronto (elected at Milan) was not recognized. When Laurentius died, King Agilulfus wished to secure the election of an Arian bishop, in which, however, he was thwarted by the vigilance of St. Gregory the Great, and both at Genoa and at Milan, Constantius was elected to the vacant see; under him, the cathedral of Monza was erected, Agilulfus became a Catholic, and the conversion of the Lombards to the Faith was begun, while the episcopal residence was again taken up at Milan. The first prelate of this diocese who bore the title of archbishop was St. Petrus (784), but it is certain that St. Ambrose had already exercised metropolitan jurisdiction over northern Italy, from Bologna to Turin, and that the Frankish king Childebert gave to Bishop Laurentius II the title of Patriarch. St. Petrus established an asylum for foundlings, one of the first institutions of its kind in Europe. Mention has been made above of Ansperto da Biassono.

In 980 Landolfo, a son of the imperial vicar, Bonizo, became archbishop through simony; he was driven from the city on account of his abuse of power, but was taken back by the emperor Otto II, and repaired the evil that he had done. He was succeeded by Arnolfo II (998) and Ariberto d'Intimiano (1018), mentioned above. The latter was succeeded by Guido (1045), also a simoniac. At this time the morals of the clergy were deplorable: simony and concubinage were common, and out of these conditions developed the famous *pataria*, a popular movement for social and ecclesiastical reform, headed by the priest Anselmo da Biaggio, later Bishop of Lucca, and by the cleric Arialdo, both of whom used force to compel the clergy to observe continence, and to drive its members from benefices obtained by simony. From this great confusion ensued. In 1059 Nicholas II sent to Milan St. Peter Damian and the same Anselmo, at which the people murmured, demanding that the church of Milan be not subject to that of Rome. Archbishop Guido, however, promised amendment, and accepted the conditions imposed upon him, but soon relapsed, and Arialdo, with whom the noble warrior Erlembaldo was associated, began again to agitate the people, in consequence of which he was brutally assassinated 27 June, 1066. Erlembaldo then gave a military organization to the *pataria*, and Guido, who was excommunicated, was compelled to leave the city. While the election of his successor was being discussed, Guido sold the archiepiscopal dignity to his secretary. Until 1085 there were several pretenders to the see;

CATHEDRAL, MILAN

BEGUN UNDER GIAN GALEAZZO VISCONTI IN 1386, FINISHED UNDER NAPOLEON IN 1805

and in one of the many tumults caused by this condition of affairs Erlembaldo was killed (1074). Under Anselm III order was re-established.

Unfortunately, the *pataria* had created an anti-clerical sentiment in the people, and had prepared them to accept the doctrines of Manichæism. In fact, the Cathari of Italy were more frequently called Patari, and in Milan, one of their chief centres, they maintained a kind of university. Archbishop Oberto was exiled by Barbarossa in 1162; and though his successor, St. Galdino, was elected at Rome by the emigrated Milanese, he was able to take possession of his see in 1167; he reorganized the hospital del Broglio. Archbishop Uberto Crivelli became Pope Urban III in 1185. At an archiepiscopal election, in 1263, no agreement could be reached, for the people wanted Raimondo della Torre, and the nobles a member of the family of Settala; therefore Urban IV appointed Ottone Visconti, who was prevented by the Milanese from taking possession of his see until 1277, when he entered Milan, both as archbishop and as lord. Roberto Visconti, who succeeded John in 1354, was obliged to enter into litigation with his brothers for the property of the Church, which they regarded as the personal property of their uncle. Among other archbishops of Milan were Pietro Filargo (1402), who became Alexander V; Fra Gabriele Sforza (1454), an Augustinian, brother of Duke Francesco and founder of the *Ospedale Maggiore;* and the cardinals Stefano Nardini (1461), Giovanni Arcimboldi (1448), Ippolito d'Este (1497), also the latter's nephew Ippolito (1520). During the incumbency of this prelate, always absent from his diocese, great abuses grew up which Giovanni Angelo Arcimboldo (1550) and St. Charles Borromeo (q. v.) sought to remedy (1561). Here it is enough to mention the latter's zeal for the reformation of morals, his earnestness in preserving the Ambrosian Rite and extending its use throughout the archdiocese (Monza alone retaining the Roman rite), and his foundation of the Oblates for diocesan missions. His work was continued by Gaspare Visconti (1584) and by a nephew of St. Charles, Federigo (1594–1631), who was a cardinal, as were all of his successors, to Filippo Visconti (1784–1801), whose nomination by Joseph II, made without the consent of the Holy See, nearly brought on a schism. He was followed by Cardinal Caprara, well-known as Apostolic legate to the court of Napoleon. After the death of this prelate in 1811 the See of Milan remained vacant for six years; the next archbishop, Cardinal Carlo Gætano Gaisruck, was appointed in 1818, and governed the diocese until 1848 "more as a soldier than as a prelate". He was especially opposed to the re-establishment of the religious orders. Archbishop Paolo Angelo Ballerini (1859–67) was never able to take possession of his see, because the Italian Government denied him the *exequatur;* and his auxiliary bishop Dominioni was also persecuted.

Councils were held at Milan in 343 and 347, against Photinus; 355, in the cause of St. Athanasius, at which the Emperor Constans menaced the bishops; 390, against Jovinian; 451, against the Robber Council of Ephesus; 680, against the Monothelites; 1060, 1098, 1117, 1287, for ecclesiastical reforms. The diocesan synods of St. Charles Borromeo and those of 1636 and of 1669 were also reform synods. Diocesan synods were held in 1609 and 1850 respectively. The suffragan bishops of Milan were wont to meet each year at Rò; their sees are Bergamo, Brescia, Como, Crema, Cremona, Lodi, Mantua, and Pavia. The archdiocese has 788 parishes, with 1,828,000 inhabitants, 27 religious houses of men, and of women nearly 80 in the city and 220 throughout the diocese; it has 43 educational establishments for boys and 176 for girls, 2 Catholic daily papers, and many important periodicals. In the Middle Ages there was a monastery at Milan, St. Cosmas, for Armenian monks of the Rule of St. Basil; they depended, however, on a similar monastery in Genoa, and had no relation with Armenia. This order, which used the so-called Aquileian rite, was suppressed in 1650.

Religious Edifices.—The wonderful Italian Gothic cathedral is built of white marble, has five naves, and is 486 feet in length; it is surmounted by 98 slender turrets, on the principal one of which is a bronze-gilt statue of the Madonna; there are, in all, 6000 statues, 2000 of which are on the exterior. The cathedral is situated on the site of the ancient basilica of Santa Maria Maggiore (fourth or fifth century), and was begun in 1386 by Giovanni Galeazzo Visconti. The tomb of St. Charles is under the cupola. The treasury of the cathedral contains, among other valuable objects, two statues, of St. Charles and of St. Ambrose, made of silver and set with precious stones, the gift of the city. The high altar is a gift of Pius IV. The church of St. Ambrose, built by its patron saint in 386, and often restored, especially in the twelfth century, contains the tomb of the Emperor Louis II; in the chapel of St. Satyrus is a mosaic that dates, probably, from the fifth century, while the central door, with wood-carvings representing scenes from the life of David, is held, on seemingly good grounds, to be of the time of St. Ambrose; the church possesses also a golden altar-front (*palliotto*) of Angilbert (835). The monastery annexed to this church had a fine library, and belonged at first to the Benedictines, later to the Cistercians; it serves now as a military hospital. The church of St. Eustorgius contains the mausoleums of Stefano Visconti, Martino della Torre, and others. The church of St. Stefano Maggiore is of the fifth century; that of San Vittore *al corpo* is the Basilica Portiana, dating from before the time of St. Ambrose; it contains the body of the martyr St. Victor, and also valuable paintings. San Nazaro Maggiore (382?) has a vestibule by Bramante, and contains the tombs of the Trivulzio family. In the church of St. Aquilinus there is a beautiful mosaic and the sarcophagus of a lady of the family of the Emperor Theodosius. Santa Maria delle Grazie is a church in the style of the Renaissance (1465), with a cupola by Bramante; it has valuable frescoes, beautiful carvings, and inlaid work in the choir; in the ancient monastery, which formerly belonged to the Dominicans, is the famous Last Supper of Leonardo da Vinci. On the site of the principal hall of the baths of Maximian, the peristyles of which remain, is built the church of San Lorenzo, containing ancient mosaics. The church of San Marco (1254) has a beautiful high altar, and valuable paintings; that of San Maurizio, said to have been built by Queen Theodelinda, is covered with frescoes by Luini between 1503 and 1509. San Satiro, a church that dates from 876, was restored by Bramante. There are also the church of the Holy Sepulchre, and others.

Secular Edifices.—Among these are the Palazzo di Corte (1228), restored several times; whose garden contains the Royal Villa (1790); the Broletto Nuovo, from 1228 to 1786 the palace of the commune; the Palazzo della Ragione (1233); the Broletto (1413–24), at present containing public offices; the Collegio Elvetico, founded by St. Charles Borromeo, and now the seat of the Court of Assizes; the Vittorio Emanuele gallery and the Castello Sforzesco.

Schools, etc.—There are two episcopal seminaries, and the Lombard Seminary for foreign missions; the Academy of Sciences and Letters; the Technical Institute; the Superior Institute of Commerce; 3 royal and 6 private gymnasia; many other schools, 17 of which are under religious direction; the Verdi Conservatory of Music; the Lombard Institute for Sciences and Letters; the Royal Pinacoteca della Brera, formerly a Jesuit college, rich in paintings of the old Lombard school, and possessing a valuable numismatic collection. In the Castello Sforzesco is a museum of ancient and medieval art, while many of the private

palaces, such as those of the Borromeos and of the Trivulzios, contain valuable collections of paintings. The National Library in the Brera (1770) and the Ambrosian Library are famous. The latter was founded by Cardinal Federigo Borromeo (1609) and contains 200,000 volumes, besides 8300 manuscripts, 126 of which are illuminated with miniatures. The State and the municipal archives are important; so, also, in their sphere, are the astronomical and the meteorological observatories. Milan has 14 theatres, of which the Scala is world-famous. There are 17 hospitals and 5 polyclinics, also asylums for the insane, the blind, the deaf-mute, etc. There are nearly 5000 industrial establishments, with 150,000 workmen; the textile, typographic, and pharmaceutic industries are especially well represented.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XI (Venice, 1856); EUSTACHIUS A. S. UBALDO, *De metropoli Mediolanensi* (Milan, 1699); histories of Milan by ROSMINI (4 vols., Milan, 1820); CANTÙ, (2 vols., 1855); BONFADINI GIANETI (4 vols., 1883–1904); ADY, *Milan under the Sforza* (London, 1907); SAXIUS, *Archiepiscoporum Mediolanensium* series (Milan, 1755); the periodical *Milano Benefica* (1905 sqq.).

U. BENIGNI.

Milde, VINZENZ EDUARD, Prince-Archbishop of Vienna, b. at Brünn, in Moravia, in 1777; d. at Vienna in 1853. The admirable monument erected to him in the left wing of St. Catharine's chapel in the cathedral of St. Stephen in Vienna portrays a catechist bending over two children, inscribed "Charity", to the left, a priest in the act of elevating the Blessed Sacrament, attended by a young priest and a clerk, inscribed "and Prayer". Under these two inscriptions, and extending across the whole length of the monument are the words "link together the inhabitants of this world and those of the next". The monument thus bears witness to Milde's distinction as a catechist and as the founder of a seminary for priests and teachers. Towards the close of his preparatory studies, Milde felt called to the ecclesiastical state which his stepfather was very much opposed to his entering. His mother favoured his purpose, however, and poor and without acquaintances, he entered the "Alumnat" or little seminary at Vienna in 1794. Here he formed an intimate friendship with Vinzenz Darnaut, the future professor of church history, and with Jakob Frint, later Bishop of St. Pölten. The three distinguished men were again united as court chaplains, and remained firm friends for the remainder of their lives. Meanwhile, Milde became catechist in the Normal High School and successor of the famous Augustin Gruber, and occupied also the chair of pedagogics at the university. Later, as court chaplain at Schönbrunn, Milde spoke so comfortingly to the Emperor Francis I, inconsolable after a battle lost to Napoleon, that the emperor replied: "I shall never forget this hour, dear Milde." Not content with words, the emperor named Milde Bishop of Leitmeritz in 1823, and in 1831 Prince-Archbishop of Vienna, Milde being the first archbishop named from the ranks of the people to this see, which had hitherto been always occupied by a nobleman. His farewell address is thoroughly characteristic: "The bond of the sacred ministry is broken, but the bond of the heart will never be severed. Those whom I have loved, I shall love to the end, and, though separated from you, I shall remain united with you in charity and prayer. Pray our heavenly father not that I may live long, but that I may live for the salvation of the faithful and for my own salvation." Milde thus greeted the people of Vienna: "Not only do I wish to be united with you in the bonds of the sacred ministry, but I wish to be united with you in the bonds of charity. Not for myself, but for you do I wish to live." He kept the promise which he made to his flock, and was to them a solicitous and loving father.

Nevertheless, the year of the Revolution (1848) brought him his bitterest enmities and his most severe illnesses. He was between two fires. On 13 March the storm broke, and four days later he warned his clergy, in a circular letter, not to overstep the bounds of their calling: "Priests are not intended to advise regarding the earthly affairs of men, nor to regulate them, but should only concern themselves with interior matters pertaining to the salvation of souls." But the revolution soon menaced the archbishop. Mock serenades were held repeatedly outside his palace and its windows were broken. On the other hand, a portion of the clergy clamoured that he should be declared incapable of managing the affairs of the diocese and expressed the hope of being led to victory by a stronger personality. A deputation of the clergy represented this to Milde, who complied as far as possible by retiring to his castle of Kranichberg. When the draft of the fundamental laws of the Austrian constitution was discussed by the assembly of the States of the Empire at Kremsier, the archbishop drew up an address to the assembly: "The undersigned bishops declare solemnly that they, as true citizens, promote the welfare and hold sacred the rights of the state, but it is the duty of their office and of their conscience to look after the freedom and the rights of the Catholic Church, to oppose encroachment and restriction on the part of the state, and to beg for that support which would promote the true interests of the state and the successful activity of the Church." At the great assembly of bishops in Vienna (1849), Milde was chosen one of a committee of five to continue the negotiations with the state. When finally in 1850 the imperial decisions were promulgated, which at first dealt a blow to the existing Josephist system, Milde published a pastoral for the purpose of stilling the tumult: "The uneasiness is indeed in great part the result of misunderstanding, but often also the result of malicious misrepresentation, since, through some newspapers and through speeches made by certain men inimical to the Church, the words of the august decree were distorted, and erroneous representations spread abroad." The words of Milde in "My last will" are strikingly beautiful. "Hope softens the separation. Those who did me evil I do not think wicked, but gladly persuade myself that I by my sensitiveness have in many cases been more deeply wounded than the occasion warranted. During the last years I have had to bear many bitter misunderstandings and shameful calumnies. I have kept silence through it all, not through apathy, but partly that the malice might not be excited further, and partly in imitation of my Redeemer."

Milde's "Lehrbuch der allgemeinen Erziehungskunde" is famous, and even yet much used (Vol. I: Von der Kultur der physischen und der intellectuellen Anlagen; Vol. II: Von der Kultur des Gefühls- und des Begehrungsvermögens, Vienna, 1811–13, 3rd ed., 1843). A compendium of the Erziehungskunde was published in 1821. J. Ginzel edited Milde's "Reliquien" (2nd ed., Vienna, 1859), which contained various discourses and addresses which he delivered as bishop and archbishop.

BRUNNER, *Denk Pfennige zur Erinnerung an Personen, Zustände und Erlebnisse vor, in und nach dem Explosionsjahre 1848* (Vienna and Würzburg, 1886); GINZEL, *Reliquien von Milde* (2nd ed., Vienna, 1859); THURNWALD, *Milde als Pädagoge*, with portrait of Milde (Vienna, 1877); WOLFSGRUBER, *Die k. u. k. Hofburgkapelle und die geistliche Hofkapelle* (Vienna, 1904); WOTKE, *Vinzenz Eduard Milde als Pädagoge und sein Verhältnis zu den geistigen Strömungen seiner Zeit* (Vienna, 1902); WURZBACH, *Biogr. Lexikon des Kaisertums Oesterreich*, XVIII (Vienna, 1868), 301–8.

C. WOLFSGRUBER.

Miles, GEORGE HENRY, dramatist and man of letters, b. in Baltimore, Maryland, 31 July, 1824; d. near Emmitsburg, 23 July, 1871. He graduated from Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, in 1842, and then took up the study of law, commencing to practise later in his native city. But the profession of

law was ill-suited to his temper of thought and to his literary talents, which had early evinced themselves in a tendency to turn many neat verses. His first appearance in print was with an historical tale, "The Truce of God", which appeared serially in the "United States Catholic Magazine", followed shortly by "The Governess", and in 1849, by "Loretto", which won a $50 prize offered by the "Catholic Mirror". The following year, when but twenty-six years of age, with his tragedy of "Mahommed", he won the $1000 prize offered by Edwin Forrest. The law was now definitely abandoned for the drama. In 1859 he scored his first success with the tragedy of "De Soto", produced at the Broadway Theatre, New York City, and during the same season his comedy, "Mary's Birthday", was performed. In 1859 "Señor Valiente" earned the distinction of being presented in New York, Boston, and Baltimore on the same night. During the season 1860–61 the "Seven Sisters", based on the theme of Secession, was produced at Laura Keene's Theatre, New York City. Other dramatic ventures were not so successful, and his most pretentious effort, "Cromwell, a Tragedy", remains unfinished. In 1851 he was despatched to Spain by President Fillmore on official business. He was again in Europe in 1864 and, on his return, published in the "Catholic World" a series of charming sketches, "Glimpses of Tuscany", and, in 1866, "Christine: a Troubadour's Song", and a volume of verse, "Christian Poems". In 1859 he had been appointed professor of English Literature at Mount St. Mary's, in which year he married Adaline Tiers, of New York, and moved from Baltimore to Thornbrook, a cottage near Emmitsburg, where he lived until his death.

In addition to works of creative fancy, Miles delivered in 1847 a "Discourse in Commemoration of the Landing of the Pilgrims of Maryland", and, shortly before his death, contemplated a series of critical estimates on Shakespeare's characters. Only one, that upon "Hamlet", was published (in the "Southern Review"), which won no mean measure of appreciation from contemporary scholars in England.

Articles on *Mahommed* in *Southern Quarterly Review*, XVIII, 375; and *Poems of G. H. Miles*, by DIDIER in *Catholic World*, XXXIII, 145.

JARVIS KEILEY.

Mileto, DIOCESE OF (MILETENSIS), in Calabria, in the province of Reggio, southern Italy. According to tradition, the city was founded, not far from the site of the ancient Medama, by fugitives from Miletus in Asia Minor, destroyed by Darius. It suffered much from earthquakes, especially from those of 1905 and 1906, and, although in a less degree, from that of 28 December, 1908, which destroyed Reggio and Messina. Mileto was made an episcopal see by Gregory VII in 1073. The earthquake of 1783 destroyed the cathedral, built by Count Roger, who also built the monastery of the Most Holy Trinity and St. Michael for Greek Basilian monks. Callistus II united this diocese with those of Tauriana and Vibona, the latter destroyed by the Saracens. The first bishop was Arnolfo; after him were Godfrey (1094), under whom the see became immediately subject to Rome; Cardinal Corrado Caracciolo (1402); Cardinal Astorgio Agnensi (1411); Antonio Sorbilli (1435), who founded the seminary in 1440; Felice Centini (1611), afterwards a cardinal; Gregorio Ponziani (1640), charged with a mission to England by Urban VIII. The present incumbent (since 1898), Mgr. Morabito, has been a charitable father to the sufferers from the recent earthquakes. The diocese has 124 parishes, containing 220,000 souls; 2 convents of men, and 12 houses of nuns, 2 schools for boys, and 7 for girls.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le chiese d'Italia*, XXI (Venice, 1870).

U. BENIGNI.

Miletopolis, a titular see of Asia Minor, suffragan of Cyzicus. Miletopolis was a town north of Mysia, at the confluence of the Macestus and the Rhyndacus, west of Lake Miletopolitis Limne. There seems to have been a tribe there, called Milatæ, of which Miletopolis was the chief town and whose name was hellenized in order to suggest a colony from Miletus. Nothing is known of the history of Miletopolis except that its inhabitants served to colonize the city of Gargara. It has been identified with Bali-Kesser, Manias, Mikhalitch; but the first two identifications are certainly erroneous and the third doubtful. It was more probably located at Hammamli, in the vilayet of Brusa, where the remains of an ancient town can be seen. Miletopolis figures in the "Notitiæ episcopatuum" among the suffragan sees of Cyzicus until the twelfth or thirteenth century; toward the end of the twelfth it was united with the See of Lopadium, as an archbishopric and later as metropolis. Le Quien (Oriens Christ., I, 779) gives the names of some twelve bishops of Miletopolis; the first is Philetus, a contemporary of St. Parthenius, Bishop of Lampsacus, born at Miletopolis, in the beginning of the fourth century.

HAMILTON, *Researches*, I, 81; II, 91; SMITH, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*, s. v.; RAMSAY, *Asia Minor*, 159.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Miletus, a titular see of Asia Minor, suffragan of Aphrodisias, in Caria. Situated on the western coast of Caria near the Latmic Gulf at the mouth of the Mæander and the terminus of several of the great roads of Asia Minor, Miletus was for a long period one of the most prosperous cities of the ancient world. At first inhabited by the Leleges and called Lelegeis or Pityussa, it was rebuilt under the name of Miletus by the Cretans (Strabo, XIV, i, 3). It is mentioned by Homer (Iliad, II, 868). About the tenth century B. C. the Ionians occupied it, and made it a maritime and commercial power of the first rank. From it numerous colonies were founded along the Hellespont, the Propontis, and the Black Sea, among others Cyzicus and Sinope. Miletus also had its period of literary glory with the philosophers Thales, Anaximander, and Anaximenes, the historians Hecatæus and Cadmus, the rhetorician Æschines, and the writer of tales, Aristides. After the sixth century B. C., it passed successively under the domination of the Persians, Alexander, the Seleucides, and the Romans, and finally lost its splendour to such an extent as to become for the Greeks and Romans the symbol of vanished prosperity. It is, nevertheless, often mentioned by Strabo (XII, viii, 16; XIV, i, 3, 6) and by Pliny (Hist. nat., IV, xi; V, xxxii etc.). St. Paul landed there from Samos, and there bade farewell to the ancients of the Church of Ephesus. On another occasion, doubtless after his first captivity, he left here his companion Trophimus, who was ill (II Tim., iv, 20). In the Acts of St. Thyrsus and his companions, martyred at Miletus under Decius, mention is made of a Bishop Cæsarius who gave them burial (Acta SS., III, Jan., 423). Eusebius, Bishop of Miletus, assisted at the Council of Nicæa (325). For the list of the other known bishops see Le Quien (I, 917–20) and Gams (448). Mention may be here made of St. Nicephorus in the tenth century (Anal. Bolland., XIV, 129–66). At first a suffragan of Aphrodisias, Miletus afterwards became an autocephalous archdiocese and even a metropolis. Among those who brought fame to the city during Byzantine times must be mentioned the architect Isidore, who, with Anthemius of Tralles, built St. Sophia at Constantinople. The ancient city is now buried under the alluvium of the Mæander, which has also filled up the Latmic Gulf. Near its site, about four and a half miles from the sea, is the village which since the medieval times has been called Palatia or Palatscha. Recent excavations have brought to light other ruins, the remains of a temple of Apollo Didymæus. Greek Christian inscriptions have also been found there, among others one mentioning the

martyr Onesippus, and another, probably of the fourth century, containing an invocation to the seven archangels, guardians of the city (Corp. inscr. gr., 2892, 8847).

LE QUIEN, *Oriens christ.*, I, 917–20; RAYET AND THOMAS, *Milet et le golfe Latmique* (Paris, 1877); TEXIER, *Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1862), 331–6; RAMSAY, *Hist. Geog. of Asia Minor* (London, 1890), 37, 40, 58–60, 62, 422; PERROT AND CHIPIEZ, *Hist. de l'art dans l'antiquité*, VIII (Paris, 1904), 268–70.

S. SALAVILLE.

Miletus (originally MÜLLER), VITUS, Catholic theologian, b. at Gmünd, Swabia, 1549; d. at Mainz, 11 Sept., 1615. He studied at the German College, Rome, from 1567 to 1575; on 28 Oct., 1573, as dean of the students he gave a short address before Pope Gregory XIII, when he visited the newly organized academy. He was ordained in St. John Lateran on Easter Saturday, 1575, and returned to Germany in the summer of that year; on his way home he was made doctor of theology at Bologna (11 June, 1575). He was summoned to Mainz by the Elector Daniel Brendel von Homburg, where he was active in the reform of the clergy. From there he was sent by the elector to Erfurt, to assist the suffragan bishop Nicolaus Elgard in his efforts for the restoration of Catholicism. His sermons on the doctrine of the Eucharist, preached at Erfurt in Lent, 1579, involved him in sharp controversy with the Protestant preachers. He was sent to Rome in 1582 to bring the pallium for the new archbishop, Wolfgang von Dalberg. The latter brought him back again to Mainz, and employed him on important affairs, notably on the visitation of monasteries. Also in 1601 and 1604 he brought from Rome the confirmation and the pallium for the succeeding archbishops, Adam von Bicken, and Schweikart von Cronenberg. Under all these archbishops, the last of whom appointed him his spiritual counsellor, he was tirelessly engaged in defending the Catholic Faith, both by preaching and writing, until his death. He was provost of St. Moritz, dean of the Liebfrauenstift, canon of St. Victor's and St. Peter's, all in Mainz; and canon of St. Severus' at Erfurt. After 1575 he also had a canonry in the cathedral chapter at Breslau. He did not visit Breslau until 1599, and then only for a short time, while taking part in the election of a bishop; he then went to Rome to bring the confirmation of the elected bishop. His polemical and apologetic writings are:—"De festo Corporis Christi in honorem Jesu Christi" (Mainz, 1580); "Augenschein des Jesuiter Spiegels, so neuwlich zu Erffurdt in truck aussgangen" (Cologne, 1582); "De sacramentis, mille sexcenti errores, vaniloquia et cavillationes eorum, qui hoc tempore ab Ecclesia secesserunt catholica, cum brevi eorum refutatione; plerique collecti ex Kemnitio" (Mainz, 1593); "Brevis discussio et refutatio sexcentorum errorum, quos duo Prædicantes Saxonici Tilemannus Heshusius et Joannes Olearius Pontificiis hoc est Christianis Catholicis vanissime hactenus attribuerunt" (Mainz, 1604).

ROTH in *Württembergische Vierteljahrshefte für Landesgeschichte*, new series, ninth year (1900), S. 304-306; STEINHUBER, *Geschichte des Collegium Germanicum Hungaricum in Rom.*, I (Freiburg im Br., 1895), 75, 96 sq., 195, 197, 201–3, 303; JUNGNITZ, *Die Breslauer Germaniker* (Breslau, 1906), S. 24–27; FUNK in *Kirchenlex.*, 2, Aufl., VIII, 1515 f.

FRIEDRICH LAUCHERT.

Milevum, a titular see of Numidia. In Ptolemy's "Geography", IV, iii, 7, the city is mentioned under the name of Mileum or Mireon. During the Roman era it was called Colonia Sarnensis Milevitana, after the River Sarnus in Campania, whence the colonists had emigrated. This name is often found in the inscriptions of the city. Together with Cirta, Collo, and Rusicade, Milevum formed the confederation known as the Four Colonies, the territory of which was very extensive. In the sixth century the Emperor Justinian had Milevum enclosed by a fortified wall, which still stands and forms a rampart for the Arabian city of Milah (Diehl, "L'Afrique byzantine", Paris, 1896, 603 sq.). Two councils were held at Milevum, one in 402 and the other in 416; the second appealed to Pope Innocent I for the repression of the Pelagian heresy. Among the bishops of this titular see were Pollianus, present at the Council of Carthage in 255 and martyred two years later; St. Optatus, noted for his work against the Donatists, d. c. 385, and commemorated on 4 June; Honorius; Severus, fellow-countryman and friend of St. Augustine; Benenanus (484); Restitutus, who attended the Fifth Œcumenical Council in 553. Milevum, now Milah, is a city in the department of Constantine in Algeria, with 8000 inhabitants, 400 of whom are Europeans. We have quite a number of Latin inscriptions from this city and a colossal statue of Saturn.

TOULOTTE, *Géographie de l'Afrique chrétienne: Numidie* (Paris, 1894), 222–27

S. VAILHÉ.

Milic, JAN, a pre-Hussite reform preacher and religious enthusiast, b. at Kremsier in Moravia, d. 29 June, 1374, at Avignon. From 1358–60 he was registrar and from 1360–2 corrector at the imperial chancery of Charles IV. In 1363 he was priest and canon, probably also archdeacon, at Prague; but towards the end of the same year he renounced all his dignities, began a life of extreme austerity and fearlessly denounced the vices of the clergy and the laity. At least once each day he preached at St. Nicholas's, later at St. Egid's in Prague, in Latin for ecclesiastics and in the Czech language for the laity. After the death of Conrad of Waldhausen in 1369 he preached daily at the cathedral in German. In the spring of 1367 he went to Rome where he was imprisoned by the Inquisition because he had declared to the people that Antichrist had arrived. During his imprisonment he wrote "Libellus de Antichristo", which he submitted to Pope Urban V, who upon his return from Avignon to Rome on 16 Oct., 1367, released him. In 1372 he founded at Prague a home for fallen women, which he called "Jerusalem". In 1373 the mendicants and the city clergy of Prague lodged twelve accusations against him with Pope Gregory XI at Avignon, whereupon he went to Avignon, was completely justified by the pope, and was even permitted to preach before the cardinals. There are extant in manuscript two collections of his Latin sermons, entitled "Gratia Dei" and "Abortivus". His "Libellus de Antichristo" was edited by Mencik in "Sitzungsberichte der böhmischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften" (Prague, 1890), 328–336.

Vita venerabilis presbyteri Milicii prælati ecclesiæ Pragensis, ed. EMLER, in *Fontes rerum Bohem.*, I (1871), 401–36; PALACKY, *Vorläufer des Husitismus* (Prague, 1869), 18–46; TOMEK, *Dejepis Prahy*, III, 2nd ed. (Prague, 1897), 178 sq.

MICHAEL OTT.

Military Orders, THE.—Including under this term every kind of brotherhood of knights, secular as well as religious, historians of the military orders have enumerated as many as a hundred, even after eliminating the apocryphal and stillborn. This great number is explained by the eagerness with which the Middle Ages welcomed an institution so thoroughly corresponding to the two occupations of that period, war and religion. Royalty afterwards utilized this new idea to strengthen its own position or to reward faithful nobles, creating secular orders of knighthood until there was no country without its royal or princely order. Even private individuals entered into the business; adventurers attempted to exploit the vanity of the *noblesse* by sham insignia of knighthood with which they decked themselves, and which they distributed among their dupes lavishly—though not gratuitously. Hence came a whole category of orders justly considered apocryphal. In the seventeenth century Marino Caraccioli (1624), a Neapolitan nobleman, succeeded in

passing himself off as Grand Master of the Order of Knights of St. George, which he pretended to trace to Constantine the Great. In 1632, Balthazar Giron, who called himself an Abyssinian, brought to Europe an order no less ancient, that of St. Anthony of Ethiopia, an imposture almost immediately unmasked by another Oriental, the learned Abraham Echelensis (1646). At the court of Louis XIV, a negro, brought to France from the Gold Coast, posed as a prince, even securing the honour of being baptized by Bossuet (1686), and instituted the Order of the Star of Our Lady before returning to his alleged dominions.

A regular order of knighthood means a brotherhood or confraternity which combines with the insignia of knighthood the privileges of monks. This supposes recognition on the part of both Church and State; to belong to the regular clergy, they needed the pope's confirmation; they could not wear the sword of knighthood without the authorization of the prince. Orders of knighthood lacking this official recognition should be expunged from history, even though they figure in the pages of all the old historians of the military orders. As a matter of fact, more than one rule of this kind, scarcely passing beyond the initial stages, has existed, and such are the orders which may be designated stillborn. No trace is to be found in the "Bullarium romanum" of the order called the Wing of St. Michael, attributed to King Alfonso I of Portugal (1176), nor of the Order of the Ship, which St. Louis was supposed to have founded on the eve of the crusade to Tunis where he died (1270), nor of that of the Argonauts of St. Nicholas, attributed to Charles III, King of Naples, 1382. Philippe de Mezières, chancellor of the King of Cyprus, drew up the statutes of an Order of the Passion of Christ (1360), the text of which has recently been published, but which were never enforced. After the conquest of Lemnos from the Turks, Pope Pius II founded an order of Our Lady of Bethlehem, intending to transfer to it the possessions of older orders which no longer fulfilled their purpose (1459), but the loss of the island prevented its institution. The same fate befell the German Order of the Christian Militia, projected (1615) under Paul V; of the French order of The Magdalen for the suppression of duelling (1614); of the Conception of Our Lady, the statutes of which, drawn up by the Duke of Mantua and approved by Urban VIII (1623), have remained a dead letter. The age of the crusades had passed. The orders of any historical existence may be reduced to three categories: I. The Greater Regular Orders; II. The Lesser Regular Orders; III. The Secular Orders.

I. The Greater Regular Orders.—The great military orders had their origin in the crusades, from which they retain the common badge of every order of knighthood, the cross worn on the breast. The oldest of these, the Knights Templars (q. v.), has served as a model for all the others. After barely a century of existence, they were suppressed by Clement V; but two remnants remained after the fourteenth century, the Order of Christ (q. v.) in Portugal, and the Order of Montesa (q. v.) in Spain. In the twelfth century Portugal had borrowed their rule from the Templars and founded the Portuguese Order of Aviz (q. v.). Almost at the same time there arose in Castile the Order of Calatrava (q. v.) and in Leon the Order of Alcantara (q. v.). Contemporary with these purely military orders, others were founded, at once military and hospitaller, the most famous of which were the Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem and the Teutonic Knights, modelled on the former, both still in existence. In the same category should be included the Order of Santiago (q. v.) which spread throughout Castile, Leon, and Portugal. Lastly, there are the purely hospitaller orders whose commanders, however, claimed the rank of knights though they had never been in battle, such as the Orders of St. Lazarus of Jerusalem (q. v.) and of the Holy Spirit of Montpellier (q. v.). With these may be connected the Order of Our Lady of Ransom (*Nuestra Señora de Merced*, also called Mercedarians), founded (1218) in Aragon by St. Peter Nolasco for the redemption of captives. Including religious knights as well as religious clerics, it was originally considered a military order, but dissensions arose and each rank chose its own grand master. John XXII (1317) reserved the grand-mastership to clerics, with the result of a general exodus of knights into the newly founded military Order of Montesa.

II. The Lesser Regular Orders.—There is mention in the twelfth century, in Castile, of an Order of

Knights of Livonia, or Sword-bearers

Montjoie, confirmed by Alexander III (1180), but difficult to distinguish from the Order of Calatrava, with which it was soon amalgamated. In 1191, after the siege of Acre, Richard I of England founded there in fulfilment of a vow, the Order of St. Thomas of Canterbury, an order of hospitallers for the service of English pilgrims. It seems to have been made dependent on the Hospitallers of St. John, whom it followed to Cyprus after the evacuation of Palestine. Its existence is attested by the Bullarium of Alexander IV and John XXII; beyond this it has left but little trace except a church of remarkable architecture, St. Nicholas, at Nicosia in Cyprus. Better known is the history of the Schwertzbrüder (*Ensiferi*, or Sword-bearers) of Livonia, founded by Albert, first Bishop of Riga (1197), to propagate the Faith in the Baltic Provinces and to protect the new Christianity there against the pagan nations still numerous in that part of Europe. Against these pagans a crusade had been preached; but, the temporary crusaders having made haste to withdraw, it became necessary, as in Palestine, to supply their place with a permanent order. This order adopted the statutes, the white mantle and the red cross of the Templars, with a red sword as their distinctive badge, whence their name of *Ensiferi*. The order was approved in 1202 by a Bull of Innocent III. Thrown open to all sorts of persons without distinction of birth, overrun by aimless adventurers whose excesses were calculated rather to exasperate the pagans than to convert them, it endured but a short time, having only two grand mas-

ters, the first of whom, Vinnon, was murdered by one of his fellows in 1209, while the second, Volquin, fell on the field of battle in 1236, with four hundred and eighty knights of the order. The survivors petitioned to be allowed to enter the Teutonic Order, of which the Knights of Livonia thenceforward formed one branch under a provincial master of their own (1238). Their possessions, acquired by conquest, formed a principality under Charles V (1525), and the last of their masters, Gottart Kettler, apostatized and converted it into the hereditary Duchy of Courland under the suzerainty of the kings of Poland (1562).

The Gaudenti of Our Lady at Bologna, confirmed by Urban IV in 1262, and suppressed by Sixtus V

Knights Templars

in 1589, were not so much a military order as an association of gentlemen who undertook to maintain the public peace in those turbulent times. An order of St. George of Alfama, in Aragon, approved in 1363 by Urban V, was merged in the Order of Montesa in 1399. The Knights of St. George, in Austria, founded by the Emperor Frederick III, and approved by Paul II in 1468, failing to perpetuate their existence, owing to the lack of territorial possessions, gave place to a purely secular confraternity. The Order of St. Stephen Pope was founded in Tuscany by the Grand Duke Cosmo I and approved in 1561 by Pius IV, being placed under the Benedictine Rule. It had its principal house at Pisa, and was obliged to equip a certain number of galleys to fight the Turks in the Mediterranean after the manner of, and in concert with, the "caravans" of the Knights of Malta.

III. The Secular Orders.—Dating from the fourteenth century, fraternities of lay knights were formed modelled on the great regular orders; as in the latter, we find in these secular orders a patron, a vow to serve the Church and the sovereign, statutes, a grand master (usually the reigning prince), and the practice of certain devotions. Most of them also asked for the approbation of the Holy See, which, on the other hand, granted them spiritual favours—indulgences, the privilege of private oratories, dispensation from certain fasts, etc. The chief of these orders, classified by countries, are as follows:—In England, Edward III, in memory of the legendary Knights of the Round Table, established in 1349 a brotherhood of twenty-five knights, exclusive of princes of the blood and foreign princes, with St. George as its patron and with its chapel in Windsor Castle for the holding of chapters. This, the Order of the Garter, takes its name from the characteristic badge, worn on the left knee. The choice of this badge has given rise to various anecdotes of doubtful authenticity. Nothing is now known of the original object of the Order of the Bath, the creation of which dates from the coronation of Henry IV (1399). A third order, Scottish by origin, is that of the Order of the Thistle, dating from the reign of James V of Scotland (1534). These orders still exist, though they have been protestantized. In France, the royal orders of the Star, dating from John the Good (1352), of St. Michael, founded by Louis XI (1469), of the Holy Ghost, founded by Henry III (1570), of Our Lady of Carmel, amalgamated by Henry IV with that of St. Lazarus (q. v.), were absolutely suppressed by the Revolution. Austria and Spain now dispute the inheritance from the House of Burgundy of the right to confer the Order of the Golden Fleece, founded by Duke Philip the Good, approved by Eugene IV in 1433, and extended by Leo X in 1516.

In Piedmont, the Order of the Annunziata, under its later form, dates only from Charles III, Duke of Savoy, in 1518, but its first dedication to the Blessed Virgin goes back to Amadeus VIII, first Duke of Savoy, antipope under the name of Felix V (1434). There had, previously to this dedication, existed in Savoy an Order of the Collar, which held its chapters in the Charterhouse (founded in 1392) of Pierre-Châtel in Bugey. Here also the Knights of the Annunziata kept their feast of the Annunciation, so that they have considered themselves as successors of the Order of the Collar. After the cession of Bugey to France, they transferred their chapters to the newly founded Camaldolese monastery on the Mountain of Turin (1627). In the Duchy of Mantua, Duke Vincent Gonzaga, on the marriage of his son Francis II, instituted, with the approbation of Paul V, the Knights of the Precious Blood, a relic of which is venerated in that capital. Lastly there are a number of pontifical secular orders, the oldest of which is the Order of Christ, contemporary with the institution of the same order in Portugal in 1319. In approving the latter institution, John XXII reserved the right of creating a certain number of knights by patent, and it is now used to reward services rendered by any person whatsoever without distinction of birth. The same is to be said of the Orders of St. Peter, instituted by Leo X in 1520, of St. Paul, founded by Paul III in 1534, of Our Lady of Loretto, charged by Sixtus V in 1558, to watch over and preserve that sanctuary. These distinctions were mostly granted to functionaries of the pontifical chancery. There has been some question as to the Order of the Holy Sepulchre (q. v.), formerly dependent on the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and quite recently reorganized by the reigning pope (Pius X). The Knights of St. Catherine of Sinai (q. v.) are not an order, either secular or regular. The respective particular histories of the great military orders have been traced in the various articles devoted to them; it is necessary here only to explain their general organization, religious, military, and economic.

(1) *Religious State.*—The knights of the great orders were regarded in the Church as analogous to monks, whose three vows they professed and whose immunities they shared. They were answerable to the pope alone; they had their chapels, their clerics, and their cemeteries, all exempted from the jurisdiction of the secular clergy. Their landed property was free from tithes. They were not subject to the interdicts which the bishops in those days employed so freely. They did not all follow the same monastic rule. The Templars and orders derived from them

followed the Cistercian Reform. The Hospitallers followed the Rule of St. Augustine. Nevertheless, in consequence of the relaxation which manifested itself among them after the period of the crusades, the Holy See introduced mitigations in favour of the non-clerical brethren. For these it was difficult to maintain the rule of celibacy in all its rigour; they were permitted, in certain orders, to marry once, and that only with a maiden. Even where second marriages were tolerated, they had to vow conjugal fidelity, so that if they violated this obligation of the natural law they sinned doubly, against the law and against their vow. Besides the three vows, the rule bound the brethren to the exercises of the monastic life such as the recitation of the

KNIGHTS OF ST. JOHN OF JERUSALEM

Hours, for which, in the case of illiterates, a fixed number of Paters was substituted. It also prescribed their dress and their food, and their feast, abstinence, and fast days. Lastly, the rule imposed detailed obligations in regard to the election of dignitaries and the admission of members to the two ranks of combatants —knights and men-at-arms—and the two of non-combatants—chaplains, to whom all sacerdotal functions were reserved, and *casaliers*, or tenants, who were charged with the management of temporal affairs.

(2) *Military Organizations.*—The military organization of the orders was uniform, explained by that law of war which compels the belligerent to maintain his military apparatus on a level with those of his adversary, on pain of defeat. The strength of an army was in its cavalry, and to this type the armament, mounting, and tactics of the military orders conformed. The knights-brethren were the heavy cavalry; the men-at-arms-brethren, the light cavalry. The former were entitled to three horses apiece; the latter had to be content with one. Among the former, only knights of tried prowess were admitted, or, in default of this qualification, sons of knights, because in such families the warlike spirit and military training were hereditary. The consequence was that the knights, properly so-called, were never very numerous; they formed a *corps d'élite* which carried the great mass of the crusaders. Gathered in convents which were also barracks, combining with the passive obedience of the soldier, the spontaneous submission of the religious, living shoulder to shoulder in brotherly union, commander and subordinate, these orders surpassed, in that cohesiveness which is the ideal of every military organization, the most famous bodies of picked soldiery known to history, from the Macedonian phalanx to the Ottoman Janissaries.

(3) *Economic Organization.*—The importance acquired by the military orders during the course of the Middle Ages may be measured by the extent of their territorial possessions, scattered throughout Europe. In the thirteenth century nine thousand manors formed the portion of the Templars; thirteen thousand that of the Hospitallers. These temporalities were an integral part of the ecclesiastical domain, and as such had a sacred character which placed them beyond liability to profane uses or to secular imposts. They differed from the temporalities of other monastic institutions only in the centralized system of their administration. While within each of the other religious institutes every abbey was autonomous, all the houses of a military order were bound to contribute their revenues, after deducting expenses, to a central treasury. As a result of this enormous circulation of capital controlled by the orders, their wealth could be applied to financial operations which made them veritable credit and deposit banks. Their perfect good faith earned for them the implicit confidence of the Church and of temporal rulers. The papacy employed them to collect contributions for the crusades; princes did not hesitate to entrust to them their personal property. In this respect, again, the military orders were model institutions.

MIRÆUS, *Origine des chevaliers et ordres militaires* (Antwerp, 1609); FAVYN, *Histoire des ordres de chevalerie* (2 vols., Paris, 1620); BIELENFELD, *Geschichte und Verfassung aller Ritterorden* (Weimar, 1841); CAPPELLETI, *Storia degli ordini cavallereschi* (Leghorn, 1904); CLARKE, *Concise History of Knighthood*, II (London, 1884); DIGBY, *The Broad Stone of Honour* (London, 1876–77); LAWRENCE-ARCHER, *The Orders of Chivalry* (London, 1887); see also bibliographies attached to special articles on the several great orders.

CH. MOELLER.

Millennium and Millenarianism.—The fundamental idea of millenarianism, as understood by Christian writers, may be set forth as follows: At the end of time Christ will return in all His splendour to gather together the just, to annihilate hostile powers, and to found a glorious kingdom on earth for the enjoyment of the highest spiritual and material blessings; He Himself will reign as its king, and all the just, including the saints recalled to life, will participate in it. At the close of this kingdom the saints will enter heaven with Christ, while the wicked, who have also been resuscitated, will be condemned to eternal damnation. The duration of this glorious reign of Christ and His saints on earth, is frequently given as one thousand years. Hence it is commonly known as the "millennium", while the belief in the future realization of the kingdom is called "millenarianism" (chiliasm, from the Greek χίλια, scil. ἔτη).

This term of one thousand years, however, is by no means an essential element of the millennium as conceived by its adherents. The extent, details of the realization, conditions, the place, of the millennium were variously described. Essential are the following points: The early return of Christ in all His power and glory, the establishment of an earthly kingdom with the just, the resuscitation of the deceased saints and their participation in the glorious reign, the destruction of the powers hostile to God, and, at the end of the kingdom, the universal resurrection with the final judgment, after which the just will enter heaven, while the wicked will be consigned to the eternal fire of hell.

The roots of the belief in a glorious kingdom, partly natural, partly supernatural, are found in the hopes of the Jews for a temporal Messiah and in the Jewish apocalyptic. Under the galling pressure of their polit-

ical circumstances, the expectation of a Messiah who would free the people of God had, in the Jewish mind, assumed a character that was to a great extent earthly; the Jews longed above all for a saviour who would free them from their oppressors and restore the former splendour of Israel. These expectations generally included the belief that Jehovah would conquer all powers hostile to Himself and to His chosen people, and that He would set up a final, glorious kingdom of Israel. The apocalyptic books, principally the book of Henoch and the fourth book of Esdras, indicate various details of the arrival of the Messiah, the defeat of the nations hostile to Israel, and the union of all the Israelites in the Messianic kingdom followed by the renovation of the world and the universal resurrection.

The natural and the supernatural are mingled in this conception of a Messianic kingdom as the closing act of the world's history. The Jewish hopes of a Messiah, and the descriptions of apocalyptic writers were blended; it was between the close of the present world-order and the commencement of the new that this sublime kingdom of the chosen people was to find its place. That many details of these conceptions should remain indistinct and confused was but natural, but the Messianic kingdom is always pictured as something miraculous, though the colours are at times earthly and sensuous. The evangelical accounts clearly prove how fervently the Jews at the time of Christ expected an earthly Messianic kingdom, but the Saviour came to proclaim the spiritual kingdom of God for the deliverance of man from his sins and for his sanctification, a kingdom which actually began with His birth. There is no trace of chiliasm to be found in the Gospels or in the Epistles of St. Paul; everything moves in the spiritual and religious sphere; even the descriptions of the end of the world and of the last judgment bear this stamp. The victory over the symbolical beast (the enemy of God and of the saints) and over Antichrist, as well as the triumph of Christ and His saints, are described in the Apocalypse of St. John (Apoc., 20–21), in pictures that resemble those of the Jewish apocalyptic writers, especially of Daniel and Henoch. Satan is chained in the abyss for a thousand years, the martyrs and the just rise from the dead and share in the priesthood and kingship of Christ. Though it is difficult to focus sharply the pictures used in the Apocalypse and the things expressed by them, yet there can be no doubt that the whole description refers to the spiritual combat between Christ and the Church on the one hand and the malignant powers of hell and the world on the other. Nevertheless, a large number of Christians of the post-Apostolic era, particularly in Asia Minor, yielded so far to Jewish apocalyptic as to put a literal meaning into these descriptions of St. John's Apocalypse; the result was that millenarianism spread and gained staunch advocates not only among the heretics but among the Catholic Christians as well.

One of the heretics, the Gnostic Cerinthus, who flourished towards the end of the first century, proclaimed a splendid kingdom of Christ on earth which He would establish with the risen saints upon His second advent, and pictured the pleasures of this one thousand years in gross, sensual colours (Caius in Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl.", III, 28; Dionysius Alex. in Eusebius, ibid., VII, 25). Later among Catholics, Bishop Papias of Hierapolis, a disciple of St. John, appeared as an advocate of millenarianism. He claimed to have received his doctrine from contemporaries of the Apostles, and Irenæus narrates that other "Presbyteri", who had seen and heard the disciple John, learned from him the belief in millenarianism as part of the Lord's doctrine. According to Eusebius (Hist. Eccl., III, 39) Papias in his book asserted that the resurrection of the dead would be followed by one thousand years of a visible, glorious earthly kingdom of Christ, and according to Irenæus (Adv. Hæreses, V, 33), he taught that the saints too would enjoy a superabundance of earthly pleasures. There will be days in which vines will grow, each with 10,000 branches, and on each branch 10,000 twigs, and on each twig 10,000 shoots, and on each shoot 10,000 clusters, and on each cluster 10,000 grapes, and each grape will produce 216 gallons of wine etc.

Millenarian ideas are found by most commentators in the Epistle of St. Barnabas, in the passage treating of the Jewish sabbath; for the resting of God on the seventh day after the creation is explained in the following manner. After the Son of God has come and put an end to the era of the wicked and judged them, and after the sun, the moon, and the stars have been changed, then He will rest in glory on the seventh day. The author had premised, if it is said that God created all things in six days, this means that God will complete all things in six millenniums, for one day represents one thousand years. It is certain that the writer advocates the tenet of a re-formation of the world through the second advent of Christ, but it is not clear from the indications whether the author of the letter was a millenarian in the strict sense of the word. St. Irenæus of Lyons, a native of Asia Minor, influenced by the companions of St. Polycarp, adopted millenarian ideas, discussing and defending them in his work against the Gnostics (Adv. Hæreses, V, 32). He developed this doctrine mainly in opposition to the Gnostics, who rejected all hopes of the Christians in a happy future life, and discerned in the glorious kingdom of Christ on earth principally the prelude to the final, spiritual kingdom of God, the realm of eternal bliss. St. Justin of Rome, the martyr, opposes to the Jews in his Dialogue with Tryphon (ch. 80–81) the tenet of a millennium and asserts that he and the Christians whose belief is correct in every point know that there will be a resurrection of the body and that the newly built and enlarged Jerusalem will last for the space of a thousand years, but he adds that there are many who, though adhering to the pure and pious teachings of Christ, do not believe in it. A witness for the continued belief in millenarianism in the province of Asia is St. Melito, Bishop of Sardes in the second century. He developes the same train of thought as did St. Irenæus.

The Montanistic movement had its origin in Asia Minor. The expectation of an early advent of the celestial Jerusalem upon earth, which, it was thought, would appear in Phrygia, was intimately joined in the minds of the Montanists with the idea of the millennium. Tertullian, the protagonist of Montanism, expounds the doctrine (in his work now lost, "De Spe Fidelium" and in "Adv. Marcionem", IV) that at the end of time the great kingdom of promise, the new Jerusalem, would be established and last for the space of one thousand years. All these millenarian authors appeal to various passages in the prophetic books of the Old Testament, to a few passages in the Letters of St. Paul and to the Apocalypse of St. John. Though millenarianism had found numerous adherents among the Christians and had been upheld by several ecclesiastical theologians, neither in the post-Apostolic period nor in the course of the second century, does it appear as a universal doctrine of the Church or as a part of the Apostolic tradition. The primitive Apostolic symbol mentions indeed the resurrection of the body and the return of Christ to judge the living and the dead, but it says not a word of the millennium. It was the second century that produced not only defenders of the millennium but pronounced adversaries of the chiliastic ideas. Gnosticism rejected millenarianism. In Asia Minor, the principal seat of millenarian teachings, the so-called Alogi rose up against millenarianism as well as against Montanism, but they went too far in their opposition, rejecting not only the Apocalypse of St. John, alleging Cerinthus as its author, but his Gospel also. The opposition to millenarianism

became more general towards the end of the second century, going hand in hand with the struggle against Montanism. The Roman presbyter Caius (end of the second and beginning of the third century) attacked the millenarians. On the other hand, Hippolytus of Rome defended them and attempted a proof, basing his arguments on the allegorical explanation of the six days of creation as six thousand years, as he had been taught by tradition. The most powerful adversary of millenarianism was Origen of Alexandria. In view of the Neo-Platonism on which his doctrines were founded and of his spiritual-allegorical method of explaining the Holy Scriptures, he could not side with the millenarians. He combatted them expressly, and, owing to the great influence which his writings exerted on ecclesiastical theology especially in Oriental countries, millenarianism gradually disappeared from the ideas of Oriental Christians. Only a few later advocates are known to us, principally theological adversaries of Origen. About the middle of the third century Nepos, bishop in Egypt, who entered the lists against the allegorism of Origen, also propounded millenarian ideas and gained some adherents in the vicinity of Arsinoë. A schism threatened; but the prudent and moderate policy of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, preserved unity; the chiliasts abandoned their views (Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl.", VII, 14). Egypt seems to have harboured adherents of millenarianism in still later times. Methodius, Bishop of Olympus, one of the principal opponents of Origen at the beginning of the fourth century, upheld chiliasm in his Symposion (IX, 1, 5, in Migne, "Patr. Græc.", XVIII, 178 sqq.). In the second half of the fourth century, these doctrines found their last defender in Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea and founder of Apollinarism (q. v.). His writings on this subject have been lost; but St. Basil of Cæsarea (Epist. CCLXIII, 4, in Migne, "Patr. Græc.", XXXII, 980), Epiphanius (Hæres. LXX, 36, in Migne loc. cit., XLII, 696) and Jerome (In Isai. XVIII, in Migne, "Patr. Lat." XXIV, 627) testify to his having been a chiliast. Jerome also adds that many Christians of that time shared the same beliefs; but after that millenarianism found no outspoken champion among the theologians of the Greek Church.

In the West, the millenarian expectations of a glorious kingdom of Christ and His just, found adherents for a long time. The poet Commodian (Instructiones, 41, 42, 44, in Migne, "Patr. Lat." V, 231 sqq.) as well as Lactantius (Institutiones, VIII, Migne, "Patr. Lat.", VI, 739 sqq.) proclaim the millennial realm and describe its splendour, partly drawing on the earlier chiliasts and the Sybilline prophecies, partly borrowing their colours from the "golden age" of the pagan poets; but the idea of the six thousand years for the duration of the world is ever conspicuous. Victorinus of Pettau also was a millenarian though in the extant copy of his commentary on the Apocalypse no allusions to it can be detected. St. Jerome, himself a decided opponent of the millenial ideas, brands Sulpicius Severus as adhering to them, but in the writings of this author in their present form nothing can be found to support this charge. St. Ambrose indeed teaches a twofold resurrection, but millenarian doctrines do not stand out clearly. On the other hand, St. Augustine was for a time, as he himself testifies (De Civitate Dei, XX, 7), a pronounced champion of millenarianism; but he places the millennium after the universal resurrection and regards it in a more spiritual light (Sermo, CCLIX, in Migne, "Patr. Lat.", XXXVIII, 1197) When, however, he accepted the doctrine of only one universal resurrection and a final judgment immediately following, he could no longer cling to the principal tenet of early chiliasm. St. Augustine finally held to the conviction that there will be no millennium. The struggle between Christ and His saints on the one hand and the wicked world and Satan on the other, is waged in the Church on earth; so the great Doctor describes it in his work De Civitate Dei. In the same book he gives us an allegorical explanation of Chap. 20 of the Apocalypse, The first resurrection, of which this chapter treats, he tells us, refers to the spiritual rebirth in baptism; the sabbath of one thousand years after the six thousand years of history, is the whole of eternal life; or, in other words, the number one thousand is intended to express perfection, and the last space of one thousand years must be understood as referring to the end of the world; at all events, the kingdom of Christ, of which the Apocalypse speaks, can only be applied to the Church (De Civitate Dei, XX, 5–7, in Migne, "Patr. Lat.", XLI, 607 sqq.). This explanation of the illustrious Doctor was adopted by succeeding Western theologians, and millenarianism in its earlier shape no longer received support. Cerinthus and the Ebionites are mentioned in later writings against the heretics as defenders of the millennium, it is true, but as cut-off from the Church. Moreover, the attitude of the Church towards the secular power had undergone a change with closer connexion between her and the Roman empire. There is no doubt that this turn of events did much towards weaning the Christians from the old millenarianism, which during the time of persecution had been the expression of their hopes that Christ would soon reappear and overthrow the foes of His elect. Chiliastic views disappeared all the more rapidly, because, as was remarked above, in spite of their wide diffusion even among sincere Christians, and in spite of their defence by prominent Fathers of the early Church, millenarianism was never held in the universal Church as an article of faith based on Apostolic traditions.

The Middle Ages were never tainted with millenarianism; it was foreign both to the theology of that period and to the religious ideas of the people. The fantastic views of the apocalyptic writers (Joachim of Floris, the Franciscan-Spirituals, the Apostolici), referred only to a particular form of spiritual renovation of the Church, but did not include a second advent of Christ. The "emperor myths," which prophesied the establishment of a happy, universal kingdom by the great emperor of the future, contain indeed descriptions that remind one of the ancient Sybilline and millenarian writings, but an essential trait is again missing, the return of Christ and the connexion of the blissful reign with the resurrection of the just. Hence the millennium proper is unknown to them. The Protestantism of the sixteenth century ushered in a new epoch of millenarian doctrines. Protestant fanatics of the earlier years, particularly the Anabaptists, believed in a new, golden age under the sceptre of Christ, after the overthrow of the papacy and secular empires. In 1534 the Anabaptists set up in Münster (Westphalia) the new Kingdom of Zion, which advocated sharing property and women in common, as a prelude to the new kingdom of Christ. Their excesses were opposed and their millenarianism disowned by both the Augsburg (art. 17) and the Helvetian Confession (ch. 11), so that it found no admission into the Lutheran and Reformed theologies. Nevertheless, the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries produced new apocalyptic fanatics and mystics who expected the millennium in one form or another: in Germany, the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren (Comenius); in France, Pierre Jurien (L'Accomplissement des Prophéties, 1686); in England at the time of Cromwell, the Independents and Jane Leade. A new phase in the development of millenarian views among the Protestants commenced with Pietism. One of the chief champions of the millennium in Germany was I. A. Bengel and his disciple Crusius, who were afterwards joined by Rothe, Volch, Thiersch, Lange and others. Protestants from Wurtemberg emigrated to Palestine (Temple Communities) in order to be closer to Christ at His second advent. Certain fantastical sects of England and North America,

as the Irvingites, Mormons, Adventists, adopted both apocalyptic and millenarian views, expecting the return of Christ and the establishment of His kingdom at an early date. Some Catholic theologians of the nineteenth century championed a moderate, modified millenarianism, especially in connexion with their explanations of the Apocalypse; as Pagani (The End of the World, 1856), Schneider (Die chiliastische Doktrin, 1859), Rohling (Erklärung der Apokalypse des hl. Iohannes, 1895; Auf nach Sion, 1901), Rougeyron Chabauty (Avenir de l'Eglise catholique selon le Plan Divin, 1890).

CORRODI, *Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus*, IV (Zurich, 1794); ATZBERGER, *Die christliche Eschatologie in den Stadien ihrer Offenbarung* (Freiburg im Br., 1890); IDEM, *Geschichte der christlichen Eschatologie in der vornicänischen Zeit* (ibid., 1896); CHIAPELLI, *Le idee millenarie dei Cristiani* (Naples, 1888); ERMONI, *Les Phases successives de l'Erreur millénariste* in *Revue des Questions Hist.* (Oct., 1901); GRY, *Le Millénarisme dans ses origines et son développement* (Paris, 1904); *The Millennium* in *The Spectator*, LXXXIV (London, 1899), 625; for modern Protestant views, cf. BRIGGS, in the *Lutheran Quarterly Review* (Gettysburg, 1879); *Pre-millennial Essays of the Prophetic Conference* (Chicago, 1879); RIGGLE, *The Kingdom of God and the One Thousand Years Reign* (Moundsville, 1904); BROWN in HASTINGS, *Dictionary of the Bible* (s. v.); for the Jewish view, cf. DRUMMOND, *The Jewish Messiah* (London, 1877); VON SCHURER, *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, II (London, 1885–87), ii, 178 sqq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Miller, FERDINAND VON, b. at Fürstenfeldbruck, 1813; d. at Munich, 1887. He laboured for the development of the bronze founders' craft and the uplifting of the artistic profession, far beyond the borders of Bavaria. After a sojourn at the academy and a preliminary engagement at the royal brass foundry, he went to Paris in 1833, where he learnt from Soyer and Blus the varied technique necessary to him in the manipulation of bronze. He also visited England and the Netherlands, and after his return worked under his teacher and uncle Stiglmayr, whom the Crown Prince Ludwig had induced to devote himself to bronze foundry work and to the establishment of the Munich foundry as a state institution. Miller soon took his uncle's place, and upon the death of the latter was appointed inspector of the workshop. He soon won for it a world-wide reputation, and for himself a fortune and position of influence. He was a gifted artist, a quiet worker, skilful in negotiation and entirely a self-made man. The casting of the Bavaria, one of the world's greatest representations in bronze (1844–55), especially brought him great fame. Commissions came to him from far and near. Thus he cast not merely the statues of Herder, Goethe, and Schiller for Weimar, but also the figures of Duke Eberhard in Stuttgart, of Berzelius in Stockholm and two Washington monuments by Mills and Crawford in Boston and Richmond. The gate of the capital in Washington is also by him. The Munich exhibition of art and the art crafts in the year 1876, which resulted so successfully for the art industries in Germany, was largely Miller's work. Two years before he had been elected to the directorate of the society of art industries. He understood not only how to interest the influential classes in the productions of rising arts and crafts, but also to win over artists to a general exhibition of German art in alliance with the art handicrafts. When he had brought architects, sculptors and painters into harmony with the lesser arts he found it possible to bring about an exhibition on an entirely new plan. Drawing rooms, cabinets, boudoirs, sitting rooms and chapels were arranged so as to form in their grouping an harmonious whole by having art and trade appliances put into the place for which they were intended. Where this was not possible, a partition or a wall would be placed with picturesque effect in some adjoining room. As a result art became, especially in Munich, the mistress of industry. Miller forthwith established a center of exhibition and sale for the society, and procured himself a home especially for the social intercourse of artists and art craftsmen. The result was an unexpected rise of the art industries. Ferdinand Miller junior followed in his father's footsteps, and is known in America by the figures on the Sinton fountain in Cincinnati (at the unveiling of which he was much honoured), as well as by the statues of Shakespeare and von Humboldt in St. Louis, and finally by the war memorial at Charleston.

PECHT, *Gesch. der Münchener Kunst* (Munich, 1888); MÜLLER, *Universalhandbuch von München; Deutsches Kunstblatt* for 1850, 1853, 1856, etc.

G. GIETMANN.

Miller, WILLIAM J. See TRANSVAAL, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF.

Millet, JEAN-FRANÇOIS, French painter; b. at Gruchy, near Cherbourg, 4 October, 1814; d. at Barbizon, 20 January, 1875. This great painter of peasants was a son of peasants: he himself began life as a tiller of the soil, and he never lost touch with it. But though a family of rustics, the Millets were far removed from rusticity of manners: they were serious folks, profoundly pious, a strange stock of Catholic Puritans whose stern sentiments of religion, handed down from generation to generation, gave them something like an aristocratic character; they were incapable of mean ideas. The grandmother—the soul of that household—was an assiduous reader of Pascal, Bossuet, Nicole, and Charron. Young Jean-François was reared by the parish priest in the cult of Vergil and the Bible; the "Georgics" and the Psalms, which he read in Latin, were his favourites. Later on he became acquainted with Burns and Theocritus, whom he preferred even to Vergil. His imagination never lost these majestic impressions. Nature and poetry, the open country and Holy Scripture, shared equally in the shaping of his genius. Of that genius the young ploughman gave the first signs at the age of eighteen. He studied at Cherbourg under Langlois, a pupil of Baron Gros, and the Municipal Council gave him a pension of 600 francs to go and finish his studies in Paris. There he entered the *atelier* of Delaroche in 1837; but he spent most of his time in the Louvre, with the masters of bygone ages.

The primitives of Italy enraptured him by their fervour: Fra Angelico filled him with visions. The colourists were little to his taste; he remained unmoved in the presence of Velazquez. But then again, he liked Ribera's vigour and Murillo's homespun grace. Among the Frenchmen, the beauty of Le Sueur's sentiment touched him, Le Brun and Jouvenet he thought "strong men". But his favourite masters were the masters of "style"—Mantegna, Michelangelo, and Poussin: they haunted him all his life. Poussin's "Letters" were his everyday food, and "I could look at Poussin's pictures forever and ever", he writes, "and always learn something". His contemporaries, Delacroix excepted, moved him but little and for the most part to indignation. Millet's early works—those of his Paris period (1837–50)—are extremely different from those which made him famous. They are now very rare, but ought not to be forgotten: from the point of view of art, they are probably his most pleasing and felicitous productions; in them the painter's temperament voices itself most naturally before his "conversion", without method, without ulterior purpose. They are generally idylls—eclogues—thoroughly rural in feeling, with a frank, noble sensuality, the artist's Vergilian inspiration finding expression in little pagan scenes, antique bas-reliefs, and neutral subjects, such as "Women bathing", "Nymphs", "Offerings to Pan", and so on—thoughts but slightly defined in forms as definite as sculpture.

Some of these pieces are the most Poussinesque things in modern art. In them the young painter already appears as an accomplished stylist, with a

Correggian feeling for grace that was to be almost entirely lacking in his latest works. Here he has powerfully expressed the joy of living as it might be known to a soul like his—serious and robust, and always veiled in melancholy. His palette is brighter and less embarrassed than it afterwards became; indeed, the colour is sometimes even a little florid, as in the graceful portrait of Mlle Feuardent. On the other hand, the severity of the modelling always saves his work from anything like carelessness or lack of dignity. Some—like the charming pastel of "Daphnis and Chloe" in the Boston Museum—are frankly reminiscent of Puvis de Chavannes. But the beauty of these pastorals had not been very well appreciated. To make a living, Millet was obliged to undertake base and ill-paid work, painting signs for mountebanks and midwives. His "Œdipus taken down from the tree", a study of the nude which excels as a piece of virtuosity and an impression of savage wildness, rather shocked and astonished the public than won admiration.

His difficulties increased more and more: having lost his first wife, he married again in 1845, and with children came want. Matters were precipitated by the Revolution of 1848. At first the Republican Government took an interest in the artist, and he received some help from it; but the events of the month of June and the disorders of the following year frightened Millet and inspired him with an unconquerable dislike of Paris. He was beginning at last to understand his own nature; he turned his back forever on the frivolous, worldly public. Without disowning his earlier works, he addressed himself to another, newer and more human, method of interpreting the things of the earth and the life of the rustic. In the summer of 1849 he went to Barbizon, a little village about one league from Chailly, on the borders of the Forest of Fontainebleau. He only meant to spend a few weeks there; but remained for the rest of his life—twenty-seven years. From that time Millet was Millet, the painter of peasants. It is impossible to recount in detail all his life during the ten or fifteen years following his exodus into the country, until his final triumph—to trace the long course of effort and of heroic sacrifice, through which the name of a little obscure hamlet of the Ile-de-France by the tenacity of a small group of painters was made one of the most famous names in the art of all ages.

Jean-François Millet
By himself

It was at Barbizon that Millet found Rousseau, who had been settled there for some fifteen years, and with whom he became united in a truly memorable friendship. Other painters—Aligny and Diaz—also frequented the village and the now historic *auberge* of Père Gaune. The little band of pariahs lived in this wilderness like anchorites of nature and art. Nothing could be more original than this modern Thebaïd, so curiously analogous to the Port-Royal colony of solitaries or the English Lake School. As a matter of fact, Englishmen and Americans—a William Hunt or a Richard Hearn, a Babcock or a Wheelwright—had the honour of being the first to comprehend this new art and to form an admiring circle of neophytes and disciples about its misunderstood exponents. Nevertheless, these were years of fierce struggle for the unfortunate painter. Millet, with his large family (he had four sons and five daughters), knew what it was to want for bread, for firewood, for the most indispensable necessities of life. The baker cut off his credit, the tailor sent him summonses. The poor artist lived in agonies of hunger, tormented by bailiffs, by distraint warrants, and by humiliation. It is impossible to read the story of his sufferings without shedding tears.

And yet it was just then that Millet, disgraced and baffled, shut out of the Salon, unable to sell his pictures, was at the height of his genius. From these ten or twelve years date the following immortal works: "The Sower" and "Haymakers" (1850); "Harvesters", "Sheep-shearers" (1853); "Peasant grafting a tree" (1855); "Gleaners" (1857); "The Angelus" (1859). To be sure, these admirable achievements did not always meet with disparagement: Victor Hugo had written in one of his famous poems: "Le geste auguste du semeur" (The sower's noble attitude). The leading critics, Théophile Gautier and Paul de Saint-Victor, agreed in recognizing the epic power of these peasant paintings. But the public still resisted: repelled by the abrupt presentment, the rugged execution, the fierce poesy, they insisted on seeing in these works pleas for democracy, socialistic manifestos, and appeals to the mob. In vain did the painter protest: whether he liked it or not, many made of him a revolutionary, a demagogue, a tribune of the people. In the France of that day no one was able to understand what depth of religion was here—to recognize in this sombre and pessimistic art the only Christian art of our time. The only peasants then known to painting were comic-opera peasants—the rude buffoons of Ostade and Teniers, or the beribboned ninnies of Watteau and Greuze. They were always travestied in the interests of romance or of caricature, burlesque or preciosity. No one had ever ventured to show them in the true character of their occupations—the rough beauty of the labour from which they derive their dignity.

The whole of Millet's work is but a paraphrase or an illustration of the Divine Sentence: "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat thy bread". "Every man", he writes, "is doomed to bodily pain". And again, "It is not always the joyous side that shows itself to me. The greatest happiness I know is calm and silence". But at the same time, this harsh law of labour, because it is God's law, is the condition of our nobility and our dignity. Millet is quite the opposite of a Utopian or an insurgent. To him the chimeras of Socialism and the wholesale regulation of the good things of life are impious, childish, and disgraceful. "I have no wish to suppress sorrow", he proudly exclaims: "it is sorrow that gives most strength to an artist's utterance". In his subsequent work, moreover, as if challenging the world, he accentuated still further the ruggedness of his painting and the harshness of his sentiment. The year 1863 marks the lowest point of this depressed and misanthropic mood. Nothing ever exceeded his "Winter" in

desolateness, or his "Man with the Hoe" and "Vine-dresser resting" in sense of utter exhaustion. The impression of physical fatigue reaches the point of stupefaction and insensibility. The figures seem so thoroughly emptied of their vital energy as to be petrified. The hard look is congealed into a grimace. Nowhere has his effort, the forcing of his individual style to its utmost limit, brought the great artist to results more harsh, more grandiose, or more barbarous.

But things were getting quieter and easier for him. His extraordinary personality, his eloquence, the strong conviction of this "Danubian peasant", were all making themselves felt. The world was beginning to appreciate the loftiness of view and the moral grandeur of this man of the fields with the lion's mane and the head of a "Jupiter in wooden shoes". A relaxation came over his spirit and his ideas. He travelled, rested, revisited his own part of the country, made short trips to Auvergne, to Alsace, and to Switzerland. In 1868 he was made a chevalier of the Legion of Honour—at fifty years of age. In 1870 he was elected a member of the jury. But the great war, the death of his sister and of his dear friend Rousseau, finally wrecked a constitution already injured by hard work and privation. During the German invasion he and his family took refuge at Cherbourg near his native home. After that time he almost ceased to paint. His latest pictures, the tragic "November" (1870), the "Church of Gréville" (1872), and the incomparable "Spring" (1873), are mere landscapes, with the human figure entirely absent. Thenceforward he preferred simpler, more direct processes to that of painting, using the pencil or pastel—like the great idealists, who always ended by simplifying or minimizing the material medium and contenting themselves with etching, as did Rembrandt, with drawing, as Michelangelo, or with the piano, as Beethoven. These last works of Millet's are among his finest and most precious. His colouring, formerly heavy and sad, often rusty and unpleasing, or sticky and muddy, is here more delicate than ever before. Nowhere does one feel the touching beauty of this artistic soul, and its masculine but tender eloquence, more perfectly than in his studies and sketches. The finest collections of them are in the possession of M. A. Rouart, in Paris, and of Mr. Shaw, in Boston. Millet passed away at the age of sixty years and four months.

He was one of the noblest figures in contemporary art, one of those men who in our day have done most credit to mankind. As a painter he was not without his faults—somewhat clumsy in technique, not pleasing in colour, while emotion, with him, does not always keep clear of declamation. These faults are most palpable in his most famous works, such as "The Sower" and "The Angelus". But on the other hand, so many others are perfect gems—marvels of execution and poetic sentiment, like "The Morsel in the Beak" (La Becquée), "Maternal solicitude", and "The Sheepfold". Other painters have had more influence than Millet. Courbet, for example, surpassed him in scope and in prodigious sense of life; Corot, with just as much poetry, has in a higher degree the grace, the charm, the exquisite gift of harmony. But who shall say that Millet's rugged gravity was not the condition, the outward sign, of the deep import of his message? No one has done more than he to make us feel the sanctity of life and the mystic grandeur of man's mission upon the earth. His peasants, rooted to the soil and as if fixed there for eternity, seem to be performing the rites of a sacred mystery. One is conscious of something permanent in them, one feels how intimately they are united with the great whole, their fraternal solidarity with the rest of mankind and with the cosmic ends. Though he never handled professedly religious subjects, Millet succeeded in being the most religious painter of our times. His "Return to the Farm" irresistibly suggests the Flight into Egypt; his "Repast" of harvesters, or of gleaners, evokes the Biblical poetry of Ruth and Booz. On the river where his "Washerwomen" come and beat their linen, one would think the cradle of Moses was floating. The greatness of his soul has set in relief before our eyes the dignity of our nature; he has shown us how the trivial can be made to serve in the expression of the sublime, and how the Infinite and the Divine can be discerned in the humblest existence.

SENSIER, *La vie et l'œuvre de J.-F. Millet* (Paris, 1881); IDEM, *Souvenirs sur Th. Rousseau* (Paris, 1872); PIÉDAGNEL, *Jean-François Millet, Souvenirs de Barbizon* (Paris, 1876); WHEELWRIGHT, *Recollections of Millet* in *Atlantic Monthly* (Sept., 1876); BURTY, *Maîtres et Petits-Maîtres* (Paris, 1877); HUYSMANS, *Certains* (Paris, 1899); YRIARTE, *J.-F. Millet* (Paris, 1884); MICHEL, *Notes sur l'art moderne* (Paris, 1896); CARTWRIGHT, *J.-F. Millet* (London, 1896); MOLLET, *The Painters of Barbizon*, I (London, 1890); CHARAVET, *Une lettre de Millet* in *Cosmopolis* (April, 1898); ROLLAND, *J.-F. Millet* (London, 1904); MARCEL, *J.-F. Millet* (Paris, 1908).

LOUIS GILLET.

Millet (or MILET), PIERRE, a celebrated early Jesuit missionary in New York State, b. at Bourges, France, 19 November, 1635 (al. 1631); d. at Quebec, 31 December, 1708. Having graduated Master of Arts, he entered the Society of Jesus at Paris on 3 October, 1655, studied philosophy at La Flèche (1657–8), taught various classes there (1658–61) and at Compiègne (1661–3), and then returned to La Flèche for a second year of philosophy (1663–4). After a four years' course in theology at the College of Louis-le-Grand in Paris (1664–8), he was sent to Canada, and had already been chosen to help Father Allouez in the west, when, quite unexpectedly, his destination was changed. The Onondaga ambassadors had received the answer to their address, on 27 August, 1668, and Fathers Millet and de Carheil were assigned them as missionaries. In an incredibly short time Millet picked up enough of the language to enable him to preside at public prayers and to his still greater satisfaction, to teach catechism. This joy, however, was soon turned to sadness and pity at the sight, new to him, of some captive Andastes, brought in by a war party to be burnt at the stake. His feelings may be gathered from what he wrote on this occasion: "I am at a loss to know how to interpret this presage. Would to God that it might betoken that I was to make of these tribes captives of Jesus Christ and prevent their burning throughout eternity. What happiness for me if it foreshadowed that one day I also might be a captive to be burnt for Jesus Christ."

His method of evangelizing the Onondagas may be judged from a letter written from the mission of St. Jean Baptiste, 15 June, 1670 (Rel. 1670, vii). In 1671 he made his solemn profession of the four vows, and received from the Onondaga nation the name of *Teahronhiagannra*, that is "The Looker-up to Heaven". In 1672 he was appointed missionary of the Oneidas (q. v.), "the most arrogant and least tractable of all the Iroquois" (Rel. 1672, iii), and laboured among them until 1685 with marvellous success. He was then recalled to act as interpreter at the Grand Council of Peace to be held at Catarakouy (now Kingston, Ontario). Both he and the other missionaries were shamefully duped by the governor and used to lure the Iroquois into the pitfall prepared for them (see MISSIONS, INDIAN; Charlevoix, I, 510). Late in 1687 or early in 1688 Millet was sent as chaplain at Fort Niagara. Here, as at Catarakouy, scurvy was decimating the troops, affording ample scope for Millet's charity and zeal. To invoke God's mercy in behalf of the stricken garrison, a cross eighteen feet high was erected in the fort by the officers and blessed by Father Millet on Good Friday, 16 April, 1688. On 15 Sept., 1688, however, the

THE ANGELUS—MILLET, PARIS

remnants of the garrison were informed the fort was to be evacuated, and all were to embark for Catarakouy.

Millet was still engaged at Catarakouy in the ordinary routine of a military chaplain, when about 30 July, 1689, a party of Iroquois presented themselves at Fort Frontenac and asked for an interview. They professed to be on their way home from Montreal whither they had gone with propositions of peace. They needed a surgeon, they said, for some of their chiefs who were sick and Father Millet's services for one who was dying, while the elders wished also to consult with him (Millet's letter in Rels., Cleveland ed., LXIV, 64). The story looked suspicious, but as there was question of a soul to save, Millet undertook the risk, and St. Armand, a surgeon, accompanied him. Both were immediately set upon and bound; his captors first took Millet's breviary, and were divesting him of all he carried, when Manchot, an Oneida chief, interposed on his behalf, and recommended him to the care of the other chiefs. But, when Manchot left to join the three hundred Iroquois who were lying in wait to attack Fort Frontenac, the maltreatment recommenced. Having stripped him almost naked, the Indians bitterly reproached him for all that their countrymen had suffered from the French; they then threw him into the water and trampled him under foot (ibid., 69). When the other Indians returned after their failure to surprise Fort Frontenac, he was escorted to an island two leagues below the fort, where the main body of 1400 Iroquois warriors were encamped. Derisive shouts and yells went up at his approach. According to custom, he was made sing his death-song, the words which came first to his mind being *Ongienda Kehasakchoüa* (I have been made a prisoner by my children). For all thanks a Seneca Indian struck him a brutal blow in the face with his fist in such a way that the nails cut him to the bone. He was then led to the cabins of the Oneidas where he was protected from further insult. That same evening the whole force moved down the river eight leagues from the fort, and there halted three days.

On a hilltop on what is now Grenadier Island a great council was held, the war-kettle swung, and all that remained was to choose a fitting victim to cast into it. The final decision was left to the Onondagas, and no doubt the lot would have fallen on Millet, whose death at the hands of the Iroquois would have set the seal to an undying enmity and an unrelenting war, such as they seemed to desire with the French, but for an apparently insignificant detail which had been overlooked. To make the proceedings legal according to their code, all the prisoners should have been present, whereas only the surgeon and Father Millet stood before the council (ibid., 73). The captors of the other prisoners had scattered in hunting parties and had taken them along. An elderly Cayuga sachem blocked all proceedings with the simple announcement: "All are not present at this assembly", and then bade Millet to pray to God. Informed that it was not in preparation for death, Millet rose and prayed aloud in Iroquois, especially for all those assembled. He was then told to resume his seat, one of his hands was unbound, and he was sent to the camp of the Oneidas. There he was acclaimed with joy by several of their leading men, who, to forestall further molestation, determined to send him to Oneida. The next day (about 2 August, 1689), thirty warriors were told off under two chiefs, of whom one was the friendly Manchot, to conduct him thither; from one of Millet's letters (ibid., 87, 91), it is certain that the main body of Indians they were leaving was the identical band of Iroquois who, about 4 August, crossed during the night to the north side of Lake St. Louis, fired the houses for several leagues along the lake shore from St. Anne's to Lachine, and butchered men, women, and children as they fled from their burning homes. Two hundred in all were massacred, and ninety carried off to be burnt at the stake. Charlevoix's statement (Hist., I, 549) that this occurrence took place on 25 August is erroneous; the contemporaneous reports of de Denonville, de Champigny, and de Frontenac (Archives Colon. Paris. Cor. Gen. Can. X) give the correct date as 4 and 5 August, 1689. The surgeon St. Amand, whom the Iroquois had brought with them to Lachine, there made his escape (Collec. MSS. Quebec, I, 571).

On the journey to Oneida, Father Millet was not badly treated; he was unencumbered by any burden until they were nearing their last night's sleeping place, ten leagues from their destination, when one of the friendly chiefs, probably to keep up appearances, gave him a light sack to carry. On 9 August, two leagues from their destination, they met Manchot's wife and daughter, belonging to the first nobility of Oneida, both of whom Father Millet had formerly baptized on the same day as Manchot himself. Manchot had left the army at Otoniata for the sole purpose of protecting Millet on the way to Oneida, and had gone ahead two days before to notify his wife of his approach. These good Christians brought with them an abundance of provisions and refreshments; they took the rope from Millet's neck, unbound his arms, and gave him clean clothing. Greatly moved by this kindness and scarcely realizing what he saw, Millet asked if their intention was to deck out the victim, and if, on his arrival, he was to die. The Christian matron answered that nothing had yet been settled, and that the Council of Oneida would decide. Clothed with what he had just received and in a close-fitting jerkin which a sympathizing warrior had lent him at Otoniata, Millet made his approach to the town, wearing the livery of the two most important families of the tribe, that of the Bear and that of the Tortoise. Warned of his near arrival the aged sachems marched out to meet him, and kindled a fire in readiness for what might occur, for they did not all entertain the same benevolent feeling towards him. He was made sit down near the elders, and Manchot presented him to this preliminary council, declaring that he had come, not as a captive, but as a missionary returning to visit his flock; that it was the will of the other chiefs and himself that the father should be placed at the disposal of those who decided the affairs of the nation, and not be given over to the soldiery or populace. A sachem of the Bear Clan, a great friend of the English, then proceeded to denounce Millet as a partisan of the Governor of Canada, who was bent on overthrowing the great Iroquois lodge (i. e. the Iroquois Confederacy), and had burned the Seneca towns. The orator was so violent at the beginning of his speech, that it looked as if Millet would be condemned; but towards the close he grew milder, and admitted that since such was the will of the chiefs, the prisoner should be led to the council lodge which was a privileged cabin.

Crowds of drunken Indian braves and squaws, shouting and yelling, followed him to the council lodge, where he was cordially welcomed by Manchot's wife (ibid., 81). He had, however, to be hidden from the mob of drunken Indians, who stoned the cabin, threatened to batter it down or set it on fire, heaped abuse on those who were sheltering him, and vowed that, since war had begun, they would not be cheated out of its first fruits. Two days after, when the fury of the drunken rabble had somewhat abated, the friends of the captive missionary thought it wiser to have his case adjudicated without further delay, as the popular feeling might be embittered should the army returning from Montreal have to deplore the loss of some of its braves. But once again he was placed in a state of suspense as to his fate, the assembled chiefs deciding that they must wait the return of the warriors and learn what their intentions were.

Three more weeks dragged on thus, but, apart from the importunities and threats of the drunkards, Millet was left in comparative quiet. That he was walking in the shadow of death, is shown by the fact that he was given the name of *Genherontatie*, i. e. "The Dead (or Dying) Man who walks". His everyday work as pastor served to console him, the faithful flocking to him in their spiritual necessities, even to the remote lurking places where he had frequently to be hidden, and his bodily wants were amply supplied. When the Iroquois returned after their bloody foray against Lachine and other settlements near Montreal, it was found that the Oneidas had left three dead warriors behind in the enemy's country, including a leading war-chief. The exasperated braves considered the death and torture of the number of prisoners they had brought back insufficient to atone for this loss, and demanded that Millet should be added to the number. Fearing lest this bloodthirsty faction should, by cutting off a finger or by some similar mutilation, set the mark of death upon their missionary, the Christian Indians were more careful than ever to keep him out of sight (ibid., 87). He was made pass the night sometimes in one cabin, sometimes in another, and more than once under the starlight, anywhere in fact where a drunken Indian was not likely to find him. His protectress added foresight to her zeal, and secured the support of her relatives, the most influential warriors of the tribe, towards saving Millet.

The day when the final sentence was to be pronounced arrived at last. Millet had time to hear the confessions of his fellow-prisoners, two of whom eventually died by fire. As for himself, he could only commend himself to the providence and the mercy of God. His case was a knotty one for the assembled chiefs to decide: on the one hand, he was regarded by the Iroquois as a great criminal and deceiver, being held responsible for the seizure of their fellow-countrymen at Catarakouy (ibid., 89); but, on the other, he was protected by the Christians, among whom were the most influential and distinguished members of the nation, and thus could not be put to death without incurring their displeasure. The result was that he was sent to and fro from one special tribunal to another, his face smeared with black and red to brand him as a victim of the god of war and of the wrath of the Iroquois. At this critical juncture the family which had befriended him so often assembled anew, and ingeniously turned the difficulty in Millet's favour by offering him as a substitute—not for one of the braves killed by the French at Lachine, nor for any made prisoner at Fort Frontenac, but—for a captain named Otasseté, who had died long since a natural death, and whose name was famous as that of one of the founders of the Iroquois Confederation. By this presentation Chief Gannassatiron became the sole arbiter of Millet's life or death. He consulted only the warriors of his family, and, these having without hesitation pronounced in favour of life, he approached the father and in the set formula addressed him: "Satonnheton Szaksi" (My elder brother, you are resuscitated). A few days afterwards the notables of Oneida were invited to a grand banquet, and at the ceremony the name of Otasseté was given Millet to make it manifest to all that the Oneidas had adopted him into their nation and naturalized him an Iroquois. Everything that had been taken from him was restored.

Father Millet turned his long captivity among the Oneidas to good account. Father Bruyas writes to the General on 21 October, 1693: "We have received letters from Father Millet, a captive among the Iroquois for the last six years.... He performs with happy results all the offices of a missionary. He stands in need of one thing only, an altar outfit (a chalice, vestments, etc., so as to say Mass); but he thinks that the time to send him this has not yet come on account of the hostility of the drunkards among the tribe and of the English who have done their best to have this saintly missionary handed over to their keeping. They cannot brook the presence of a Jesuit there." Dablon had already in the same month and year, written to Rome that the father, a captive among the Iroquois, was most assiduous in opening the way to heaven for many little children by baptism, and for dying adults and old men by a careful preparation and the administration of the sacraments (Letters to the Gen., MS. copy 45, 48). Father Jean de Lamberville writing from Paris on 3 Jan., 1695, says: "They [his friends among the Oneidas] made a chapel of their dwelling, where the Father performed his functions of missionary, with the result that in the midst of these hostile barbarians he maintained the worship of God and there converted many Iroquois. After having been five years among them, assisting in their death throes the French prisoners who were burned, and interceding successfully for the life of others, he was brought back to Quebec with fifteen French captives" (Rels., LXIV, 245). Belmont (Hist. du Can., p. 36) is certainly astray in giving 1697 as the date of Millet's delivery. Most authors state that the captive missionary was brought back to Quebec in 1694. Colden (History of the Five Nations, I, 210-30) states that the return took place towards the end of August; Charlevoix, however, states very positively (II, 143) that Father Millet was brought to Montreal towards the end of October (1694).

Millet passed the year 1695 at Quebec College and in 1696 was sent to Lorette to assist Father Michel Germain de Couvert with the Hurons, and, to the ordinary duties of missionary to the Hurons, those of parish priest of Lorette were added in 1697. In 1698 he is marked in the catalogues of the Society as missionary at Sault-St-Louis (*Caughnawaga*), but in all probability he went there in the summer of 1697. For, on 15 February of that year, thirty-three Oneidas came to Montreal. They came, they said, to fulfil a promise they had made their Father to throw in their lot with his children and that their fellow-countrymen wished to assure him that they also would have followed if the Mohawks and Onondagas, between whose cantons they dwelt, had not held them back (Charlevoix, "Hist.", II, 199). From 1697 to 1703 inclusively, he remained as missionary at Sault-St-Louis. During this period he wrote at least once to Rome (10 August, 1700) a mild and submissive complaint that he had not yet obtained the favour of returning to the Iroquois cantons; through feelings of gratitude he begs the Father General to give a share in the prayers of the Society to Tarsha the chief and Suzanne his sister at Oneida, both of whom had acted as hosts to the Father during his captivity. Although peace had been concluded with the Five Nations on 8 September, the missions were not yet re-established when Father Bouvart wrote to Rome 5 October, 1700. The catalogue of 1704 places Father Millet at the college in Quebec as a valetudinarian, though he himself desired to return to the Iroquois mission and continue till the end "to fight like a good soldier the battles of the Lord". In 1705 he is described as under treatment for broken-down health. He lingered on for three years more, always in the hope of going back to the scenes of his captivity, but, on the last day of 1708, he died.

THWAITES, *Jesuit Relations and Allied Docs.*, XVII, 242; LXIV, 66–107, 119, 133, 275, 276; (de Lamberville's letter) 238, 259; LXV, 27, 261; LVI, 43; LXXI, 134, 151; O'CALLAGHAN, *Docs. relative to Colonial Hist. of New York*, III, 621, 714, 732, 783; IV, 24, 41–55, 60–3, 78–97, 120, 169, 170, 349, 659; IX, 241, 254, 287, 387–9, 466, 499, 518, 531, 533, 566, 582, 605, 611, 665; COLDEN, *Hist. of the Five Nations* (reprint, New York, 1902), I, 191–230; II, 249; SHEA, *Hist. of the Cath. Church in U. S.*, I (New York, 1886), 286, 288, 302, 332–5; IDEM, *Hist. of Cath. Missions among the Indians* (1855), 260–1, 276–81, 319, 325–6, 329; CAMPBELL, *Pioneer Priests in N. Amer.*, I (New York, 1908), 246; *Archives St. Mary's College, Montreal; Catalogues of Soc. of Jesus, MSS.; Letters to the General*, copies

(*Martin*); *Relations des Jésuites* (Quebec, 1858), *Rel.* 1668, 19, 2 col.; *Rel.* 1669, 10, 1, 2 cols.; *Rel.* 1670, 48–63; *Rel.* 1672, 18, 1 col.; 20, 2 col.; *Rels. Inédites* (Paris, 1861), I, 22–30, 32–3, 38, 46, 54, 175, 239–56; II, 11, 38, 106, 197; GIROUARD in *Proceed. Roy. Soc. Can.*, V, *Memoirs*, 87–101; CHARLEVOIX, *Hist. de la N.-France*, I (Paris, 1764), 398, 501–10, 564; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la C. de J.*, V, 1099; DE ROCHEMONTEIX, *Les Jésuites et la N.-France*, III, 185–200; MARGRY, *Découvertes*, etc. V, 28, 38; *Collect. de Docs. rélatifs à la N.-France*, I, 21, 239, 335, 488, 552–3, 559–62, 557, 571, 595; II, 59, 80, 87; [SAINT-VALLIER], *Estat présent (1687) de l'Eglise*, etc. (Paris, 1688), 204 sqq.

ARTHUR EDWARD JONES.

Mill Hill College. See JOSEPH, SOCIETY OF SAINT, FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS.

Milner, JOHN, b. in London, 14 October, 1752; d. at Wolverhampton, 19 April, 1826. At the age of twelve he went to Sedgley Park School, but the following year he was sent by the venerable Bishop Challoner to the English College at Douai, France, to study for the priesthood. He remained twelve years, but he does not seem to have distinguished himself in any special manner there. On his ordination in 1777 he returned to England. Two years later he was sent to Winchester to assist the French prisoners in that city, among whom a fever had broken out; and when the pastor, Rev. Mr. Nolan, fell a victim to the fever, Milner was permanently appointed in his place. Winchester was then one of the few towns in the south of England where a Catholic chapel was openly supported. Its existence was indeed illegal, for the penal laws were still in full force; but practically there was not much prospect of its being interfered with. Milner remained there twenty-three years, during which time he devoted himself to missionary work, rebuilt the chapel, and established a school. The Catholic religion in England was at the time going through a double crisis, partly by the action of its own members, and partly by the influence from without, due to the French Revolution. Some thousands of French priests took refuge in England, and were supported by the Government. Some 700 were lodged in the old unfinished king's house outside Winchester, where they formed themselves into a large religious community. Milner, who was brought into daily contact with them, spoke in high terms of the extraordinary edification of their daily lives. The same events on the Continent led to the breaking up of the English convents in France and the Low Countries, and the nuns fled for refuge to their own country, where they arrived penniless and helpless. A great effort was made to assist them. Milner took his share in the movement by establishing in his mission the Bendictine nuns, formerly of Brussels, with whom he ever afterwards maintained cordial relations. The Franciscans from Bruges likewise settled at Winchester.

During succeeding years, Milner began to make his name as a writer and controversialist. His "History of Winchester" appeared in 1798, and showed remarkable power and learning. It led to a controversy with Dr. Sturges, a prebendary of the cathedral, which brought forth two of Milner's best-known works, "Letters to a Prebendary" and "The End of Religious Controversy". In deference to the wishes of his bishop, however, the last-named work was withheld for the sake of peace, and it did not see the light until nearly twenty years later. It was during his residence at Winchester that Milner was first brought into contact with the public affairs of Catholics, which formed the other aspect of the crisis in that body. The Cisalpine or antipapal movement among the laity was beginning, the moving spirit being Charles Butler, nephew of Alban Butler, a lawyer of eminence and reputation, and the lifelong opponent of Milner. The movement also affected some of the clergy, the well-known writer, Rev. Joseph Berington, being the most notable example. Milner, who had a keen sense of orthodoxy and loyalty to the Holy See, directed all his endeavours to combating this movement. His writings were numerous and powerful; but they had the defect of unceasing asperity of language, so that he continued to embitter the strife. The committee of Catholic laymen, elected first in 1782, and re-elected five years later, were the centre of such opinions, and towards the end three ecclesiastics were added, two of whom (James Talbot and Charles Berington) were bishops. The object of the committee was to help to bring about Catholic emancipation. With this end in view, in 1789 they issued a "Protestation", disclaiming some of the more objectionable doctrines with which they were popularly credited, including the deposing power and papal infallibility. Despite the Cisalpine tone of the document, it was signed by nearly 1500 Catholics, including all the vicars Apostolic, though the signatures of two were afterwards withdrawn. Pitt who was then Prime Minister promised to introduce a bill of Catholic relief; but when it was drafted, it was found to contain an oath which all Catholics were to be called upon to take, based on the "protestation", but in stronger language, and containing doctrine to which no good Catholic could set his name; while the Catholics throughout were called by the absurd title of "Protesting Catholic Dissenters".

JOHN MILNER

The four vicars Apostolic met at Hammersmith, in October, 1789, Milner attending as theological adviser. They unanimously condemned the oath and the new appellation. During the following year the Bishops of the Northern and London Districts died. A great effort was made by the committee to secure the transference of Bishop Charles Berington to the London District. This would have been a triumph for the Cisalpines; but fortunately it did not succeed. Rome, being warned, appointed Dr. Douglass, a Yorkshireman, who had been outside the late disputes.

The committee now suggested some modification of the oath; but it was not sufficient to free it from objection, and three out of the four vicars Apostolic joined in condemning it a second time. When the Relief Bill was brought forward in February, 1791, the bishops called Milner to their assistance. By means of his vigorous action an impression was made on the Government and the oath was further modified; but the situation was really saved after his return to Winchester, when the House of Lords, at the instigation of the Protestant Bishop of St. David's, substituted a totally different oath for the one objected to; and in this form the Bill was passed. It abolished the penal laws properly so-called and legalized the celebration of Mass; but Catholics continued liable to numerous disabilities for many years afterwards. After this the Catholic Committee dissolved; but the chief members re-formed themselves into an association to which they gave the name of the Cisalpine Club and which lasted for many years. Milner continued to write and speak in opposition to them. The clergy who were supporters of the Cisalpine spirit were chiefly in the Midland District, one group who had acted together being known as the Staffordshire Clergy. By a strange fate it was this very district over which Milner was called to rule in 1803, when he was consecrated Bishop of Castabala, and appointed Vicar Apostolic of the Midland District. It is credit-

able both to them and to Milner himself that the resulting state of tension was of short duration. The clergy learned to value the great qualities of their new bishop, and conceived an admiration of him, the tradition of which has lasted to the present day.

Milner, however, was not satisfied with his position in the Midlands. He had formed an alliance with the Irish bishops, and with their co-operation, a determined attempt was made to have him transferred to London as coadjutor with right of succession. This scheme was opposed by Bishop Douglass, and ultimately defeated, though the pope consented that Milner should become parliamentary agent to the Irish bishops in their struggle to procure Catholic emancipation, and that for this purpose he should be permitted to go to London as often as necessary. This unfortunate disagreement with his colleagues led to regrettable results. Milner found fault with the manner in which the London District was governed, and was not afraid to say so publicly, in numerous pamphlets and other publications, and even in his pastorals. The subjects of contention were several; but two especially may be mentioned. One was the well-known "Veto" question, which first came into prominence in the year 1808. By this it was intended to concede to the Crown a negative voice in the election of Catholic bishops, by conferring a right to veto any candidate whose loyalty was open to question. The chief Irish bishops had agreed to the measure in 1799; but since then, owing to the postponement of emancipation, the scheme had dropped. Milner revived it, and was for a time the warm advocate of the veto. He found himself in opposition to most of the Irish bishops. He visited Ireland, and afterwards wrote his "Letter to a Parish Priest" (who was really an Irish bishop) in defence of his position. The Irish bishops, however, condemned the Veto in 1808. A year later Milner was converted to their way of thinking, and became as vigorous in opposition to it as he had been before in its favour. About this time the English Catholics, in presenting a petition to Parliament, embodied what was known as their "Fifth Resolution", offering a "grateful concurrence" to a Bill which would give them emancipation, accompanied by any "arrangements" for the safe-guarding of the Established Church which should not be inconsistent with their religion. Milner declared—contrary to the assertions of the framers of the Resolution—that the "arrangements" intended, included the Veto, and he denounced those who signed the petition, including all the other vicars Apostolic of England. In this he received the support of the Irish bishops. Another source of criticism was the want of vigour which he alleged against the London Vicar in combating the Blanchardist schism among the French emigrant clergy, especially the restoration of one of them, Abbé de Trevaux, to spiritual faculties without a public retractation. In this matter also he was supported by the Irish bishops.

A crisis occurred in 1813, Dr. Poynter being then Vicar Apostolic of the London District. A Bill for the full emancipation of Catholics was introduced into the House of Commons by Grattan; but Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning introduced amending clauses giving the Crown a veto on the appointment of bishops, to be exercised only on the recommendation of a committee consisting chiefly of Catholic Peers. Milner and the Irish bishops maintained that no Catholic could assent to this without incurring schism. The other vicars Apostolic did not go so far as this, though they opposed the clauses. The leading members of the Catholic Board, consisting chiefly of laymen, were in favour of accepting them as the necessary price to pay for emancipation. Milner, however, used all his influence to procure the rejection of the Bill. He printed a "Brief Memorial" in this sense, and distributed it among members of Parliament. The Bill passed its second reading, but in committee the clause admitting Catholics to Parliament was defeated by a small majority of four votes, and the Bill was abandoned. Milner took to himself the credit of having been the cause of its defeat, and the laymen were so angry with him that, to their permanent disgrace, they publicly expelled him from the committee of the Catholic Board. In the meantime Dr. Poynter appealed to Rome for guidance in the expected event of the re-introduction of the Bill. The pope was at that time the prisoner of Bonaparte, and the cardinals were dispersed. In their absence Mgr. Quarantotti, Secretary of Propaganda, using the powers with which he had been provisionally invested, issued a Rescript, dated February, 1814, approving of the Bill as it stood. Milner did not fail to see the serious results which would follow from this and decided immediately to appeal to the pope, who having been liberated from captivity, was on his way back to Rome. His journey was so far successful that the Quarantotti Rescript was recalled, and the pope ordered the whole matter to be examined afresh. In the end a decision was promulgated in the shape of a letter from Cardinal Littà, Prefect of Propaganda, to Dr. Poynter, who had also come to Rome. The provisions of the late Bill were condemned; but on the general question of the veto, apart from the Lay Committees, the decision was against Milner; subject to certain safeguards, Catholics were empowered to concede a veto to the Crown, provided this negative power was so limited as not to be allowed to grow into a positive nomination. This led to further agitation in Ireland, and another deputation was sent to Rome; but the English Catholics, including Milner himself, accepted the decision without question. The English vicars Apostolic were, however, naturally opposed to the veto, and in the event it never became necessary to utilize the permission granted.

On his return from Rome Milner continued to write controversially, the new "Orthodox Journal" being a frequent medium for his communications. His language was as harsh as ever, and unbecoming in a bishop, until at length an appeal was made to Rome, and Cardinal Fontana, who was then Prefect of Propaganda, forbade him to write in it any more. During the last years of his life Milner withdrew to a great extent from public politics. He ceased to act on behalf of the Irish bishops, and though he did not hold any intercourse with the other vicars Apostolic, he ceased to write against them. He devoted himself to literary work. In 1818 his "End of Controversy", perhaps the best known of all his books, at length appeared, and it was followed by a war of pamphlets and replies which went on for several years. Feeling his health failing, he applied for a coadjutor, and Rev. Thomas Walsh, President of Oscott College, was appointed. He was consecrated in 1825 when all the bishops of England met, and a reconciliation was effected. Milner survived less than a year, his death taking place at his house at Wolverhampton on 19 April, 1826. He left behind him a record of a life marked by whole-hearted devotion to religion, and of eminent services rendered to the cause, both as a writer and a man of action. In both capacities his work was marred by the asperity of his language, and his intolerance of any views differing from his own. This made him many enemies through life, and cut him off from his brother bishops during the greater part of his episcopate. But his lot was cast at a difficult time, and he succeeded in combating difficulties which few other men would have faced. He had the advantage of a strong constitution; his vigour and activity were phenomenal, and, added to his devotion to the Holy See, earned for him the title of the English Athanasius.

There are many portraits of Milner: (1) sketch, age about 25; (2) miniature, as a bishop about 1803; (3) miniature by Kernan (1808—considered the best

likeness); (4) painting by Barber, drawing master at Oscott, 1817; (5) painting by Herbert, R.A.—said to be the most like, but it is in Gothic vestments and mitre, having been painted long after Milner's death. (These are all at Oscott.) (6) Painting of Milner as a priest, age about 45, at the convent, East Bergholt. (7) Painting at the presbytery, Norwich, very similar to (5). (8) Engraving in "Laity's Directory", 1827, from a painting by Radcliffe (Orth. Jour., I, 173). (9) Bust, by Clarke sen. of Birmingham: many copies to be met with. (1), (2), and (6) reproduced in the "Dawn of the Catholic Revival"; (8) in Miss Harting's "Catholic London Mission"; (4) in "Catholic London a Century ago"; (5) in the penny "Life of Milner," by Rev. E. Burton (Catholic Truth Society). His chief works are: "Funeral Discourse on Bishop Challoner" (1781); "The Clergyman's Answer to the Layman's Letter" (1790); "Pastoral of the Bishop of Léon" (translated, 1791); "Discourse at Consecration of Bishop Gibson" (1791); "Divine Rights of Episcopacy" (1791); "Audi Alteram Partem" (1792); "Ecclesiastical Democracy detected" (1793); "Reply to Cisalpine Club" (1795); "Serious Expostulation with Rev. Joseph Berington" (1797); "History of Winchester" (1798); "Brief Life of Challoner" (1798); "Letters to a Prebendary" (1800); "Case of Conscience solved" (1801); "Elucidation of the Conduct of Pius VII" (1802); "Arguments against Catholic Petition" (1805); "Cure of Winefride White" (1805); "Letter to a Parish Priest" (1808); "Letters from Ireland" (1808); "Pastoral Letter on Blanchardists", "Sequel", "Supplement", and "Appendix" (1808–9); "Appeal to the Catholics of Ireland" (1809); "Discourse at Funeral of Sir William Jerningham" (1809); "Treatise on Ecclesiastical Architecture" (1810); "Instructions for Catholics of Midland Counties" (1811); "Letter to Prelate of Ireland" (1811); "Explanation with Bishop Poynter" (1812); "Pastoral on Jurisdiction of Church", I, II, and III (1812–3); "Brief Memorial on Catholic Bill" (1813); "Multum in Parvo" (1813); "Encyclical Letter" (1813); "Inquisition. A letter to Sir John Cox Hippisley" (1816); "Humble Remonstrance to House of Commons" (1816); "Memoir of Bishop Hornyold" (Directory, 1818); "End of Religious Controversy" (1818); "Supplementary Memoirs of English Catholics" (1820, and "Additional Notes to" in 1821); "Devotion to the Sacred Heart" (1821); "Vindication of the End of Controversy" (1822); "Exposer exposed" (1824); "Parting Word to Dr. Grier" (1825). (For a complete list, see Husenbeth, *infra*, 572.)

Husenbeth, *Life of Milner* (Dublin, 1862); Ward, *Dawn of the Catholic Revival* (London, 1909); Amherst, *History of Catholic Emancipation* (London, 1886); Butler, *Historical Memoirs of English Catholics* (1819); Milner, *Supplementary Memoirs* (1820); Kirk, *Biographies* (London, 1909); Ward, *Catholic London a Century Ago* (London, 1905); Brady, *Catholic Hierarchy* (Rome, 1877); McCaffrey, *Hist. of Church in Nineteenth Century* (Dublin, 1909); Flanagan, *History of the Church in England* (London, 1857); *Laity's Directory* (1827). Numerous articles in the *Orthodox Journal*, *Gentlemen's Magazine*, *Catholic Miscellany*, *Catholicon*, *Oscotian*, etc.

Bernard Ward.

Milner, Ralph, Venerable, layman and martyr, b. at Flacsted, Hants, England, early in the sixteenth century; suffered at Winchester, 7 July, 1591. The greater part of his life was probably passed in his native village, where, being practically illiterate, he supported his wife and eight children by manual labour. He was brought up an Anglican, but, struck by the contrast between the lives of Catholics and Protestants of his acquaintance, he determined to embrace the old religion, and, after the usual course of instruction, was received into the Church. On the very day of his first Communion, however, he was arrested for changing his religion and committed to Winchester jail. Here his good behaviour during the years of his imprisonment won him the jailer's confidence to such a degree that he was frequently allowed out on parole, and was even trusted with the keys of the prison. This leniency enabled him to render valuable service to the other Catholic prisoners and to introduce priests to administer the sacraments. Soon, extending the sphere of his charitable activity, he acted as escort first to Father Thomas Stanney, and later to his successor at Winchester, Father Roger Dicconson, conducting them to the different villages to minister to the spiritual needs of the scattered and persecuted flock. Finally seized with Father Dicconson, Milner was with him placed under close confinement in Winchester jail pending the approaching sessions. Probably moved with compassion for the aged man, the judge urged Milner to attend even once the Protestant church and thus escape the gallows. The latter refused, however, "to embrace a counsel so disagreeable to the maxims of the Gospel", and began immediately to prepare for death. Every effort was made to persuade him to change his purpose and renounce the Faith, and, when he was approaching the gallows with Father Dicconson, his children were conducted to him in the hope that he might even then relent. Unshaken in his resolution, Milner gave his children his last blessing, declared that "he could wish them no greater happiness than to die for the like cause", and then met his death with the utmost courage and calm.

Challoner, *Memoirs*, I (1741), 260, 425; Ribadeneira, *Sanders' De Schism. Angl.* (1610), appendix, p. 36; Dodd, *Church History*, II, 149.

Thomas Kennedy.

Milo. See Sira, Diocese of.

Milo Crispin, monk, and cantor of the Benedictine Abbey of Bec, wrote the lives of five of its abbots: Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, Gulielmus de Bellomonte, Boso, Theobaldus, and Letardus. His life of Lanfranc is printed in the "Acta Sanctorum" of the Bollandists (May 28). The other four (those of Theobaldus and Letardus being mere summaries) are included in P. L. (Vol. CL.). Milo must have been an old man when he wrote them, for in the last chapter of his life of Lanfranc he relates something which he himself heard St. Anselm say. As St. Anselm died in 1109, and Letardus did not die till 1149, Milo Crispin shows here incidentally that his own religious life had lasted more than forty years. He came of the noble race of Crispin descended from the Neustrian, Gislebert, who first received the name Crispin because of his erect curly hair. All Gislebert's sons distinguished themselves, and the family proved generous benefactors to the Abbey of Bec. Two of his descendants subsequently became monks there—Gilbert, afterwards Abbot of Westminster, who wrote the life of St. Herluin, founder and first Abbot of Bec, and Milo himself. No details of the latter's career have been preserved, nor is it known when he died.

Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Latina med. ætatis*, V (Hamburg, 1736); Sevestre, *Dict. Patrol.* III (Paris, 1854), 1343–4; Hardy, *Descriptive catalogue of documents illustrating British History* (London, 1862–71); Migne, *P. L.*, CL (Paris, 1880); 714; Hurter, *Nomenclator Literarius*, II (Innsbruck, 1899), 108.

Edwin Burton.

Milopotamos, a titular see of Crete, suffragan of Candia. Certain historians and geographers identify this locality with the ancient Pantomatrion mentioned by Stephanus of Byzantium, by Ptolemy (III, xv, 5), who places it between Rhethymnos and the promontory of Dium, and by Pliny (IV, xx, 3), who places it elsewhere. If Milopotamos is identical with Avlopotamos, this Greek see is alluded to for the first time towards 1170 (Parthey, "Hieroclis Synecdemus", 118); it is spoken of again in another undated "Notitia episcopatuum" (Gelzer, "Ungedruckte . . . Texte der Notitiæ episcop.", 627). As to the Latin residential see, its first titular, Matthew, is mentioned about 1212, shortly after the conquest of the island by the Venetians. From 1538 to 1549 the Diocese of Cher-

onesus was joined to it; on the other hand, in 1641, the Diocese of Milopotamos was united with Rhethymnos and after the conquest of the island by the Turks in 1670, became merely titular. We know the names of about twenty residential Latin bishops. Among the schismatic Greeks the See of Aulopotamos is united with that of Rhethymnos. The ruins of the city may be seen along the sea-shore at Castel Mylopotamo, about twelve miles from Rhethymnos.

Le Quien, *Oriens christianus*, III, 935–938; Cornelius, *Creta sacra*, II (Venice, 1755), 173–180; Gams, *Series episcoporum*, 403; Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii ævi*, I, 357; II, 212; III, 261.

S. Vailhé.

Miltiades, Saint, Pope.—The year of his birth is not known; he was elected pope in either 310 or 311; died 10 or 11 January, 314. After the banishment of Pope Eusebius (q. v.) the Roman See was vacant for some time, probably because of the complications which had arisen on account of the apostates (*lapsi*), and which were not cleared up by the banishment of Eusebius and Heraclius. On 2 July, 310 or 311, Miltiades (the name is also written Melchiades), a native of Africa, was elevated to the papacy. There is some uncertainty as to the exact year, as the "Liberian Catalogue of the Popes" (Duchesne, "Liber Pontificalis", I, 9) gives 2 July, 311, as the date of the consecration of the new pope (ex die VI non. iul. a cons. Maximiliano VIII solo, quod fuit mense septembri Volusiano et Rufino); but in contradiction to this the death of the pope is said to have occurred on 2 January, 314, and the duration of the pontificate is given as three years, six months and eight days; possibly owing to the mistake of a copyist, we ought to read "ann. II" instead of "ann. III"; and therefore the year of his elevation to the papacy was most probably 311. About this time (311 or 310), an edict of toleration signed by the Emperors Galerius, Licinius, and Constantine, put an end to the great persecution of the Christians, and they were permitted to live as such, and also to reconstruct their places of religious worship (Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl.", VIII, xvii; Lactantius, "De mortibus persecutorum", xxxiv). Only in those countries of the Orient which were under the sway of Maximinus Daia did the Christians continue to be persecuted. The emperor now gave Pope Miltiades in Rome the right to receive back, through the prefect of the city, all ecclesiastical buildings and possessions which had been confiscated during the persecutions. The two Roman deacons, Strato and Cassianus, were ordered by the pope to discuss this matter with the prefect, and to take over the church properties (Augustinus, "Breviculus collationis cum Donatistis", iii, 34); it thus became possible to reorganize thoroughly the ecclesiastical administration and the religious life of the Christians in Rome.

Miltiades caused the remains of his predecessor, Eusebius, to be brought back from Sicily to Rome, and had them interred in a crypt in the Catacombs of St. Callistus. In the following year the pope witnessed the final triumph of the Cross, through the defeat of Maxentius, and the entry into Rome of the Emperor Constantine (now converted to Christianity), after the victory at the Milvian Bridge (27 October, 312). Later the emperor presented the Roman Church with the Lateran Palace, which then became the residence of the pope, and consequently also the seat of the central administration of the Roman Church. The basilica which adjoined the palace or was afterwards built there became the principal church of Rome. In 313 the Donatists (q. v.) came to Constantine with a request to nominate bishops from Gaul as judges in the controversy of the African episcopate regarding the consecration in Carthage of the two bishops, Cæcilian and Majorinus. Constantine wrote about this to Miltiades, and also to Marcus, requesting the pope with three bishops from Gaul to give a hearing in Rome, to Cæcilian and his opponent, and to decide the case. On 2 October, 313, there assembled in the Lateran Palace, under the presidency of Miltiades, a synod of eighteen bishops from Gaul and Italy, which, after thoroughly considering the Donatist controversy for three days, decided in favour of Cæcilian, whose election and consecration as Bishop of Carthage was declared to be legitimate. In the biography of Miltiades, in the "Liber Pontificalis", it is stated that at that time Manichæans were found in Rome; this was quite possible as Manichæism began to spread in the West in the fourth century. The same source attributes to this pope a decree which absolutely forbade the Christians to fast on Sundays or on Thursdays, "because these days were observed by the heathen as a holy fast". This reason is remarkable; it comes most likely from the author of the "Liber Pontificalis" who with this alleged decree traces back a Roman custom of his own time to an ordinance of Miltiades. The "Liber Pontificalis" is probably no less arbitrary in crediting this pope with a decree to the effect that the Oblation consecrated at the Solemn Mass of the pope (by which is meant the Eucharistic Bread) should be taken to the different churches of Rome. Such a custom actually existed in Rome (Duchesne, "Christian Worship," London, 1903, 185); but there is nothing definite to show that it was introduced by Miltiades, as the "Liber Pontificalis" asserts.

After his death, on 10 or 11 January (the "Liberian Catalogue" gives it as III id. jan.; the "Depositio Episcoporum" as IIII id. ian.), 314, Miltiades was laid to rest in the Catacomb of St. Callistus and he was venerated as a saint. De Rossi regards as highly probable his location of this pope's burial-chamber (Roma Sotterranea, II, 188 sq.). His feast was celebrated in the fourth century, on 10 January, according to the "Martyrologium Hieronymianum". In the present "Roman Martyrology" it occurs on 10 December.

Liber Pontificalis, ed. Duchesne, I, 168–196; Urbain, *Ein Martyrologium der christl. Gemeinde zu Rom* (Leipzig, 1901), 118–119; Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, I, 328 sqq.; Allard, *Histoire des persécutions*, V, 200, 203; Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, II, 96, 97, 110–112.

J. P. Kirsch.

Miltiz, Karl von, papal chamberlain and nuncio, b. about 1480, the son of Sigismund von Miltiz, "Landvogt" of Meissen, drowned in the Main near Gross Steinheim, 20 November, 1529. He received his humanistic and theological education at Mainz, Trier, and Meissen and went to Rome in 1514 or 1515, where he was made papal chamberlain and notary, and acted as agent of Frederic, Elector of Saxony, and of Duke George the Bearded. He obtained for the latter the permission to transport some of the earth of the Campo Santo in Rome, which originally had been brought from Jerusalem, to Annaberg, Saxony, where it was used in the cemetery. After the endeavours of Cardinal Cajetan to silence Luther had failed, Miltiz appeared to be the person most suited to bring the negotiations to a successful ending. To have some pretence for the journey to Germany, he was to deliver to his elector the papal golden rose, which the latter had coveted in vain for three years. He went first to Altenburg where he had his first conversation with Luther. Leaving aside all discussion of a promise of retraction, he and Luther agreed to remain silent for the present, and to let the learned Archbishop Richard of Trier conduct the examination. Luther even promised to write an humble letter to the pope. Miltiz then journeyed to Leipzig and covered Tetzel with mortifying, wholly unnecessary reproaches. But the movement started and fanned by Luther, had progressed too far to be halted by mere conclaves and conversations, and for this reason two further meetings between Luther and Miltiz at Liebenwerda (9 Oct., 1519) and Lichtenburg

(Oct., 1520) were without success. After a short stay in Rome he returned to Germany in 1522, where he died. He was buried in the cathedral of Mainz.

SEIDEMANN, *Karl von Miltiz, eine chronologische Untersuchung* (Dresden, 1844); CREUTZBERG, *Karl von Miltiz, sein Leben und seine geschichtliche Bedeutung* (Freiburg, 1907).

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Milwaukee, ARCHDIOCESE OF (MILWAUKIENSIS), established as a diocese, 28 Nov., 1843; became an archbishopric, 12 February, 1875, comprises seventeen counties of the State of Wisconsin: Columbia, Dane, Dodge, Fond du Lac, Green, Green Lake, Jefferson, Kenosha, Marquette, Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Racine, Rock, Sheboygan, Walworth, Washington, Waukesha, an area of 9321 square miles. The metropolitan city of Milwaukee is picturesquely situated on Milwaukee Bay, on the eastern shore of Lake Michigan. Its name is derived from the Algonquin family of Indian dialects and means Good Land. In the history of Catholicism it is first mentioned in the "Catholic Almanac" of 1840: "Milvakie, Rev. Mr. Kelly who visits alternately Racine, Rochester, Burlington, Southpost (Kenosha), etc." The first Mass, however, was celebrated in Milwaukee as early as 1837 by Rev. J. Bonduel, a missionary from Green Bay, in the home of the "founder of Milwaukee", Solomon Juneau. In the same year Rev. Patrick Kelly came to the city and held services in the court-house till, in 1839, he erected the first Catholic church, dedicated to St. Peter, for several years the bishop's cathedral. It was afterwards removed to its present site near St. Peter and Paul's Church by Mgr. Leonard Batz, V. G. Northwest territory, of which the present State of Wisconsin forms a part, belonged to the Diocese of Quebec and afterwards to Bardstown, Ky., till it was affiliated to the newly created See of Cincinnati in 1821. In 1833, when Detroit was made a see, it became a dependency of that see. It was in 1841 that the first bishop visited Milwaukee in the person of Rt. Rev. P. Lefevre of Detroit, accompanied by one of his zealous priests, Rev. Martin Kundig, later vicar-general, whose name is inseparably linked with the early history and subsequent growth of the diocese. In 1843, the Fathers of the Fifth Provincial Council of Baltimore petitioned the Holy See to make Milwaukee a see and to appoint the Rev. John Martin Henni as its first bishop.

Episcopal Succession.—John Martin Henni, first Bishop of Milwaukee, was born at Obersaxen, Switzerland, 13 June, 1805. He studied philosophy and theology in Rome, where he met the Very Rev. Frederic Résé, Vicar-General of Cincinnati (later Bishop of Detroit), who had come there in quest of priests for the American missions. Together with his fellow-student M. Kundig, he landed in New York, in 1828. Having been ordained priest at Cincinnati, 2 Feb., 1829, he laboured with the zeal and enthusiasm of an apostle for the scattered Catholics of Ohio, traversing the state in all directions, baptizing, preaching, and building churches. Later on he was appointed vicar-general of the diocese and pastor of the church of the Holy Trinity. He also was the founder of the Catholic weekly, "Der Wahrheitsfreund", for some time the only German Catholic paper in the United States. On 19 March, 1844, Henni was consecrated Bishop of Milwaukee by Bishop Purcell of Cincinnati, and soon after started for his new field of labour. He came accompanied by the Rev. Michael Heiss, who for some time acted as his secretary. The prospects of the new diocese were far from encouraging. He found only four priests in the whole extent of his diocese, a few Catholics scattered over the territory, and a small frame church encumbered with a heavy debt. But undaunted by these difficulties the youthful bishop set to work with apostolic zeal, and, thanks to his untiring efforts, the number of Catholics, mostly immigrants from Germany and Ireland, increased from year to year, so that after three years the number of priests had risen from four to thirty. But a rich share of this phenomenal progress is due to the arduous labours and sacrificing spirit of his priests, the pioneers of the North-west, men like Mazuchelli, the founder of Sinsinawa, Morrissey, C. Rehrl, Wisbauer, Beitter, Inama, Gaertner, Gernbauer, Holzhauer, Conrad, and others.

In 1847 there arrived from Austria Dr. Joseph Salzmann, founder of St. Francis Seminary (Salesianum). In the same year Henni laid the foundation of his new cathedral, dedicated to St. John the Evangelist. To raise funds for the building, he made extensive journeys to Cuba and Mexico. The cathedral was consecrated by Archbishop (afterwards Cardinal) Bedini, 31 July, 1853. Owing to the large influx of Germans at that time, St. Mary's church, for the spiritual wants of the German Catholics, was erected in 1846. In the same year the first hospital was opened under Catholic auspices in charge of the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul. In 1856 the Seminary of St. Francis of Sales, destined to become the fertile nursery of priests for the North-west, was erected and in the course of years became one of the most flourishing institutions of the country. Its first rector was the Rev. Michael Heiss, while its founder, the Rev. Dr. Salzmann, acted as procurator. On the elevation of Father Heiss to the episcopal dignity, Salzmann was appointed his successor, a position which he held to the time of his death which occurred 17 January, 1874. Salzmann was also the founder of the first Catholic normal school in the United States and of the Pio Nono College. Both institutions were opened in 1871, and have to this day faithfully carried out the intentions of their founder. In 1866 two new dioceses were established in Wisconsin with episcopal sees in La Crosse and Green Bay. In 1875 Milwaukee was made an archepiscopal see, with Mgr. Henni as first archbishop. During the last years of his administration his burden was considerably lightened by the appointment of Rt. Rev. M. Heiss as coadjutor, with the right of succession, and titular Archbishop of Adrianople. Archbishop Henni who is rightly called the Patriarch of the North-west, was called to his reward 7 Sept., 1881.

Michael Heiss was born at Pfahldorf, Bavaria, 12 April, 1818. Having finished his theological studies at the famous University of Munich, he spent the first two years of his priesthood in his home diocese of Eichstätt, and then offered his services to the American mission. He first had charge of St. Mary's church in Covington, Ky., where he remained till 1844, when he consented to accompany Bishop Henni of Milwaukee to his new see. Having filled the office of secretary for some years, he was appointed pastor of St. Mary's church, Milwaukee. In 1856 he was appointed first rector of St. Francis Seminary, an office which he held till his elevation to the episcopal dignity as first Bishop of La Crosse, in 1868. On the death of Archbishop Henni, in 1881, he succeeded him as archbishop. Archbishop Heiss was known and esteemed as one of the most learned theologians of the country, a reputation which secured to him a place among the members of the dogmatic commission at the Vatican Council. His works "De Matrimonio" (Munich, 1861) and "The Four Gospels Examined and Vindicated" (Milwaukee, 1863), hold a prominent place in theological literature. In 1883 he was invited to Rome to take part in the deliberations preparatory to the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, which he also attended in 1884. In 1886 he convoked the First Provincial Council of Milwaukee, which opened its sessions on 23 May, in St. John's cathedral. Bishops Flasch of La Crosse, Ireland of St. Paul, Seidenbusch of St. Cloud, Marty, Vicar Apostolic of Dakota, and Katzer, administrator of Green Bay, took part in its deliberations.

During the last years of Archbishop Heiss's wise and peaceful administration, the ecclesiastical horizon was somewhat darkened by the plot of the American Protective Association, a new phase of defunct Know-

nothingism (q. v.). In their bigotry and hatred of everything Catholic, they aimed their first blow at the Catholic schools by the "Bennett Law", which seriously interfered with the rights of Catholic parents. But the timely and united action of the bishops of Wisconsin, and their vigorous protest, by which they branded the bill as "unnecessary, offensive, and unjust", effectively defeated the iniquitous scheme. In 1888 the Diocese of St. Paul was separated from Milwaukee and made an archbishopric. Three suffragan sees were thenceforth subject to Milwaukee: La Crosse and Green Bay in the State of Wisconsin and Marquette in Upper Michigan. The Diocese of Superior was added in 1905. Archbishop Heiss died at St. Francis Hospital, La Crosse, 26 March, 1890. His mortal remains rest beneath the sanctuary of the seminary chapel at St. Francis, at the side of his faithful friend and co-labourer, Joseph Salzmann.

Frederic Xavier Katzer was born at Ebensee, Upper Austria, 7 February, 1844. His preparatory studies he completed at Linz, the capital of Upper Austria, under the direction of the Jesuit Fathers. He came to America in 1864. Having finished his theological studies at the Salesianum, he was ordained priest 21 December, 1866. After his ordination he remained at the seminary where he taught mathematics and, later on, philosophy and dogmatic theology. In 1875 he followed Fr. Krautbauer, the newly appointed Bishop of Green Bay, to his see, where he acted as secretary, and afterwards as vicar-general. Upon the death of Bishop Krautbauer, in 1885, he was appointed administrator of the diocese; and on 31 May, 1886, he was chosen Bishop of Green Bay and consecrated in St. Francis Xavier's cathedral, 21 September of the same year. After the death of Archbishop Heiss he was promoted to the archiepiscopal dignity as third Archbishop of Milwaukee in December, 1890. Archbishop Katzer was a man of profound learning and a thorough theologian. His poetical talent is evidenced by an allegorical drama, entitled "Der Kampf der Gegenwart" (The Combat of the Present Age). His administration was marked by a uniform regard for justice and strict adherence to the laws of the Church. He died at Fond du Lac, 4 August, 1903, on the same day on which the great pontiff Leo XIII breathed his last. His earthly remains found their last resting place in the little cemetery near the "chapel in the woods" at St. Francis.

Sebastian Gebhard Messmer was born at Goldach, Switzerland, 29 August, 1847. Having finished his theological studies at the University of Innsbruck he was ordained priest in the same city, 23 July, 1871. In the same year he came to the United States, where he joined the Diocese of Newark. For several years he taught canon law, Scripture, and dogmatic theology in Seton Hall. For a short time he also had charge of St. Peter's, Newark, N. J. In 1889 he was called to the chair of canon law in the Catholic University at Washington, but first went to Rome to study Roman civil law. After his return he entered upon his duties as professor and kept this position till his elevation to the episcopal dignity. On 27 March, 1892, he was consecrated Bishop of Green Bay in St. Peter's Church, Newark, by his former classmate, Bishop Zardetti of St. Cloud. On the death of Archbishop Katzer he succeeded him as archbishop, 28 November, 1903. Archbishop Messmer is honourably known as a very able and prolific contributor to Catholic literature, and his name is intimately linked with the principal religious movements in the country. Together with Bishop McFaul of Trenton he has been chiefly instrumental in inaugurating the American Federation of Catholic Societies.

Religious Orders in the Diocese.—Orders of Men.—The rapid, almost miraculous growth of Catholicism in the State of Wisconsin is chiefly due to the apostolic zeal of the pioneer priests of the secular priesthood; but the labours and trials of the early missionaries belonging to religious orders ought not to be forgotten. In 1857 the first Capuchin convent was erected at Mount Calvary, Wisconsin. It has been asserted, not without reason, that the foundation of the Calvary Province is a fact unprecedented in the history of the Catholic Church in this country, in as far as the order of Capuchins was introduced into Wisconsin, not by religious, but by two secular priests, Rev. Francis Haas and Rev. Bonaventure Frey. The opposition which they met on all sides, the trials which they had to endure, and the undaunted courage with which they met them, border on the miraculous. To-day the order possesses a flourishing community with convent and college at Calvary, a convent and two parishes in Milwaukee, not to speak of the numerous religious houses and communities in other dioceses. The Society of Jesus was established in Milwaukee in 1856, and St. Gall's church, erected in 1849, was placed in charge of the Society. In 1880 the Jesuit college known as Marquette College was opened, and has lately developed into the flourishing Marquette University. The Jesuits also have charge of the Gesù church, one of the finest religious edifices in the Northwest. The Fathers of the Holy Cross conduct the College of the Sacred Heart at Watertown; the Servite Fathers, a monastery and novitiate at Granville Center; and the Discalced Carmelites, lately arrived from Ratisbon, Bavaria, attend to the chapel on "Holy Hill", a well known place of pilgrimage.

Orders of Women.—The School Sisters of Notre Dame came to Milwaukee in 1855, on the invitation of Bishop Henni, who showed himself their generous friend and protector, especially during the first years when they had to struggle with poverty and violent opposition. To Mother Caroline, who brought the first band of sisters from Munich to Milwaukee, and who for forty-two years stood at the helm, is principally due the present flourishing condition of the community. The sisters have their mother-house and novitiate in Milwaukee. In 1876 the community was divided into two provinces, with the second mother-house in Baltimore; and in 1895 a third province was formed with a mother-house at St. Louis, Mo. The Sisters of St. Francis have two mother-houses in the diocese, one at St. Francis, where they built their first convent in 1847, near the present site of St. Francis Seminary, the other in Milwaukee (St. Joseph's Convent and the Sacred Heart Sanatorium). The Sisters of St. Agnes have their mother-house at Fond du Lac, where they also have charge of a hospital, a home for the aged, and an academy. The Sisters of St. Dominic have their mother-house at Racine, and an academy at Corliss. The sisters of these communities teach in the numerous parochial schools of Wisconsin and other states. The Sisters of Mercy, too, have a mother-house in Milwaukee. Other communities which have no mother-house in the diocese, but are in charge of some charitable or educational establishment are: the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent of Paul, Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Franciscan Sisters of St. Louis, Mo., Polish Sisters of St. Joseph, Hospital Sisters of St. Francis, Little Sisters of the Poor, Society of the Divine Saviour, Dominican Sisters of the Perpetual Rosary, Sisters of the Third Order of St. Dominic (Sinsinawa), Sisters of the Good Shepherd, Felician Sisters, and Sisters de Misericorde.

Statistics.—The official reports for 1910 give the following figures: There are in the archdiocese 377 priests (303 secular and 74 regulars). The city of Milwaukee counts 38 churches; outside of Milwaukee there are 169. Besides there are 65 mission churches without a resident priest and 41 chapels. In the seminary of St. Francis de Sales there are 150 students of philosophy and theology studying for the different dioceses of the province and other dioceses. There is one university, one Catholic normal school, and five colleges with 770 students; six academies for young

ladies; 142 parish schools with 33,279 pupils, four orphan asylums with 401 orphans, one infant asylum, one industrial school for girls, one deaf-mute asylum, one home for boys, one school for feeble-minded, nine hospitals and sanatoriums, two homes for aged poor, and one home for girls. The Catholic population of the archdiocese is estimated at about 238,000.

The Metropolitan Catholic Almanac and Laity's Directory (Baltimore); WILTZIUS, *Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee); *The Catholic Church in Wisconsin* (Milwaukee, 1895); *Memoirs of Milwaukee County* (Madison, 1909); MARTY, *Johann Martin Henni, erster Bischof und Erzbischof von Milwaukee* (New York, 1888); RAINER, *A Noble Priest, Joseph Salzmann, Founder of the Salesianum*, tr. from the German by BERG (Milwaukee, 1903); ABBELEN, *Die Ehrwuerdige Mutter Caroline Fries* (St. Louis, 1892).

J. RAINER.

Mind (Gk. *νοῦς*; Lat. *mens;* Ger. *Geist, Seele;* Fr. *âme, esprit*).—The word mind has been used in a variety of meanings in English, and we find a similar want of fixity in the connotation of the corresponding terms in other languages. Aristotle tells us that Anaxagoras, as compared with other early Greek philosophers, appeared like one sober among drunken men in that he introduced *νοῦς*, mind, as efficient cause of the general order in the universe. In treating of the soul, Aristotle himself identifies *νοῦς* with the intellectual faculty, which he conceives as partly active, partly passive (see INTELLECT). It is the thinking principle, the highest and most spiritual energy of the soul, separable from the body, and immortal. The Latin word, *mens*, was employed in much the same sense. St. Thomas, who represents the general scholastic usage, derives *mens* from *metior* (to measure). He identifies *mens* with the human soul viewed as intellectual and abstracting from lower organic faculties. Angels, or pure spirits, may thus be called minds (De Veritate, X, a. 1). For Descartes the human soul is simply *mens, res cogitans*, mind. It stands in complete opposition to the body and to matter in general. The vegetative faculties allotted to the soul by Aristotle and the Schoolmen are rejected by him, and those vital functions are explained by him mechanically. The lower animals do not possess minds in any sense; they are for him mere machines. An early usage in English connects the word mind closely with memory, as in the sentence "to bear in mind". Again it has been associated with the volitional side of our nature, as in the phrases "to mind" and "to have a mind to effect something". Still when restricted to a particular faculty the general tendency has been to identify mind with the cognitive and more especially with the intellectual powers. In this usage it more closely corresponds to the primary meaning of the Latin *mens*, understood as the thinking or judging principle. Mind is also conceived as a substantial being, equivalent to the scholastic *mens*, partly identified with, partly distinguished from the soul. If we define the soul as the principle within me, by which I feel, think, will, and by which my body is animated, we may provide a definition of mind of fairly wide acceptance by merely omitting the last clause. That is, in this usage mind designates the soul as the source of conscious life, feeling, thought, and volition, abstraction being made from the vegetative functions. On the other hand the term soul emphasizes the note of substantiality and the property of animating principle.

In the English psychological literature of the last century there has indeed been exhibited a most remarkable timidity in regard to the use of the term "soul". Whilst in German at all events the word *Seele* has been in general acceptance among psychologists, the great majority of English writers on mental life completely shun the use of the corresponding English word, as seemingly perilous to their philosophical reputation. Even the most orthodox representatives of the Scotch school rigorously boycotted the word, so that "the nature and attributes of the Human Mind", came to be recognized as the proper designation of the subject-matter of psychology, even amongst those who believed in the reality of an immaterial principle, as the source of man's conscious life. However, the spread of the positivist or phenomenalist view of the science of psychology has resulted in a very widely adopted identification of mind merely with the conscious states, ignoring any principle or subject to which these states belong. The mind in this sense is only the sum of the conscious processes or activities of the individual with their special modes of operating. This, however, is a quite inadequate conception of the mind. It may, of course, be convenient and quite legitimate for some purposes to investigate certain activities or operations of this mind or soul, without raising the ultimate question of the metaphysical nature of the principle or substance which is the basis and source of these phenomena; and it may also serve as a useful economy of language to employ the term mind, merely to designate mental life as a stream of consciousness. But the adoption of this phraseology must not cause us to lose sight of the fact that along with the action there is the agent, that underlying the forms of mental behaviour there is the being which behaves. The connexion of our abiding personal identity, nay the simplest exercise of self-conscious memory, compels us to acknowledge the reality of a permanent principle, the subject and connecting bond of the transitory states. Mind adequately conceived must thus be held to include the subject or agent along with states or activities, and it should be the business of a complete science of mind to investigate both.

All our rational knowledge of the nature of the mind must be derived from the study of its operations. Consequently metaphysical or rational psychology logically follows empirical or phenomenal psychology. The careful observation, description, and analysis of the activities of the mind lead up to our philosophical conclusions as to the inner nature of the subject and the source of those activities. The chief propositions in regard to the human mind viewed as a substantial principle which Catholic philosophers claim to establish by the light of reason are, its abiding unity, its individuality, its freedom, its simplicity, and its spirituality (see CONSCIOUSNESS; INDIVIDUALITY; INTELLECT; SOUL).

MIND AND CONSCIOUSNESS.—In connexion with the investigation of our mental operations there arises the question, whether these are to be deemed coextensive with consciousness. Are there unconscious mental processes? The problem under different forms has occupied the attention of philosophers from Leibnitz to J. S. Mill, whilst in recent years the phenomena of hypnotism, "multiple personality", and abnormal forms of mental life have brought the question of the relation between the unconscious and the conscious processes in the human organism into greater prominence. That all forms of mental life, perception, thought, feeling, and volition are profoundly affected in character by nervous processes and by vital activities, which do not emerge into the strata of conscious life, seems to be indisputably established. Whether, however, unconscious processes which affect conclusions of the intellect and resolutions of the will, but are in themselves quite unconscious, should be called mental states, or conceived as acts of the mind, has been keenly disputed. In favour of the doctrine of unconscious mental processes have been urged the fact that many of our ordinary sensations arise out of an aggregate of impressions individually too faint to be separately perceivable, the fact that attention may reveal to us experiences previously unnoticed, the fact that unobserved trains of thought may result in sudden reminiscences, and that in abnormal mental conditions hypnotized, somnambulistic, and hysterical patients often accomplish difficult intellectual feats

whilst remaining utterly unaware of the rational intermediate steps leading up to the final results. On the other side it is urged that most of those phenomena can be accounted for by merely subconscious processes which escape attention and are forgotten; or, at all events, by unconscious cerebration,—the working out of purely physical nervous processes without any concomitant mental state till the final cerebral situation is reached, when the corresponding mental act is evoked. The dispute is probably, at least in part, grounded on differences of definition. If, however, the mind be identified with the soul, and if the latter be allowed to be the principle of vegetative life, there can be no valid reason for denying that the principle of our mental life may be also the subject of unconscious activities. But if we confine the term mind to the soul, viewed as conscious, or as the subject of intellectual operations, then by definition we exclude unconscious states from the sphere of mind. Still whatever terminology we may find it convenient to adopt, the fact remains, that our most purely intellectual operations are profoundly influenced by changes which take place below the surface of consciousness.

Origin of Mental Life.—A related question is that of the simple or composite character of consciousness. Is mind, or conscious life, an amalgam or product of units which are not conscious? One response is offered in the "mind-stuff" or "mind-dust" theory. This is a necessary deduction from the extreme materialistic evolutionist hypothesis when it seeks to explain the origin of human minds in this universe. According to W. K. Clifford, who invented the term "mind-stuff", those who accept evolution must, for the sake of consistency, assume that there is attached to every particle of matter in the universe a bit of rudimentary feeling or intelligence, and "when the material molecules are so combined as to form the film on the under-side of a jelly fish, the elements of mind-stuff which go along with them are so combined as to form the faint beginnings of sentience. When the matter takes the complex form of the living human brain, the corresponding mind-stuff takes the form of human consciousness, having intelligence and volition" (Lectures and Essays, 284). Spencer and other thorough-going evolutionists are driven to a similar conclusion. But the true inference is rather, that the incredibility of the conclusion proves the untenableness of the materialistic form of evolution which these writers adopt. There is no evidence whatever of this universal mind-stuff which they postulate. It is of an inconceivable character. As Professor James says, to call it "nascent" consciousness is merely a verbal quibble which explains nothing. No multiplicity and no grouping or fusing of unconscious elements can be conceived as constituting an act of conscious intelligence. The unity and simplicity which characterize the simplest acts of the mind are incompatible with such a theory.

Mind and Matter.—The opposition of mind and matter brings us face to face with the great controversy of Dualism and Monism. Are there two forms of being in the universe ultimately and radically distinct? or are they merely diverse phases or aspects of one common underlying substratum? Our experience at all events appears to reveal to us two fundamentally contrasted forms of reality. On the one side, there is facing us matter occupying space, subject to motion, possessed of inertia and resistance, permanent, indestructible, and seemingly independent of our observation. On the other, there is our own mind, immediately revealing itself to us in simple unextended acts of consciousness, which seem to be born and then annihilated. Through these conscious acts we apprehend the material world. All our knowledge of it is dependent on them, and in the last resort, limited by them. By analogy we ascribe to other human organisms minds like our own. A craving to find unity in the seeming multiplicity of experience has led many thinkers to accept a monistic explanation, in which the apparent duality of mind and matter is reduced to a single underlying principle or substratum. Materialism considers matter itself, body, material substance, as this principle. For the materialist, mind, feelings, thoughts, and volitions are but "functions" or "aspects" of matter; mental life is an *epiphenomenon*, a by-product in the working of the Universe, which can in no way interfere with the course of physical changes or modify the movement of any particle of matter in the world; indeed, in strict consistency it should be held that successive mental acts do not influence or condition each other, but that thoughts and volitions are mere incidental appendages of certain nerve processes in the brain; and these latter are determined exclusively and completely by antecedent material processes. In other words, the materialistic theory, when consistently thought out, leads invariably to the startling conclusion that the human mind has had no real influence on the history of the human race.

On the other hand, the idealistic monist denies altogether the existence of any extra-mental, independent material world. So far from mind being a mere aspect or *epiphenomenon* attached to matter, the material universe is a creation of the mind and entirely dependent on it. Its *esse* is *percipi*. It exists only in and for the mind. Our ideas are the only things of which we can be truly certain. And, indeed, if we were compelled to embrace monism, it seems to us there can be little doubt as to the logical superiority of the idealistic position. But there is no philosophical compulsion to adopt either a materialistic or an idealistic monism. The conviction of the common sense of mankind, and the assumption of physical science that there are two orders of being in the universe, mind and matter, distinct from each other yet interacting and influencing each other, and the assurance that the human mind can obtain a limited yet true knowledge of the material world which really exists outside and independently of it occupying a space of three dimensions, this view, which is the common teaching of the Scholastic philosophy and Catholic thinkers, can be abundantly justified (see Dualism; Energy, Conservation of).

Mind and Mechanism.—Mind is also contrasted with mechanical theories as cause or explanation of the order of the world. The affirmation of mind in this connexion is equivalent to teleologism, or idealism in the sense of there being intelligence and purpose governing the working of the universe. This is the meaning of the word in Bacon's well-known statement: "I had rather believe all the fables in the Legend and the Alcoran than that this universal frame is without a mind" (Essays: Of Atheism). It is, in fact, the doctrine of theism. The world as given demands a rational account of its present character. The proximate explanations of much, especially in the inorganic and non-living portion of it, can be furnished by material energies acting according to known laws. But reason demands an account of all the contents of the universe—living and conscious beings as well as lifeless matter; and, moreover, it insists on carrying the inquiry back until it reaches an ultimate explanation. For this, Mind, an Intelligent Cause, is necessary. Even if the present universe could be traced back to a collection of material atoms, the particular collocation of these atoms from which the present cosmos resulted, would have to be accounted for; because in the mechanical or materialistic theory of evolution, that original collocation contained this universe and no other, and that particular collocation clamours for a sufficient reason just as inevitably as does the present complex result. If we are told that the explanation of a page of a newspaper is to be found in the contact of the paper with a plate of set types, we are

still compelled to ask how the particular arrangement of the types came about, and we are certain that the sufficient explanation ultimately rests in the action of mind or intelligent being.

JAMES, *Principles of Psychology* (New York and London, 1890); LADD, *Psychology, Descriptive and Explanatory* (N. Y. and London, 1894); IDEM, *Philosophy of Mind* (N. Y. and London, 1895); MAHER, *Psychology, Empirical and Rational* (7th ed., N. Y. and London, 1910); MERCIER, *Les origines de la psychologie contemporaine* (2nd ed., Paris and Louvain, 1908).
(See CONSCIOUSNESS; INTELLECT; PSYCHOLOGY.)

MICHAEL MAHER.

Minden, DIOCESE OF, a former see of Westphalia. Minden on the Weser is first heard of in 798, and in 803 in the Treaty of Salz, made with the Saxons, it is spoken of as a see. The first bishop was Erkambert (Herumbert), probably a Saxon, who was appointed in 780 and died in 813. The third bishop, Dietrich I (853–80), fell in battle against the Northmen; the fifth, Drogo (887–902), founded a convent at Möllenbeck. The diocese gradually developed until it extended on the east across the Aller to Celle, on the west to Hunte, embracing the districts of Lidbekegowe, Enterigowe, Loingo, Merstem, Buki, and Tilithi. From the beginning the bishops of Minden were suffragans of Cologne. The later estates of the bishops comprised about a fourth of the diocese; it extended from Porta Westfalica, on both sides of the river, to Schlüsselburg, and on the north-west across to Hunte. The most important places were Minden, Lübbecke, Petershagen, Schlüsselburg, Reineberg, and Rahden. The see suffered in the tenth century from the Hungarians, but began to flourish under the Saxon dynasty.



THE CATHEDRAL, MINDEN

Bishop Landward (956–69) obtained from Otto I immunity from all foreign jurisdiction, and also obtained the revenues derived from the administration of justice; Milo (969–96) on account of his loyalty to Otto II received important privileges, among others the right to elect the bailiff who represented the bishop in the imperial court, in 977 penal jurisdiction, the Weser toll, the right of coinage and of conducting a cattle market. The bishop became so important that he was almost an independent prince. The cathedral canons obtained in 961 the right to choose the bishop, provided a worthy man was chosen. Bishops Dietrich II (1002–22), Sigebert (1022–36), and Bruno (1037–55) were in the emperor's favour and consequently added to their church property. During the reign of Henry IV the bishops were caught in the Investitures conflict, and more than once papal and imperial sympathizers contended for the see. After the Concordat of Worms the bishopric under Sigward (1120–40) and Heinrich I (1140–53) made great strides. Werner (1153–70) and Anno (1170–85) guided the see safely through the struggle between Frederick Barbarossa and the Saxon Duke Henry the Lion. The overthrow of the duke removed the last remnant of episcopal dependence on the ducal power, and the prelates of Minden were henceforth subject to the emperor.

Continuous conflict with encroaching nobles brought a load of debt and forced many bishops to pledge or sell the diocesan estates. The town of Minden profited by the financial embarrassment of its episcopal lords, gradually acquired more rights, and partially freed itself from the overlordship of the bishops; on the other hand, the authority of the bishop was restricted by the cathedral chapter which, in Minden as in other dioceses, acquired the right of choosing the provost and dean, and made all important matters of administration subject to its consent. Bishop Gottfried von Waldeck (1304–24), to evade the oppression of the burgesses, moved his residence to the castle of Petershagen. With the papal nomination of Louis of Brunswick (1324–46) began the unedifying and detrimental series of conflicts between pope and chapter as to the nomination to the see. Louis involved the see in the feuds of neighbouring nobles. The town acquired the administration of justice, the right to levy customs duties, and the right of coinage. Some energetic bishops followed: Gerhard I (1346–53); Gerhard II von Schauenburg (1361–66); Wedekind vom Berge (1369–83); Otto III (1384–97).

In the fifteenth century more than one double election took place. Wulbrand, Count of Hallermund (1406–36), endeavoured to bring order out of confusion; his successor, Albert II von Hoya, as coadjutor and as bishop (1436–73), was involved in a long dispute with Osnabrück and the Duke of Brunswick. His successor, Heinrich III von Schauenburg (1473–1508), sought better relations with his neighbours, but episcopal authority was so weakened that a return to

former conditions was impossible. The power of the bishop was now so restricted by the chapter and the town, that he was unable to take any important step without their consent; indeed, a complete co-regency of the chapter was set up. Almost all the castles were in the hands of the aristocratic canons, and the revenues of the bishop were extremely limited. The lives of the clergy did not in many cases conform to the canonical rules; concubinage was quite general, monastic discipline had relaxed, and the faith of the laity had grown cold. For these reasons the Reformation spread rapidly in the town and the diocese under Bishop Franz I of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel (1508–29), who involved the see in the Hildesheim chapter feuds, and died as the result of his excesses. His successor, Franz II von Waldeck, also Bishop of Münster and Osnabrück from 1532, led a dissolute life, and was an adherent of the new religious teachings, which he privately furthered with all his power. In 1553 he was forced to resign in favour of Julius of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel (1553–54), who soon resigned in favour of his uncle, Georg (1554–66).

Under his successor Hermann von Schauenberg (1567–82), Protestantism spread rapidly; Hermann accepted the Council of Trent, it is true, but governed as a Protestant prince. Heinrich Julius of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel (1582–85) declared the Confession of Augsburg the only authorized creed in his diocese. Otto von Schauenberg (1587–99) was a devoted Catholic, but, owing to disputes with the cathedral chapter and the estates, accomplished little for Catholicism. The last bishop but one, Christian of Brunswick (1599–1633, a Protestant), troubled himself little about his diocese, and ruled it from his paternal estates. By the terms of his election he had to allow the free exercise of both creeds. The attempt of the cathedral chapter to turn over the church of St. John at Minden to the Jesuits (1604) was frustrated by the opposition of the citizens. By the Edict of Restitution (1629) the Catholics of Minden obtained the churches of St. Martin and St. Simeon; the Franciscans in 1630 established themselves in the cathedral until 1651, and even the Jesuits, though for only a short time, were welcomed to the city. Franz von Wartenberg (1633–48), last Bishop of Minden, endeavoured to restore the Catholic faith in his Sees of Minden, Osnabrück, and Verden; but in 1633 he was obliged to flee before the Swedes, and after the Treaty of Prague (1635) was unable to return.

By the Peace of Westphalia the diocese was suppressed, Franz Wilhelm retained the title of Bishop of Minden, but its temporal possessions, embracing more than twenty-two square miles, were awarded to the Electorate of Brandenburg. It was only in 1649 that Brandenburg was able to obtain possession; in 1650 the Elector Frederick William received the oath of allegiance from the town and the nobility at the episcopal castle of Petershagen. The "principality" of Minden remained at first a special jurisdiction, until in 1729 it was united to the Countship of Ravensberg. The Catholics retained only the cathedral with eleven canonries, all of which were suppressed early in the nineteenth century; but the cathedral is still in Catholic hands. After the suppression of the see, its territory was administered for ecclesiastical purposes by the Northern Mission. In 1821 most of it fell to Paderborn, and a small remnant to Hildesheim.

South Wall of the Cathedral, Minden

Chronicon Episcoporum Mindensium in Pistorius, *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum*, III (Ratisbon, 1726), 807–41; Culemann, *Mindische Geschichte* (Minden, 1747–48); Schlichthaber, *Mindische Kirchengeschichte* (Minden, 1753–55); Holscher, *Beschreibung des vormaligen Bistums Minden* (Münster, 1877); Schröder, *Chronik des Bistums und der Stadt Minden* (Minden, 1886); Idem, *Die Einführung der Reformation in Westfalen* (Minden, 1883), Protestant standpoint; *Westfälisches Urkundenbuch*, VI: *Die Urkunden des Bistums Minden 1201–1300*, ed. Hoogeweg (Münster, 1898); *Die Bau- und Kunstdenkmäler des Kreises Minden* (Münster, 1902); Frie, *Die Entwicklung der Landeshoheit der Mindener Bischöfe* (Münster, 1908); *Zeitschr. des hist. Vereins für Niedersachsen* (Lüneburg, 1835—).

Joseph Lins.

Ming, John, philosopher and writer, b. at Gyswyl, Unterwalden, Switzerland, 20 Sept., 1838; d. at Brooklyn, Ohio, U. S. A., 17 June, 1910. He was educated at the Benedictine College, Engelburg, Switzerland, and entered the German Jesuit novitiate in 1856. He studied philosophy at Aachen (1861–64), and theology at Maria-Laach (1865–69). After a year's tertianship in Westphalia he was sent to Kreuzberg, near Bonn, as a preacher, and in 1871 became lecturer in theology at Görz, Austria. In 1872 he came to the United States, where, after two years devoted to pastoral ministry, he professed theology at Milwaukee. He was transferred two years later to Spring Hill, Alabama, where he taught philosophy, in which work he was afterwards engaged for twenty-one years, mainly at Buffalo, Prairie du Chien, and St. Louis. When once he had acquired English, Father Ming began to write for the leading Catholic magazines, especially the "Messenger" and the "American Catholic Quarterly Review", in which his first article appeared in 1879. His contributions deal mainly with evolution and socialism, the two most important questions confronting Catholics in the United States in his day. After the publication of a short but instructive

treatise on the "Temporal Power of the Pope", he undertook a more ambitious work in his "Data of Modern Ethics Examined". The prominence of the labour question led him to engage in a deep study of that problem. To this we owe "The Characteristics and the Religion of Modern Socialism", and "The Morality of Modern Socialism". These two works supply Catholic students with not only an unprejudiced exposition of the Socialistic movement as propounded by its leading advocates, but a critical refutation of the erroneous theories on which it is based.

HUSSLEIN in *America*, III (2 July, 1910), 307–308.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

Minimi (or MINIMS) are the members of the religious order founded by St. Francis of Paula. The name is an allusion to Friar Minor, or to Matt., xxv, 40: "Quamdiu fecistis uni ex his fratribus meis minimis, mihi fecistis", and suggests, as Leo X in the Bull of canonization of the holy founder says, the great humility which should characterize the religious of this order, and by reason of which, they ought to consider themselves as the least of all religious. With the first Order of the Minims are connected a second and a third order. In this article we are concerned principally with the first.

I. ORIGIN AND RULE.—St. Francis of Paula, having in his youth lived one year in a Franciscan convent at S. Marco (Calabria), dedicated himself to solitary life in a hermitage near Paula. In 1435 some disciples joined him, and after a few years he founded convents at Paterno, 1444, and at Milazzo in Sicily, 1469. The new society was called "Hermits of St. Francis of Assisi". The Archbishop of Cosenza granted them of his own accord, in 1471, exemption from his jurisdiction (Lanovius, "Bullarium", 9), which privilege was confirmed by Sixtus IV, 1473 (Lanovius, "Bull.", 11). The same pontiff gave them the privileges of mendicant friars (q. v.). For 57 years (1435–93) the new foundation had no written rule, but in 1493 the first rule, containing 13 chapters, which was almost a faithful copy of that of St. Francis of Assisi, was confirmed by Alexander VI. (See text Lanovius, ad ann. 1493, and Bull. Rom., V, 352.) A second version of the rule in 10 chapters, which showed more independence of the Rule of St. Francis, was approved by Alexander VI in 1501. Here the fourth solemn vow of *vita quadragesimalis* appears, which forms the distinctive character of the Minims. In the same Bull of confirmation is inserted the rule of the third order in 7 chapters, for seculars of both sexes. (Text Lanovius ad ann. 1501; Bull. Rom., V, 385.) Hardly different from this second version is the rule confirmed in 1502. (Lanovius, ad ann. 1502.) Finally a third definite text of the rule of the first order, which is still observed by the Minims, was confirmed by Julius II, "Dudum ad sacrum ordinem", 28 July, 1506. (Bull. Rom., V, 421.) The rule of the second order, which is for sisters and which originated in Spain, appears for the first time in the same Bull. It is almost a literal adoption of the rule of the first order, while the rule of the third order here inserted is the same as that confirmed in 1501. The spirit which permeates these rules, especially those of the first and second orders, is that of great penance and abnegation. The fourth vow imposes perpetual abstinence from all flesh and white meats, and only in case of grave sickness by order of the physician may it be dispensed with. The Order of Minims is founded on the same principle of organization as that of all mendicants. The superiors are called correctors. At the head is the corrector general, who formerly was elected every three years, but since 1605 every six years. The corrector provincial is elected for three years, while the local superior is elected by each convent for only one year. The habit of the Minims is made of coarse black wool, has broad sleeves, and is girded by a thin black cord. The *mozzetta* of the *capuce* reaches below the cord, almost in the form of a scapular. To ensure the stricter observance of the rules of the first and second orders, Francis of Paula drew up a "Correctorium", consisting of ten chapters corresponding to the number of chapters in the rule, which determines the penance to be inflicted on those who transgress its precepts. This "Correctorium" was approved by Julius II in 1506 and by Leo X in 1517 (Digestum, see below, I, 55).

II. PROPAGATION AND ACTIVITIES.—The Order of the Minims, propagated at first in Italy was introduced by special royal favour into France, whither the holy founder was called in 1482. There the earliest convents were at Plessis-les-Tours, Amboise, and Nigeon, near Paris. On account of their great simplicity the Minims in France received the appellation of *bons hommes*. In 1495 Charles VIII of France founded in Rome the convent of Trinità dei Monti, which, by Bull of Innocent X (1645), was exclusively reserved to the French fathers. From France the Minims spread to Spain, where they were called "Fathers of the Victory", owing to the victory of King Ferdinand over the Moors of Malaga. In 1497 the Emperor Maximilian introduced the new order into Germany (Bohemia). At the death of St. Francis of Paula, 1507, there existed five provinces spread over Italy, France, Spain, and Germany.

A MINIM FRIAR

A little later the order counted 450 convents. In 1623 Dony d'Attichi gives the number of members as 6430, convents 359, and provinces 30, distributed in the principal Catholic countries of Europe. Lanovius in 1635 adds to the number of provinces three commissariates, of which one was in the West Indies. In 1646 the Propaganda approved the foundation of a mission in Canada, but it is not known if this plan was ever carried out (Roberti, II, 688). In England the Minims seem not to have had any convents, still some illustrious English members are recorded, as Thomas Felton, martyred in 1588, Henry More, nephew of the chancellor, Blessed Thomas More, d. at Reims, 1587; Andrew Folere, d. at Soissons, 1594. The second order was never very widely propagated. In 1623 there existed 11 convents with 360 sisters. The third order, on the contrary, found many adherents among the faithful in the countries where convents of the first order existed.

To give some indication of its activity we mention some of its most distinguished members. The first to be named is Bernard Boil (see BUIL, BERNARDO), the first vicar Apostolic in America, appointed 1493, who, as

the documents published by Fita certainly indicate, belonged at that time to the Minims, although the papal Bull of appointment (see reproduction in this ENCYCLOPEDIA, I, 414) used the words *ordinis Minorum*. See Roberti, op. cit. below, I, 89–102. Distinguished theologians were: Lalemandet, d. 1647; Salier, d. 1707; Boucat, d. 1718; Palanco, d. 1720; Perrimezzi, d. 1740; historians (see bibliography), Giry, d. 1688; Marin, d. 1767; mathematicians, Maignan, d. 1676; Mersenne, d. 1648; philosophers, Saguens, d. about 1718, and some of the previously mentioned theological authors. For the bishops chosen from this order see Roberti (op. cit. below, I, 377, II, 681). The cause for beatification of two Minims has been introduced.

III. PRESENT STATE.—Since the French Revolution the Minims are greatly reduced in number. At present there are 19 convents with about 330 friars. There are 15 convents in Italy, 2 in Sicily, 1 in Sardinia, and 1 in Spain. The corrector general resides at St. Andrea delle Fratte, Rome. There are two other convents at Rome, S. Francesco di Paola and S. Maria della Luce. The second order is spread especially in Spain, where it has 10 convents. There are single convents at Marseilles, Rome, and Todi. The third order is spread in Latin countries and also in South America, where secular priests are delegated and authorized to receive members.

ROBERTI (O. Minim.), *Disegno storio dell' Ordine de' Minimi dalla morte del santo Institutore fino ai nostri tempi*, I, *1507–1600* (Rome, 1902), II, *1600–1700* (Rome, 1909); FRANCISCUS LANOVIUS (O. Minim.), *Chronicon generale Ordinis Minimorum . . . accedit Registrum Pontificium seu Bullarium a Sixto IV ad Urbanum VIII* (Paris, 1635); DONY D'ATTICHI (O. Minim.), *Histoire Générale de l'Ordre des Minimes* (2 vols., Paris, 1624); JACOBUS LADORE-FRANC. A LONGOBARDIS (O. Minim.), *Digestum Sapientiæ Minimitanæ tripartitum, complectens regulas S. Francisci de Paula, Statuta Capitulorum Generalium . . .* 3 pts. (Rome, 1664); TOSCANO (O. Minim.), *Della vita di S. Francesco di Paola* (Venice, 1691). The rules of the three orders also in HOLSTENIUS, *Codex Regularium*, ed. BROCKIE, III (Augsburg, 1759), 84–100, and in *Bullarium Romanum*, V (Turin, 1860), passim. On the relation of the first redaction of the rule (1493) with the Rule of St. Francis, see MAZARRA, *Legendario Francescano*, IV (Venice, 1721), 441–60; MONTOIA (O. Minim.), *Crónica general de la Orden de los Minimos de S. Francisco de Paula* (Madrid, 1619); ANNIBALI DA LATERA (O. Minim.), *Compendio della Storia degli Ordini regolari esistenti*, pt. II, vol. II (Rome, 1791), 351; HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche*, 2nd ed., II (Paderborn, 1907), 527. For full bibliography see ROBERTI, I, 17–22, HEIMBUCHER, loc. cit. The information concerning the present state of the order was furnished by the present corrector general.

LIVARIUS OLIGER.

Minister.—The term *minister* has long been appropriated in a distinctive way to the clergy. The language of I Cor., iv, 1–2; Heb., viii, 2; Matt., xx, 26, etc. must have helped to familiarize the thought that those charged with spiritual functions in the Christian Church were called upon to be the servants (*ministri*) of their brethren. Even before the Reformation the word minister was occasionally used in English to describe those of the clergy actually taking part in a function, or the celebrant as distinguished from the assistants, but it was not then used *sine addito* to designate an ecclesiastic. This employment of the term dates from Calvin, who objected to the name priest etc. as involving an erroneous conception of the nature of the sacred office. These Calvinistic views had some influence in England. In the Book of Common Prayer the word minister occurs frequently in the sense of the officiant at a service, and in the thirty-second of the Canons Ecclesiastical (1603) we read "no bishop shall make a person deacon and minister both upon one day", where clearly minister stands as the equivalent of priest. As regards modern usage the Hist. Eng. Dictionary says: "The use of minister as the designation of an Anglican clergyman (formerly extensively current, sometimes with more specific application to a beneficed clergyman) has latterly become rare, and is now chiefly associated with Low Church views; but it is still the ordinary appellation of one appointed to spiritual office in any non-Episcopal communion, especially of one having a pastoral charge".

As regards Catholic use, minister is the title of certain superiors in various religious orders. The head of the Franciscan Order is known as the minister general, and the superior of the different provinces of the various branches is called minister provincial. The same is true of the Order of the Trinitarians for the Redemption of Captives and of some other orders. In the Society of Jesus the second in command in each house, who is usually charged with the internal discipline, the commissariat, etc., is called minister. The statement made in Addis and Arnold's "Catholic Dictionary" and thence incorporated into the great Hist. Eng. Dictionary that each of the five assistants of the General of the Jesuits is called minister is without foundation.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Minkelers, JEAN-PIERRE, inventor of illuminating gas; b. at Maastricht, Holland, 1748; d. there 4 July, 1824. At the age of sixteen, in 1764, he went to Louvain, where he studied theology and philosophy at the Collège du Faucon, in which he became professor of natural philosophy in 1772. At this time the question of aerostats and Montgolfiers was occupying the mind of scientists, and the Duc d'Arenberg, a Mæcenas of science and art, engaged a committee to examine into the question of the best gas for balloon purposes. Minkelers was on this committee, and published in 1784, after many experiments, a work entitled "Mémoire sur l'air inflammable tiré de différentes substances, rédigé par M. Minkelers, professeur de philosophie au collège du Faucon, université de Louvain" (Louvain, 1784). As an appendix to this memoir there was a "Table de gravités spécifiques des différentes espèces d'air", by T. F. Thysbaert, a member of the committee. In his memoir Minkelers tells us how he made his precious discovery: from the very beginning of his experiments he had had the idea of enclosing oil in the barrel of a gun and heating it in a forge. Under action of the heat the oil dissolved and gave place to a remarkably light gas, having other advantageous qualities. Having proved that oil gas was the best for balloons, Minkelers used it for many balloons which rose rapidly and travelled great distances in the neighbourhood of Louvain. As we learn from his pupil von Hulstein, who was in his class in 1785, Minkelers at times used this same gas to light his workshop. Moreover, the drift of his memoir proves clearly that in its inventor's eyes the great combustibility of the gas was one of its leading qualities. When Joseph II, in 1788, transferred the University of Louvain to Brussels, Minkelers continued as professor, but when it was removed back to Louvain he refused to return. He resigned in 1794 and was appointed professor of physics and chemistry at the Central School of Maastricht, 4 July, 1824.

MINKELERS, *Mémoire sur l'air inflammable tiré de différentes substances* (Louvain, 1784); DE RAS, *Historisch Verslag over J. P. Minkelers* (Maastricht, 1897); VERHAEGEN, *Les cinquante dernières années de l'université de Louvain* (Liège, 1894); DE BOCKE, *De vervaardiging van lichtgas uit steenkolen* (Alkmaar, 1882).

D. NYS.

Minnesota, one of the North Central States of the American Union, lies about midway between the eastern and western shores of the continent, and about midway between the Gulf of Mexico and Hudson's Bay.

GEOGRAPHY.—Minnesota extends from 43° 30′ to 49° N. lat. and from 89° 39′ to 97° 5′ W. long. Its length from north to south is about 400 miles, and its greatest breadth about 354 miles. Of its total area of 84,287 sq. miles, no less than 5637 are water surface, owing to the great number of inland lakes (numbering about ten thousand) and watercourses, large and

small. Minnesota is bounded on the north by Canada, on the east by Lake Superior and Wisconsin, on the south by Iowa, and on the west by North and South Dakota. Within the wide domain of the State originate the three principal water systems of North America: those of the Mississippi and the Red River of the North, and the St. Lawrence system beginning with the St. Louis River, which rises in the north-eastern part of Minnesota and flows into the western end of Lake Superior.

Soil and Geology.—A large portion of the state was originally prairie, but along the rivers a dense growth of trees has always extended, while, between the Minnesota River and the Mississippi and extending north-westerly, almost to the Red River, is the great forest of hardwood trees, commonly known as the "Big Woods". The northern part of the state was formerly covered with a dense growth of pine, and has supplied a large portion of the white pine utilized throughout the United States in various industries. Aside from the districts originally covered by pine and the rocky ridges near Lake Superior, the state possesses a warm, dark soil of great fertility. Its geological formations vary from the Laurentian trap-rock, granite, and basalt along the shore of Lake Superior and the banks of the St. Croix, with outcrops of similar formations in various other portions of the state, to the soft limestone of a later period. The granite is of various colours, ranging from dark brown to light grey, and is highly valued for building purposes. Another excellent building material is the Kasota limestone, which has been largely used in the construction of the new and magnificent state capitol. In the north-eastern, and to a considerable extent throughout the entire northern part of the state, are found extensive beds of iron ore of excellent quality. Shipments of this ore have been so great during recent years as to render Minnesota the greatest iron producing state of the Federal Union. No less than 150,000,000 tons of ore have been mined and shipped, and the amount still underground is estimated at fully one thousand million tons, a supply that will not be exhausted for fifty years.

Surface and Climate.—The fact that the state is the source of three continental river systems suggests its high elevation. The Mississippi, which has its chief source in Lake Itasca at an elevation of 1466 feet, leaves the state at 620 feet above sea-level. The Red River of the North rises near Itasca Lake at an altitude of 1600 feet, and, after a circuitous route south and west to Breckenridge in Wilkin County, turns north and enters Canada at an elevation of 750 feet. The Minnesota shore of Lake Superior is 602 feet above sea-level. The average elevation of the state is given as about 1275 feet, the highest elevation being the Misquah Hills in Cook County (2230 feet). Its elevation above the sea, its fine drainage, and the dryness of its atmosphere give Minnesota an unusually salubrious and most agreeable climate. The mean annual temperature is 44°; the mean summer temperature 70°. Owing to its higher latitude, Minnesota enjoys correspondingly longer days in summer than states farther south, and during the growing season there are two and a half hours more sunshine than (e. g.) in Cincinnati. This fact, taken in connexion with the abundant rainfall of early summer, accounts for the rapid and vigorous growth of crops in Minnesota and their early maturity. The winter climate is one of the attractive features of the state. Its uniformity, its general freedom from thaws, excessive periods of cold, severe weather, or heavy snowstorms, and its dryness, together with the bright sunshine and a full supply of ozone in the atmosphere, all tend to make the winters of Minnesota very delightful. It is asserted by labourers from abroad that they can work out-of-doors on more days of the year in Minnesota than in any other region in which they have lived.

Name.—The name of the state is derived from the Dakota language. Before the white men came to their hunting grounds, the Dakotas called the river which rises on the western border of the state and flows into the Mississippi near the site of St. Paul the *Minisotah* (*mini*, water; *sotah*, sky-coloured), and, when the region between the western border of Wisconsin and the Missouri River was organized by Congress into a territory, it was given the name of this river in a slightly modified form— the name which the state bears at present.

History.—At the time when the explorations of white men began, the region now known as Minnesota was inhabited by people of two great divisions of the American race. From the southern boundary of the state as far north as lat. 46° 30′, the land was inhabited by the Dakotas, while the shore of Lake Superior and the northern portion of the state were occupied by the Ojibways. Many places in Minnesota bear Indian names, and those derived from the respective languages of these two aboriginal nations show very clearly at the present time the areas which they respectively occupied. The French came into contact, first with the Ojibways and other kindred Indian nations of the Algonquin family, who in their language designated the Dakotas the *Nadouessioux* (Ojibway for "enemies"). The French soon abbreviated this long word into its final syllable, and called the Dakotas the *Sioux*, under which title they have been commonly known since the days of Marquette and Allouez.

Seal of Minnesota

The real history of the state may be said to begin in 1680 with the visit to the Falls of St. Anthony and adjacent regions made by Rev. Louis Hennepin and his companions, Accault and Augelle. During the same year Sieur Daniel Greyolson Du Lhut explored the northern part of the state, and, in July, joined Father Hennepin at or near the lake now known as Mille Lacs. Late in the autumn Du Lhut and Hennepin departed from the land of the Dakotas and returned to Eastern Canada. From the time of these explorations to the English conquest of Canada in 1760, France held sway over the Upper Mississippi region. Formal assertion of sovereignty was made in 1689, as appears from a document drawn up at Green Bay on the western shore of Lake Michigan, in which Nicholas Perrot, commanding for the king at that post and holding a commission from Marquis Denonville, Governor of New France, issued a declaration in these words:

"We this day, the 8th day of May, 1689, do in the presence of Reverend Father Marest of the Society of Jesus, Missionary among the Nadouessioux; of Monsieur de Borieguillot, commanding the French in the neighbourhood of the Ouiskonche on the Mississippi; Augustine Legardeur, Sieur de Caumont, and of Messieurs Le Sueur, Hebert Lemire, and Blein:

"Declare to all whom it may concern, that, being come to the Bay des Puants [Green Bay], and to the Lake of Ouiskonches, and to the River Mississippi, we did transport ourselves to the country of the Nadouessioux, on the border of the River St. Croix, and to the mouth of the River St. Pierre, on the bank of which were the Mantantans; and further up to the interior to the north-east of the Mississippi, as far as the Menchokatonx, with whom dwell the majority of the Songeskitons, and other Nadouessioux, who are to the

north-east of the Mississippi, to take possession for, and in the name of, the King, of the countries and rivers inhabited by the said tribes, and of which they are the proprietors. The present act done in our presence, and signed with our hand and subscribed."

Without delay, practical measures were taken to ensure the rights of France. A map of the year 1700 shows a fort on the west side of Lake Pepin. In 1695 a second post was established by Le Sueur on an island above the lake. Thus, in the beginning of the eighteenth century what was officially termed "La Baye Department", consisting of a line of military and trading posts, was organized to command the waterway from Green Bay to the Falls of St. Anthony. Not until 1727, however, were systematic efforts made to establish permanent military garrisons north of the mouth of the Wisconsin River.

In the spring of 1685 Governor De La Barre of New France sent from Quebec to the west twenty men under the command of Nicholas Perrot to establish friendly alliances with the Dakotas. Proceeding to the Mississippi, he established a post near the outlet of Lake Pepin, which was known as Fort Perrot. War having been declared in 1687 between the French and the Indians, Perrot and his followers left the Mississippi River and repaired to Mackinac. Early in 1689, however, he returned with a party of forty men to his post on Lake Pepin, and re-established trade with the Dakotas. On a map published in 1700 this post is denominated Fort Bon Secours; three years later it was marked Fort Le Sueur, but was in that year abandoned. In a much later map it is correctly called Fort Perrot. In 1700, acting upon the recommendation of the Governor of Louisiana, Pierre Le Sueur, a native of Artois, France, came to the region now known as Minnesota with an intelligent ship carpenter named Penicaut and about twenty others, in search of copper which, according to earlier explorers, existed in the Sioux country. Le Sueur and his party spent the winter of that year in the neighbourhood of the great bend of the Minisotah, and there gathered a large quantity of green earth which was supposed to contain copper in the crude state. From the circumstance that this earth is sometimes described by Le Sueur and his contemporaries as "blue earth", that name has been given to the tributary of the Minnesota River at the mouth of which Le Sueur spent a winter and built a fort, and also to the country within which the site of this old fort is situated. The Dakota word *Mahkahto* means blue or green earth, and that word, corrupted in the course of time to *Mankato*, is the name of the county seat of Blue Earth County.

A trading company, formed in Montreal to carry on traffic in furs with the Indians of the La Baye Department, dispatched on 16 June, 1727, an expedition under René Boucher to the land of the Sioux. The expedition arrived at its destination on the shore of Lake Pepin on 17 September. Two Jesuit missionaries, Michel Guignas and Nicholas de Gonnor, accompanied Boucher and his small command. Before the end of October a small fort, called *Beauharnois* as a compliment to the Governor of New France, was built on the low lands opposite the towering cliff which now bears the name of Maiden Rock. A chapel was erected within the enclosure of Fort Beauharnois, and was dedicated to St. Michael the Archangel. This was the first Christian temple to cast its beneficent shadow upon the soil of Minnesota. The first ceremony of note in the new chapel was the celebration of the feast of St. Charles of which Father Guignas writes: "We did not forget that the 4th day of the month [November] was the saint's day of the general. Holy Mass was said for him in the morning, and we were well prepared to celebrate the event in the evening, but the slowness of the pyrotechnists and the variableness of the weather led to the postponement of the celebration to the 14th of the same month, when some very beautiful rockets were shot off and the air was made to resound with a hundred shouts of 'Vive le Roy' and 'Vive Charles de Beauharnois'. . . . What contributed very much to the merry-making was the fright of some Indians. When these poor people saw fireworks in the air and the stars falling from the sky, the women and children fled and the more courageous of the men cried for mercy, and earnestly begged that we should stop the astonishing play of the terrible medicine." It may be stated in explanation that, among all the American Indians, any phenomenon which exerted a powerful influence upon the physical and nervous system was designated by a term corresponding to the word medicine in other languages.

In a report made in October, 1728, by the Governor of Canada to the Government of France, Fort Beauharnois was said to be badly situated on account of freshets "and, therefore," as the report says, "this fort could be removed four or five arpents from the lake shore without prejudice to the views entertained in building it on its present site." The report declares that the interests of religion, of the service, and of the colony demand that the fort on the bank of Lake Pepin be permanently maintained. In September, 1730, Fort Beauharnois was rebuilt on a plot of higher ground near the old establishment. Upon this lofty site, surrounded by some of the most beautiful scenery in America, now stands the Ursuline Convent, Villa Maria. The convent chapel very properly bears the same name as its historic predecessor, St. Michael the Archangel. Sieur Linctot was made commandant of the new fort in June, 1731, and in 1735 was succeeded by St. Pierre. The Dakotas having shown a very hostile spirit, St. Pierre decided to abandon Fort Beauharnois, and accordingly on 13 May, 1737, the post was burned. In 1743, and again in 1746, representative chiefs of the Dakota nation made a journey to Quebec and presented to the Government of New France a petition for the re-establishment of the fort and for the restoration of trade relations. Their request was not granted until 1750, when Pierre Marin was commissioned to rebuild the little fortress. Fort Beauharnois was retained until the outbreak of the war between the English and French, but it was never occupied after the surrender which followed the defeat of Montcalm in the famous battle of Quebec (1759).

About one-third of the state, comprising its north-eastern part to the east of the Mississippi, was included in the territory surrendered by Great Britain under the treaty of 1783, at the end of the War of Independence; the greater portion (about two-thirds) of the territory embraced within the boundaries of Minnesota, however, was included in the Louisiana Purchase, ceded to the United States by France in 1803. In 1805 a grant of land nine miles square, at the confluence of the Mississippi and St. Peter (now Minnesota) Rivers, was obtained from the Sioux Indians. A military post was established on the grant in 1819, and in 1820 arrangements were made for the erection of a fort, which was completed in 1822 and named, at first Fort St. Anthony, but later Fort Snelling after the commanding officer. The grant has ever since been known as the Fort Snelling Reservation. In 1823 the first steamboat ascended the Mississippi as far as Fort Snelling, and annually thereafter one or two trips were made by steamboats to this isolated post for a number of years.

From the date of the English victory over the French until the establishment of Fort St. Anthony by the Government of the United States, conditions were unfavourable for the maintenance of Catholic missions in the Upper Mississippi country. However, some colonists from Switzerland, who possessed the true Faith and spoke the French language, having migrated from their original settlements near Fort Garry in Canada to a place seven or eight miles below

the Falls of St. Anthony, Bishop Mathias Loras of Dubuque, whose diocese included the entire region now called Minnesota, visited Fort Snelling and the adjacent Swiss settlement in 1839, and in the following year sent a missionary to Minnesota, Father Lucien Galtier. The latter established himself upon the present site of the metropolitan city of St. Paul, and in the following year built a log chapel which he called by the name of the great Apostle of the Gentiles. The gradual increase of population about the chapel, the development of the community into a village and finally into a large city under the name of St. Paul, constitute an imposing material monument to the missionary zeal of Father Galtier, and for ever associate the name and fame of the capital city of Minnesota with the glories of the Catholic Faith. Minnesota was organized as a Federal territory by Act of Congress of 1849, and, on 11 May, 1858, its territorial existence terminated and it became a state.

Population.—The population of the state has shown a rapid increase. According to the successive census returns the population was: 172,023 in 1860; 250,099 in 1865; 439,706 in 1870; 780,773 in 1880; 1,117,798 in 1885; 1,301,826 in 1890; 1,997,912 in 1905. In that year, the population of the five largest cities was: Minneapolis, 261,874; St. Paul, 197,023; Duluth, 64,942; Winona, 20,334; Stillwater, 12,435. The population of Minnesota according to nationalities was thus classified by the census of the year 1905:

Native born	366,767
Minnesota born	1,057,566
Germany	119,868
Sweden	126,283
Norway	111,611
Canada	47,211
Ireland	19,531
Denmark	16,266
England	11,598
Bohemia	8,403
Poland	7,881
Finland	19,847
Austria	14,403
Russia	8,835
Scotland	4,651
France	1,277
Wales	1,035
All other Countries	18,345

This makes a total foreign born population of 537,041. The inmates of state institutions, and the 10,225 Indians in the state at the time of taking the census, are not included in the above figures.

The progress of the Catholic Faith in Minnesota has been marvellous. In 1841 the mission of Father Galtier included some twenty families, and in 1851, when Father Joseph Crétin (q. v.) was named first Bishop of St. Paul, the number of Catholics in Minnesota is estimated to have been about 1000. In 1888 the See of St. Paul was raised to archiepiscopal rank, the dioceses of St. Cloud, Winona, Duluth, Fargo, Sioux Falls, and Lead becoming later its suffragans. As each of these dioceses is treated in a special article, it will be sufficient to quote here some general statistics for the State of Minnesota, which includes the Archdiocese of St. Paul and the first three of the above-named suffragans: 1 archbishop; 4 bishops; 602 priests (476 secular); 406 churches with resident priests; 168 missions with churches; 67 missions without churches; 67 chapels; 1 university; 6 orphan asylums; 14 hospitals; 32,426 children in parochial schools; 427,627 Catholics. The recently established Diocese of Crookston, separated from Duluth, will constitute an additional suffragan of St. Paul.

Liberty of Conscience.—The Constitution provides expressly for religious liberty by declaring that "the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience shall never be infringed nor shall any man be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any religious or ecclesiastical ministry, against his consent, nor shall any control of or interference with the rights of conscience be permitted or any preference be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship." It further provides: "No religious test or amount of property shall ever be required as a qualification for any office of public trust under the State. No religious test or amount of property shall ever be required as a qualification of any voter at any election in this state; nor shall any person be rendered incompetent to give evidence in any court of law or equity in consequence of his opinion upon the subject of religion." This Constitution has been interpreted by the legislature in the most liberal manner, and Minnesota has led all of the other states in the Union in providing liberty of conscience and the free exercise of religion in favour of the inmates of penal, correctional, and eleemosynary institutions. The general statutes now in force contain these provisions: "Religious Instruction.—Said Board [The State Board of Control] shall provide at least one hour, on the first day of each week, between nine o'clock a. m. and five o'clock p. m., for religious instruction to inmates of all prisons and reformatories under its control, during which clergymen of good standing in any church or denomination may freely administer and impart religious rites and instruction to those desiring the same. It shall provide a private room where such instruction can be given by clergymen of the denomination desired by the inmate, or in case of minors, by the parents or guardian, and, in case of sickness, some other day or hour may be designated; but all sectarian practices are prohibited, and no officer or employee of the institution shall attempt to influence the religious belief of any inmate, and none shall be required to attend religious services against his will" (Revised Laws, 1905, chap. 25, sec. 1903). As to the state prison, the laws provide: "Visitors.—Fees.—The members of the state board of control, the governor, lieutenant governor, members of the legislature, state officers, and regularly authorized ministers of the Gospel may visit the prisoners at pleasure, but no other persons, without special permission of the warden, under rules prescribed by said board. A moderate fee may be required of visitors, other than those allowed to visit at pleasure. Such fees shall be used to defray the expenses of ushers for conducting such visitors, for the maintenance of the prison library, the prison band, and other entertainments of the inmates" (Chap. 105, sec. 5434).

Regulations Concerning Property.—The Constitution of Minnesota provides security for private rights in the declaration that "every person is entitled to a certain remedy in the laws for all injuries or wrongs which he may receive in his person, property or character; he ought to obtain justice freely and without purchase; completely and without denial; promptly and without delay; conformably to the laws", and by the further provision that, "private property shall not be taken, destroyed or damaged for public use, without compensation therefor first paid or secured". To prevent any revival of abuses and monopolies such as grew up under the feudal system, the Constitution contained this provision: "All lands within this State are declared to be allodial, and feudal tenures of every description, with all their incidents, are prohibited. Leases and grants of agricultural land for a longer period than twenty-one years, hereafter made, in which shall be reserved any rent or service of any kind, shall be void."

The statutes of Minnesota provide for the free and untrammelled acquisition of real property, and also for abundant security to its possessor. Estates in lands are divided by statute into estates of inheritance, estates for life, estates for years, and estates at will and by sufferance. The decisions of the Supreme Court

establish the principle that tenancies from year to year are estates at will. The laws further provide that every estate of inheritance shall continue to be termed a fee simple, or fee; and every such estate when not defeasible or conditional, shall be a fee simple absolute. All estates which would at common law be considered as estates tail are deemed and adjudged to be fee simple estates in the person who would, otherwise, be seized thereof in fee tail. Every future estate is void in its creation, which suspends the absolute power of alienation by any limitation for a longer period than during the continuance of two lives in being at the creation of the estate, except that a contingent remainder in fee may be created on a prior remainder in fee, to take effect in the event that the persons, to whom the first remainder is limited, die under the age of twenty-one years, or upon any other contingency by which the estate of such persons may be determined before they attain their full age. The rule in Shelley's case has been abolished. With a few express exceptions, no corporation, unless organized for the construction or operation of a railway, canal, or turnpike, may acquire more than five thousand (5000) acres of land. Uses and trusts, with a few exceptions, have been abolished.

Religious Corporations.—In furtherance of the liberal principles regarding the exercise of religion contained in the state Constitution, the laws of Minnesota provide for the creation of religious corporations and special statutory provisions enable a bishop of the Catholic Church, in association with the vicar-general and the chancellor of his diocese, to create such diocese a corporate body. The bishop and vicar-general, in association with the pastor of any parish, are likewise authorized to create parochial corporations. These corporations have the right to acquire and to hold land to the same extent as have individuals. Every person (and the term includes married women) may dispose of his estate, real and personal, or any part thereof, or right or interest therein, by a last will and testament, in writing. There is no limitation on religious bequests, and full force and effect have been given thereto by the decisions of the courts.

Charitable Societies and Institutions.—The laws of Minnesota contain the most liberal provisions for the founding and incorporation of charitable societies. Under these provisions, many Catholic hospitals, orphanages, refuges, and reformatories have been established. The public charitable institutions of the state are various and manifold. Provision is made for the care and treatment of all insane persons, not only in great general hospitals, but also in various institutions equipped with buildings on the "cottage group" plan for the custody of the harmless and incurable insane. The state prison is situated at Stillwater and is a most admirably conducted penitentiary. The state reformatory is at St. Cloud and receives for correction, rather than for punishment, offenders whose ages range from sixteen to thirty years. This institution is managed upon the benevolent plan of instruction of the mind and the rehabilitation of character. For boys of wayward tendencies who have repeatedly violated the laws of the state, is provided the state training school, at Red Wing, which is not only a school of moral and mental discipline, but also a manual training school. Wayward girls are accommodated and placed under moral restraint at a similar institution. Each county provides for paupers in a county alms-house, and also distributes out-door relief to the poor. All public charitable institutions and agencies are under the watchful care of the state board of control, consisting of three members appointed by the governor. The board of control not only has visitorial powers, but is also invested with administrative functions. It has proved highly efficient. The public charities of Minnesota are famous throughout the world for their advanced humanitarianism and general excellence.

Marriage and Divorce.—The statutes of Minnesota declare that marriage, so far as its validity in law is concerned, is a civil contract, to which the consent of the parties capable in law of contracting is essential. Every male person who has attained the full age of eighteen years, and every female person who has attained the full age of fifteen years, is capable in law of contracting marriage, if otherwise competent. No marriage may be contracted while either of the parties has a husband or wife living; nor within six months after either has been divorced from a former spouse; nor between parties who are nearer of kin than first cousin, whether of the half or full blood, computed by the rules of the civil law; nor between persons either one of whom is epileptic, imbecile, feeble-minded, or insane. Marriage may be solemnized by any justice of the peace in the county in which he is elected, and throughout the state by any judge of a court of record, the superintendent of the department for the deaf and dumb (in the state school for the deaf and dumb), or by any licensed or ordained minister of the gospel in regular communion with a religious society. Before any persons are joined in marriage, a license must be obtained from the clerk of the district court of the county in which the woman resides, or, if not a resident of the state, then from such clerk in the county where the marriage is to take place.

The statutes of Minnesota are liberal in regard to divorce. A divorce from the bonds of matrimony may be adjudged by the district court for any of the following causes: (1) adultery; (2) impotency; (3) cruel and inhuman treatment; (4) sentence to imprisonment in any state prison or state reformatory subsequent to the marriage, and in such case a pardon will not restore conjugal rights; (5) wilful desertion for one year next preceding the filing of the complaint; (6) habitual drunkenness for one year immediately preceding the filing of the complaint. Limited divorces, extending to a separation *a mensa et toro* permanently or for a limited time, may be adjudged by the district court, on the complaint of a married woman, between any husband and wife who are inhabitants of the state, or in cases where the marriage has taken place within the state and the wife is an actual resident at the time of filing her complaint; or in cases where the marriage has taken place outside the state and the parties have been inhabitants of the state at least one year, and the wife shall be an actual resident at the time of the filing of her complaint. The grounds upon which limited divorces may be granted are: (1) cruel and inhuman treatment by the husband; (2) such conduct on the part of a husband toward his wife as may render it unsafe and improper for her to cohabit with him; (3) the abandonment of the wife by the husband and his refusal or neglect to provide for her.

Public Education.—The public property of the state consists of realty used in connexion with the various public institutions, and also of a large public domain consisting of lands granted to the State Government by the General Government of the United States at the time when the State of Minnesota was admitted to the Union; such grants having been made for the benefit of the state university, for the support of the common school system, and for the purpose of making internal improvements. The title to such lands is vested in the State of Minnesota, and the care and control of such lands is vested in the auditor of the state, who is ex officio Land Commissioner of Minnesota. The portion of the grant assigned to the support of public education has been estimated by competent authority to be sufficient to yield ultimately a fund of $250,000,000. The educational system of the state is organized as follows: School districts are divided into common, independent, and special. Among schools are distinguished state rural schools, state

semi-graded schools, state graded schools, state high schools, normal schools, and university. A common school district is controlled by a board of three members; an independent, by one of six members; a special, by a board of six or more members. Common schools are supervised by a county superintendent; independent and special districts have their own superintendents, and in the main are not subject to the county superintendents. The state graded and state high schools are subject to a board of five members; the president of the state university, the superintendent of public instruction, and the president of normal school board are ex-officio members, a city superintendent or high school principal and a fifth member are appointed by the governor. The normal schools are controlled by a board of nine members; five of these are resident directors; three are appointed for the state at large, and one, the superintendent of public instruction, serves ex-officio. The state university is situated in Minneapolis and is in a most flourishing condition. Its enrollment for the year 1909–10 includes 5000 students. The university is controlled by a board of twelve regents; the governor, the president of the university and the superintendent of public instruction are ex-officio members, and nine are appointed by the governor.

The public schools of the state are supported by a direct tax upon the property of the school districts, by a county one-mill ($·001) tax, by a state mill tax, and by the income from the permanent school fund, together with small fines that are accredited to this fund. No religious school receives any subsidy direct or indirect. The educational institutions established by the Catholic Church have exhibited wonderful vitality and increase. The Seminary of St. Paul, a monument to the zeal of Archbishop Ireland, is the leading institution of theological instruction in the Northwest. A university is conducted by the Benedictines at Collegeville, in the Diocese of St. Cloud, Minnesota, and is well supplied with all the facilities for modern education, including laboratory equipment and scientific collections. The College of St. Thomas at St. Paul has not only acquired a reputation as a seat of learning and sound instruction in the classics, but also as a military school of the first rank. It is attended by six hundred cadets and is constantly expanding both in educational facilities and in attendance. The College of St. Catherine at St. Paul is the leading Catholic institution for the education of women, but the education of girls and women is provided for in many other excellent institutions in the Archdiocese of St. Paul and other parts of the state.

BANCROFT, *Hist. of the U. S. A.*, II (Boston, 1879); NEILL, *Hist. of Minnesota* (Minneapolis, 1882); *Diocese of St. Paul, Golden Jubilee* (St. Paul, 1901); SHEA, *Hennepin's Description of Louisiana; Jesuit Relations*, LXVIII, 207; *Annals of the Faith* (Dublin, 1840); *Memoirs of Rev. A. Ravoux* (St. Paul, 1900).

JOHN W. WILLIS.

Minor (Lat. *minor*), that which is less, or inferior in comparison with another, the term being employed as well of things as of persons. To glance rapidly at its application to things, we may mention *causæ minores*, matters of lesser importance, as opposed to *causæ majores*, those more important; minor benefices as opposed to the major benefices, which imply jurisdiction and are confirmed in papal consistory; minor churches or those of inferior rank; the minor excommunication (now out of use), as opposed to the major excommunication. In reference to persons, certain uses of the word minor may also be mentioned which depend upon usage rather than upon law: the younger of two persons of the same name is sometimes called minor (or "the less") as St. James the Less. Through humility St. Francis of Assisi gave his religious the name of "Friars Minor", that is, less than other friars.

But in its most frequent and most strictly judicial acceptation, the word designates a person who, having passed his infancy, has not yet reached the age required by law for the performance of certain acts or the exercise of certain rights; in practice the utmost limit is considered, and beyond it there exists no restriction; those are called minors who have not yet reached the age at which the law makes them capable of performing all civil acts whatever, especially the administration of their property. This age being fixed by most modern laws at twenty-one years, everyone is a minor until the age of twenty-one, or whatever may be the legal age of majority. As the matter is primarily one of civil rights, the Church leaves distinctions to the civil law. In what concerns canon law and Christian acts, no uniform limit of minority has ever been established; for given acts and rights the canon law and ecclesiastical usage have established the necessary and sufficient age. In the first place children are not considered as minors; it is presumed that until the age of reason, legally fixed at seven years, a child possesses neither the intelligence nor the experience to commit sin or to exercise any rights whatsoever. When no longer a child a person becomes a minor. Minors are either under or over the age of puberty, which is fixed by the Roman law at fourteen full years for boys and twelve full years for girls; between the age of seven years and that of puberty they are said to be nearer, or less near to infancy or puberty, as the case may be. For those under puberty, there begins with the age of reason the obligation of observing the moral law and those precepts of the Church from which they are not exempt by their age, notably the obligation to receive the Sacraments; such minors therefore are capable of sinning although their responsibility is less in proportion as they are nearer childhood; for this reason they are not liable to the penalties of the *forum externum*, except where this is specially provided. It is presumed that with puberty the Christian begins to enjoy the plenitude of his intelligence and liberty in spiritual matters and purely personal rights: the minor of the age of puberty can contract marriage, he can receive minor orders, and be nominated to and administrate a benefice (Conc. Trid., Sess. XXIII, c. vi, "De ref."; c. iii, "De judic.", in 6). There are, however, acts binding his future which he cannot perform until at a more advanced age; he cannot make a religious profession until the age of sixteen is completed (Conc. Trid., Sess. XXV. "De regular", c. xv); he cannot receive the sub-diaconate before his twenty-first year (Sess. XXIII. c. vii). At the age of twenty-one, too, he begins to be subject to the law of fasting. (For more ample developments see AGE, CANONICAL.)

A leading characteristic in all legislation on minors is the protection afforded them in regard to the administration of property and the obligations which they can assume in reference to third parties. As a general rule the liberty of minors is unrestrained as to contracts which are to their advantage, but they cannot make any contracts which are burdensome to themselves except under certain determined formalities, and with the required authorization. Still more, if they consider themselves as suffering by such contracts they may, by the terms of the Roman Law ("De minorib., xxv, ann." ff., IV, iv), for four years after their majority of twenty-five years, obtain the "restitutio in integrum", i. e. a judicial decree restored the condition of things which existed before the contract by which the minor suffered. These provisions have been more or less completely embodied in the modern laws of various countries, the discussion of which would be out of place here. It is enough to say that the canon law has accepted them (Decret., lib. I, tit. xli, "De in integrum restitutione"), and applied them to churches and other juridical entities which it was expedient to protect against maladministration. When it is said that churches are assimilated to minors (c. vii, 3, 8, "De in integrum restit.") the meaning is that, in respect to burdensome contracts,

churches and other ecclesiastical establishments are subject to the same protective measures, and enjoy the same privileges, as minors.

D'ANNIBALE, *Summula*, I, n. 33; FERRARIS, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, s. v. *Ætas;* the Canonists on lib. I, Decret, tit. lxi. See also bibliography to AGE, CANONICAL.

A. BOUDINHON.

Minorca, DIOCESE OF (MINORICENSIS), suffragan of Valencia, comprises the Island of Minorca, the second in size of the Balearic Islands, which are possessions of Spain. The civil capital is Port Mahon; the ecclesiastical, Ciudadela. The origin of the Diocese of Minorca is not known, but it certainly existed in the fifth century, as its bishop, Macarius, together with Elias and Opilio, Bishops of Majorca and Iviza, came to Carthage in 484 to make profession of his faith. Baronius published from a Vatican MS., a letter of Severus, Bishop of Minorca in the fifth century. Dameto translates and inserts it. The learned Antonio Roig, a native of Minorca, rector of Felanitx, published in 1787 a Latin treatise commenting upon it and defending its authenticity. But the account of the expedition undertaken, under the direction of a certain Theodore, to convert the Jews who were in possession of Minorca, and the events therein related, are of a legendary character.

The Vandals took possession of Minorca, as well as of Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily, and during their dominion the Diocese of Minorca was under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan See of Sardinia. The Bull of Pope Romanus, dated 897, in which among other territories assigned to the Bishop of Gerona we find the islands of Majorca and Minorca, shows that the invasion of Spain by the Mohammedans brought the existence of the Diocese of Minorca to an end. It was not re-established until the eighteenth century. When Minorca was recovered, in 1783, from the English, who obtained possession of it in the War of the Spanish Succession (1701–14), the re-establishment of the diocese was considered. Pius VI by the Bull of 23 July, 1795, erected the new Diocese of Minorca. Its first bishop, Antonio Vila, a native of Minorca, took possession of the see on 2 September, 1798. He was a man of learning, and the author of "El noble bien educado" (Madrid, 1776), "Vida y Virtudes del invicto mártir . . . S. Juan Nepomuceno" (Madrid, 1777), and "El Vasallo instruido" (Madrid, 1792). The last-named won for its author his canonry in the cathedral of Minorca. He also worked on an encyclopedic dictionary of which twenty volumes in folio are still preserved in the cathedral of Albarracín. On 25 July, 1802, Bishop Vila was transferred to the Diocese of Albarracín, where he died 30 October, 1809. D. Pedro Antonio Juano was appointed to succeed him in 1814, and was followed by the famous D. Jaime Creus y Martí, canon of Urgel, president of the Junta Suprema of Catalonia during the War of Independence, deputy in the Cortes of Cadiz, and a member of the Royal Council. Having been raised to the dignity of Archbishop of Tarragona, he was succeeded by D. Antonio de Ceruelo and the Dominican Fray Antonio Diaz Merino, who, since 1825, had been an active collaborator in the "Biblioteca de Religión". In 1837 Fray Antonio was exiled first to Cadiz and then to France, and died at Marseilles in 1844. His successor, D. Mateo Jaume was present at the Vatican Council. Since then the see has been filled in succession by D. Manuel Mercador (1875–90), D. Juan Comes y Vidal, founder of the Academia de la Juventud Católica (26 July, 1906), D. Salvador Castellote y Pinazo (1901–6), and D. Juan Torres y Ribas, the present bishop.

The capital, Port Mahon, which has a population of 18,445, is on the east coast and has the best port in the Mediterranean. The saying, "Junio, Julio, Agosto y Puerto Mahón, Los mejores puertos del Mediterraneo son" (June, July, August, and Port Mahon are the best harbours in the Mediterranean), is attributed to the famous Andrea Doria. At the entrance stand the fortresses of San Felipe, built by Philip II, la Mola, and Isabel II. The Isla del Rey (Island of the King), so called from the fact that Alfonso III landed there when he visited Minorca in 1287, is in the centre. In the thirteenth century the famous military hospital was built on this island. Port Mahon has a school for secondary instruction and a custom-house of the first order.

Among the public buildings the most noteworthy are the court-house and the parish church built by order of Alfonso III. The latter has a magnificent organ. A handsome façade ornaments the entrance to the cemetery. Ciudadela, the episcopal city, is believed to be the Jamnona of the Carthaginians, founded by their captain Jamna, or Jama. Many traces of an earlier Celtic civilization are to be found here, among which may be mentioned the *talayots* (Cyclopean constructions of huge blocks of stone in the shape of a tower with a high entrance), obelisks, dolmens, covered galleries, and *corneillons*, or Celtic cemeteries. Many Roman inscriptions, vases, and coins are also to be found. The city is fairly well laid out and well kept, and has a population of 8,000. It has a fortress and other defensive works. On the Paseo del Borne there is an obelisk about 72 feet in height, erected to the memory of the heroes of 9 July, 1558, when the Turks attacked Ciudadela. The defenders of the city on this occasion were commanded by Negrete y Arquimbau, and the monument was erected on the initiative of the Franciscan, José Niu, who died caring for the victims of the cholera epidemic of 1865.

The cathedral of Minorca had, from the time of its foundation in 1287, all the magnificence requisite for the only parish church of Ciudadela, then the capital of the island. A memorial tablet of the year 1362 says that Juan Corça held a benefice in this church. Constructed in the Gothic style of architecture, with a single nave, it presents an imposing appearance. The belfry is square, finished with an octagonal spire. In the beginning of the last century the main entrance was enriched with a mass of Græco-Roman architecture, but the original Gothic portal is still preserved behind this. When the Turks attacked the city they fired the church. Bishop Comes y Vidal restored it, adding numerous small windows, and restoring the main altar. Other church buildings of note are the chapel of the convent of the Poor Clares (ogival style) and the church of San Agustín, very spacious and elegant. The latter has two towers on each side of the portico, colossal frescoes, now in a bad state of preservation, and rich gildings; it is used at present for the chapel of the diocesan seminary which was installed by Bishop Jaume in the ancient convent del Socorro. This seminary (San Ildefonso) was founded by the learned Franciscan Niu, in 1858. Lastly, there may be mentioned the church of San Francisco, in the Gothic style.

Crónica general de España; FULGOSIO, *Crónica de las islas Baleares* (Madrid, 1867); *Biografía eclesiástica completa* (Madrid, 1848–68); DE LA FUENTE, *Historia eclesiástica de España* (Barcelona, 1855), III; PIFERRER AND CUADRADO, *España, sus monumentos y artes: Islas Baleares* (Barcelona, 1888).

RAMÓN RUIZ AMADO.

Minor Clerks Regular. See FRANCIS CARACCIOLO, SAINT.

Minorites. See FRANCISCAN ORDER; FRIARS MINOR.

Minor Orders (Lat. *Ordines Minores*).—The lower degrees of the hierarchy are designated by the name of minor orders, in opposition to the "major" or "sacred" orders. At the present time the ranks of the clergy are entered by the tonsure (q. v.), after which all the orders without omission are received in succession. Moreover, ecclesiastics, as a general rule, no longer remain in the lower orders, the liturgical functions of which are discharged either by the clergy in the higher orders, as in exorcism, or by the

laity, as in singing and serving at the altar. Formerly one entered the clergy by being appointed to discharge any of the functions reserved to ecclesiastics. Such functions were of two kinds. The liturgical ones constituted orders, though of a lower rank; by ordination the recipients of the minor orders received official authority to perform these functions. The other ecclesiastical functions were rather offices entrusted to clerics, whether ordained or not. Thus in the first centuries there figured in the ranks of the clergy notaries, *defensores ecclesiæ*, *œconomi*, catechists, cantors, *fossores* (for the cemeteries), etc., to say nothing of deaconesses. But these various offices did not constitute orders, and those who filled them formed part of the clergy without having been ordained, like tonsured clerics and lay-brothers of to-day. As to the liturgical functions attached to the various minor orders, they are really but a participation, originally rather indefinite, in the liturgical ministry formerly confided entirely to the deacons. This explains why minor orders differ in the Latin Church and in the various Eastern Churches.

In the East, though at an early date we hear of porters and exorcists (never of acolytes), after the Trullan Synod in 692, in accordance with its sixth canon, only lectors and cantors are known, and often even these orders coalesce, or are conferred at the same time; the three other minor orders of the Latin Church (porter, exorcist, acolyte) are held to be included in the subdiaconate. In the East, moreover, the subdiaconate has remained a minor order; in the West it was gradually detached from the minor orders, on account of its higher liturgical functions and also because of the vow of celibacy it called for. Finally, Innocent III definitively included it in the major orders, and made the subdeacon, as well as the deacon and priest, eligible for the episcopate (c. 9, "De ætate et qualit.", I, tit. 14, an. 1207). There are, then, in the Western Church four minor orders: porter, lector, exorcist, and acolyte; the cantors merely exercise an office and are not an order. These four orders are all mentioned about the year 252 in the famous letter of Pope Cornelius to Fabius of Antioch (Euseb., "Hist. Eccl.", I, vi, 43): "He (Novatian) knew that there were in this Church (of Rome) 46 priests, 7 deacons, 7 subdeacons, 42 acolytes, and 52 exorcists, lectors, and porters." This quotation shows that besides the acolytes, who were enumerated separately and were at Rome almost assimilated with the subdeacons, there was a kind of indefinite class formed by the clerics of the three latter orders. This seems to indicate that all clerics did not necessarily pass through the four lower orders; as a matter of fact the Council of Sardica (can. xiii) mentions only the lectorate as obligatory before receiving the diaconate. Pope Siricius (Ad Himerium, nn. 9–10) and Pope Zosimus (Ad Hesychium, nn. 1 and 3) describe for us the ordinary career of Roman clerics: from boyhood or youth they are lectors; about the age of twenty, acolytes or subdeacons; those who enter the clergy when already grown up are first exorcists or lectors, after a certain time acolytes or subdeacons. Briefly, it appears that the obligation of receiving all the minor orders without exception is a law dating from the time when the minor orders ceased to be exercised in the original way. Moreover, there is no longer any fixed age at which the minor orders may be received. Canon law is silent on the subject. Canonists, including Benedict XIV (Constitution, "Eo quamvis", 4 May, 1745), admit that minor orders may be conferred not only on those who have reached the age of puberty, but on boys over seven years. In fact, minor orders are usually conferred on ecclesiastical students during their seminary studies. The Council of Trent requires merely that the candidates understand Latin (Sess. XXIII, c. xii).

Although several medieval theologians regarded minor orders as sacramental, this opinion is no longer held, for the fundamental reason that minor orders, also the subdiaconate, are not of Divine or Apostolic origin. The rites by which they are conferred are quite different from ordination to holy orders. Minor orders are conferred by the presentation to the candidate of the appropriate instruments, in accordance with the ritual given in the "Statuta Ecclesiæ antiqua", a document which originated in Gaul about the year 500. We do not know how even in Rome the porters and exorcists were ordained in former times. Lectors received a simple benediction; acolytes were created by handing them the linen bag in which they carried the Eucharist; subdeacons by the reception of the chalice. Moreover, while deacons and priests could be ordained only on the four Ember Saturdays and on two Saturdays in Lent, minor orders could be conferred on any day. Even at the present time the latter may be conferred, apart from general ordinations, on all Sundays and on Holy Days of obligation, not necessarily at Mass. The usual minister of these orders, as of the others, is a bishop; but regular abbots who have received episcopal benediction may give the tonsure and minor orders to their subjects in religion. By papal privilege several prelates *Nullius* (i. e., exempt) can confer these orders. It is an almost universal custom now to confer the four minor orders at one time, and the Council of Trent (loc. cit.) leaves the bishop quite free to dispense with the interstices (q. v.).

Clerics in minor orders enjoy all ecclesiastical privileges. They may be nominated to all benefices not major, but must receive within a year the major orders necessary for certain benefices. On the other hand, they are not bound to celibacy, and may lawfully marry. Marriage, however, causes them at once to forfeit every benefice. Formerly it did not exclude them from the ranks of the clergy, and they retained all clerical privileges, provided they contracted only one marriage and that with a virgin, and wore clerical costume and the tonsure (c. unic., "de cler. conjug." in VI°); they might even be appointed to the service of a church by the bishop (Conc. Trid., Sess XXIII, c. vi). This earlier discipline, however, is no longer in accordance with modern custom and law. A minor cleric who marries is regarded as having forfeited his clerical privileges. (See Orders; Acolyte; Exorcist; Lector; Porter; Subdeacon; Abbot; Tonsure.)

Many, *Prælect. de sacra ordinatione* (Paris, 1905), 29, 127, 265, etc.; Gasparri, *De sacra ordinatione* (Paris, 1893); Ferraris, *Prompta bibliotheca*, s. v. *Ordo*. See also commentaries of various canonists on the Decretals, *De clericis conjugatis*, I, tit. 11–14; III, tit. 3.

A. Boudinhon.

Minsk, Diocese of (Minscensis), suffragan of Mohileff, in Western Russia. The city of Minsk is situated on the Swislotsch, a tributary of the Beresina, which, again, flows into the Dnieper. In 1879 it numbered 91,500 inhabitants, of whom 27,280 were Catholics. It is the nominal see of a Roman Catholic, a Græco-Ruthenian Uniat, and a Russian Orthodox bishop. After the suppression of the Sees of Smolensk and Livland, Catherine II sought and obtained from the pope the establishment of the metropolitan See of Mohilew, at the same time arbitrarily abolishing the See of Kieff. To make amends for this suppression, Paul I, with the concurrence of Pius VI, established, 17 Nov., 1798, the Latin See of Minsk, and placed it under the Metropolitan of Mohileff. The first bishop was Jacob Ignatius Dederko, formerly a canon of Wilna (d. 1829). After his resignation (1816), the see remained vacant until 1831. In 1839 Pope Gregory XVI appointed Mathias Lipski, after whose death the see again remained for some time without an occupant, the pope and the Russian Government being unable to agree as to a successor. Like the other dioceses of Western Russia and of Poland,

Minsk suffered much from the violent attempts at proselytism on the part of Emperors Nicholas I and Alexander II, by whom the Uniat Lithuanians and Ruthenians were driven out. After the death of Bishop Hermann Woitkiewicz (1852–69) no successor was appointed, owing to governmental opposition, and since then the diocese has been administered by the Archbishop of Mohileff. According to the census of the Archdiocese of Mohileff for 1910, the Diocese of Minsk contained 51 parishes, with 77 priests and 262,-374 faithful. The Uniat Ruthenian See of Minsk was erected by Pius VI, 9 August, 1798, but has been left vacant on account of the opposition of the Russian Government. (See RUSSIA.)

JOSEPH LINS.

Mint, PAPAL.—The right to coin money being a sovereign prerogative, there can be no papal coins of earlier date than that of the temporal power of the popes. Nevertheless, there are coins of Pope Zacharias (741–52), of Gregory III (Ficoroni, "Museo Kircheriano"), and, possibly, of Gregory II (715–741). There is no doubt that these pieces, two of which are of silver, are true coins, and not merely a species of medals, like those which were distributed as "presbyterium" at the coronation of the popes since the time of Valentine (827). Their stamp resembles that of the Byzantine and Merovingian coins of the seventh and eighth centuries, and their square shape is also found in Byzantine pieces. Those that bear the inscription GREII PAPE—SCI PTR (Gregorii Papæ—Sancti Petri) cannot be attributed to Pope Gregory IV (827–44), because of the peculiarity of minting. The existence of these coins, while the popes yet recognized the Byzantine domination, is explained by Hartmann (Das Königreich Italien, Vol. III), who believes that, in the eighth century, the popes received from the emperors the attributes of "Præfectus Urbis". Under the empire, coins that were struck in the provinces bore the name of some local magistrate, and those coins of Gregory and of Zacharias are simply imperial Byzantine pieces, bearing the name of the first civil magistrate of the City of Rome. There are no coins of Stephen III or of Paul I, who reigned when the Duchy of Rome was already independent of the Eastern Empire; the first true papal coins are those of Adrian I, from whose time until the reign of John XIV (984) the popes coined money at Rome.

There is no pontifical money of a date between the last-named year and 1305; this is explained, in part, by the fact that the Senate of Rome, which sought to replace the papacy in the temporal government of the city, took over the mint in 1143. On the other hand, Prince Alberic had already coined money in his own name. The coins of the Senate of Rome usually bear the inscription "ROMA CAPUT MUNDI", or, S. P. Q. R., or both, with or without emblems. In 1188 the mint was restored to the pope (Clement III), with the agreement, however, that half of its profits should be assigned to the *sindaco*, or mayor. The Senate, meanwhile, continued to coin money, and there is no reference, on the coins of that time, to the papal authority. In the thirteenth century the Sindaco caused his own name to be stamped upon the coins, and, consequently, we have coins of Brancaleone, of Charles I of Anjou, of Francesco Anguillara, viceroy of Robert of Naples, etc.; so, also, did King Ladislao. Cola di Rienzi, during his brief tribunate, likewise struck coins, with the inscription: N. TRIBUN. AUGUST.: ROMA CAPU. MU. Papal coins reappeared with the removal of the pontifical Court to Avignon, although there exists a single coin that is referred to Benedict XI (1303–4), with the legend COITAT. VENASIN; as, however, this pope never resided in Venaissin, which had belonged to the Holy See since 1274, the coin should be referred to Benedict XII. There are coins of all the popes from John XXII to Pius IX.

The popes, and also the Senate when it coined money, appear to have used the imperial mint of Rome, which was on the slope of the Campidoglio, not far from the Arch of Septimius Severus; but, in the fifteenth century, the mint was near the bank of Santo Spirito. Finally, in 1665, Alexander VII moved it to the rear of the apse of St. Peter's, where it is at present. Bernini invented for it a machine to do the work more rapidly, and Francesco Girardini furnished a very sensitive balance; so that the mint of Rome was technically the most perfect one of those times. In 1845 Pius IX equipped it with the most modern appliances. The administration of the mint was at first entrusted to the cardinal camerlengo; direct supervision, however, was exercised by the senate, from the time at least when that body took possession of the mint, until the reign of Martin V. The sindaco and the conservators of the *Camera Capitolina* appointed the masters of the mint, while the minting was witnessed by the heads of the guild of goldsmiths and silversmiths. In 1322 John XXII created the office of treasurer for the mint of Avignon, and its incumbent, little by little, made himself independent of the camerlengo. Later, the office of prelate president of the mint was created. According to Lunadori (Relaz. della Corte di Roma, 1646), the establishments for the coining of money were in charge of a congregation of cardinals.

Rome was not the only city of the Pontifical States that had a mint: prior to the year 1000, there existed at Ravenna the former imperial mint, which was ceded in 996 to Archbishop Gerberto by Gregory V; there were mints also at Spoleto and at Benevento, former residences of Lombard dukes. The Archbishop of Ravenna, who was a feudatory of the emperor rather than of the pope, coined money as long as his temporal power over that city and its territory lasted. The mint of the Emperor Henry VI was established at Bologna in 1194, and nearly all of the coins struck there bear the motto BONONIA DOCET, or BONONIA MATER STUDIORUM. The *baiocchi* of Bologna were called *bolognini*, while the gold bolognino was equivalent to a gold sequin. The *lira*, also a Bolognese coin, was worth 20 bolognini. These coins were struck in the name of the commune; it is only from the time when Bologna was recovered by the Holy See, under Clement VI, that Bolognese coins may be regarded as papal.

Other cities had mints because they were the capitals of principalities subject to the Holy See, or in virtue of a privilege granted them by some prince; and when these feudal states fell to the Holy See, they retained the mints as papal establishments. This was so in the case of Camerino (from Leo X to Paul III), Urbino, Pesaro and Gubbio (under Julius II, Leo X, and Clement XI), Ferrara (from Clement VIII), Parma and Piacenza (from Julius II to Paul III). There were other cities to which the popes granted a mint for limited periods of time, as Ancona (from Sixtus IV to Pius VI), Aquila (1486, when that city rebelled against Ferdinand I of Naples and gave its allegiance to Innocent VIII; its coins, which are very rare, bear the inscription AQUILANA LIBERTAS), Ascoli (from Martin V to Pius VI), Avignon (from Clement V on), Carpentras (under Clement VIII), Venaissin (from Boniface VIII), Fabriano (under Leo X), Fano (from Innocent VIII to Clement VIII), Fermo (from Boniface IX, 1390, to Leo X), The Marches (from Boniface IX to Gregory XIII), Macerata (from Boniface IX to Gregory XIV), Modena (under Leo X and Clement VII), Montalto (under Sixtus V), Orvieto (under Julius II), the "Patrimony" (from Benedict XI to Benedict XII), Perugia (from Julius II to Julius III), Ravenna (from Leo X to Paul III, and under Benedict XIV), Recanati (under Nicholas V), Reggio (from Julius II to Adrian VI), Spoleto (under Paul II), Duchy of

Spoleto, PROVINCIÆ DUCATUS (under Paul V), Viterbo (under Urban VI and Sixtus IV). Pius VI, being obliged to coin a great deal of copper money, gave the minting of it to a great many cities of the Patrimony, of Umbria, and of the Marches, which, together with those already named, continued to strike these coins; among them were Civitavecchia, Gubbio, Matelica, Ronciglione (the coins of 1799 showing the burning of this city are famous), Terni, and Tivoli. Pius VII suppressed all the mints except those of Rome and of Bologna.

As far back as 1370 there were coins struck during the vacancies of the Holy See, by authority of the cardinal camerlengo, who, after the fifteenth century at least, caused his name and his coat of arms to be stamped on the reverse of the coin, the obverse bearing the words "SEDE VACANTE" and the date, surrounding the crossed keys surmounted by the pavilion. All papal coins, with rare exceptions, bear the name of the pope, preceded (until the time of Paul II) by a Greek cross, and nearly all of the more ancient ones bear, either on the obverse or on the reverse, the words S. PETRUS, and some of them, the words S. PAULUS also. From Leo III to the Ottos, the coins bear the name of the emperor as well as that of the pope. After the sixteenth century the coat of arms of the pope alone frequently appears on pontifical coins. There are also found images of the Saviour, or of saints, symbolical figures of men or of animals, the keys (which appear for the first time on the coins of Benevento), etc. From the sixteenth century to the eighteenth, Biblical or moral phrases are added, in allusion to the saint or to the symbol that is stamped upon the coin, as, for example, MONSTRA TE ESSE MATREM, SPES NOSTRA, SUB TUUM PRÆSIDIUM, TOTA PULCHRA, SUPRA FIRMAM PETRAM, DA RECTA SAPERE (during the Conclave), UBI THESAURUS IBI COR, CRESCENTEM SEQUITUR CURA PECUNIAM, HILAREM DATOREM DILIGIT DEUS, PRO PRETIO ANIMÆ, FERRO NOCENTIUS AURUM, IN SUDORE VULTUS, CONSERVATÆ PEREUNT, TOLLE ET PROIICE, etc. Sometimes allusion is made to an historical event, as the acquisition of Ferrara, or the deliverance of Vienna (1683), or to some concession of the pope to his subjects, or to a jubilee. From the time of Clement X the coins struck at Rome bear a minute representation of the coat of arms of the prelate in charge of the mint, a custom that obtained until 1817. The only instance of a cardinal camerlengo stamping his coat of arms on the coins during the lifetime of the pope is that of Cardinal Armellini, under Adrian VI, in the case of four *grossi*.

The mints outside of Rome stamped the coins with the arms of their respective cities, or with those of the cardinal legate, of the vice-legate, or of the governor; thus, Cardinal Scipione Borghese in 1612 struck coins at Avignon with his own name and arms, omitting the name of the pope, an example that was followed a year later by the pro-legate Cardinal Filonardi. The city very often placed the image of its patron saint on its coins. The date came to be stamped on coins that were struck during the vacancies of the Holy See, occasionally at first, and later as a rule; it rarely appears on other coins before 1550; the practice became general in the seventeenth century, the year of the Christian era or that of the pontificate being used; and Gregory XVI established it by law, as also the requirement that each coin should bear upon it an expression of its value. At Bologna as early as the seventeenth century, the value of gold or silver coins was usually indicated with the figures 20, 40, 80, etc., i. e. so many bolognini or baiocchi; at Rome, in the eighteenth century, nearly all the copper coins bore an indication of their value. The rim of papal coins rarely bore an inscription; at most, the monogram of the city in which the coin was struck was stamped upon it. From the sixteenth century, the engravers, also, put their ciphers on the coins; among these engravers may be named Benvenuto Cellini, Francesco Raibolini, called il Francia (Bologna), the four Hamerani, Giulio Romano (trident), Cavaliere Lucenti, Andrea Perpenti, etc. Until the time of Pius VI, the dies for the mint remained the property of the engravers.

The Byzantine monetary system is followed in the papal coinage until the reign of Leo III, after which the system of the Frankish Empire obtains. John XXII adopted the Florentine system, and coined gold florins; the weight of this coin, however, varied from 22 carats to 30, until Gregory XI reduced it to the original 24 carats; but deterioration came again, and then there were two kinds of florins, the *papal* florin, which maintained the old weight, and the florin *di Camera*, the two being in the ratio of 69 *papal* florins = 100 florins *di Camera* = 1 gold pound = 10 *carlini*. The ducat was coined in the papal mint from the year 1432; it was a coin of Venetian origin that circulated with the florin, which, in 1531, was succeeded by the *scudo*, a piece of French origin that remained the monetary unit of the Pontifical States. At the same time, there appeared the *zecchino*. The ancient papal florin was equal to 2 scudi and 11 baiocchi (1 baiocco = 0·01 scudi); one ducat was equal to one scudo and 9 baiocchi. The scudo also underwent fluctuations, in the market and in its weight: the so called *scudo delle stampe* (1595) was worth 184·2 baiocchi, that is, a little less than 2 scudi. Benedict XIII re-established the good quality of the alloy, but under Pius VI it again deteriorated. In 1835 Gregory XVI regulated the monetary system of the Pontifical States, establishing the scudo as the unit, and dividing it into 100 baiocchi, while the baiocco was divided into 5 quattrini (the quattrino, until 1591, had been equal to ¼ of a baiocco). The scudo was coined both in gold and in silver; there were pieces of 10 scudi, called Gregorine; and pieces of 5 scudi, and of 2½ scudi were also coined. The scudo of the eighteenth century was equal to 1·65 scudi of Pius VII, which last was adopted by Gregory XVI; the zecchino was worth 2·2 scudi. The scudo is equal to 5·3 lire in the monetary system of the Latin Union. The fractional silver coins were the half scudo, and the *giulio*, called also *paolo*, which was equal to 0·1 scudi. The latter coin was created by Julius II in order to put the *carlini* of Charles of Anjou out of circulation, these coins being of bad alloy. There were pieces of 2 *giulii* that were called *papetti*, at Rome, and *lire* at Bologna, a name that was later given to them officially. A *grosso*, introduced in 1736, was equal to half a giulio (25 baiocchi); there were also the *mezzogrosso*, and the *testone* = 30 giulii. The copper coins were the baiocco or soldo (which was called bolognino, at Bologna) and the 2 baiocchi piece. The name baiocco is derived from that of the city of Bayeux.

Other coins that were used at various times in the Pontifical States were the *baiocchella* = 1 baiocco, a copper piece with a silver surface, and therefore smaller than the copper baiocco; there were coins made of the two metals of the values, respectively, of 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, and 16 baiocchi; the copper *madonnina* (Bologna) = 5 baiocchi; the *sampietrino* (Pius VI) = 2½ baiocchi; the *paludella* was a soldo, made of an alloy of copper and silver, established by Pius VI as a more easily portable specie with which to pay the workmen of the Pontine Marshes; the *sesino* = 0·4 of a baiocco = 2 quattrini; the *leonina* (Leo XII) = 4·4 Gregorian scudi; the *doblone* = 2 old scudi = 3·3 scudi of the nineteenth century; there were dobloni of the relative values of 4, 8, and 16 scudi; the *doppio* was worth a little less than the doblone, that is, 3·21 scudi of the nineteenth century; at Bologna there were also coined scudi of 80 baiocchi, and half-scudi of 40 baiocchi; the *gabella* was a Bolo-

gnese coin, equivalent to a carlino or giulio; the *gabellone* was equivalent to 26 bolognini (baiocchi); the *franco*, in the fifteenth century, was worth 12 baiocchi at Bologna, but only 10 baiocchi at Rome; the *alberetti* was a two-baiocco piece that was coined by the Roman Republic (1798–99).

No official collection of the papal coins was made before the time of Benedict XIV, who acquired from Cardinal Passionei the valuable collection of Scilla which was enriched later by other acquisitions; in 1809, however, it was taken to Paris, and was never recovered. In the nineteenth century the Holy See obtained possession of the fine collection of Belli, begun in the previous century by Luigi Tommasini, and this collection became the basis of the Numismatic Cabinet, which is under the direction of the prefect of the Vatican Library and has a special custodian. Since the loss of the temporal power, the pope has not coined money; each year, however, he strikes the customary medal for the feast of Saint Peter, which is given to cardinals and to the employees of the Roman Curia.

CINAGLI, *Le monete dei papi descritte in tavole sinottiche* (Fermo, 1848); BELLI, *Cimelioteca delle monete pontificie del dott. Cav. Belli* (Rome, 1835); FLORAVANTES, *Antiqui romanorum pontificum denarii a Benedicto IX ad Paulum III* (2 vols., Rome, 1738); PROMIS, *Monete dei romani pontefici avanti il 1000* (Turin, 1858); VENUTI, *Numismata pontificum romanorum præstantiora a Martino V ad Benedictum XIV* (Rome, 1744); CAPOBIANCHI, *Origine della zecca del Senato romano nel secolo XII* (Camerino, 1883); AMBROSOLI, *Atlantino di monete papali moderne a sussidio del Cinagli* (Milan, 1905). Special subjects were treated by SALVAGGI, ROSSI, BELLI, CAPOBIANCHI, RUSPOLI, GARAMPI, DIAMILLA, PILA, CARONI, VITALINI, GREGOROVIUS, etc. ORFER, *De veteris numismatis potestate ejusque incremento et decremento* (Rome, 1835); MORELLI, *Tariffa universale figurata delle monete* (Rome, 1833).

U. BENIGNI.

Minucius Felix, Christian apologist, flourished between 160 and 300; the exact date is not known. His "Octavius" has numerous points of agreement with the "Apologeticum" of Tertullian, similarities that have been explained by the theory of a common source—an apology written in Latin, and which is supposed to have disappeared without leaving any trace, not even in the name of its author. This hypothesis is now generally abandoned. It seems improbable that such a work, from which Minucius and Tertullian might have drawn, would have so thoroughly disappeared. Lactantius (Diu. Inst., V, i, 21) enumerates the apologists who preceded him and does not even suspect the existence of such a writer. The most natural supposition is that one of the two writers, Minucius or Tertullian, is directly dependent on the other. Formerly, Minucius was regarded as posterior to Tertullian. The first doubts in this respect were expressed in France by Blondel in 1641, by Dallæus in 1660, and in England by Dodwell. The theory of the priority of Minucius was defended by van Hoven in the second edition of Lindner in 1773. In modern times it was most ably defended by Ebert. The priority of Tertullian has been chiefly defended by Ad. Harnack, who has been refuted by A. Krueger. M. Waltzing, the scholar best acquainted with Minucius Felix and what has been written about him, is inclined to think him anterior to Tertullian. The arguments in favour of one or the other of these theories are not decisive. However, it may be said that in the passages taken from the ancient authors, such as Seneca, Varro, and especially Cicero, Minucius seems to be more exact and closer to the original; consequently he seems to be intermediary between them and Tertullian. The ecclesiastical authors were probably not better informed than we are with regard to Minucius. Lactantius puts him before Tertullian (Diu. Inst., I, xi, 55; V, i, 21), and St. Jerome after; but St. Jerome contradicts himself by putting him after St. Cyprian (Ep. lxx, (lxxxiii); v; lx; xlviii; "In Isaiam", VIII, præf.), and elsewhere putting him between Tertullian and St. Cyprian (De Viris, lviii). Fronto (d. about 170) is mentioned by Minucius. If the treatise "Quod idola non dii sint" is by St. Cyprian (d. about 258) there is no need of going beyond that date, for this treatise is based on the "Octavius". It is true that the attribution of the aforesaid treatise to St. Cyprian has been contested, but without serious reason. If this be rejected there is no period *ante quem* before Lactantius.

The birthplace of the author is believed to be Africa. This is not proved by Minucius's imitation of African authors, any more than it is by the resemblance between Minucius and Tertullian. At this period the principal writers were Africans, and it was natural that a Latin, of whatever province he might be, would read and imitate them. The allusions to the customs and belief of Africa are numerous, but this may be explained by the African origin of the champion of paganism. The "Octavius" is a dialogue of which Ostia is the scene. Cæcilius Natalis upholds the cause of paganism, Octavius Januarius that of Christianity; the author himself is the judge of the debate. Cæcilius Natalis was a native of Cirta; he lived at Rome and attentively followed Minucius in his activity as an advocate. Octavius had just arrived from a foreign country where he had left his family. Minucius lived at Rome. All three were advocates. The name Minucius Felix has been found on inscriptions at Tebessa and Carthage (Cor. Inscrip. Lat. VIII, 1964 and 12499); that of Octavius Januarius at Saldæ (Bougie; ib., 8962); that of Cæcilius at Cirta itself (ib., 7097–7098, 6996). The M. Cæcilius Natalis of the inscriptions discharged important municipal duties and gave pagan festivals with memorable prodigality. He may have belonged to the same family as the interlocutor of the dialogue. Attempts have been made to make them identical or to establish family relationship between them. These are pure hypotheses subordinate to the opinion entertained regarding the date of the dialogue.

The persons are real. The dialogue may likewise be so, despite the fact that Minucius has transformed into an almost judicial debate what must have been a mere conversation or series of conversations. Owing to the adjournment of the courts during the vintage time, the three friends went for rest to Ostia. Here they walked on the sea-shore, and when they passed before a statue of Serapis, Cæcilius saluted it with the customary kiss. Octavius thereupon expressed his indignation that Minucius should allow his daily companion to fall into idolatry. They resume their walk while Octavius gives an account of his voyage; they go to and fro on the shore and the quay; they watch children jumping about in the sea. This beginning is charming; it is the most perfect portion of the work. During the walk Cæcilius, silenced by the words of Octavius, has not spoken. He now explains himself and it is agreed to settle the debate. They seat themselves on a lonely pier; Minucius seated in the centre is to be the arbitrator. Thereupon Cæcilius begins by attacking Christianity; Minucius says a few words, and then Octavius replies. At the end Minucius and Cæcilius express their admiration and the latter declares that he surrenders. Fuller explanations of the new religion are postponed until the next day. The dialogue therefore consists of two discourses, the attack of Cæcilius and the refutation of Octavius.

The discussion bears on a small number of points: the possibility of man arriving at the truth, creation, Providence, the unity of God, the necessity of keeping the religion of one's ancestors and especially the advantage to the Romans of the worship of the gods, the low character of Christians, their tendency to conceal themselves, their crimes (incest, worship of an ass's head, the adoration of the generative organs of the priest, prayers addressed to a criminal, sacrifice of

children) their impious and absurd conception of the Divinity, their doctrine of the end of the world and the resurrection of the dead, the hardships of their life, threatened, and exposed without remedy to all sorts of dangers, cut off from the joys of life. In this debate the conception of Christianity is very limited, and is reduced almost solely to the unity of God, Providence, the resurrection, and reward after death. The name of Christ does not appear; among the apologists of the second century Aristides, St. Justin, and Tertullian are the only ones who pronounced it. But Minucius omits the characteristic points of Christianity in dogma and worship; this is not because he is bound to silence by the discipline of the secret, for St. Justin and Tertullian do not fear to enter into these details. Moreover in the discussion itself Octavius ends abruptly. To the accusation of adoring a criminal he contents himself with replying that the Crucified One was neither a man nor guilty (xxix, 2) and he is silent with regard to the mysteries of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption which would have made clear his reply. He merely repels the accusation of incest and infanticide without describing the agape or the Eucharist (xxx and xxxi). He does not quote Scripture, or at least very little; and he does not mention the fulfilment of the prophecies. On the other hand he makes only a brief allusion to the manner of proceeding against the Christians (xxiii, 3). He does not speak of the loyalty of the Christians towards the state and the emperors. Political and judicial considerations, which are given so much space in Tertullian, are almost entirely absent here. These omissions are explained by a voluntary limitation of the subject. Minucius wished only to remove the prejudices of the pagans, to prepossess his readers by a pleasant discussion, and to show them the possibility of Christianity. He himself indicated this intention by putting off until the next day a more profound discussion (xl, 2). He addressed himself chiefly to the learned, to sceptics, and to the cultured; and wished to prove to them that there was nothing in the new religion that was incompatible with the resources of dialectics and the ornaments of rhetoric. In a word his work is an introduction to Christianity, a *Protrepticon*.

It is a mosaic of imitations, especially of Cicero, Seneca, and Virgil. The plan itself is that of the "De natura deorum" of Cicero, and Cæcilius here plays the rôle of Cotta. However the personages have their peculiar characteristics. Cæcilius is a young man, presumptuous, somewhat vain, sensitive, yielding to his first impression. Octavius is more sedate, but provincial life seems to have made him more intolerant; his pleading is hot and emotional. Minucius is more indulgent and calm. These learned men are charming friends. The dialogue itself is a monument of friendship. Minucius wrote it in memory of his dear Octavius, recently deceased. In reading it one thinks of Pliny the Younger and his friends. These minds exhibited the same delicacy and culture. The style is composite, being a harmonious combination of the Ciceronian period with the brilliant and short sentences of the new school. It sometimes assumes poetic tints, but the dominating colour is that of Cicero. By the choice of subjects treated, his ease in reconciling very different ideas and styles, the art of combinations in ideas as well as in language, Minucius Felix belongs to the first rank of Latin writers whose talent consisted in blending heterogeneous elements and in proving themselves individual and original in imitation.

MINUCIUS FELIX, *Octavius*, ed. WALTZING (Louvain, 1903); WALTZING, *Studia minuciana*, I and II (Louvain, 1906); IDEM, *Octavius de Minucius Felix, introduction, texte, commentaire, traduction, langue et syntaxe, appendice critique* (2 vols., Bruges, 1909); IDEM, *Lexicon Minucianum* in *Bib. de la faculté de philosphie et lettres de l'Université de Liège*, fasc. iii (Liège and Paris, 1909). A complete bibliography will be found in the first three works, with analyses and discussion. Recently ELTER in his *Prolegomena zu Minucius Felix* (Bonn, 1909), has attempted to show the *Octavius* to be a "consolation" intended exclusively for Christian readers; this theory is without probability.

PAUL LEJAY.

Mirabilia Urbis Romæ, the title of a medieval Latin description of the city of Rome, dating from about 1150. Unhampered by any very accurate knowledge of the historical continuity of the city, the unknown author has described the monuments of Rome, displaying a considerable amount of inventive faculty. From the pontificate of Boniface VIII (1294–1303) to that of John XXII (1316–34) it was revised and attained unquestioned authority, despite the increase in the already large number of misconceptions and errors. Attention was first called to these different recensions by de Rossi in the first volume of his "Roma Sotterranea" (158 sqq.). Almost simultaneously appeared two editions of the text, by Parthey ("Mirabilia Romæ e codicibus Vaticanis emendata", Berlin, 1869) and by Jordan ("Topographie der Stadt Rom im Altertum", II, Berlin, 1871, 605–43), respectively. In the third section Jordan discusses at some length the Mirabilia and its redactions (357 sqq.), in the fourth, the earlier divisions of the work (401 sqq.), and in the fifth, the topography of the Mirabilia (421 sqq.), presenting most valuable information, the result of much research on all the questions involved. The latest edition is that of Duchesne in the "Liber Censuum de l'Eglise Romaine" (I, Paris, 1905, 262–73), being the text of the original of Cencius Camerarius with the variants of four other manuscripts. Especially valuable for a proper conception of the Mirabilia are the 125 notes appended by Duchesne on pp. 273–83, many of them of considerable length. (The concordance with the text in the "Excerta politici a presbitero Benedicto compositi de ordinibus Romanis et dignitatibus Urbis et Sacri Palatii" may be found in the "Liber Censuum", vol. II, 91, 92, n. 5.) A critical edition of the "Mirabilia Urbis" is still lacking. The contents of the Mirabilia fall into the following sections, the titles being taken from the "Liber Censuum": (1) De muro urbis (concerning the wall of the city); (2) De portis urbis (the gates of the city); (3) De miliaribus (the milestones); (4) Nomina portarum (the names of the gates); (5) Quot porte sunt Transtiberim (how many gates are beyond the Tiber); (6) De arcubus (the arches); (7) De montibus (the hills); (8) De termis (the baths); (9) De palatiis (the palaces); (10) De theatris (the theatres); (11) De locis qui inveniuntur in sanctorum passionibus (the places mentioned in the "passions" of the saints); (12) De pontibus (the bridges); (13) De cimiteriis (the cemeteries); (14) De iussione Octaviani imperatoris et responsione Sibille (the demand of the Emperor Octavian and the Sibyl's response); (15) Quare facti sunt caballi marmorei (why the marble horses were made); (16) De nominibus iudicum et eorum instructionibus (the names of the judges and their instructions); (17) De columna Antonii et Trajani (the column of Antony and Trajan); (18) Quare factus sit equus qui dicitur Constantinus (why the horse was made, which is called of Constantine); (19) Quare factum sit Pantheon et postmodum oratio B. (why the pantheon was built and later oration B.); (20) Quare Octavianus vocatus sit Augustus et quare dicatur ecclesia Sancti Petri ad vincula (Why Octavianus was called Augustus, and why the church of St. Peter ad Vincula was so called); (21) De vaticano et Agulio; (22) Quot sunt templa trans Tiberim (how many temples are beyond the Tiber); (23) Predicatio sanctorum (the preaching of the saints).

The reader may consult in addition to the above-mentioned authors, the *Monatsberichte* of the Berlin Academy (1869), 681 sqq.; GRÄSSE, *Beiträge zur Litteratur und Sage des Mittelalters;* [NIBBY], *Effemeridi letterarie di Roma* (1820), 63 sqq. part of this was reprinted without alteration under the title of *Mirabilia ossia le cose maravigliose di Roma* (Rome, 1864). In editing the second of the two recensions mentioned above,

JORDAN (II, 33, 357) calls attention to the Sant' Isidoro manuscript, in the collection of Cardinal Nicholas of Aragon (1356–62), on which are based the *Graphia aureæ urbis Romæ* edited by OZANAM, and the *Chronicle* of MARTINUS POLONUS. Notwithstanding the learned notes of DUCHESNE and the comprehensive commentary of JORDAN, already referred to (in which must be included section 3, vol. 1, pt. I, 37–74, on topographical research since the fifteenth century), many questions concerning the text of the *Mirabilia* still remain to be cleared up or are still in dispute. The authorship of the *Mirabilia*, which had never been discussed by any recognized authority, is treated in a most satisfactory manner by Duchesne in the sixth fascicule of the *Liber Censuum* (97–104), which has just appeared. He adduces numerous arguments to prove that the above-mentioned BENEDICT (Canonicus Sancti Petri de Urbe, cantor Romanæ Ecclesiæ, the compiler of the *Ordo Romanus*) was also the author of the *Mirabilia*, "Who, if not the indulgent author, would have wished to create a future for it by incorporating it with the *Liber Censuum*?". Duchesne's theory also explains the curious fact that the *Mirabilia* should be found in the *Liber Censuum*, with which it is in no way connected.

PAUL MARIA BAUMGARTEN.

Miracle (Lat. *miraculum*, from *mirari*, "to wonder").—In general, a wonderful thing, the word being so used in classical Latin; in a specific sense, the Latin Vulgate designates by *miracula* wonders of a peculiar kind, expressed more clearly in the Greek text by the terms *τέρατα*, *δυνάμεις*, *σημεῖα*, i. e., wonders performed by supernatural power as signs of some special mission or gift and explicitly ascribed to God. These terms are used habitually in the New Testament and express the meaning of *miraculum* of the Vulgate. Thus St. Peter in his first sermon speaks of Christ as approved of God, *δυνάμεσιν, καὶ τέρασιν καὶ σημείοις* (Acts, ii, 22) and St. Paul says that the signs of his Apostleship were wrought, *σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν καὶ δυνάμεσιν* (II Cor., xii, 12). Their united meaning is found in the term *ἔργα* i. e., works, the word constantly employed in the Gospels to designate the miracles of Christ. The analysis of these terms therefore gives the nature and scope of the miracle.

I. NATURE. A. The word *τέρατα* literally means "wonders", in reference to feelings of amazement excited by their occurrence; hence effects produced in the material creation appealing to, and grasped by, the senses, usually by the sense of sight, at times by hearing, e. g., the baptism of Jesus, the conversion of St. Paul. Thus, though the works of Divine grace, such as the Sacramental Presence, are above the power of nature, and due to God alone, they may be called miraculous only in the wide meaning of the term, i. e., as supernatural effects, but they are not miracles in the sense here understood, for miracles in the strict sense are apparent. The miracle falls under the grasp of the senses, either in the work itself (e. g., raising the dead to life) or in its effects (e. g., the gifts of infused knowledge with the Apostles). In like manner the justification of a soul in itself is miraculous, but is not a miracle properly so called, unless it takes place in a sensible manner, as, e. g., in the case of St. Paul. The wonder of the miracle is due to the fact that its cause is hidden, and an effect is expected other than what actually takes place. Hence, by comparison with the ordinary course of things, the miracle is called extraordinary. In analyzing the difference between the extraordinary character of the miracle and the ordinary course of nature, the Fathers of the Church and theologians employ the terms *above, contrary to*, and *outside nature*. These terms express the manner in which the miracle is extraordinary.

A miracle is said to be above nature when the effect produced is above the native powers and forces in creatures of which the known laws of nature are the expression, as raising a dead man to life, e. g., Lazarus (John, xi), the widow's son (III Kings, xvii). A miracle is said to be outside, or beside, nature when natural forces may have the power to produce the effect, at least in part, but could not of themselves alone have produced it in the way it was actually brought about. Thus the effect in abundance far exceeds the power of natural forces, or it takes place instantaneously without the means or processes which nature employs. In illustration we have the multiplication of loaves by Jesus (John, vi), the changing of water into wine at Cana (John, ii)—for the moisture of the air by natural and artificial processes is changed into wine—or the sudden healing of a large extent of diseased tissue by a draught of water. A miracle is said to be contrary to nature, when the effect produced is contrary to the natural course of things.

The term miracle here implies the direct opposition of the effect actually produced to the natural causes at work, and its imperfect understanding has given rise to much confusion in modern thought. Thus Spinoza calls a miracle a violation of the order of nature (*præverti*, "Tract. Theol. Polit.", vi). Hume says it is a "violation" or an "infraction"; and many writers—e. g., Martensen, Hodge, Baden-Powell, Theodore Parker—use the term for miracles as a whole. But every miracle is not of necessity contrary to nature; for there are miracles above or outside nature. Again, the term *contrary to nature* does not mean "unnatural" in the sense of producing discord and confusion. The forces of nature differ in power and are in constant interaction. This produces interferences and counteractions of forces. This is true of mechanical, chemical, and biological forces. So, also, at every moment of the day I interfere with and counteract natural forces about me. I study the properties of natural forces with a view to obtain conscious control by intelligent counteractions of one force against another. Intelligent counteraction marks progress in chemistry, in physics—e. g., steam locomotion, aviation—and in the prescriptions of the physician. Man controls nature, nay, can live only by the counteraction of natural forces. Though all this goes on around us, we never speak of natural forces violated. These forces are still working after their kind, and no force is destroyed, nor is any law broken, nor does confusion result. The introduction of human will may bring about a displacement of the physical forces, but no infraction of physical processes. Now in a miracle God's action relative to its bearing on natural forces is analogous to the action of human personality. Thus, e. g., it is against the nature of iron to float, but the action of Eliseus in raising the axe-head to the surface of the water (IV Kings, vi) is no more a violation, or a transgression, or an infraction, of natural laws than if he raised it with his hand. Again, it is of the nature of fire to burn, but when, e. g., the Three Children were preserved untouched in the fiery furnace (Dan., iii) there was nothing unnatural in the act, as these writers use the word, any more than there would be in erecting a dwelling absolutely fire-proof. In the one case, as in the other, there was no paralysis of natural forces and no consequent disorder.

The extraordinary element in the miracle—i. e., an event apart from the ordinary course of things—enables us to understand the teaching of theologians that events which ordinarily take place in the natural or supernatural course of Divine Providence are not miracles, although they are beyond the efficiency of natural forces. Thus, e. g., the creation of the soul is not a miracle, for it takes place in the ordinary course of nature. Again, the justification of the sinner, the Eucharistic Presence, the sacramental effects, are not miracles for two reasons: they are beyond the grasp of the senses and they have place in the ordinary course of God's supernatural Providence.

B. The word *δύναμις*, "power" is used in the New Testament to signify: (a) the power of working miracles, (*ἐν δυνάμει σημείων*—Rom., xv, 19); (b) mighty works as the effects of this power, i. e., miracles themselves (*αἱ πλεῖσται δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ*—Matt., xi, 20) and expresses the efficient cause of the miracle, i. e.,

Divine power. Hence the miracle is called supernatural, because the effect is beyond the productive power of nature and implies supernatural agency. Thus St. Thomas teaches: "Those effects are rightly to be termed miracles which are wrought by Divine power apart from the order usually observed in nature" (Contra Gent., III, cii), and they are apart from the natural order because they are "beyond the order or laws of the whole created nature" (Summa Theol., I, Q. cii, a. 4). Hence δύναμις adds to the meaning of τέρατα by pointing out the efficient cause. For this reason miracles in Scripture are called "the finger of God" (Exod., viii, 19; Luke, xi, 20), "the hand of the Lord" (I Kings, v, 6), "the hand of our God" (I Esdras, viii, 31). In referring the miracle to God as its efficient cause, the answer is given to the objection that the miracle is unnatural, i. e., an uncaused event without meaning or place in nature. With God as the cause, the miracle has a place in the designs of God's Providence (Contra Gent., III, xcviii). In this sense—i. e., relatively to God—St. Augustine speaks of the miracle as natural (De Civit. Dei, XXI, viii, n. 2).

An event is above the course of nature and beyond its productive powers: (a) with regard to its substantial nature, i. e., when the effect is of such a kind that no natural power could bring it to pass in any manner or form whatsoever, as, e. g., the raising to life of the widow's son (Luke, vii), or the cure of the man born blind (John, ix). These miracles are called miracles as to substance (*quoad substantiam*). (b) With regard to the manner in which the effect is produced, i. e., where there may be forces in nature fitted and capable of producing the effect considered in itself, yet the effect is produced in a manner wholly different from the manner in which it should naturally be performed, i. e., instantaneously, by a word, e. g., the cure of the leper (Luke, v). These are called miracles as to the *manner* of their production (*quoad modum*).

God's power is shown in the miracle: (a) directly through His own immediate action or (b) mediately, through creatures as means or instruments. In this case the effects must be ascribed to God, for He works in and through the instruments— "Ipso Deo in illis operante" (Augustine, "De Civit. Dei", X, xii). Hence God works miracles through the instrumentality (1) of angels, e. g., the Three Children in the fiery furnace (Dan., iii), the deliverance of St. Peter from prison (Acts, xii); (2) of men, e. g., Moses and Aaron (Exod., vii), Elias (III Kings, xvii), Eliseus (IV Kings, v), the Apostles (Acts, ii, 43), St. Peter (Acts, iii, ix), St. Paul (Acts, xix), the early Christians (Galat., iii, 5). (3) In the Bible also, as in church history, we learn that inanimate things are instruments of Divine power, not because they have any excellence in themselves, but through a special relation to God. Thus we distinguish holy relics, e. g., the mantle of Elias (IV Kings, ii), the body of Eliseus (IV Kings, xiii), the hem of Christ's garment (Matthew, ix), the handkerchiefs of St. Paul (Acts, xix, 12); holy images, e. g., the brazen serpent (Num., xxi); holy things, e. g., the Ark of the Covenant, the sacred vessels of the Temple (Dan., v); holy places, e. g., the Temple of Jerusalem (II Par., vi, vii), the waters of the Jordan (IV Kings, v), the Pool of Bethsaida (John, v). Hence the contention of some modern writers, that a miracle requires an immediate action of Divine power, is not true. It is sufficient that the miracle be due to the intervention of God, and its nature is revealed by the utter lack of proportion between the effect and what are called means or instruments.

The word σημεῖον means "sign", an appeal to intelligence, and expresses the purpose or final cause of the miracle. A miracle is a factor in the Providence of God over men. Hence the glory of God and the good of men are the primary or supreme ends of every miracle. This is clearly expressed by Christ in the raising of Lazarus (John, xi); and the Evangelist says that Jesus, in working His first miracle at Cana, "manifested his glory" (John, ii, 11). Therefore the miracle must be worthy the holiness, goodness, and justice of God, and conducive to the true good of men. Hence they are not performed by God to repair physical defects in His creation; nor are they intended to produce, nor do they produce, disorder or discord; nor do they contain any element which is wicked, ridiculous, useless, or unmeaning. Hence they are not on the same plane with mere wonders, tricks, works of ingenuity, or magic. The efficacy, usefulness, purpose of the work and the manner of performing it clearly show that it must be ascribed to Divine power. This high standing and dignity of the miracle is shown, e. g., in the miracles of Moses (Exod., vii–x), of Elias (III Kings, xviii. 21–38), of Eliseus (IV Kings, v). The multitudes glorified God at the cure of the paralytic (Matt., ix, 8), of the blind man (Luke, xviii, 43), at the miracles of Christ in general (Matt., xv, 31; Luke, xix, 37), as at the cure of the lame man by St. Peter (Acts, iv, 21). Hence miracles are signs of the supernatural world and our connexion with it.

In miracles we can always distinguish secondary ends, subordinate, however, to the primary ends. Thus (1) they are evidences attesting and confirming the truth of a Divine mission, or of a doctrine of faith or morals, e. g., Moses (Exod., iv), Elias (III Kings, xvii, 24). For this reason the Jews see in Christ "the prophet" (John, vi, 14), in whom "God hath visited his people" (Luke, vii, 16). Hence the disciples believed in Him (John, ii, 11) and Nicodemus (John, iii, 2) and the man born blind (John, ix, 38), and the many who had seen the raising of Lazarus (John, xi, 45). Jesus constantly appealed to His "works" to prove that He was sent by God and that He is the Son of God, e. g., to the Disciples of John (Matt., xi, 4), to the Jews (John, x, 37). He claims that His miracles are a greater testimony than the testimony of John (John, v, 36), condemns those who will not believe (John, xv, 24), as He praises those who do (John, xvii, 8), and exhibits miracles as the signs of the True Faith (Mark, xvi, 17). The Apostles appeal to miracles as the confirmation of Christ's Divinity and mission (John, xx, 31; Acts, x, 38), and St. Paul counts them as the signs of his Apostleship (II Cor., xii, 12). (2) Miracles are wrought to attest true sanctity. Thus, e. g., God defends Moses (Num., xii), Elias (IV Kings, i), Eliseus (IV Kings, xiii). Hence the testimony of the man born blind (John, ix, 30 sqq.) and the official processes in the canonization of saints. (3) As benefits either spiritual or temporal. The temporal favours are always subordinate to spiritual ends, for they are a reward or a pledge of virtue, e. g., the widow of Sarephta (III Kings, xvii), the Three Children in the fiery furnace (Dan., iii), the preservation of Daniel (Dan., v), the deliverance of St. Peter from prison (Acts, xii), of St. Paul from shipwreck (Acts, xxvii). Thus σημεῖον, i. e., "sign", completes the meaning of δύναμις, i. e., "[Divine] power". It reveals the miracle as an act of God's supernatural Providence over men. It gives a positive content to τέρας, i. e., "wonder", for, whereas the wonder shows the miracle as a deviation from the ordinary course of nature, the sign gives the purpose of the deviation.

This analysis shows that (1) the miracle is essentially an appeal to knowledge. Therefore miracles can be distinguished from purely natural occurrences. A miracle is a fact in material creation, and falls under the observation of the senses or comes to us through testimony, like any natural fact. Its miraculous character is known: (a) from positive knowledge of natural forces, e. g., the law of gravity, the law that fire burns. To say that we do not know all the laws of nature, and therefore cannot know a miracle (Rousseau, "Lett. de

la Mont.", let. iii), is beside the question, for it would make the miracle an appeal to ignorance. I may not know all the laws of the penal code, but I can know with certainty that in a particular instance a person violates one definite law. (b) From our positive knowledge of the limits of natural forces. Thus, e. g., we may not know the strength of a man, but we do know that he cannot by himself move a mountain. In enlarging our knowledge of natural forces, the progress of science has curtailed their sphere and defined their limits, as in the law of abiogenesis. Hence, as soon as we have reason to suspect that any event, however uncommon or rare it appear, may arise from natural causes or be conformable to the usual course of nature, we immediately lose the conviction of its being a miracle. A miracle is a manifestation of God's power; so long as this is not clear, we should reject it as such.

(2) Miracles are signs of God's Providence over men; hence they are of high moral character, simple and obvious in the forces at work, in the circumstances of their working, and in their aim and purpose. Now philosophy indicates the possibility, and Revelation teaches the fact, that spiritual beings, both good and bad, exist, and possess greater power than man possesses. Apart from the speculative question as to the native power of these beings, we are certain (a) that God alone can perform those effects which are called substantial miracles, e. g., raising the dead to life; (b) that miracles performed by the angels, as recorded in the Bible, are always ascribed to God, and Holy Scripture gives Divine authority to no miracles less than Divine; (c) that Holy Scripture shows the power of evil spirits as strictly conditioned, e. g., testimony of the Egyptian magicians (Exod., viii, 19), the story of Job, evil spirits acknowledging the power of Christ (Matt., viii, 31), the express testimony of Christ himself (Matt., xxiv, 24) and of the Apocalypse (Apoc., ix, 14). Granting that these spirits may perform prodigies—i. e., works of skill and ingenuity which, relatively to our powers, may seem to be miraculous—yet these works lack the meaning and purpose which would stamp them as the language of God to men.

II. Errors.—Deists reject miracles, for they deny the Providence of God. Agnostics, also, and Positivists reject them: Comte regarded miracles as the fruit of the theological imagination. Modern Pantheism has no place for miracles. Thus Spinoza held creation to be the aspect of the one substance, i. e., God, and, as he taught that miracles were a violation of nature, they would therefore be a violation of God. The answer is, first that Spinoza's conception of God and nature is false and, secondly, that in fact miracles are not a violation of nature. To Hegel creation is the evolutive manifestation of the one Absolute Idea, i. e., God, and to the neo-Hegelians (e. g., Thos. Green) consciousness is identified with God; therefore to both a miracle has no meaning. Erroneous definitions of the supernatural lead to erroneous definitions of the miracle. Thus (a) Bushnell defines the natural to be what is necessary, the supernatural to be what is free; therefore the material world is what we call nature, the world of man's life is supernatural. So also Dr. Strong ("Baptist Rev.", vol. I, 1879), Rev. C. A. Row ("Supernat. in the New Test.", London, 1875). In this sense every free volition of man is a supernatural act and a miracle. (b) The natural supernaturalism proposed by Carlyle, Theodore Parker, Prof. Pfleiderer, and, more recently, Prof. Everett ("The Psychologic Elem. of Relig. Faith", London and New York, 1902), Prof. Bowne ("Immanence of God", Boston and New York, 1905), Hastings ("Diction. of Christ and the Gospels", s. v. "Miracles"). Thus the natural and the supernatural are in reality one: the natural is its aspect to man, the supernatural is its aspect to God. (c) The "Immediate theory", that God acts immediately without second causes, or that second causes, or laws of nature, must be defined as the regular methods of God's acting. This teaching is combined with the doctrine of evolution.

(d) The "relative" theory of miracles is by far the most popular with non-Catholic writers. This view was originally proposed to hold Christian miracles and at the same time hold belief in the uniformity of nature. Its main forms are: (1) the mechanical view of Babbage (Bridgewater Treatises), later advanced by the Duke of Argyll (Reign of Law). Thus nature is presented as a vast mechanism wound up in the beginning and containing in itself the capacity to deviate at stated times from its ordinary course. The theory is ingenious, but it makes the miracle a natural event. It admits the assumption of opponents of miracles, viz., that physical effects must have physical causes, but this assumption is contradicted by common facts of experience, e. g., will acts on matter. (2) The "unknown" law of Spinoza, who taught that the term *miracle* should be understood with reference to the opinions of men, and that it means simply an event which we are unable to explain by other events familiar to our experience. Locke, Kant, Eichhorn, Paulus, Renan hold the same view. Thus Prof. Cooper writes "The miracle of one age becomes the ordinary working of nature in the next" ("Ref. Ch. R.", July, 1900). Hence a miracle never happened in fact, and is only a name to cover our ignorance. Thus Matthew Arnold could claim that all Biblical miracles will disappear with the progress of science (Lit. and Bible) and M. Müller that "the miraculous is reduced to mere seeming" (n. Rel., pref., p. 10). The advocates of this theory assume that miracles are an appeal to ignorance. (3) The "higher-law" theory of Argyll of "Unseen Universe", Trench, Lange (on Matt., p. 153), Gore (Bampton Lect., p. 36) proposed to refute Spinoza's claim that miracles are unnatural and productive of disorder. Thus with them the miracle is quite natural because it takes place in accordance with laws of a higher nature. Others—e. g., Schleiermacher and Ritschl—mean by *higher law*, subjective religious feeling. Thus, to them a miracle is not different from any other natural event; it becomes a miracle by relation to the religious feeling. A writer in "The Biblical World" (Oct., 1908) holds that the miracle consists in the religious significance of the natural event in its relation to the religious appreciation as a sign of Divine favour. Others explain higher law as a moral law, or law of the spirit. Thus the miracles of Christ are understood as illustrations of a higher, grander, more comprehensive law than men had yet known, the incoming of a new life, of higher forces acting according to higher laws as manifestations of the spirit in the higher stages of its development. The criticism of this theory is that miracles would cease to be miracles: they would not be extraordinary, for they would take place under the same conditions. To bring miracles under a law not yet understood is to deny their existence. Thus, when Trench defines a miracle as "an extraordinary event which beholders can reduce to no law with which they are acquainted", the definition includes hypnotism and clairvoyance. If by *higher law* we mean the high law of God's holiness, then a miracle can be referred to this law, but the higher law in this case is God Himself and the use of the term is apt to create confusion.

III. Antecedent Improbability.—The great problem of modern theology is the place and value of miracles. In the opinion of certain writers, their antecedent improbability, based on the universal reign of law, is so great that they are not worthy of serious consideration. Thus his conviction of the uniformity of nature led Hume to deny testimony for miracles in general, as it led Baur, Strauss, and Renan to explain the miracles of Christ on natural grounds. The fundamental principle is that whatever happens is

natural, and what is not natural does not happen. On belief in the uniformity of nature is based the profound conviction of the organic unity of the universe, a characteristic trait of nineteenth-century thought. It has dominated a certain school of literature, and, with George Eliot, Hall Caine, and Thomas Hardy, the natural agencies of heredity, environment, and necessary law rule the world of human life. It is the basic principle in modern treatises on sociology. Its chief exponent is science-philosophy, a continuation of the Deism of the eighteenth century without the idea of God, and the view herein presented, of an evolving universe working out its own destiny under the rigid sway of inherent natural laws, finds but a thin disguise in the Pantheistic conception, so prevalent among non-Catholic theologians, of an immanent God, who is the active ground of the world-development according to natural law—i. e., Monism of mind or will. This belief is the gulf between the old and the modern school of theology, according to Delitzsch ("Deep Gulf between the Old and the Modern Theology", 1890; Principal Fairbairn, "Studies in the Philos. of Hist. and Religion"). Max Müller finds the kernel of the modern conception of the world in the idea that "there is a law and order in everything, and that an unbroken chain of causes and effects holds the whole universe together" ("Anthrop. Relig.", pref., p. 10). Throughout the universe there is a mechanism of nature and of human life, presenting a necessary chain, or sequence, of cause and effect, which is not, and cannot be, broken by an interference from without, as is assumed in the case of a miracle. This view is the ground of modern objections to Christianity, the source of modern scepticism, and the reason for a prevailing disposition among Christian thinkers to deny miracles a place in Christian evidences, and to base the proof for Christianity on internal evidences alone.

Criticism. (1) This view ultimately rests upon the assumption that the material universe alone exists. It is refuted: (a) by proving that in man there is a spiritual soul totally distinct from organic and inorganic existence, and that this soul reveals an intellectual and moral order totally distinct from the physical order; (b) by inferring the existence of God from the phenomena of the intellectual, the moral, and the physical order. (2) This view is also based on an erroneous meaning of the term *nature*. Kant made a distinction between the *noumenon* and the *phenomenon* of a thing; he denied that we can know the *noumenon*, i. e., the thing in itself; all we know is the *phenomenon*, i. e., the appearance of the thing. This distinction has profoundly influenced modern thought. As a Transcendental Idealist, Kant denied that we know the real phenomenon; to him only the ideal appearance is the object of the mind. Thus knowledge is a succession of ideal appearances, and a miracle would be an interruption of that succession. Others, i. e., the Sense-School (Hume, Mill, Bain, Spencer, and others), teach that, while we cannot know the substance or essences of things, we can and do grasp the real phenomena. To them the world is a phenomenal world and is a pure coexistence and succession of phenomena; the antecedent determines the consequent. In this view a miracle would be an unexplained break in the (so-called) invariable law of sequence, on which law Mill based his Logic. Now we reply that the real meaning of the word *nature* includes both the phenomenon and the noumenon. We have the idea of substance with an objective content. In reality the progress of science consists in the observation of, and experimentation upon, things with a view to find out their properties or potencies, which in turn enable us to know the physical essences of the various substances. (3) Through the erroneous conception of nature, the principle of causality is confounded with the law of the uniformity of nature. But they are absolutely different things. The former is a primary conviction which has its source in our inner consciousness. The latter is an induction based upon a long and careful observation of facts: it is not a self-evident truth, nor is it a universal and necessary principle, as Mill himself has shown (Logic, IV, xxi). In fact uniformity of nature is the result of the principle of causation.

(4) The main contention, that the uniformity of nature rules miracles out of consideration, because they would imply a break in the uniformity and a violation of natural law, is not true. The laws of nature are the observed modes or processes in which natural forces act. These forces are the properties or potencies of the essences of natural things. Our experience of causation is not the experience of a mere sequence but of a sequence due to the necessary operation of essences viewed as principles or sources of action. Now essences are necessarily what they are and unchangeable; therefore their properties, or potencies, or forces, under given circumstances, act in the same way. On this, Scholastic philosophy bases the truth that nature is uniform in its action, yet holds that constancy of succession is not an absolute law, for the succession is only constant so long as the noumenal relations remain the same. Thus Scholastic philosophy, in defending miracles, accepts the universal reign of law in this sense, and its teaching is in absolute accord with the methods actually pursued by modern science in scientific investigations. Hence it teaches the order of nature and the reign of law, and openly declares that, if there were no order, there would be no miracle. It is significant that the Bible appeals constantly to the reign of law in nature, while it attests the actual occurrence of miracles. Now human will, in acting on material forces, interferes with the regular sequences, but does not paralyze the natural forces or destroy their innate tendency to act in a uniform manner. Thus a boy, by throwing a stone into the air, does not disarrange the order of nature or do away with the law of gravity. A new force only is brought in and counteracts the tendencies of the natural forces, just as the natural forces interact and counteract among themselves, as is shown in the well-known truths of the parallelogram of forces and the distinction between kinetic and potential energy. The analogy from man's act to God's act is complete as far as concerns a break in the uniformity of nature or a violation of its laws. The extent of the power exerted does not affect the point at issue. Hence physical nature is presented as a system of physical causes producing uniform results, and yet permits the interposition of personal agency without affecting its stability.

(5) The truth of this position is so manifest that Mill admits Hume's argument against miracles to be valid only on the supposition that God does not exist, for, he says, "a miracle is a new effect supposed to be produced by the introduction of a new cause . . . of the adequacy of that cause, if present, there can be no doubt" (Logic, III, xxv). Hence, admitting the existence of God, Hume's "uniform sequence" does not hold as an objection to miracles. Huxley also denies that physicists withhold belief in miracles because miracles are in violation of natural laws, and he rejects the whole of this line of argument ("Some Controverted questions", 209; "Life of Hume", 132), and holds that a miracle is a question of evidence pure and simple. Hence the objection to miracles on the ground of their antecedent improbability has been abandoned. "The Biblical World" (Oct., 1908) says "The old rigid system of 'Laws of Nature' is being broken up by modern science. There are many events which scientists recognize to be inexplicable by any known law. But this inability to furnish a scientific explanation is no reason for denying the existence of any event, if it is adequately attested. Thus the old *a priori* argument against miracles is gone." Thus in modern thought

the question of the miracle is simply a question of fact.

IV. Place and Value of Miracles in the Christian View of the World.—As the great objection to miracles really rests on narrow and false philosophical views of the universe, so the true world-view is necessary to grasp their place and value. Christianity teaches that God created and governs the world. This government is His Providence. It is shown in the delicate adjustment and subordination of the tendencies proper to material things, resulting in the marvellous stability and harmony which prevail throughout the physical creation, and in the moral order, which through conscience, is to guide and control the tendencies of man's nature to a complete harmony in human life. Man is a personal being, with intelligence and free-will, capable of knowing and serving God, and created for that purpose. To him nature is the book of God's work revealing the Creator through the design visible in the material order and through conscience, the voice of the moral order based in the very constitution of his own being. Hence the relation of man to God is a personal one. God's Providence is not confined to the revelation of Himself through His works. He has manifested Himself in a supernatural manner throwing a flood of light on the relations which should exist between man and Himself. The Bible contains this revelation, and is called the Book of God's Word. It gives the record of God's supernatural Providence leading up to the Redemption and the founding of the Christian Church. Here we are told that beyond the sphere of nature there is another realm of existence, the supernatural, peopled by spiritual beings and departed souls. Both spheres, the natural and the supernatural, are under the overruling Providence of God. Thus God and man are two great facts. The relation of the soul to its Maker is religion.

Religion is the knowledge, love, and service of God; its expression is called worship, and the essence of worship is prayer. Thus between man and God there is constant intercourse, and in God's Providence the appointed means of this intercourse is prayer. By prayer man speaks to God in acts of faith, hope, love, and contrition, and implores His aid. In answer to prayer God acts on the soul by His grace and, in special circumstances, by working miracles. Hence the great fact of prayer, as the connecting link of man to God, implies a constant interference of God in the life of man. Therefore, in the Christian view of the world, miracles have a place and a meaning. They arise out of the personal relation between God and man. The conviction that the pure of heart are pleasing to God, in some mysterious way, is world-wide; even among the heathens pure offerings only are prepared for the sacrifice. This intimate sense of God's presence may account for the universal tendency to refer all striking phenomena to supernatural causes. Error and exaggeration do not change the nature of the belief founded in the abiding conviction of the Providence of God. To this belief St. Paul appealed in his discourse to the Athenians (Acts, xvii). In the miracle, therefore, God subordinates physical nature to a higher purpose, and this higher purpose is identical with the highest moral aims of existence. The mechanical view of the world is in harmony with the teleological, and when purpose exists, no event is isolated or unmeaning. Man is created for God, and a miracle is the proof and pledge of His supernatural Providence. Hence we can understand how, in devout minds, there is even a presumption for and an expectation of miracles. They show the subordination of the lower world to the higher; they are the breaking in of the higher world on the lower ("C. Gent.", III, xcviii, xcix; Benedict XIV, 1, c; 1, IV, p. 1, c. I).

Some writers—e. g., Paley, Mansel, Mozley, Dr. George Fisher—push the Christian view to the extreme, and say that miracles are necessary to attest revelation. Catholic theologians, however, take a broader view. They hold (1) that the great primary ends of miracles are the manifestation of God's glory and the good of men; that the particular or secondary ends, subordinate to the former, are to confirm the truth of a mission or a doctrine of faith or morals, to attest the sanctity of God's servants, to confer benefits and vindicate Divine justice. (2) Hence they teach that the attestation of Revelation is not the primary end of the miracle, but its main secondary end, though not the only one. (3) They say that the miracles of Christ were not necessary but "most fitting and altogether in accord with His mission" (*decentissimum et maximopere conveniens*"—Bened. XIV, IV, p. 1, c. 2, n. 3; Summa, III, Q. xliii) as a means to attest its truth. At the same time they place miracles among the strongest and most certain evidences of Divine revelation. (4) Yet they teach that, as evidences, miracles have not a physical force, i. e., absolutely compelling assent, but only a moral force, i. e., they do no violence to free will, though their appeal to the assent is of the strongest kind. (5) That, as evidences, they are not wrought to show the internal truth of the doctrines, but only to give manifest reasons why we should accept the doctrines. Hence the distinction: not *evidenter vera*, but *evidenter credibilia*. For the Revelation, which miracles attest, contains supernatural doctrines above the comprehension of the mind and positive institutions in God's supernatural Providence over men. Thus the opinion of Locke, Trench, Mill, Mozley, and Cox, that the doctrine proves the miracle, not the miracle the doctrine, is not true. (6) Finally, they maintain that the miracles of Scripture and the power in the Church of working miracles are of Divine faith, not, however, the miracles of church history themselves. Hence they teach that the former are both evidences of faith and objects of faith; that the latter are evidences of the purpose for which they are wrought, not, however, objects of Divine faith. Hence this teaching guards against the other exaggerated view recently proposed by non-Catholic writers, who hold that miracles are now considered not as evidences, but as objects of faith.

V. Testimony.—A miracle, like any natural event, is known either from personal observation or from the testimony of others. In the miracle we have the fact itself as an external occurrence and its miraculous character. The miraculous character of the fact consists in this: that its nature and the surrounding circumstances are of such a kind that we are forced to admit natural forces alone could not have produced it, and the only rational explanation is to be had in the interference of Divine agency. The perception of its miraculous character is a rational act of the mind, and is simply the application of the principle of causality with the methods of induction. The general rules governing the acceptance of testimony apply to miracles as to other facts of history. If we have certain evidence for the fact, we are bound to accept it. The evidence for miracles, as for historical facts in general, depends on the knowledge and veracity of the narrators, i. e., they who testify to the occurrence of the events must know what they tell and tell the truth. The extraordinary nature of the miracle requires more complete and accurate investigation. Such testimony we are not free to reject; otherwise we must deny all history whatsoever. We have no more rational warrant for rejecting miracles than for rejecting accounts of stellar eclipses. Hence, they who deny miracles have concentrated their efforts with the purpose of destroying the historical evidence for all miracles whatsoever and especially the evidence for the miracles of the Gospel.

Hume held that no testimony could prove miracles,

for it is more probable that the testimony is false than that the miracles are true. But (1) his contention that "a uniform experience", which is "a direct and full proof", is against miracles, is denied by Mill, provided an adequate cause—i. e., God—exists. (2) Hume's "experience" may mean: (a) the experience of the individual, and his argument is made absurd (e. g., historic doubts about Napoleon) or (b) the experience of the race, which has become common property and the type of what may be expected. Now in fact we get this by testimony; many supernatural facts are part of this race experience; this supernatural part Hume prejudges, arbitrarily declares it untrue, which is the point to be proved, and assumes that *miraculous* is synonymous with *absurd*. The past, so expurgated, is made the test of the future, and should prevent the consistent advocates of Hume from accepting the discoveries of science. (3) Hard-pressed, Hume is forced to make the distinction between testimony contrary to experience and testimony not conformable to experience, and holds that the latter may be accepted—e. g., testimony of ice to the Indian prince. But this admission is fatal to his position. (4) Hume proceeds on the supposition that, for practical purposes, all the laws of nature are known, yet experience shows that this is not true. (5) His whole argument rests upon the rejected philosophical principle that external experience is the sole source of knowledge, rests upon the discredited basis that miracles are opposed to the uniformity of nature as violations of natural laws, and was advanced through prejudice against Christianity. Hence later sceptics have receded from Hume's extreme position and teach, not that miracles cannot be proved, but that as a matter of fact they are not proved.

The attack by Hume on miracles in general has been applied to the miracles of the Bible, and has received added weight from the denial of Divine inspiration. Varying in form, its basic principle is the same, viz., the humanism of the Renaissance applied to theology. Thus we have: (1) The old rationalism of Semler, Eichhorn, de Wette, and Paulus, who held the credibility of the Bible records, but contended that they were a collection of writings composed by natural intelligence alone, and to be treated on the same plane with other natural productions of the human mind. They got rid of the supernatural by a bold interpretation of miracles as purely natural facts. This is called the "interpretation" theory, and appears today under two forms: (a) modified rationalism, which teaches that we are warranted in accepting a very considerable portion of the Gospel narratives as substantially historical, without being compelled to believe in any miracles. Hence they give credence to the accounts of the demoniacs and healings, but allege that these wonders were wrought by, or in accordance with, natural law. Thus we have the electric theory of M. Corelli, the appeal to "moral therapeutics" by Matthew Arnold, and the psychological theory advanced by Prof. Bousset of Göttingen, in which he claims that Christ performed miracles by natural mental powers of a superior kind (cf. "N. World", March, 1896). But the attempt to explain the miracles of the Gospel either by the natural powers of Christ, i. e., mental or moral superiority, or by peculiar states of the recipient, faith cure, and allied psychic phenomena, is arbitrary and not true to facts. In many of the miracles faith is not required, and is in fact absent; this is shown, in the miracles of power, by the expressed fear of the Apostles, e. g., at Christ stilling the tempest (Mark, iv, 40), at Christ on the waters (Mark, vi, 51), at the draught of fishes (Luke, v, 8), and in the miracles of expelling demons. In some miracles Christ requires faith, but the faith is not the cause of the miracle, only the condition of His exercising the power.

(b) Others, like Holstein, Renan, and Huxley, follow de Wette, who explains the miracles as the emotional interpretation of commonplace events. They claim that the facts which occurred were substantially historical, but in the narrating were covered over with the interpretations of the writers. Hence, they say that, in studying the Gospels, we must distinguish between the facts as they actually took place and the subjective emotions of those who witnessed them, their strong excitement, tendency to exaggeration, and vivid imagination. Thus they appeal not to the "fallacies of testimony" so much as to the "fallacies of the senses". But this attempt to transform the Apostles into nervous visionaries cannot be held by an unbiased mind. St. Peter clearly distinguished between a vision (Acts, x, 17) and a reality (Acts, xii), and St. Paul mentions two cases of visions (Acts, xxii, 17; II Cor., xii), the latter by way of contrast with his ordinary missionary life of labours and sufferings (II Cor., xi). Renan even goes so far as to present the glaring inconsistency of a Christ remarkable, as he says, for moral beauty of life and doctrine, who nevertheless is guilty of conscious deception, as, e. g., in the make-believe raising of Lazarus. This teaching is in reality a denial of testimony. The miracles of Christ must be taken as a whole, and in the Gospel setting where they are presented as a part of his teaching and his life. On the ground of evidence there is no reason to make a distinction among them or to interpret them so that they become other than they are. The real reason is prejudgment on false philosophical grounds with a view to get rid of the supernatural element. In fact, the conjectures and hypotheses proposed are far more improbable than the miracles themselves. Again, how thus explain the great miracle that the hero of a baseless legend, the impotent and deceitful Christ, could become the founder of the Christian Church and of Christian civilization? Finally, this method violates the first principles of interpretation; for the New-Testament writers are not allowed to speak their own language.

(2) The theory of Biblical Humanism.—The fundamental idea of Hegel's metaphysic (viz., that existing things are the progressive manifestation of the idea, i. e., the absolute) gave a philosophical basis for the organic conception of the universe, i. e., the Divine as organic to the human. Thus revelation is presented as a human process, and history—e. g., the Bible—is a record of human experience, the product of a human life. This philosophy of history was applied to explain the miraculous in the Gospels and appears under two forms: (a) the Tübingen School. Baur regards the Hegelian process in its objective aspect, i. e., the facts as things. He held the books of the New Testament to be states through which the human life and thought of early Christianity had passed. He attempted to do with reference to the origin what Gibbon tried with reference to the spread of Christianity— i. e., get rid of the supernatural by the tacit assumption that there were no miracles and by the enumeration of natural causes, chief of which was the Messianic idea to which Jesus accommodated Himself. The evolution element in Baur's Humanism, however, constrained him to deny that we possess contemporaneous documents of our Lord's life, to hold that the New-Testament literature was the result of warring factions among the early Christians, and therefore of a much later date than tradition ascribes to it, and that Christ was only the occasional cause of Christianity. He accepted as genuine only the Epistles to the Galatians, Romans, I and II Corinthians, and the Apocalypse. But the Epistles admitted by Baur show that St. Paul believed in miracles and asserted the actual occurrence of them as well-known facts both in regard to Christ and in regard to himself and the other Apostles (e. g., Rom., xv, 18; I Cor., i, 22; xii, 10; II Cor., xii, 12; Gal., iii, 5, especially his repeated references to the Resurrection of Christ, I Cor., xv). The basis on which the Tübingen School

rests, viz., that we possess no contemporaneous records of Christ's life, and that the New-Testament writings belong to the second century, has been proved to be false by the higher criticisms. Hence Huxley admits that this position is no longer tenable (The Nineteenth Century, Feb., 1889), and in fact there is no longer a Tübingen School at Tübingen. Harnack says: "As regards the criticisms of the sources of Christianity, we stand unquestionably in a movement of return to tradition. The chronological framework in which tradition set the earliest documents is to be henceforth accepted in its main outlines" (The Nineteenth Cent., Oct., 1899). Hence Romanes said that the outcome of the battle on the Bible documents is a signal victory for Christianity (Thoughts on Religion, p. 165). Dr. Emil Reich speaks of the bankruptcy of the higher criticism ("Contemp. Rev.", April, 1905).

(b) The "Mythical" School.—Strauss regarded the Hegelian process in its subjective aspect. The facts as matters of consciousness with the early Christians concerned him exclusively. Hence he regarded Christ within the Christian consciousness of the time, and held that Christ of the New Testament was the outcome of this consciousness. He did not deny a relatively small nucleus of historical reality, but contended that the Gospels, as we possess them, are mythical inventions or fabulous and fanciful embellishments and are to be regarded only as symbols for spiritual ideas, e. g., the Messianic idea. Strauss thus attempted to remove the miraculous—or what he considered the unhistorical matter—from the text. But this view was too fanciful long to hold currency after a careful study of the truthful, matter-of-fact character of the New-Testament writings, and a comparison of them with the Apocrypha. Hence it has been rejected, and Strauss himself confessed to disappointment at the result of his labours (The Old and New Faith).

(3) The Critical Agnostic School.—Its basis is the organic idea of the universe, but it views the world-process apart from God, because reason cannot prove the existence of God, and therefore, to the Agnostic, He does not exist (e. g., Huxley); or to the Christian Agnostic, His existence is accepted on Faith (e. g., Baden-Powell). To both there is no miracle, for we have no way of knowing it. Thus Huxley admits the facts of miracles in the New Testament, but says that the testimony as to their miraculous character may be worthless, and strives to explain it by the subjective mental conditions of the writers ("The Nineteenth Cent.", Mar., 1889). Baden-Powell (in "Essays and Reviews"), Holtzmann (Die synoptischen Evangelien), and Harnack (The Essence of Christianity) admit the miracles as recorded in the Gospels, but hold that their miraculous character is beyond the scope of historical proof, and depends on the mental assumptions of the readers.—Criticism: The real problem of the historian is to state well-authenticated facts and give an explanation of the testimony. He should show how such events must have taken place and how such a theory only can explain them. He takes cognizance of all that is said about these events by competent witnesses, and from their testimony he draws the conclusion. To admit the facts and to deny an explanation is to furnish very great evidence for their historical truth, and to show qualities not consistent with the scientific historian.

(4) The theory of liberal Protestantism.—(a) In its older form, this was advocated by Carlyle (Froude's "Life of Carlyle"), Martineau (Seal of Authority in Religion), Rathbone Greg (Creed of Christendom), Prof. Wm. H. Green (Works, III, pp. 230, 253), proposed as a religious creed under the title of the "new Reformation" ("The Nineteenth Cent.", Mar., 1889) and popularized by Mrs. Humphry Ward in "Robert Elsmere". As the old Reformation was a movement to destroy the Divine authority of the Church by exalting the supernatural character of the Bible, so the new Reformation aimed at removing the supernatural element from the Bible and resting faith in Christianity on the high moral character of Jesus and the excellence of His moral teaching. It is in close sympathy with some writers on the science of religion, who see in Christianity a natural religion, though superior to other forms. In describing their position as "a revolt against miraculous belief", its adherents yet profess great reverence for Jesus as "that friend of God and Man, in whom, through all human frailty and necessary imperfection, they see the natural head of their inmost life, the symbol of those religious forces in man which are primitive, essential and universal" ("The Nineteenth Cent.", Mar., 1889). By way of criticism it may be said that this school has its source in the philosophical assumption that the uniformity of nature has made the miracle unthinkable —an assumption now discarded. Again, it has its basis in the Tübingen School, which has been proved false, and it requires a mutilation of the Gospels so radical and wholesale that nearly every sentence has to be excised or rewritten. The miracles of Jesus are too essential a part of His life and teaching to be thus removed. We might as well expurgate the records of military achievements from the lives of Alexander or of Cæsar. Strauss exposed the inconsistencies of this position, which he once held (Old Faith and the New), and von Hartmann considered the Liberal theologians as causing the disintegration of Christianity ("Selbstersetzung des Christ", 1888).

(b) In its recent form, it has been advocated by the exponents of the psychological theory. Hence, where the old school followed an objective, this pursues a subjective method. This theory combines the basic teaching of Hegel, Schleiermacher, and Ritschl. Hegel taught that religious truths are the figurative representation of rational ideas; Schleiermacher taught that propositions of faith are the pious states of the heart expressed in language; Ritschl, that the evidence of Christian doctrine is in the "value-judgment", i. e., the religious effect on the mind. On this basis Prof. Gardner ("A Historical View of the New Test.", London, 1904) holds that no reasonable man would profess to disprove the Christian miracles historically; that in historical studies we must accept the principle of continuity as set forth by evolution, that the statements of the New Testament are based mainly on Christian experience, in which there is always an element of false theory; that we must distinguish between the true underlying fact and its defective outward expression; that this expression is conditioned by the intellectual atmosphere of the time, and passes away to give place to a higher and better expression. Hence the outward expression of Christianity should be different now from what it was in other days. Hence, while miracles may have had their value for the early Christians, they have no value for us, for our experience is different from theirs. Thus M. Réville ("Liberal Christianity", London, 1903) says: "The faith of a liberal Protestant does not depend upon the solution of a problem of historical criticism. It is founded upon his own experience of the value and power of the Gospel of Christ", and "The Gospel of Jesus is independent of its local and temporary forms" (pp. 54, 58).—All this, however, is philosophy, not history; it is not Christianity, but Rationalism; it inverts the true standard of historical criticism—viz., we should study past events in the light of their own surroundings, and not from the subjective feeling on the part of the historian of what might, could, or would have occurred. There is no reason to restrict these principles to questions of religious history; and if extended to embrace the whole of past history, they would lead to absolute scepticism.

VI. The Fact.—The Bible shows that at all times God has wrought miracles to attest the Revelation

of His will. (1) The miracles of the Old Testament reveal the Providence of God over His chosen people. They are convincing proof for the commission of Moses (Exod., iii, iv), manifest to the people that Jehovah is Sovereign Lord (Exod., x, 2; Deut., v, 25), and are represented as the "finger of God" and "the hand of God." God punishes Pharaoh for refusing to obey His commands given by Moses and attested by miracles, and is displeased with the infidelity of the Jews for whom He worked many miracles (Num., xiv). Miracles convinced the widow of Sarephta that Elias was "a man of God" (III Kings, xvii, 24), made the people cry out in the dispute between Elias and the prophets of Baal, "the Lord he is God" (III Kings, xviii, 39), caused Naaman to confess that "there is no other God in all the earth, but only in Israel" (IV Kings, v, 15), led Nabuchodonosor to issue a public decree in honour of God upon the escape of the Three Children from the fiery furnace (Dan., iii), and Darius to issue a like decree on the escape of Daniel (Dan., v). The ethical element is conspicuous in the miracles and is in consonance with the exalted ethical character of Jehovah, "a king of absolute justice, whose love for his people was conditioned by a law of absolute righteousness, as foreign to Semitic as to Aryan tradition", writes Dr. Robertson Smith ("Religion of the Semites", p. 74; cf. Kuenen, Hibbert Lect., p. 124). Hence the tendency among recent writers on the history of religion to postulate the direct intervention of God through revelation as the only explanation for the exalted conception of the Deity set forth by Moses and the prophets (R. Kettel, "Geschichte der Hebräer", 1889–92).

(2) The Old Testament reveals a high ethical conception of God who works miracles for high ethical purposes, and unfolds a dispensation of prophecy leading up to Christ. In fulfilment of this prophecy Christ works miracles. His answer to the messengers of John the Baptist was that they should go and tell John what they had seen (Luke, vii, 22; cf. Isa., xxxv, 5). Thus the Fathers of the Church, in proving the truth of the Christian religion from the miracles of Christ, join them with prophecy (Origen, "C. Celsum", I, ii; Irenæus, Adv. hær. L, ii, 32; St. Augustine, "C. Faustum", XII). Jesus openly professed to work miracles. He appeals repeatedly to His "works" as most authentic and decisive proof of His Divine Sonship (John, v, 18–36; x, 24–37) and of His mission (John, xiv, 12), and for this reason condemns the obstinacy of the Jews as inexcusable (John, xv, 22, 24). He worked miracles to establish the Kingdom of God (Matt., xii; Luke, xi), gave to the Apostles (Matt., x, 8) and disciples (Luke, x, 9, 19) the power of working miracles, thereby instructing them to follow the same method, and promised that the gift of miracles should persist in the Church (Mark, xvi, 17). At the sight of His marvellous works, the Jews (Matt., ix, 8), Nicodemus (John, iii, 2), and the man born blind (John, ix, 33) confess that they must be ascribed to Divine power. Pfleiderer accepts the second Gospel as the authentic work of St. Mark, and this Gospel is a compact account of miracles wrought by Christ. Ewald and Weiss speak of the miracles of Christ as a daily task. Miracles are not accidental or external to the Christ of the Gospels; they are inseparably bound up with His supernatural doctrine and supernatural life—a life and doctrine which is the fulfilment of prophecy and the source of Christian civilization. Miracles form the very substance of the Gospel narratives, so that, if removed, there would remain no recognizable plan of work and no intelligent portrait of the worker. We have the same evidence for miracles that we have for Christ. Dr. Holtzmann says that the very traits whose astonishing combination in one person presents the highest kind of historical evidence for His existence are indissolubly connected with miracles. Unless we accept miracles, we have no Gospel history. Admit that Christ wrought many miracles, or confess that we do not know Him at all—in fact, that He never existed. The historical Christ of the Gospels stands before us remarkable in the charm of personality, extraordinary in the elevation of life and beauty of doctrine, strikingly consistent in tenor of life, exercising Divine power in varied ways and at every turn. He rises supreme over, and apart from, His surroundings and cannot be regarded as the fruit of individual invention or as the product of the age. The simplest, clearest, only explanation is that the testimony is true. They who deny have yet to offer an explanation strong enough to withstand the criticism of the sceptics themselves.

(3) The testimony of the Apostles to miracles is twofold: (a) They preached the miracles of Christ, especially the Resurrection. Thus St. Peter speaks of the "miracles, and wonders, and signs" which Jesus did as a fact well-known to the Jews (Acts, ii, 22), and as published through Galilee and Judea (Acts, x, 37). The Apostles profess themselves witnesses of the Resurrection (Acts, ii, 32), they say that the characteristic of an Apostle is that he be a witness of the Resurrection (Acts, i, 22), and upon the Resurrection base their preaching in Jerusalem (Acts, iii, 15; iv, 10; v, 30; x, 40), at Antioch (Acts, xiii, 30 sqq.), at Athens (Acts, xvii, 31), at Corinth (I Cor., xv), at Rome (Rom., vi, 4), and in Thessalonica (I Thess., i, 10). (b) They worked miracles themselves, wonders and signs in Jerusalem (Acts, ii, 43), cure the lame (Acts, iii, xiv), heal the sick, and drive out demons (Acts, viii, 7, 8), raise the dead (Acts, xx, 10 sqq.). St. Paul calls the attention of the Christians at Rome to his own miracles (Rom., xv, 18, 19), refers to the well-known miracles performed in Galatia (Gal., iii, 5), calls the Christians of Corinth to witness the miracles he worked among them as the signs of his apostleship (II Cor., xii, 12), and gives to the working of miracles a place in the economy of the Christian Faith (I Cor., xii). Thus the Apostles worked miracles in their missionary journeys in virtue of the power given them by Christ (Mark, iii, 15) and confirmed after His Resurrection (Mark, xvi, 17).

(4) Dr. Middleton holds that all miracles ceased with the Apostles. Mozley and Milman ascribe later miracles to pious myths, fraud, and forgery. Trench admits that few points present greater difficulty than the attempt to determine the exact period when the power of working miracles was withdrawn from the Church. This position is one of polemical bias against the Catholic Church, just as presumptions of various kinds are behind all attacks on the miracles of scripture. Now we are not obliged to accept every miracle alleged as such. The evidence of testimony is our warrant, and for miracles of church history we have testimony of the most complete kind. If it should happen that, after careful investigation, a supposed miracle should turn out to be no miracle at all, a distinct service to truth would be rendered. Throughout the course of church history there are miracles so well authenticated that their truth cannot be denied. Thus St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch speak of the miracles wrought in their time. Origen says he has seen examples of demons expelled, many cures effected, and prophecies fulfilled ("C. Celsum", I, II, III, VII). Irenæus taunts the magic-workers of his day that "they cannot give sight to the blind nor hearing to the deaf, nor put to flight demons; and they are so far from raising the dead, as Our Lord did, and the Apostles, by prayer, and as is most frequently done among the brethren, that they even think it impossible" (Adv. hær., II). St. Athanasius writes the life of St. Anthony from what he himself saw and heard from one who had long been in attendance on the saint. St. Justin in his second apology to the Roman Senate appeals to miracles wrought in Rome and well attested. Tertullian

challenges the heathen magistrates to work the miracles which the Christians perform (Apol., xxiii); St. Paulinus, in the life of St. Ambrose, narrates what he has seen. St. Augustine gives a long list of extraordinary miracles wrought before his own eyes, mentions names and particulars, describes them as well known, and says they happened within two years before he published the written account (De civit. Dei., XXII, viii; Retract., I, xiii). St. Jerome wrote a book to confute Vigilantius and prove that relics should be venerated, by citing miracles wrought through them. Theodoret published the life of St. Simon Stylites while the saint was living, and thousands were alive who had been eye-witnesses of what had happened. St. Victor, Bishop of Vita, wrote the history of the African confessors whose tongues had been cut out by command of Hunneric, and who yet retained the power of speech, and challenges the reader to go to Reparatus, one of them then living at the palace of the Emperor Zeno. From his own experience Sulpicius Severus wrote the life of St. Martin of Tours. St. Gregory the Great writes to St. Augustine of Canterbury not to be elated by the many miracles God was pleased to work through his hands for the conversion of the people of Britain. Hence Gibbon says, "The Christian Church, from the time of the Apostles and their disciples, has claimed an uninterrupted succession of miraculous powers, the gift of tongues, of visions and of prophecy, the power of expelling demons, of healing the sick and of raising the dead" (Decline and Fall, I, pp. 264, 288); thus miracles are so interwoven with our religion, so connected with its origin, its promulgation, its progress and whole history, that it is impossible to separate them from it. The existence of the Church, the kingdom of God on earth, in which Christ and His Holy Spirit abide, rendered illustrious by the miraculous lives of saints of all countries and all times, is a perpetual standing witness for the reality of miracles (Bellar., "De notis eccl.", LIV, xiv). The well-attested records are to be found in the official processes for the canonization of saints. Mozley held that an enormous distinction exists between the miracles of the Gospel and those of church history, through the false notion that the sole purpose of miracles was the attestation of revealed truth: Newman denies the contention and shows that both are of the same type and as well-authenticated by historical evidence.

VII. Place and Value of the Gospel Miracles. —In studying the Gospel miracles we are impressed by the accounts given of their multitude, and by the fact that only a very small proportion of them is related by the Evangelists in detail; the Gospels speak only in the most general terms of the miracles Christ performed in the great missionary journeys through Galilee and Judea. We read that the people, seeing the things which He did, followed Him in crowds (Matt., iv., 25), to the number of 5000 (Luke, ix, 14), so that He could not enter the cities, and His fame spread from Jerusalem through Syria (Matt., iv, 24). His reputation was so great that the chief priests in council speak of Him as one who "doth many miracles" (John, xi, 47), the disciples at Emmaus as the "prophet, mighty in work and word before God and all the people" (Luke, xxiv, 19), and St. Peter describes Him to Cornelius as the wonder-working preacher (Acts, x, 38). Out of the great mass of miraculous events surrounding our Lord's person, the Evangelists made a selection. True, it was impossible to narrate all (John, xx, 30). Yet we can see in the narrated miracles a twofold reason for the selection.

(1) The great purpose of the Redemption was the manifestation of God's glory in the salvation of man through the life and work of His Incarnate Son. Thus it ranks supreme among the works of God's Providence over men. This explains the life and teaching of Christ; it enables us to grasp the scope and plan of His miracles. They can be considered in relation to the office and person of Christ as Redeemer. Thus (a) they have their source in the hypostatic union and follow on the relation of Christ to men as Redeemer. In them we can see references to the great redemption work He came to accomplish. Hence the Evangelists conceive Christ's miraculous power as an influence radiating from Him (Mark, v, 30; Luke, vi, 19), and theologians call the miracles of Christ theandrical works (Bellar, "Controv.", I, lib. V, c. vii). (b) Their aim is the glory of God in the manifestation of Christ's glory and in the salvation of men, as e. g. in the miracle of Cana (John, ii, 11), in the Transfiguration (Matt., xvii), the Resurrection of Lazarus (John, xi, 15), Christ's last prayer for the Apostles (John, xvii), the Resurrection of Christ (Acts, x, 40). St. John opens his Gospel with the Incarnation of the Eternal Word, and adds, "we saw his glory" (John, i, 14). Hence Irenæus (Adv. hær., V) and Athanasius (Incarn.) teach that the works of Christ were the manifestations of the Divine Word who in the beginning made all things and who in the Incarnation displayed His power over nature and man, as a manifestation of the new life imparted to man and a revelation of the character and purposes of God. The repeated references in the Acts and in the Epistles to the "glory of Christ" have relation to His miracles. The source and purpose of the miracles of Christ is the reason for their intimate connexion with His life and teaching. A saving and redeeming mission was the purpose of the miracles, as it was of the doctrine and life of the eternal Son of God. (c) Their motive was mercy. Most of Christ's miracles were works of mercy. They were performed not with a view to awe men by the feeling of omnipotence, but to show compassion for sinful and suffering humanity. They are not to be regarded as isolated or transitory acts of sympathy, but as prompted by a deep and abiding mercy which characterizes the office of Saviour. The Redemption is a work of mercy, and the miracles reveal the mercy of God in the works of His Incarnate Son (Acts, x, 38). (d) Hence we can see in them a symbolical character. They were signs, and in a special sense they signified by the typical language of external facts, the inward renewal of the soul. Thus, in commenting on the miracle of the widow's son at Naim, St. Augustine says that Christ raised three from the death of the body, but thousands from the death of sin to the life of Divine grace (Serm. de verbis Dom., xcviii, al. xliv).

The relief which Christ brought to the body represented the deliverance He was working on souls. His miracles of cures and healings were the visible picture of His spiritual work in the warfare with evil. These miracles, summarized in the answer of Jesus to the messengers of John (Matt., xi, 5), are explained by the Fathers of the Church with reference to the ills of the soul (Summa, III, Q. xliv). The motive and meaning of the miracles explain the moderation Christ showed in the use of His infinite power. Repose in strength is a sublime trait in the character of Jesus; it comes from the conscious possession of power to be used for the good of men. Rousseau confesses, "All the miracles of Jesus were useful without pomp or display, but simple as His words, His life, His whole conduct" (Lettr. de la Montag., pt. I, lett. iii). He does not perform them for the sake of being a mere worker of miracles. Everything He does has a meaning when viewed in the relation Christ holds to men. In the class known as miracles of power Jesus does not show a mere mental and moral superiority over ordinary men. In virtue of His redeeming mission He proves that He is Lord and Master of the forces of nature. Thus by a word He stills the tempest, by a word He multiplied a few loaves and fishes so that thousands feasted and were filled, by a word He healed lepers, drove out demons, raised the dead to life, and

finally set the great seal upon His mission by rising from death, as He had explicitly foretold. Thus Renan admits that "even the marvellous in the Gospels is but sober good sense compared with that which we meet in the Jewish apocryphal writings or the Hindu or European mythologies" (Stud. in Hist. of Relig., pp. 177, 203).

(e) Hence the miracles of Christ have a doctrinal import. They have a vital connexion with His teaching and mission, illustrate the nature and purpose of His kingdom, and show a connexion with some of the greatest doctrines and principles of His Church. Its catholicity is shown in the miracles of the centurion's servant (Matt., viii) and the Syro-phenician woman (Mark, vii). The Sabbatical miracles reveal its purpose, i. e., the salvation of men, and show that Christ's kingdom marks the passing of the Old Dispensation. His miracles teach the power of faith and the answer given to prayer. The central truth of His teaching was life. He came to give life to men, and this teaching is emphasized by raising the dead to life, especially in the case of Lazarus and His own Resurrection. The sacramental teaching of the miracles is manifested in the miracle of Cana (John, ii), in the cure of the paralytic, to show he had the power to forgive sins [and he used this power (Matt., ix) and gave it to the Apostles (John, xx, 23)], in the multiplication of the loaves (John, vi) and in raising the dead. Finally, the prophetic element of the fortunes of the individual and of the Church is shown in the miracles of stilling the tempest, of Christ on the waters, of the draught of fishes, of the didrachma and the barren fig-tree. Jesus makes the miracle of Lazarus the type of the General Resurrection, just as the Apostles take the Resurrection of Christ to signify the rising of the soul from the death of sin to the life of grace, and to be a pledge and prophecy of the victory over sin and death and of the final resurrection (I Thess., iv).

(2) The miracles of Christ have an evidential value. This aspect naturally follows from the above considerations. In the first miracle at Cana He "manifested His glory", therefore the disciples "believed in Him" (John, ii, 11). Jesus constantly appealed to His "works" as evidences of His mission and His divinity. He declares that His miracles have greater evidential value than the testimony of John the Baptist (John, v, 36); their logical and theological force as evidences is expressed by Nicodemus (John, iii, 2). And to the miracles Jesus adds the evidence of prophecy (John, v, 31). Now their value as evidences for the people then living is found not only in the display of omnipotence in His redeeming mission but also in the multitude of His works. Thus the unrecorded miracles had an evidential bearing on His mission. So we can see an evidential reason for the selection of the miracles as narrated in the Gospels.

(a) This selection was guided by a purpose to make clear the main events in Christ's life leading up to the Crucifixion and to show that certain definite miracles (e. g., the cure of the lepers, the casting out of demons in a manner marvellously superior to the exorcisms of the Jews, the Sabbatical miracles, the raising of Lazarus) caused the rulers of the Synagogue to conspire and put Him to death. (b) A second reason for the selection was the expressed purpose to prove that Jesus was the Son of God (John, xx, 31). Thus, for us, who depend on the Gospel narratives, the evidential value of Christ's miracles comes from a comparatively small number related in detail, though of a most stupendous and clearly supernatural kind, some of which were performed almost in private and followed by the strictest injunctions not to publish them. In considering them as evidences in relation to us now living, we may add to them the constant reference to the multitude of miracles unrecorded in detail, their intimate connexion with our Lord's teaching and life, their relation to the prophecies of the Old Testament, their own prophetic character as fulfilled in the development of His kingdom on earth.

VIII. Special Providences.—Prayer is a great fact, which finds expression in a persistent manner, and enters intimately into the life of humanity. So universal is the act of prayer that it seems an instinct and part of our being. It is the fundamental fact of religion, and religion is a universal phenomenon of the human race. Christian philosophy teaches that in his spiritual nature man is made to the image and likeness of God, therefore his soul instinctively turns to his Maker in aspirations of worship, of hope, and of intercession. The real value of prayer has been a vital subject for discussion in modern times. Some, like O. B. Frothringham (Recollections and Impressions, p. 296), Drobisch and Herbart (Pfleiderer, "Phil. of Religion", II, p. 296), hold that its value lies only in its being a factor in the culture of the moral life, by giving tone and strength to character. Thus Professor Tyndall, in his famous Belfast address, proposed this view, maintaining that modern science has proved the physical value of prayer to be unbelievable (Fragments of Science). He based his contention on the uniformity of nature. But this basis is now no longer held as an obstacle to prayer for physical benefits. Others, like Baden-Powell (Order of Nature), admit that God answers prayer for spiritual favours, but denies its value for physical effects. But his basis is the same as that of Tyndall, and besides an answer for spiritual benefits is in fact an interference on the part of God in nature. Now Christian philosophy teaches that God, in answer to prayer, confers not only spiritual favours but at times interferes with the ordinary course of physical phenomena, so that, as a result, particular events happen otherwise than they should. This interference takes place in miracles and special providences.

When we kneel to pray we do not always beg God to work miracles or that our lives shall be constant prodigies of His power. The sense of our littleness gives an humble and reverential spirit to our prayer. We trust that God, through His Infinite knowledge and power, will in some way best known to Him bring about what we ask. Hence, by special providences we mean events which happen in the course of nature and of life through the instrumentality of natural laws. We cannot discern either in the event itself or in the manner of its happening any deviation from the known course of things. What we do know, however, is that events shape themselves in response to our prayer. The laws of nature are invariable, yet one important factor must not be forgotten: that the laws of nature may produce an effect, the same conditions must be present. If the conditions vary, then the effects also vary. By altering the conditions, other tendencies of nature are made predominant, and the forces which otherwise would work out their effects yield to stronger forces. In this way our will interferes with the workings of natural forces and with human tendencies, as is shown in our intercourse with men and in the science of government. Now, if such power rests with men, can God do less? Can we not believe that, at our prayer, God may cause the conditions of natural phenomena so to combine that, through His special agency, we may obtain our heart's desire, and yet so that, to the ordinary observer, the event happens in its ordinary place and time. To the devout soul, however, all is different. He recognizes God's favour and is devoutly thankful for the fatherly care. He knows that God has brought the event about in some way. When, therefore, we pray for rain, or to avert a calamity, or to prevent the ravages of plague, we beg not so much for miracles or signs of omnipotence: we ask that He who holds the heavens in His hands and who searches the abyss will listen to our petitions and, in His own good way, bring about the answer we need.

ST. THOMAS, *Contra gentes*, III, xcviii–cvii; IDEM, *Summa*, I, Q. c sq.; III, Q. xliii–xlv; BENEDICT XIV, *De servorum Dei beatificatione*, IV (Prato, 1839); ZIGLIARA, *Propædeutica ad sacram theologiam* (Rome, 1884); LE CAMUS, tr. HICKEY, *The Life of Christ* (New York, 1906); COLERIDGE, *The Public Life of Our Lord* (London, 1876); HAY, *The Doctrine of Miracles Explained* (New York, 1873); NEWMAN, *Essays on Miracles* (New York and London, 1890); LAW-WILSON, *The Theology of Modern Thought* (Edinburgh, 1899); THURSTON in *Brit. Med. Jour.* (London, Aug., 1910); GASQUET, *ibid.*; REICH, *Failure of the Higher Criticism* (London, 1910); WARD, *Philosophy of Theism* (London, 1884); DRISCOLL, *Christian Philosophy: God* (New York, 1905); BERTRIN, *Lourdes*, tr. GIBBS (London, 1908); BENSON, *Lourdes* in *Ave Maria*, LXVII; JOHN RICKABY, *Explanation of Miracles by Unknown Natural Forces* in *The Month* (London, Jan., 1877); HOGAN, *The Miraculous in Church History* in *Amer. Cath. Quart.* (Philadelphia, April, 1898); CALLAN, *Nature and Possibility of Miracles* in *Irish Theol. Quart.* (Dublin, Oct., 1910).

JOHN T. DRISCOLL.

Miracle Plays and Mysteries.—These two names are used to designate the religious drama which developed among Christian nations at the end of the Middle Ages. It should be noted that the word "mystery" has often been applied to all Christian dramas prior to the sixteenth century, whereas it should be confined to those of the fifteenth century, which represent the great dramatic effort anterior to the Renaissance. Before this period dramatic pieces were called "plays" or "miracles". The embryonic representations, at first given in the interior of the churches, have been designated as liturgical dramas.

LITURGICAL DRAMA.—The origin of the medieval drama was in religion. It is true that the Church forbade the faithful during the early centuries to attend the licentious representations of decadent paganism. But once this immoral theatre had disappeared, the Church allowed and itself contributed to the gradual development of a new drama, which was not only moral, but also edifying and pious. On certain solemn feasts, such as Easter and Christmas, the Office was interrupted, and the priests represented, in the presence of those assisting, the religious event which was being celebrated. At first the text of this liturgical drama was very brief, and was taken solely from the Gospel or the Office of the day. It was in prose and in Latin. But by degrees versification crept in. The earliest of such dramatic "tropes" (q. v.) of the Easter service are from England and date from the tenth century. Soon verse pervaded the entire drama, prose became the exception, and the vernacular appeared beside Latin. Thus, in the French drama of the "Wise Virgins" (first half of the twelfth century), which does little more than depict the Gospel parable of the wise and foolish virgins, the chorus employs Latin, while Christ and the virgins use both Latin and French, and the angel speaks only in French. When the vernacular had completely supplanted the Latin, and individual inventiveness had at the same time asserted itself, the drama left the precincts of the Church and ceased to be liturgical, without, however, losing its religious character. This evolution seems to have been accomplished in the twelfth century. With the appearance of the vernacular a development of the drama along national lines became possible. Let us first trace this development in France.

PLAYS AND MIRACLES OF THE TWELFTH AND THIRTEENTH CENTURIES.—The first French drama offered by the twelfth century is called "Adam", and was written by an Anglo-Norman author whose name is unknown. The subject extends from the Fall in the terrestrial Paradise to the time of the Prophets who foretell the Redeemer, relating in passing the history of Cain and Abel. It is written in French, though the directions to the actors are in Latin. It was played before the gate of the church. From the thirteenth century we have the "Play of St. Nicholas" by Jean Bodel, and the "Miracle of Theophilus" by Rutebeuf. Jean Bodel was a native of Arras, and followed St. Louis on the crusade to Egypt. He lays the scene of his play in the East, and mingles with heroic episodes of the crusades realistic pictures taken from taverns. His drama concludes with a general conversion of the Mussulmans secured through a miracle of St. Nicholas. Rutebeuf, who flourished in the second half of the thirteenth century, was born in Champagne, but lived in Paris. Though at first a gambler and idler, he seems to have ended his days in a cloister. His miracle depicts the legend, so famous in the Middle Ages, of Theophilus, the *œconomus* of the Church of Adana in Cilicia, who on losing his office bartered his soul to the devil for its recovery, but, having repented, obtained from the Blessed Virgin the miraculous return of the nefarious contract.

MIRACLES OF OUR LADY.—Save for the play of Griseldis, whose heroine, a poor shepherdess, married to the Marquis de Saluces, is subjected to cruel trials by her husband, and through the protection of St. Agnes triumphs over all obstacles, the entire dramatic activity of the fourteenth century was devoted to the miracles of Our Lady. Forty-two specimens of this style of drama are extant. Herein the Blessed Virgin saves or consoles through marvellous intervention those who are guiltless and unfortunate and sometimes great sinners who have confidence in her. The author or authors of these works are unknown.

THE MYSTERIES.—The fifteenth century is the century of the "mysteries". The word is doubtless derived from the Latin *ministerium* and means "act". In the Middle Ages sacred dramas were also called by other names; in Italy *funzione*, in Spain *autos* (acts). Even to-day we say "drama", a word of analogous signification. But the dramatic and the dogmatic mysteries were soon confused, and it was thought that the former derived their name from the latter because the plays frequently took for subject the mysteries of Christian belief. However, the mysteries were often devoted to a saint, and, in exceptional cases, even represented matters which were not religious. Thus we have the "Mystery of the Siege of Orleans", and even the "Mystery of the Destruction of Troy", the only two profane mysteries which have been preserved. The mysteries may be grouped under three cycles, that of the Old Testament, that of the New Testament, and that of the saints. It must be borne in mind that in all these the authors mingled truth and legend without distinction. The most celebrated of these were the passion plays, by which must be understood not only the plays devoted to the Passion properly so called, but also those which set forth the complete history of the Saviour. From 1400 to 1550 the authors were numerous; about a hundred of them are known, many of them priests.

At first somewhat short, the dramas eventually became very long. Thus Arnoul Greban, canon of the church of Le Mans, wrote about 1450 a "Passion" consisting of about 35,000 verses. This play was still further developed more than thirty years later by a physician of Angers, Jean Michel, whose work was the most famous and the best of its kind. The same Greban and his brother Simon, a monk of St. Riquier, composed together an enormous mystery of the "Acts of the Apostles", consisting of nearly 62,000 verses, which was played in its entirety at Bourges, the performance lasting forty days. The number of verses of mysteries still extant exceeds 1,000,000, and an equally large number may have been lost. These pieces were not played by professional actors, but by dramatic associations which were formed in all large towns for the purpose of representing them. Some were permanent, such as the "Confrérie de la Passion", which in 1402 secured the monopoly of the representations in Paris. For the people of the middle classes, artisans, and priests (all ranks in this matter being equal), it was an enviable honour to take part in this religious performance. To play it they condemned themselves to a labour to which few of our



Typogravure Goupil of Paris (France).

SCENE IN THE PASSION PLAY AT VALENCIENNES, A. D. 1547

FROM A MANUSCRIPT IN THE BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE, PARIS

contemporaries would care to submit. In some "passions" the actor who represented Christ had to recite nearly 4000 lines. Moreover, the scene of the crucifixion had to last as long as it did in reality. It is related that in 1437 the curé Nicolle, who was playing the part of Christ at Metz, was on the point of dying on the cross, and had to be revived in haste. During the same representation another priest, Jehan de Missey, who was playing the part of Judas, remained hanging for so long that his heart failed and he had to be cut down and borne away.

As regards the æsthetic side of this drama, modern standards should not be applied. This theatre does not even offer unity of action, for the scenes are not derived from one another: they succeed one another without any other unity than the interest which attaches to the chief personage and the general idea of eternal salvation, whether of a single man or of humanity, which constitutes the common foundation of the picture. Moreover, side by side with pathetic and exalted scenes are found others which savour of buffoonery. The plays used as many as one, two, and even five hundred characters, not counting the chorus, and they were so long that they could not be played on one occasion. This is true at least of the mysteries dating from the middle of the fifteenth century; on the other hand, the oldest of them and the miracles were rather short. Two faults have at every period characterized this dramatic style, viz. weakness and wordiness. The poets said things as they occurred to them, without display of selection, gradation, or taste. They had facility, but they abused it and never amended. Furthermore, in the drawing of character there was no art whatever. The dramas of the Middle Ages are simply grand and animated spectacles. Doubtless their authors sometimes, though rarely, succeeded in fittingly depicting the patience and meekness of the august Victim of the Passion. In this they were assisted by recollections of the Gospel. More often they succeeded in attractively interpreting the complex emotions experienced by the soul of the Blessed Virgin, but as a definite object the analysis of the soul did not occupy them at all.

A few words may be said as to the manner of representation and technic. Places were indicated by vast scenery, rather than really represented. Two or three trees, for example, represented a forest, and although the action often changed from place to place the scenery did not change, for it showed simultaneously all the various localities where the characters successively appeared in the course of the drama, and which were thus in close proximity, even though in reality they were often far removed from each other. For the rest nothing was neglected to attract the eye. If the scenery was immovable, it was very rich and secrets of theoretical mechanism often produced surprising and fairy-like effects. The actors were richly dressed; each defrayed the cost of his own costume, and looked more for beauty than for truth. The subject-matter admitted of the marvellous and was borrowed from religion. For the rest there was some difference between the miracles and the mysteries. The miracles emphasized the supernatural intervention of a saint or the Blessed Virgin; the events might be infinitely varied, and this afforded the authors a wide field of which, however, they did not take full advantage, though they incidentally supply us a host of details regarding the manners of the times which are not found elsewhere.

The mysteries, at least in the Old and New Testament cycles, followed a previously traced out path, from which they could with difficulty depart since the foundation was borrowed from Holy Scripture. The traditional doctrine and the august characters of the chief personages had to be respected. But, to offset this handicap, what exalted, dramatic, and affecting subjects were theirs! These poets recalled not only the events of this world, but depicted before their audience the terrors and the hopes of the next. They set forth at the same time heaven, earth, and hell, and this enormous subject gave occasion for scenes of powerful interest. The scenes of the Passion are surely the most wonderful, the most moving, and the most beautiful that can be enacted on earth. The poet lacked art, but he was saved by his subject, as Sainte-Beuve himself has observed, and from time to time he became sublime despite himself. And what the spectator saw represented was not fiction, but the holy realities which from his childhood he had learned to venerate. What was put before his eyes was most calculated to affect him, the doctrines of his faith, the consolations it afforded in the sorrows of this life, and the immortal joys it promised in the next. Hence the great success of these religious performances. The greatest celebration a city could indulge in on a solemn occasion was to play the Passion. On this occasion the entire populace crowded into the enormous theatre, the city was deserted, and it was necessary to organize bands of armed citizens to protect the deserted houses against robbery. This custom endured until 1548, when the Parliament of Paris forbade the Confrères de la Passion to play thenceforth "the Sacred mysteries". The prohibition was due to the opposition of the Protestants against the mixing of comedy and fabulous traditions with Biblical teachings. These attacks aroused the scruples of some Catholics, and the judiciary considered it time to interfere. The mysteries perished; for the example of Paris, where they were forbidden to be played, was by degrees followed by the provinces. Thus the religious drama of the Middle Ages disappeared in France at the height of its success.

GEORGES BERTRIN.

ENGLAND.—There is no record of any religious drama in England previous to the Norman Conquest. About the beginning of the twelfth century we hear of a play of St. Catharine performed at Dunstable by Geoffroy, later abbot of St. Albans, and a passage in Fitzstephen's "Life of Becket" shows that such plays were common in London about 1170. These were evidently "miracle plays", though for England the distinction between miracles and mysteries is of no importance, all religious plays being called "miracles". Of miracle plays in the strict sense of the word nothing is preserved in English literature. The earliest religious plays were undoubtedly in Latin and French. The oldest extant miracle in English is the "Harrowing of Hell" (thirteenth century). Its subject is the apocryphal descent of Christ to the hell of the damned, and it belongs to the cycle of Easter-plays. From the fourteenth century dates the play of "Abraham and Isaac". A great impetus was again given to the religious drama in England as elsewhere by the institution of the festival of Corpus Christi (1264; generally observed since 1311) with its solemn processions. Presently the Eastern and Christmas cycles were joined into one great cycle representing the whole course of sacred history from the Creation to the Last Judgment. Thus arose the four great cycles still extant and known as the Towneley, Chester, York, and Coventry plays, the last three designated from the place of their performance. The Towneley mysteries owe their name to the fact that the single MS. in which they are preserved was long in the possession of the Towneley family. They were performed, it seems, at Woodkirk, near Wakefield. These cycles are very heterogeneous in character, the plays being by different authors. In their present form the number of plays in the cycles is: Towneley 30 (or 31), Chester 24, York 48, Coventry 42. Four other plays are also preserved in the Digby codex at Oxford. The so-called "moralities" (q. v.) are a later offshoot of the "miracles". These aim at the inculcation of ethical

truths and the *dramatis personæ* are abstract personifications, such as Virtue, Justice, the Seven Deadly Sins, etc. The character called "the Vice" is especially interesting as being the precursor of Shakespeare's fool. After the Reformation the miracle plays declined, though performances in some places are on record as late as the seventeenth century.

GERMANY.—In Germany the religious drama does not show a development on as grand a scale as in France or England. The oldest extant plays hail from Freisingen and date from the eleventh century. They are in Latin and belong to the Christmas cycle. Religious dramas were early taken up by the schools and performed by travelling scholars, and this tended to secularize them. The great Tegernsee play of "Antichrist" (about 1160) shows this influence. It is in Latin, but is pervaded by strong national feeling and devoted to the glorification of the German imperial power. German songs interspersed in the Latin text are found in a Passion play preserved in a MS. of the thirteenth century from Benedictbeuren. The oldest Easter-play wholly in German dates from the beginning of the thirteenth century and hails from Muri, Switzerland. Unfortunately, it is preserved only in fragmentary form. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the religious drama flourished greatly, and specimens are extant from all parts of German territory, in High as well as Low German dialects. We also meet with attempts at a comprehensive representation of the whole of sacred history in the manner of the great English cycles—e. g., in the Corpus Christi plays of Eger and Künzelsau in Swabia (both from fifteenth century). Subjects taken from Old Testament history are not frequently met with. Of dramatic versions of New Testament parables the "Play of the Wise and Foolish Virgins", performed at Eisenach in 1322, is particularly famous on account of its tragic outcome. Landgrave Frederick of Thuringia, who was a spectator, was plunged into despair over the failure of the Blessed Virgin to save the foolish virgins, and brooding over this is said to have brought on a stroke of apoplexy, to which he succumbed in 1324. Of German miracles dealing with legend few are preserved. Of miracles in praise of Our Blessed Lady we have a Low German play of Theophilus and the well-known play of "Frau Jutten" (1480) by a cleric of Mülhausen named Theoderich Schernberg. It is the story of an ambitious woman who assumes man's disguise and attains to high ecclesiastical office, finally to the papacy itself; but her crimes are at last discovered, whereupon she submits to the most rigorous penance and is ultimately saved through the intercession of the Blessed Virgin. In Germany, as in England and France, the Reformation sapped the life of the medieval religious drama. Plays continued to be produced, but the drama was often used for polemical purposes. In Catholic parts of the country the traditional performances of passion-plays have been kept up even to the present. (See article on PASSION PLAYS.)

NETHERLANDS.—Of miracle plays and mysteries in the Netherlands few have been preserved. One of the best-known is the miracle "Van Sinte Trudo", written about 1550 by Christian Fastraets. The performance of such plays in the Netherlands was undertaken by associations formed for that purpose, especially the *Rederijkerskamers* (*Rederijker* corrupted from *Rhetorica*), which sprang into existence at the end of the fourteenth century. Besides the mysteries and miracles, the Netherlands also have "Spelen van Sinne", symbolical plays corresponding to the moralities.

EDITIONS OF TEXTS.—(A) *French:* Monmerqué et Michel, "Le Théâtre français au moyen âge" (Paris, 1839); de Montaiglon, "Ancien théâtre français" (3 vols., Paris, 1854); Fournier, "Le théâtre français avant la Renaissance" (Paris, 1872); G. Paris et U. Robert, "Miracles de Notre-Dame" (8 vols., Paris, 1876–93); Rotschild et Picot, "Le Mistère du Vieil Testament" (6 vols., Paris, 1888–91); Paris et Raynaud, "Le Mystère de la Passion d'A. Greban" (Paris, 1878). (B) *English:* Towneley plays, edited by Paine and Gordon (London, 1836); Coventry, ed. by Halliwell (London, 1841); Chester, by Wright (2 vols., London, 1843–47); York Plays, by L. T. Smith (Oxford, 1885). Selections in Manly, "Specimens of Preshakespearean Drama" (3 vols., Boston and London, 1900), and Pollard, "English Miracle Plays, Moralities and Interludes" (Oxford, 1895). (C) *German:* Mone, "Altdeutsche Schauspiele" (Quedlinburg-Leipzig, 1841) and "Schauspiele des Mittelalters" (Karlsruhe, 1846); Froning, "Das Drama des Mittelalters" in Kürschner's "Deutsche Nationalliteratur", XIV (Stuttgart, 1891).

On the religious drama of the Middle Ages in general consult CREIZENACH, *Gesch. des neueren Dramas*, I, *Mittelalter und Frührenaissance* (Halle, 1894, 1903); DE JULEVILLE, *Les Mystères* (2 vols., Paris, 1880); HASE, *Das geistl. Schauspiel* (Leipzig, 1858), tr. JACKSON (1880); SEPET, *Les origines catholiques du théâtre moderne* (Paris, 1901). For the history of the French drama see DE JULEVILLE, *Le Théâtre en France* (4th ed., Paris, 1897); IDEM, *Hist. de la langue et de la littérature française* (Paris, 1895–9), II, 399 sqq.; LINTILHAC, *Le théâtre sérieux du moyen âge* in *Hist. générale du théâtre en France*, I (Paris, 1905); GRÖBER in *Grundriss der romanischen Philologie*, II, 712 sqq., 977 sqq., 1197 sqq. For the English drama see POLLARD, *op. cit.*, introduction; WARD, *Hist. of English Dramatic Lit. to the Death of Queen Anne* (2 vols., London, 1899); TEN BRINK, *Hist. of English Lit.*, tr. ROBINSON (New York, 1893), II, i, 234–310; BATES, *English Religious Drama* (New York, 1902). For the German drama see WILKEN, *Gesch. der geistl. Spiele in Deutschland* (Göttingen, 1872); HEINZEL, *Beschreibung des geistl. Schauspiels im deutschen Mittelalter* (Hamburg-Leipzig, 1898); consult also the introduction to FRONING'S edition mentioned above.

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

Miracles, GIFT OF.—The gift of miracles is one of those mentioned by St. Paul in his First Epistle to the Corinthians (xii, 9, 10), among the extraordinary graces of the Holy Ghost. These have to be distinguished from the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost enumerated by the Prophet Isaias (xi, 2 sq.) and from the fruits of the Spirit given by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Galatians (v, 22). The seven gifts and the twelve fruits of the Holy Ghost are always infused with sanctifying grace into the souls of the just. They belong to ordinary sanctity and are within the reach of every Christian. The gifts mentioned in the Epistle to the Corinthians are not necessarily connected with sanctity of life. They are special and extraordinary powers vouchsafed by God only to a few, and primarily for the spiritual good of others rather than of the recipient. In Greek they are called *χαρίσματα*, which name has been adopted by Latin authors; they are also designated in theological technical language as *gratiæ gratis datæ* (graces gratuitously given) to distinguish them from *gratiæ gratum facientes*, which means sanctifying grace or any actual grace granted for the salvation of the recipient.

The gift of miracles, as one of these *charismata*, was expressly promised by Christ to His disciples (John, xiv, 12; Mark, xvi, 17, 18), and St. Paul mentions it as abiding in the Church: "To another [is given] the grace of healing . . . To another, the working of miracles"—(I Cor., xii, 9, 10). Christ imparts this gift to chosen servants as He did to the Apostles and disciples, that His doctrine may become credible and that Christians may be confirmed in their faith, and this the Vatican Council has declared in chapter iii, "De Fide". This gift is not given to any created being as a permanent habit or quality of the soul. The power of effecting supernatural works such as miracles is the Divine Omnipotence, which cannot be communicated to either men or angels. The greatest thaumaturgus that ever appeared in this world could not work miracles at will, neither had he any permanent gift of the kind abiding in his soul. The Apostles once asked concerning a cure of demoniacal possession: "Why

could we not cast him out?" Christ replied, "this kind is not cast out but by prayer and fasting" (Matt., xvii, 18 sqq.). Eliseus could not raise to life the son of the Sunamitess with his staff.

The grace of miracles is therefore only a transient gift by which God moves a person to do something which issues in a wonderful work. Sometimes God makes use instrumentally of contact with the relics of the saints, or visits to sacred shrines for this purpose. The miraculous work is always the effect of Omnipotence; nevertheless, men and angels may be said to work miracles in a threefold way (1) by their prayers invoking a miraculous effect; (2) by disposing or accommodating the materials, as it is said of the angels that they will in the resurrection collect the dust of the dead bodies that these may be re-animated by the Divine power; (3) by performing some other act in co-operation with the Divine agency, as in the case of the application of relics, or of visits to holy places which God has marked out for special and extraordinary favours of this kind. To Christ even as man, or to His humanity, was granted a perpetual and constant power of miracles. He was able of His free will to work them as often as He judged it expedient. For this He had the ever-ready concurrence of His Divinity, although there was in His Humanity no permanent quality which could be the physical cause of miracles.

Benedict XIV tells us sufficient with regard to miracles in their relation to sanctity of life when explaining their estimate in the cause of the beatification and canonization of the saints. He says: "It is the common opinion of theologians that the grace of miracles is a grace *gratis data*, and therefore that it is given, not only to the just but also to sinners (though only rarely). Christ says that He knows not those who have done evil, though they may have prophesied in His name, cast out devils in His name, and done many wonderful works. And the Apostle said that without charity he was nothing, though he might have faith to remove mountains. On this passage of the Apostle, Estius remarks: 'For as it offers no contradiction to the Apostle that a man should have the gift of tongues or prophecy, or knowledge of mysteries, and excel in knowledge, which are first spoken of; or be liberal to the poor, or give his body to be burned for the name of Christ, which are afterwards spoken of and yet not have charity; so also there is no contradiction in a man having faith to remove mountains, and being without charity' " (Treatise on Heroic Virtue, III, 130).

These graces manifest themselves in two ways: one way as dwelling in the Church, teaching and sanctifying her, as, for example, when even a sinner in whom the Holy Ghost does not abide works miracles to show that the faith of the Church which he preaches is true. Hence the Apostle writes: "God also bearing them witness by signs, and wonders, and divers miracles, and distributions of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will" (Heb., ii, 4). In another way, the manifestation is made by the graces of the Holy Ghost as belonging to him who performs the works. Hence in Acts it is said that St. Stephen, "full of grace and fortitude, did great wonders and signs among the people" (Acts, vi, 8). Here we have a distinction clearly drawn out as to the manner in which *gratiæ gratis datæ* may be to the advantage of the person receiving them as well as to the utility of others, and how it is that by these graces persons without sanctifying grace may perform signs and wonders for the good of others. But these are rare and exceptional cases, and real miracles can never be performed by a sinner in proof of his own personal sanctity or in proof of error, because that would be a deception and derogatory to the sanctity of God Who alone can perform miracles.

BENEDICT XIV, *Heroic Virtue* (London Oratorian Series, 1851); DEVINE, *Manual of Mystical Theology* (London, 1903); DOYLE, *Principles of Religious Life* (London, —); RIBET, *La Mystique Divine* (Paris, 1893); SCHRAM, *Theologia Mystica;* SILVIUS, *In II–II D. Thomae*, clxxviii, a. 1.

A. DEVINE.

Miræus (LE MIRE), AUBERT, ecclesiastical historian, b. at Brussels, 30 Nov., 1573; d. at Antwerp, 19 Oct., 1640. After studying at Douai and Louvain he was made canon of the cathedral of Antwerp in 1608 and secretary to his uncle, John Miræus, who was then Bishop of Antwerp. In 1611 he was appointed almoner and librarian to Archduke Albert of Austria, then viceroy of the Netherlands, and in 1624 he became dean of the cathedral of Antwerp and vicar-general of the diocese. He was an indefatigable historical writer, as is attested by the thirty-nine works on profane, ecclesiastical, and monastic history which he has given to the world. On the whole he is a reliable historian, though some of his works are wanting in thoroughness and accuracy.

His chief literary productions are: (1) "Rerum toto orbe gestarum chronica a Christo nato ad hæc usque tempora", Antwerp, 1608 (containing the chronicles of Eusebius, St. Jerome, Sigebert of Gemblours, Anselm of Gemblours, and others up to the year 1200, and a continuation of these chronicles by Miræus up to 1608); (2) "Notitia episcopatuum orbis universi", Antwerp, 1611, 1613; (3) "Politia ecclesiastica, sive de statu religionis Christianæ per totum orbem", Cologne, 1609, Lyons, 1620; (4) "Geographica Ecclesiastica", Lyons, 1620; (5) "Notitia ecclesiarum Belgii", Antwerp, 1630 (this work, together with other works of Miræus on the ecclesiastical history of the Netherlands, was re-edited by Foppens, under the title of "Miræi opera diplomatica et Historica", 4 vols., Brussels, 1723–48); (6) "Bibliotheca ecclesiastica", 2 vols., Antwerp, 1639–49 (a compilation of short sketches on ecclesiastical writers written by St. Jerome, Gennadius, St. Isidore, St. Ildephonsus, Honorius Augustodunensis, Sigebert of Gemblours, and Henry of Ghent, and is furnished with notes by Miræus); (7) "Vita Justi Lipsii", Antwerp, 1609 (Miræus had Justus Lipsius as teacher at Louvain); (8) "Originum monasticarum libri IV", Cologne, 1620.

He had previously published in separate volumes the beginnings of the Benedictines (Antwerp, 1608), of the Carthusians (Cologne, 1609), of the Military Orders (Antwerp, 1609), of the Carmelites (Antwerp, 1610), of the Augustinians, in French (Antwerp, 1611), of the Canons Regular (Cologne, 1614), of the Sisters of the Annunciation (Antwerp, 1618). Some of his letters were published by Burbure in "Messager des Sciences Historiques de Belgique" (1859).

DE RIDDER, *Aubert Le Mire, sa vie, ses écrits, mémoire historique et critique* (Paris, 1865); WAUTERS in *Biographie Nationale de Belgique* (Brussels, 1866–91), XIV, 882–95.

MICHAEL OTT.

Miranda, BARTOLOMÉ DE. See CARRANZA, BARTOLOMÉ.

Mirandola, GIOVANNI FRANCESCO PICO DELLA, Italian philosopher, nephew of Mirandola, Giovanni Pico della (see next article), b. about 1469; d. 1533. Though very gentle and pious he was drawn into the bitter feuds of his family and fell at the foot of the crucifix with his son Albert, killed by his nephew Galeotto II, who had just seized the Castle of Mirandola. His wife and the children of his other son were shut up in dreadful dungeons. At Rome he defended the eclectic Latin style against the Ciceronian Bembo. Like his uncle he devoted himself chiefly to philosophy, but made it subject to the Bible, though in his treatises, "De studio divinæ et humanæ sapientiæ" and particularly in the six books entitled "Examen doctrinæ unitatis gentium", he depreciates the authority of the philosophers, above all of Aristotle. He wrote a detailed biography of his uncle and another of Savonarola. Having observed the dangers

to which Italian society was exposed at the time, he sounded a warning on the occasion of the Lateran Council: "Joannis Francisci Pici oratio ad Leonem X et concilium Lateranense de reformandis Ecclesiæ Moribus" (Hagenau, 1512, dedicated to Pirckheimer). He was discussing funerals and tombs with Lillio Giraldi when the catastrophe occurred which carried him off. Giraldi commemorated the tragic event in a touching postscript to the "De sepulcris" (in his works, Basle, 1580, I, 640).

NICÉRON, *Mémoires*, XXXIV; TIRABOSCHI, *Storia della letteratura Italiana*, VII, part I, 397; SANDYS, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, II (Cambridge, 1908), 113. His works are appended to those of his uncle in the ed. of Basle, 1601.

PAUL LEJAY.

Mirandola, GIOVANNI PICO DELLA, Italian philosopher and scholar, b. 24 February, 1463; d. 17 November, 1494. He belonged to a family that had long dwelt in the Castle of Mirandola (Duchy of Modena), which had become independent in the fourteenth century and had received in 1414 from the Emperor Sigismund the fief of Concordia. To devote himself wholly to study, he left his share of the ancestral principality to his two brothers, and in his fourteenth year went to Bologna to study canon law and fit himself for the ecclesiastical career. Repelled, however, by the purely positive science of law, he devoted himself to the study of philosophy and theology, and spent seven years wandering through the chief universities of Italy and France, studying also Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Syriac, and Arabic. An impostor sold him sixty Hebrew manuscripts, asserting positively that they were written by order of Esdras, and contained the secrets of nature and religion. For many years he believed in the Kabbala and interwove its fancies in his philosophical theories. His aim was to conciliate religion and philosophy. Like his teacher, Marsilius Ficinus, he based his views chiefly on Plato, in opposition to Aristotle the doctor of scholasticism at its decline. But Pico was constitutionally an eclectic, and in some respects he represented a reaction against the exaggerations of pure humanism. According to him, we should study the Hebrew and Talmudic sources, while the best products of scholasticism should be retained. His "Heptaplus", a mystico-allegorical exposition of the creation according to the seven Biblical senses, follows this idea (Florence, about 1480); to the same period belongs the "De ente et uno", with its explanations of several passages in Moses, Plato, and Aristotle; also an oration on the Dignity of Man (published among the "Commentationes").

With bewildering attainments due to his brilliant and tenacious memory, he returned to Rome in 1486 and undertook to maintain 900 theses on all possible subjects ("Conclusiones philosophicæ, cabalasticæ et theologicæ", Rome, 1486, in fol.). He offered to pay the expenses of those who came from a distance to engage with him in public discussion. Innocent VIII was made to believe that at least thirteen of these theses were heretical, though in reality they merely revealed the shallowness of the learning of that epoch. Even such a mind as Pico's showed too much credulity in nonsensical beliefs, and too great a liking for childish and unsolvable problems. The proposed disputation was prohibited and the book containing the theses was interdicted, notwithstanding the author's defence in "Apologia J. Pici Mirandolani, Concordiæ comitis" (1489). One of his detractors had maintained that Kabbala was the name of an impious writer against Jesus Christ. Despite all efforts Pico was condemned, and he decided to travel, visiting France first, but he afterwards returned to Florence. He destroyed his poetical works, gave up profane science, and determined to devote his old age to a defence of Christianity against Jews, Mohammedans, and astrologers. A portion of this work was published after his death ("Disputationes adversus astrologiam divinatricem", Bologna, 1495). Because of this book and his controversy against astrology, Pico marks an era and a decisive progressive movement in ideas. He died two months after his intimate friend Politian, on the day Charles VIII of France entered Florence. He was interred at San Marco, and Savonarola delivered the funeral oration.

Besides the writings already mentioned, see his complete works (Bologna, 1496; Venice, 1498; Strasburg, 1504; Basle, 1557, 1573, 1601). He wrote in Italian an imitation of Plato's "Banquet". His letters ("Aureæ ad familiares epistolæ", Paris, 1499) are important for the history of contemporary thought. The many editions of his entire works in the sixteenth century sufficiently prove his influence.

NICÉRON, *Mémoires*, XXXIV; TIRABOSCHI, *Biblioteca Modenese*, IV, 95; biography by his nephew, in complete works; *Storia della letteratura italiana*, VI, part I, 323; SANDYS, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, II (Cambridge, 1908), 82.

PAUL LEJAY.

Miridite, ABBEY OF (MIRIDITARUM, or SANCTI ALEXANDRI DE OROSHI), the name of an *abbatia nullius* in Albania, where there formerly stood a Benedictine abbey, now destroyed, dedicated to St. Alexander, martyr. By decree of 25 October, 1888, this abbey with its two affiliated parishes, together with five other parishes in the Diocese of Ljes (Alessio, or Alise), were removed from the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Ljes. In 1890 three parishes from the Diocese of Sappa were added, and in 1894 five from Ljes. The country forms part of the Turkish dominions in Europe and is inhabited by Mohammedans, Greek Schismatics, and Catholics. The Catholics number 16,550, and are under the care of secular and regular clergy. The abbot is chosen from among the secular clergy. The present abbot, Mgr. Primus Docchi, who resides at Oroshi was born at Bulgri, 7 Feb., 1846, and studied at the Propaganda College, Rome. The Franciscans have a parish and a hospital at Gomsice.

ROUKIS, *Ethnographische und statistische Mittheilungen über Albanien* in PETERMANN'S *Mittheilungen* (1884), 367 sqq.; *Missiones Catholicæ;* MIHACEVIC, *Serafinski Perivoj*, XXIII (Livno-Sarajevo, 1909), 126.

A. L. GANCEVIĆ.

Miserere, the first word of the Vulgate text of Psalm l (Hebrew, li). Two other Psalms (lv and lvi) begin with the same word, and all three continue with *mei, Deus* (Have mercy on me, O God). In alphabetical indexes to the (Latin) Psalms they are interdistinguished by the fourth word, which in Ps. l is *secundum;* Ps. lv, *quoniam;* in Ps. lvi, *miserere:* so that Ps. l will appear as "Miserere . . . secundum". So liturgically and musically pre-eminent is Ps. l, however, that it is commonly referred to as the Miserere, without further qualification. The psalm has a title which is one of the best authenticated of all, as it is found in the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Latin, and which in the Vulgate reads: "In finem, Psalmus David, Cum venit ad eum Nathan propheta, quando intravit ad Bethsabee." This title forms vv. 1 and 2 of the psalm, and refers to the sin of David (II Kings, xi) and to the reproaches and warnings of the prophet Nathan (II Kings, xii). Some commentators think that the last two verses of the psalm were added in the time of the Captivity. Delitzsch nevertheless considers them quite admissible in the mouth of David, arguing that the Hebrew word for "build" means not only "to rebuild", but "to complete what is being built", and that Solomon's wall (III Kings, iii, 1) can be regarded as a fulfilment of David's prayer "that the walls of Jerusalem may be built up". (Cf. the appended bibliography, which gives the suffrages of some recent Catholic commentators to the traditional ascription, in addition to the opinions of several of the more recent non-Catholic commentators.)

The Miserere has a most prominent place in the Di-

vine Office and in various ceremonies. It is the first psalm at Lauds in all the ferial (week-day) Offices throughout the year, outside of Paschal Time, and in the Sunday Offices from Septuagesima to Palm Sunday inclusive. It holds the same place in the Office of the Dead. It is the psalm chosen for the *preces feriales* at Vespers for all the weekdays in Lent with the exception of the triduum of Holy Week, for those in Advent, for the ember-days except those of the Pentecostal season, and for all vigils, except those of Christmas, Epiphany, the Ascension, and Pentecost. In addition it is said just before the *oratio*, or prayer, in all the Canonical Hours in the triduum of Holy Week, except the Vespers and Compline of Holy Saturday. As it is also the fourth in order of the seven penitential psalms (q. v.), its times of recitation will be governed by the appropriate rubric in the Breviary. It (or, as alternative, Ps. cxvi, "Laudate . . . omnes") is said daily in the prayers after dinner (*post prandium*), except on days when only one meal is taken (in which case the prayers are those styled *post cænam*, "after supper") and also except the times from Christmas to the Octave of the Epiphany, from Holy Saturday until Low Sunday exclusively, and from Ascension Thursday to the Octave of Pentecost exclusively. It is very prominent in the ceremony of the Asperges (q. v.), during which the choir sings the antiphon "Asperges me, Domine, hyssopo", etc. (i. e. Ps. l, verse 8; Vulg., 9), then the verse "Miserere mei, Deus", etc. (i. e. Ps. l, 1; Vulg., 3), then the Gloria Patri, and finally the antiphon "Asperges me", the celebrant meanwhile reciting, either alone or alternately with the sacred ministers, the entire Miserere. On Passion and Palm Sundays the Gloria Patri is omitted, and during Paschal Time the antiphon and psalm are "Vidi aquam" and "Confitemini" (Ps. cxvii) respectively.

The Miserere is found in many other ceremonial functions; at the Burial of the Dead, with the antiphon "Exultabunt Domino ossa humiliata", taken from the 9th (Vulg., 10th) verse of the psalm; at the episcopal visitation of parishes; the blessing of a bell; the consecration of an altar-stone; the laying of the corner-stone of a church; the blessing of a church, of a cemetery, of a house, of congregations, and fields; the reconciliation of a profaned church (whether consecrated or merely blessed) or of a profaned cemetery. It is especially prominent in the consecration of a church, when it is first said like other psalms, and afterwards in a more solemn manner, with the antiphon "Asperges" repeated after each group of three verses, during the sprinkling of the altars with holy water. It is said by the penitent who is to be absolved from excommunication (*in foro externo*), and by the absolving priest in the case of a deceased excommunicate who had given some sign of contrition before death, the ceremony entitling to ecclesiastical burial. At the Visitation of the Sick the priest may say the Miserere or any other of the first three penitential psalms. While carrying the Blessed Sacrament to the sick, the priest is to say the Miserere ("which is the best suited for obtaining divine mercy for the sick"—de Herdt, "Praxis") and other psalms and prayers. In monasteries it is said during the customary "discipline". It figured prominently in the ancient ceremony of the Reconciliation of Penitents on Maundy Thursday, both as one of the seven penitential psalms recited by the bishop in the sanctuary, and as one of the three psalms commencing with Miserere during the prostration of clergy and laity (including the penitents). For an interesting description of this ancient function, cf. the volume entitled "Passiontide and Holy Week", of Guéranger's "Liturgical Year."

In some Jewish rituals the Miserere is recited on the Day of Atonement. It is also found in the Anglican Commination Service. In a fragmentary form it is also prominent, in the selection of some of its most searching verses, for the *preces* of Prime in the Divine Office; in the verse "Domine labia mea aperies", etc., with which the Office commonly opens at Matins and Prime; in the use of the antiphon "Asperges", and the verse "Miserere" in the Communion of the Sick, and of the antiphon alone at Extreme Unction (de Herdt, "Praxis"); in the selection of various verses for use as antiphons in the Office, and for an Offertory, a Communion, and an Alleluia-verse at Mass. The partial use made of it at Mass and Office has been minutely detailed in Bishop Marbach's exceedingly elaborate work, "Carmina Scripturarum" (Strasburg, 1907), 134–36.

As remarked above, the Miserere is not only the first psalm at Lauds in the ferial Office, but is also repeated just before the *oratio* at the end of Lauds in the triduum of Holy Week. The thought of giving to this second Miserere a musical treatment more elaborate than the ordinary plain-song used for the psalms in general, and of making it serve as a climax to the dramatic ceremonial of the Tenebræ, is probably due to Leo X. In 1514 the Miserere was sung to a *falsobordone*. The oldest example extant is that of Costanzo Festa (1517), which alternated verses in plain-song with verses in *falsibordoni* of four and five voices. This interestingly contrasted setting or method of treatment formed the type for imitation ever since.

The musical settings of the Miserere are very many. Three of them (Baini's on Wednesday, Bai's on Thursday, and Allegri's on Friday afternoons) are especially famous because of their yearly repetition in the pope's chapel during the Tenebræ. Among the numerous estimates recorded by musicians and travellers on these three settings, mention may be made of Mendelssohn's, Cardinal Wiseman's, Madame de Staël's (in "Corinne"), Mr. Rockstro's (in Grove, Dictionary of Music), and especially of the young Mozart's sincerest tribute in the famous copy of it made by him at one hearing of Allegri's Miserere (with corrections made at a subsequent hearing). In the second of his "Four Lectures on the Offices and Ceremonies of Holy Week", Cardinal Wiseman gives a comparative estimate of these settings and, in accord with all who have heard them, awards the palm of supremacy to Allegri's. His description is glowing and vivid; but that of Mr. Rockstro is equally appreciative and musically more precise and detailed in respect of Allegri's Miserere, of which he gives many illustrations, and which he defends against certain criticisms. (Cf. in the same dictionary articles on Bai, Baini.)

M'Swiney, *Translation of the Psalms and Canticles with Commentary* (St. Louis, 1901), 186–90, gives a bi-columnar translation from the Vulgate and the Hebrew Massoretic text, 186–190: "With the exception of the two last verses, probably added to the Psalm during the Babylonian captivity, there is no valid reason for assigning this Psalm to a poet of a later age, who undertook to set forth the thoughts and emotions of David, on the occasion mentioned in the title". D'Eyragues, *Les Psaumes traduits de l'hébreu* (Paris, 1904), 146–51, ascribes it to David: "Verses 20–21 were doubtless added after the return from captivity in the time of Esdras when he again raised the walls of the temple. The congregation sing the verses." Vigouroux praises the work as one of irreproachable learning. Against the Davidic authorship: Cheyne, *The Book of Psalms* (New York, 1892), 144–149; Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms* (New York, 1907), II, 3–12: "Ps. 51 is a penitential prayer of the congregation in the time of Nehemiah."—Neutral: Kirkpatrick, *The Book of Psalms* (Cambridge, 1901), bks. II, III, 284–95, briefly disposes of some objections to the Davidic authorship and allows weight to others; Lesêtre, *Le Livre de Psaumes* (Paris, 1883), a very extended commentary; Kenrick, *The Psalms*, etc. (Baltimore, 1861), very condensed, but satisfactory; Wolter, *Psallite Sapienter* (*Psallieret weise*) (Freiburg im Br., 1905), II, 294–331, an extensive account of the mystical and liturgical uses of the Miserere.—Metrical translations into English: Bagshawe, *The Psalms and Canticles in English Verse* (St. Louis, 1903), proposes the use of metrical versions of the Psalms by Catholics and gives (106) his metrical version of Ps. l; Milbourne, *The Psalms of David in English Metre* (London, 1698), 105–08, gives two translations into English verse; *The Psalter, a revised Ed. of the Scottish Metrical Version of the Psalms set to suitable music* (Dublin, 1880), 68.—Latin metrical versions: Georgii Bu-

CHANANI SCOTI, *Paraphrasis Psalmorum Davidis Poetica* (Edinburgh, 1737), 161–63, a version in nineteen Sapphic stanzas; *Poetarum Scotorum Musæ Sacræ* (Edinburgh, 1739), 44, a version into thirty-nine elegiac couplets.—MATHESON, *The Psalmist and the Scientist* (New York, 1894), 253–89, takes Ps. 1 to represent "the Psalmist's view of sin" as being "infranatural", "a life of disorder existing in the midst of order". TAYLOR, *David, King of Israel* (New York, 1874), 272–73, argues for the sincerity of the Psalmist and includes the anecdote of Voltaire's attempt to parody the Miserere; SCHULTE, *Consecranda, Benedicenda* (New York, 1907), two volumes giving in English all the ceremonial and rubrical details of many functions in which the Miserere is used; SINGENBERGER, *Guide to Catholic Church Music* (St. Francis, Wis., 1905), gives (202) author, voices, and grade of twenty-four settings for Burials of the Dead, and (200–01) of twenty-eight settings for Lauds of Holy Week.

H. T. HENRY.

Misericorde, CONGREGATION OF THE SISTERS OF, a congregation of women founded 16 January, 1848, for the purpose of procuring spiritual and corporal assistance for poor mothers and unfortunate girls. The foundress, Madame Rosalie Jetté, in religion Mother Mary of the Nativity, declining to serve as superior, Sister St. Jane de Chantal held that office. The institution was approved by Pius IX, 7 June, 1867, and the constitutions, revised according to the latest rules of the Roman Congregations, received the approbation of Pius X, 21 March, 1905. The order is governed by a superior general, assisted by four councillors, a secretary, and a bursar, who reside at the mother-house, Montreal, Canada. All branch houses are under the control of the general administration. Each house is governed by a local superior and two assistants forming her council; in each a bursar has charge of temporal matters, but is controlled by the council. There is only one novitiate, at Montreal, although the rules authorize more if necessary. Candidates are received from all parts of the world. The novitiate lasts a year, during which the novice is instructed in the constitutions of the order and other matters of the religious life; a supplementary noviceship of six months, in which to become familiar with the work of the order, is given before taking the vows, renewed annually during a period of five years and then made perpetual. The sisters also conduct Magdalen asylums. In receiving patients no discrimination is made in regard to religion, colour, or nationality. After their convalescence, those who desire to remain in the home are placed under a special sister and are known as "Daughters of St. Margaret". They follow a certain rule of life but contract no religious obligations. Should they desire to remain in the convent, after a period of probation, they are allowed to become Magdalens and eventually make the vows of the Magdalen order. The congregation celebrated its fiftieth anniversary 16 January, 1898.

At present the congregation numbers professed sisters, 189; novices, 23; candidates, 10. Branch houses have been established throughout Canada and the United States. The mother-house contains 60 sisters; with this is associated an Orphan Asylum with sisters, 7; infants, 525; also a hospital with 5 sisters and accommodations for 175 patients. At Sault-au-Recollet, P. Q., the sisters conduct a home for aged and retired priests and an Orphan Asylum with sisters, 10; attendants, 15; priests, 5; orphans, 40. The hospital at Ottawa, founded in 1879, was destroyed by fire in 1900. The new building, completed in 1904, accommodates sisters, 10; nurses, 5; patients, 100. A house was established at Winnipeg, Man., in 1898, of which a branch was founded at St. Norbert, Man., in 1904. The two houses have sisters, 19; trained nurses, 15; attendants, 25; average number of patients and children during the year, 700. In 1900 a house was opened at Edmonton, Alberta, with sisters, 12; trained nurses, 6; average number of patients during the year, 300. In the United States the sisters have a large hospital in New York City, containing sisters, 19; average number of patients during the year, 496. From this, in 1901, was established the Orphan Asylum and Kindergarten of St. Mary's of the Angels, at Hartsdale with sisters, 10; attendants, 20; average number of children during the year, 150. In Green Bay, Wis., a house was established in 1900 with sisters, 13; nurses, 15; average number of patients and children during the year, 450. In Oak Park, Ill., a hospital was founded in 1905 with sisters, 15; patients, 712. The establishment at Milwaukee contains accommodations for sisters, 9; patients, 112.

SISTER ST. BEATRICE.

Misericordia. See BURIAL, sub-title *Burial Confraternities*.

Mishna. See TALMUD.

Misocco and Calanca, PREFECTURE APOSTOLIC OF (MESAUCINÆ ET CALANCÆ), in the canton of Grisons, Switzerland, comprises the valley of the Moesa, which starts at the pass of San Bernardino and flows into the Ticino, and also the valley of Calanca, through which the Calasanca flows. The population is 6027, of whom 6011 are Catholic (5945 Italians). For adminstrative purposes the prefecture is divided into two chapters, both of which are subject to an episcopal Vicar of the See of Chur. In the chapter of Misocco, which embraces the valley of Moesa, there are 8 parishes, 5 Capuchins and 4 secular priests. In the chapter of Calanca there are 11 parishes, with 5 Capuchins and 3 seculars. At Misocco (Mesocco in Italian) there is a canonry with a prior and six canons of whom three reside in Misocco and three in San Vittore. At Roveredo there is a Catholic Institute of St. Anna, under the Fathers of the "Piccola Casa della Providenza". The prefecture was established in 1635 at the suggestion of Bishop Joseph Mohr of Chur, at whose instance the Propaganda sent Capuchin missionaries to the Italian-speaking inhabitants of Grisons valleys of Misocco and Calanca. Capuchins from Milan were the first missionaries; from 1790–1802 Novara and then until 1850 Pavia Capuchins had charge; since then the mission has been administered by the Capuchins of Ticino. The vice-prefect, Father Hilarin Odelino, resides at Cama.

BÜCHI, *Die katholische Kirche in der Schweiz* (Munich, 1902); DAUCOURT, *Les évêchés suisses* (Fribourg, 1901); *Missiones Catholicæ* (Rome, 1907), 105; *Geographisches Lexicon der Schweiz* (Neuenburg, 1902–08).

JOSEPH LINS.

Missal (Latin *Missale* from *Missa*, Mass), the book which contains the prayers said by the priest at the altar as well as all that is officially read or sung in connexion with the offering of the holy Sacrifice of the Mass throughout the ecclesiastical year.

THE PRESENT ROMAN MISSAL, now almost universally used in the Catholic Church wherever the Latin Rite prevails, consists essentially of two parts of very unequal length. The smaller of these divisions containing that portion of the liturgy which is said in every Mass, the "Ordo Missæ" with the prefaces and the Canon, is placed, probably with a view to the more convenient opening of the book, near the centre of the volume immediately before the proper Mass for Easter Sunday. The remainder of the book is devoted to those portions of the liturgy which vary from day to day according to feast and season. Each Mass consists usually of Introit, Collect, Epistle, Gradual and Alleluia or Tract, Gospel, Offertory, Secret, Communion, and Post-Communion, the passages or prayers corresponding to each of these titles being commonly printed in full. The beginning of the volume to the "Ordo Missæ" is devoted to the Masses of the season (*Proprium de Tempore*) from Advent to the end of Lent, including the Christmas cycle. After the "Ordo Missæ" and Canon follow immediately the Masses of the season from Easter to the last Sunday after Pentecost. Then come the proper Masses of the separate festivals (*Proprium Sanctorum*) for the ecclesiastical year; while these are often printed in full,

it may also happen that only a reference is given, indicating that the larger portion of each Mass (sometimes everything except the collect) is to be sought in the Common of Saints (*Commune Sanctorum*), printed at the conclusion of the *Proprium Sanctorum* (Proper of Saints). This is supplemented by a certain number of votive Masses, among the rest Masses for the dead, and a collection of sets of collects, secrets, and post-communions for special occasions. Here also are inserted certain benedictions and other miscellaneous matter, while appendixes of varying bulk supply a number of Masses conceded for use in certain



Bobbio Missal—Fol. 15 verso and 16 recto
Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris

localities or in certain religious orders, and arranged according to the order of the calendar. To the whole book is prefixed an elaborate calendar and a systematized collection of rubrics for the guidance of priests in high and low Mass, as also prayers for the private use of the celebrant in making his preparation and thanksgiving. It may be mentioned here once for all that the collection of rubrics now printed under the respective headings "Rubricæ generales Missalis", "Ritus celebrandi Missam", and "De Defectibus circa Missam occurrentibus" are founded upon a tractate entitled "Ordo Missæ" by John Burchard, master of ceremonies to Innocent VIII and Alexander VI, at the close of the fifteenth century. They are consequently absent from the first printed edition of the "Missale Romanum" (1474).

Origin of the Missal.—The printed Missal of the present day, reproducing in substance the manuscript forms of the latter part of the Middle Ages, has resulted from the amalgamation of a number of separate service books. In the early centuries, owing to the lack of competent scribes, the scarcity of writing materials, and various other causes, economy had greatly to be studied in the production of books. The book used by the priest at the altar for the prayers of the Mass usually contained no more than it belonged to him to say. It was known commonly as a "Sacramentary" (*Sacramentarium*), because all its contents centred round the great act of the consecration of the sacrifice. On the other hand those portions of the service which, like the Introit and the Gradual, the Offertory and the Communion, were rendered by the choir, were inscribed in a separate book, the "Antiphonarium Missæ" or "Graduale" (q. v.). So again the passages to be read to the people by the deacons or lectors in the *ambo* (pulpit)—the Epistle and Gospel, with lessons from the Old Testament on particular occasions—were collected in the "Epistolarium" or "Apostolus", the "Evangeliarium", and other lectionaries (q. v.). Besides this an "Ordo" or "Directorium" (q. v.) was required to determine the proper service. Only by a slow process of development were the contents of the sacramentary, the gradual, the various lectionaries, and the "Ordo" amalgamated so that all that was needed for the celebration of Mass was to be found within the covers of one volume. The first

step in this evolution seems to have been furnished by the introduction of certain smaller volumes called "Libelli Missæ" intended for the private celebration of Masses of devotion on ordinary days. In these only one, or at most two or three Masses, were written; but as they were not used with choir and sacred ministers, all the service had to be said by the priest and all was consequently included in the one small booklet. A typical example of such a volume is probably furnished by the famous "Stowe Missal". This little book of Irish origin of which the leaves measure only five and a half by four inches, is nevertheless one of our most priceless liturgical treasures. The greater part is devoted to a single Mass of the Blessed Sacrament, in which the Epistle and Gospel are inserted entire as well as a number of communion anthems, the private preparation of the priest, and other matter including rubrical directions in Irish. Thus, so far as Mass was concerned, it was in itself a complete book and is probably the type of numberless others—fragments of similar Irish "libelli Missæ" are preserved among the manuscripts of St. Gall—which were used by missionaries in their journeys among peoples as yet only half christianized.

The convenience of such books for the private celebration of Mass where sacred ministers and choir were wanting, must soon have made itself felt. When one thinks of the many hundreds and even thousands of Masses which in the eighth and ninth centuries every large monastery was called upon to say for deceased brethren in virtue of its compacts with other abbeys (see details in Ebner, "Gebets-Verbrüdernugen", Ratisbon, 1890), it appears obvious that there must have been great need of private Mass-books. Consequently it soon became common to adapt even the larger sacramentaries to the use of priests celebrating privately by inserting in some of the "missæ quotidianæ votivæ et diversæ", or sometimes again in the "commune sanctorum" such extracts from the "Graduale", "Epistolare", and "Evangeliarium" as made these particular Masses complete in themselves. Examples of Sacramentaries thus adapted may be found as early as the ninth century. Ebner for instance, appeals to a manuscript of this date in the capitular library of Verona (No. 86) where in the "*Missæ votivæ et diversæ*" the choral passages are written as well as the prayers. Whether the word *Missalis liber* was specially employed for service books thus completed for private use there seems no evidence to determine. Alcuin writing in 801 certainly seems to contrast the term "Missalis libellus" with what he calls "libelli sacratorii" and with "sacramentaria maiora" (see Mon. Germ. Hist. Epist., IV, 370); but the phrase was older than Alcuin, for Archbishop Egbert of York in his "Dialogus" speaks of the dispositions made by St. Gregory for the observance of the ember-days in "Antiphonaria cum missalibus suis" which he had consulted at Rome (Haddan and Stubbs, "Councils", III, 421), where certainly the language used seems to suggest that the "Missalia" and "Antiphonaria" were companion volumes separately incomplete. Certainly it may be affirmed with confidence that what was afterwards known as the "Missale plenum", a book like our present Missal, containing all the Epistles, Gospels, and the choral antiphons as well as the Mass prayers, did not come into existence before the year 900. Dr. Adalbert Ebner, who spent immense labour in examining the liturgical manuscripts of the libraries of Italy, reports that the earliest example known to him was one of the tenth century in the Ambrosian Library at Milan; but although such books are of more frequent occurrence from the eleventh century onwards, the majority of the Mass-books met with at this period have still only an imperfect claim to be regarded as "Missalia plena".

We find instead a great variety of transition forms belonging to the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries which may be referred in particular to two distinct types. In the first place the sacramentary, lectionary, and antiphonary were sometimes simply bound up together in one volume as a matter of convenience. Codex 101 in the library of Monza offers an example of this kind in which the three component elements are all of the ninth or tenth century, but even earlier than this in an extant notice of the visitation of the Church of Vicus (Vieil-St-Remy) in 859 by Bishop Hincmar of Reims we find mention of a "Missale cum evangeliis et lectionibus seu antiphonario volumen 1". As a rule, however, the fusion between the original sacramentary and the books used by the readers and the choir was of a more intrinsic nature, and the process of amalgamation was a very gradual one. Sometimes we find sacramentaries in which a later hand has added in the margin, or on any available blank space, the bare indication, consisting of a few initial words, of the Antiphons, the Epistles, and the Gospels belonging to the particular Mass. Sometimes the "Commune Sanctorum" and the votive Masses have from the beginning included the passages to be sung and read written out in full, though the "Proprium de Tempore" and "de Sanctis" show nothing but the Mass prayers. Sometimes again, as in the case of the celebrated Leofric Missal in the Bodleian, the original sacramentary has had extensive later supplements bound up with it containing new Masses which include the parts to be read and sung. In one remarkable example, the Canterbury Missal (MS. 270 of Corpus Christi, Cambridge), a number of the old prefaces of the Gregorian type have been erased throughout the volume and upon the blank spaces thus created the proper Antiphons from the Graduale, and sometimes also the Epistles and Gospels for each Mass, have been written entire. In not a few instances the Gospels may be found included in the Mass-book but not the Epistles, the reason probably being that the latter could be read by any clerk, whereas a properly ordained deacon was not always available, in which case the priest at the altar had himself to read the Gospel. Regarding however this development as a whole it may be said that nearly all the Mass-books written from the latter half of the thirteenth century onwards were in the strict sense *Missalia plenaria* conforming to our modern type. The determining influence which established the arrangement of parts, the selection of Masses, etc., with which we are familiar in the "Missale Romanum" to-day, seems to have been the book produced during the latter half of the thirteenth century under Franciscan auspices and soon made popular in Italy under the name "Missale secundum consuetudinem Romanæ curiæ" (see Radulphus de Rivo, "De Canonum Observatione", in La Bigne, "Bib. Max. PP.", XI, 455).

VARIETIES OF MISSALS.—Although the "Missale secundum consuetudinem Romanæ curiæ" obtained great vogue and was destined eventually to be officially adopted and to supplant all others, throughout the Middle Ages every province, indeed almost every diocese, had its local use, and while the Canon of the Mass was everywhere the same, the prayers in the "Ordo Missæ", and still more the "Proprium Sanctorum" and the "Proprium de Tempore", were apt to differ widely in the service books. In England especially the Uses of Sarum and York showed many distinctive characteristics, and the Ordinary of the Mass in its external features resembled more the rite at present followed by the Dominicans than that of Rome. After the invention of printing a great number of Missals were produced both in England itself and especially at Paris and other French cities for use in England. Of the Sarum Missal alone nearly seventy different editions were issued between that of 1487 (printed for Caxton in Paris), and that of 1557 (London). After Elizabeth's accession no more Missals were published, but a little book entitled "Missale parvum pro Sacerdoti-



FRAGMENTS OF AN EGYPTIAN LITURGY OF THE SEVENTH OR EIGHTH CENTURY

AFTER A COPY BY WALTER CRUM, WHO RECOGNIZED THEIR LITURGICAL CHARACTER

bus in Anglia, Scotia, et Ibernia itinerantibus" was printed two or three times towards the beginning of the seventeenth century for the use of missionary priests. Its size allowed it to be carried about easily without attracting observation, and as it contained relatively few Masses, only those for the Sundays and the principal feasts, it recalled in a measure the "libelli Missæ" of the Anglo-Saxon and Irish missionaries nine centuries earlier. Even at this date the peculiarities of the Sarum Rite were not retained and the Canon and Masses of this "Missale parvum" were all Roman with the exception of one special Mass of the Holy Name of Jesus which is described in the 1616 edition as "taken from the Missal according to the Use of Sarum". Moreover, just as the Roman liturgy came in this way to prevail in England, so in France and throughout the rest of Europe the local uses have for the most part been surrendered by degrees, two of the principal influences at work being no doubt the advantage of uniformity and the authority and relative purity of the Roman Missal, as authoritatively revised and improved after the Council of Trent.

The first printed edition of the "Missale Romanum" lately republished by the Henry Bradshaw Society in two volumes (1899 and 1907), was produced at Milan in 1474. Numerous editions followed, but nothing authoritative appeared until the Council of Trent left in the hands of the pope the charge of seeing to the revision of a Catechism, Breviary, and Missal. This last, committed to the care of Cardinals Scotti and Sirlet with Thomas Goldwell (an Englishman, Bishop of St. Asaph, deprived of his see upon the accession of Elizabeth), and Julius Poggio, was published in 1570. St. Pius V published a Bull on the occasion, still printed at the beginning of the Missal, in which he enjoined that all dioceses and religious orders of the Latin Rite should use the new revision and no other, excepting only such bodies as could prove a prescription of two hundred years. In this way the older orders like the Carthusians and the Dominicans were enabled to retain their ancient liturgical usages, but the new book was accepted throughout the greater part of Europe. A revised edition of the "Missale Romanum" appeared in 1604 accompanied by a brief of Clement VIII in which the pontiff complained among other things that the *vetus Itala* version of the Scripture which had been retained in the antiphonal passages of the Pian Missal had been replaced, through the unauthorized action of certain printers, by the text of the newly edited Vulgate. Another revision bearing more especially upon the rubrics followed under Urban VIII in 1634. In the early part of the nineteenth century, owing largely to the exertions of Dom Guéranger, the Benedictine liturgist, a number of the dioceses of France which had up to this persistently adhered to their own distinctive uses upon a more or less valid plea of immemorial antiquity, made a sacrifice to uniformity and accepted the "Missale Romanum". The last authoritative revision of the Missal took place in 1884 under Leo XIII. It should be noticed finally that the term Missal has been applied by a loose popular usage to a number of books which, strictly speaking, have no right to the name. The "Missale Francorum", the "Missale Gothicum", the "Missal of Robert of Jumièges", etc., are all, properly speaking, Sacramentaries.

The most important contribution to the subject is EBNER, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Gesch. und Kunstgesch. des Missale Romanum in Mittelalter* (Freiburg, 1896), a monograph in which special attention is paid to the peculiarities of the pictorial decoration of ancient Missals. Another valuable work which has at least an indirect bearing on early missals is DELISLE, *Mémoire sur les anciens Sacramentaires* (Paris, 1886); SCHROD in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Missale;* KLEINSCHMIDT in *Theologisch-praktische Quartalschr.* (Linz, 1907); LIPPE AND LEGG, *The Missale Romanum of 1474*, III (2 vols., Henry Bradshaw Society, 1907). To give a list of the more famous published Missals such as the *Missale ad usum ecclesiæ Sarum* (London, 1861, etc.), the *York Missal*, the *Ambrosian Missal*, the *Mozarabic Missal*, etc., would be superfluous. On the rubrics of the Missal the reader may be referred, besides such Catholic works as MERCATI, GAVANTI and VAN DER STAPPEN, to WICKHAM LEGG, *Tracts on the Mass* (Henry Bradshaw Society, 1904).

HERBERT THURSTON.

Mission, CONGREGATION OF PRIESTS OF THE.—A congregation of secular priests with religious vows founded by St. Vincent de Paul. The members add the letters C.M. to their name. As with many other communities, an appellation from the founder or the place they dwell in has superseded the original title. Thus in France and in almost all countries they are called Lazarists, because it was in the Priory of St. Lazare in Paris that St. Vincent de Paul dwelt and that he established his principal works. In the Irish province, which includes practically all English speaking countries except the United States, they are called Vincentians, and this name is gradually replacing that of Lazarists in the United States. In countries whose language is Spanish they are called Paules. This appellation, like the preceding, is obviously derived from the name of the founder. The name Congregation of the Mission indicates their first and chief object.

I. ORIGIN OF THE CONGREGATION.—In the beginning of the year 1617, Vincent de Paul was at the Château de Folleville in Picardy with the family of M. de Gondy, Count de Joigny, General of the Galleys of France, and had charge of the education of M. de Gondy's sons, one of whom became the celebrated Cardinal de Retz, Coadjutor of Paris. Vincent had opportunities of observing the ignorance of religion of the peasants of the neighbourhood. As the result of a sermon which he preached on the 25 Jan., 1617, in the church of Folleville, Vincent, with two Jesuit Fathers, began, at Mme de Gondy's request, to preach to and instruct the people of the neighbouring villages on her estates. Thus began the work which was to become eight years later, in 1625, the Congregation of the Mission. Mme de Gondy wished to make a foundation that would secure a mission every five years for the rural population of her extensive estates. The Oratorians and Jesuits being unable to undertake this work, she urged Vincent to gather together some zealous priests and organize missions for the poor country people at that time so little in touch with the clergy. Ecclesiastical authorization was easily obtained from John Francis de Gondy, then Archbishop of Paris, brother of the General of the Galleys. He also handed over to Vincent the ownership and all the rights of an old college in Paris, called "des Bons Enfants". Vincent de Paul took possession through his first disciple and co-labourer Anthony Portail, 6 March, 1624. The next year a contract confirming the previous promises was signed by the de Gondy family in favour of Vincent and his companions united "under the name of Company, Congregation or Confraternity of Fathers or Priests of the Mission". This took place on 17 April, 1625.

Edified by the success of their labours, the Archbishop of Paris gave his official approval a year later, 24 April, 1626, to the contract of foundation, and on 4 Sept., 1626, before two notaries of Châtelet in Paris, Vincent and his first companions declared that they had joined together "to live in a community or confraternity and to devote themselves to the salvation of the poor country people". Only three priests signed this declaration with Vincent de Paul: Du Coudray, Portail, and de la Salle. Very soon afterwards four other priests joined the little company: John Bécu, of the Diocese of Amiens; Anthony Lucas, of Paris; John Brunet, of the Diocese of Clermont; and John d'Horgny, of the Diocese of Noyon. The King of France, Louis XIII, added the seal of his royal authority to the act of foundation already approved by ecclesiastical authority the preceding year. In May, 1627, he issued letters patent, allowing the missionaries to form

a congregation, to live in community, and to devote themselves with the consent of the bishops to works of charity. Community life being established, St. Vincent could no longer hold as his own property the Collège des Bons Enfants, which was annexed to the mission by a decree of the Archbishop of Paris granted 8 June, 1627. The court of the Parlement ordered the registration of the letters patent of 1627 which the opposition of certain pastors of Paris had delayed, and pontifical authorization was granted by the Bull "Salvatoris Nostri" of Urban VIII, 12 Jan., 1632. In 1632 an important change took place in the installation of the new community. On 8 January, Vincent took possession of the house of St. Lazare, then in the outskirts of Paris. It was an immense priory where only eight regular canons of St. Victor remained and which Prior Adrian Le Bon, seeing the great good that Vincent de Paul and his missionaries were accomplishing, had resolved in concert with his religious to transfer to him. An agreement was entered into between Adrian Le Bon and his religious on one side, and Vincent de Paul acting in the name of his community on the other, on 7 Jan., 1632, and the next day the Archbishop of Paris granted the transfer of the house of St. Lazare, and came himself to introduce Vincent. Vincent left some of his priests at the Collège des Bons Enfants, which was destined to become a seminary under the name of St. Firmin. The house of St. Lazare became the headquarters of the Congregation of the Mission.

The Congregation of the Mission, according to the desire of its founder and from a canonical standpoint, is a "congregation of secular clergymen"; this is the term the Sovereign Pontiffs use; for instance, Benedict XIII in the Bull of the Beatification of St. Vincent de Paul calls him "Congregationis presbyterorum sæcularium Missionis fundator" (13 August, 1729). To ensure its permanency St. Vincent surrounded his work with safeguards including vows, but on the other hand, for many reasons, was careful to prevent its becoming a religious order. Meanwhile the missionaries extended their labours over France and in foreign lands. They undertook labours of various kinds. But the exact form of the congregation had not yet been determined. Vincent saw communities around him, which he used to say, people entered and left like a well conducted hotel. In 1642 and 1651 he held two assemblies of the priests who had been longest with him. They decided at first on a vow of stability, and afterwards on the three ordinary vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, without meaning to form a religious order, though they had due respect for the religious state. Almost immediately after his election Alexander VII completed the work of Urban VIII, confirming the transfer of St. Lazare to the Congregation of the Mission, and authorizing on 22 Sept., by the Brief "Ex commisso Nobis", the constitution of the community. The Brief declares that at the end of two years of probation, simple vows are to be taken, but that nevertheless the community belongs to the secular clergy. That there might be no question of changing the nature of his institute, Vincent did not establish a novitiate for the aspirants to his community, but a seminary, which is known as internal, to distinguish it from the diocesan or external seminaries. He also made it a rule that his missionaries wear the dress of secular priests; in a word that they should be distinguished, in the exercise of the apostolic functions, only by their organized effort to save souls (cf. Maynard, "St. Vincent de Paul", I, p. 253, ed. 1886). Such is the canonical status of the Congregation of the Mission.

II. Rule and Government.—There was, moreover, need of rules according to which the society he had just constituted should perform its functions. Vincent de Paul wished to test first, by experience, what circumstances might gradually require among the missionaries as to their manner of life and their work. Thus he was 82 years old when, 17 May, 1658, he distributed to the community the little book of "Common Rules or Constitutions". From these rules can be seen the elements of which the congregation is made up, the life it leads, its spirit, and the works to which its energies are directed. The elements, or members, of which it is composed are according to the "Common Rules", ecclesiastics and laymen. The ecclesiastics are, in imitation of Christ and His disciples, to preach and break the bread of the Word of God, to recall sinners to a Christian life, to give themselves up to various apostolic works which zeal for God's glory may call for among the people and the clergy. The laymen, or coadjutor-brothers, have for their work, while labouring also at their personal sanctification, the care of temporal concerns, and the practice of prayer and mortification to obtain the blessing of God upon the labours of the missionaries. The life prescribed by the rule is that which was led by Jesus Christ and His disciples. It does not prescribe any special austerities. But as Collet, one of the disciples of St. Vincent de Paul, says, although the life prescribed has nothing very extraordinary about it, nothing even which the Sacred Canons have not already laid down as a law for ecclesiastics who live in community, the servant of God knew that he must adopt special means to sustain human weakness in so regular and laborious a life. For this purpose he prescribed to his followers the daily exercises of piety which every priest who is desirous of his own perfection should impose on himself. As to their daily intercourse, he especially recommends charity among his followers, urging them in particular not to speak evil of any one, above all of other communities, and never to decry other nations or countries. So far as intercourse with the outside world is concerned, he prescribes dependence on superiors, which is a guarantee of prudence and regulates whatever unwisdom might be found in even the best intentioned zeal. If, in the words of Abelly, Bishop of Rodez and first biographer of St. Vincent de Paul, the man of God made it his rule never to anticipate Providence, in the words of another Bishop of Rodez, Cardinal Bourret, in the nineteenth century, it is not less true to say that St. Vincent de Paul has always followed closely in the footsteps of Providence. Asylums for foundlings, for old people, the institution of the Daughters of Charity, retreats in preparation for ordination, seminaries, the apostolate of foreign missions among the infidels of Madagascar and Barbary, all show the zeal of St. Vincent de Paul, and this zeal he urged his sons not to allow to be extinguished among them after his death. Finally, according to the rules, the works that form the special object of the congregation founded by St. Vincent de Paul are thus determined: besides devoting himself to his own perfection, each one shall be employed in preaching the Gospel to the poor, especially to poor country people, and in helping ecclesiastics to the knowledge and virtues requisite for their state.

During the life of the founder, establishments were made not only in France but also in Poland and in Italy. The congregation undertook mission work in the North, in the Hebrides, in the Tropics, in Barbary and Madagascar. It was under Vincent (in 1642) that the houses of the congregation were grouped in provinces, each having at its head a provincial superior called visitor. The same year a rule was introduced for the holding of general assemblies, for the election of the superior general, for the nomination of his advisers under the name of assistants, and for other matters of importance. The following establishments were founded in St. Vincent's lifetime: in Paris: Bons Enfans (1625) and St. Lazare (1632); Toul: seminary and mission centre (1635); Notre

Dame de la Rose: missions (1637); Richelieu: parish and missions (1638); Annecy: seminary and mission (1639); Crécy: missions (1641); Cahors: seminary, parish, and missions (1643); Marseilles: mission (1643); Sedan: parish and mission (1643) Saintes: seminary and mission (1643); Montmirail: missions (1644); Le Mans: seminary and missions (1645); Saint Méen: missions (1645); Paris: St. Charles Seminary (1645); Treguier: seminary and missions (1648); Agen: seminary and missions (1648); Montauban: seminary and missions (1652); also foundations in Rome (1642), Genoa (1645), Turin (1654), Warsaw (1651), Tunis (1645), Algiers (1646), Madagascar (1648). At the death of its founder the congregation numbered 500 members.

The government of the congregation is very simple. It consists of the superior general, and four assistants, aided by the procurator general and secretary general. All these officials are chosen by a majority vote of a general assembly, which is composed of the visitors of the several provinces and two delegates from each province, elected by secret ballot in the provincial assemblies. Each house in domestic assembly selects also by secret ballot, a delegate to accompany the superior to the provincial assembly. The provincial government is made up of a visitor appointed by the superior general and of consultors approved by him. Usually for the appointment of a visitor three names are selected by the provincial council, and presented to the superior general who chooses one to govern the province. Local superiors also are appointed by the superior general, with the advice of the visitor and his council. A general assembly is held every twelve years to legislate for the congregation. This is the only legislative body in the congregation.

An assembly is held every six years made up of the general officers of the congregation, and of one delegate from each province. This body may elect to vacancies among the superior general's assistants and may also decide minor matters of discipline. Decrees of general assemblies are binding on the entire congregation. Their interpretation rests with the superior general and his council. The office of superior general is held for life, or until his resignation. Provision is however, made in the "Constitutions" for his removal from office for crime, or perpetual inability to govern. Visitors remain in office at the discretion of the superior general. In like manner local superiors are removable, for cause, by the visitor, whose action, however, must be approved by the superior general, who alone has the right to appoint and remove superiors.

III. History.—*From St. Vincent until the Revolution.*—From St. Vincent's death until the Revolution there were nine superiors general, whose part was to complete the organization of the new society and to forward the various works for which it was instituted. These superiors general were: René Alméras (1661), Edmund Jolly (1673), Nicholas Pierron (1697), Francis Watel (1703), John Bonnet (1711), John Couty (1736), Louis Debras (1747), Antoine Jacquier (1762–1788). Felix Cayla was at the head of the congregation during the French Revolution. It was during the generalship of René Alméras, especially, that, in 1668, what are sometimes called the "Great Constitutions" were drawn up. They were discussed and accepted by the general assembly held that year from 15 July to 1 Sept., and were approved in October following by the Archbishop of Paris, Harduin de Péréfixe, with authority granted him by the Bull of Urban VIII, in 1632. The title is "Constitutions which concern the superior general and the government of the whole Congregation of the Mission". These are the general constitutions in force at the present day. Alméras is responsible for the compilation of an abridgment of these constitutions which has a still greater authority in the sense that this condensed edition under the name of "Summary", or, in Latin "Constitutiones selectæ", discussed in the general assembly of 1668 and approved by it, has been submitted to the authority of the Holy See. The text was examined and changed in some points by the examiners appointed by the pope. In this form it has been cited in its entirety in the Brief "Ex injuncto Nobis" of Clement X of 2 June, 1670. This is the chief act of internal legislation for the Lazarists. It has been published in the "Acta apostolica in gratiam Congregationis Missionis" (Paris, 1876). Alméras secured the drawing up of the rules for the offices, which were sent to all the houses in 1670. Edmund Jolly completed this work.

Bonnet, elected in 1711, had the longest and fullest generalship of all the superiors general before the Revolution. He had keen intelligence and great capacity for work. A brief sketch of his life and character is given in the preface to a collection of meditations which he composed and Collet published. He had to pass with his community through the difficult period of Jansenism. His congregation in charge of a great number of seminaries, and hence in close contact with a great number of bishops whose tendencies were very doubtful, was indeed in a delicate position. Rome condemned Jansenism, and Bonnet, regardless of the inconveniences his community might suffer, here and there, as a consequence, held firmly the course marked out by the pope. He expelled from the congregation men otherwise most distinguished such as Himbert and Philopald. After him, Couty and Debras showed themselves equally faithful and courageous in the doctrinal difficulties which still continued. The Congregation of the Lazarists had sometimes to suffer for this fidelity: for instance at Auxerre all the directors of the seminary were placed under interdict by de Caylus, an imperious bishop, a friend of the Jansenists, but they were reinstated by de Condorcet, his successor (see Migne, "Dictionnaire des Ordres Religieux", II, 766). The Lazarists held firmly to the side of Rome. One of them, Soardi, superior of the seminary of Avignon, published an important work "De Suprema Romani Pontificis auctoritate" (1747), which passed almost in its entirety into the work of Abbé, afterwards Cardinal, Villecourt, on "The Rights of the Holy See". Another Lazarist, Peter Collet, produced among other works, a theology of merit, which made him the butt of various attacks. In 1764 appeared a "Denunciation" of the theology of Peter Collet addressed to the Bishop of Troyes by a great number of ecclesiastics of his diocese (120 pp. duodecimo, 1764). The clergymen who signed it numbered one hundred and nine says an anonymous note. They accuse Collet of inclining scandalously towards a lax morality. The period of the French Revolution was approaching. The superior general since 1788 was Felix Cayla, a man of great ability. Elected as the first alternate for the deputation of the clergy of the National Assembly, he had in fact to take part in it because of the departure of one of the ecclesiastical deputies, and he refused at the tribunal of the assembly the oath for the civil constitution in 1791. He was immediately sent into exile.

When St. Vincent de Paul died in 1660 the secular clergy of Paris had a solemn service at which the preacher, Henry de Maupas du Tour, Bishop of Puy, who had been for many years in very close intimacy with Vincent did not hesitate to take as his text; "Whose praise is through all the churches" (II Cor., viii, 18). Abelly, Bishop of Rodez, writing only four years later, declared that the work founded by this humble priest had already extended most widely and through his congregation would spread still more. (1) Missions.—The end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century was for France a half century of political and religious anarchy. The clergy of the large cities, where there were universities.

were cultured, but the rural clergy were ignorant and neglected their flocks, who, in face of the disorders created by the conflict between the Protestant Reformation and Catholicism, not knowing which to believe, lost all interest in religion. To remedy this indifference and this ignorance, was what Vincent de Paul chiefly sought. The first missions of the Lazarists were in the suburbs of Paris and in Picardy and Champagne. The method and rule given by St. Vincent de Paul has been preserved for us by Abelly, a contemporary of the saint. It is in all essentials identical with the system used by his missionaries and in fact by all modern missionaries. "There was one thing that Mr. Vincent observed on the missions", says Abelly, his contemporary biographer, "and which he wished his spiritual sons to observe most faithfully; to give all the instructions and render all services gratuitously without being in any way a charge to those to whom they render these offices of charity", and this the priests of the Mission have inviolably observed. It was for this reason that Vincent de Paul would not agree to the establishment of a mission house unless it had a sufficient foundation to allow the missions to be given gratuitously. In the United States indeed where there are no foundations it has been the custom of St. Vincent's missionaries to accept whatever offering might be made them, but this usage is confined to English speaking countries, elsewhere this most disinterested custom is in full vigour. The fruits of these missions were very marked and many bishops desired to procure this blessing for their dioceses. Soon after the establishment of the congregation, while he was at the Collège des Bons Enfants, that is to say from 1625 to 1632, St Vincent himself gave one hundred and forty missions.

In 1638 Louis XIII wished Vincent to have his missionaries give a mission at St. Germain-en-Laye near Paris, where he then was with all the court. Vincent offered many excuses but to no avail. He recommended his missionaries to preach as simply at court as they did in the rural districts, having nothing in view but the good of souls. The mission was a complete success and Anne of Austria a few years later, 1641, asked for another in the same place and under the same circumstances. Mission preaching has been employed in every age of the Church; but systematic parish missions as now understood were commenced by St. Vincent de Paul (American Eccles. Rev., XI, 90), and the wonderful influence of the modern form of this great work of zeal dates from the first missions of St. Vincent and his companions in the infant Congregation of the Mission. St. Vincent cites instances: "A mission was given among the banditti and these wretched people were converted by the grace of God." Elsewhere he generalizes: "Of all the means which the Almighty has left to mankind for the correcting of their lives there is none that has produced effects more striking, more multiplied and more marvelous than the exercises of a mission." What the spiritual exercises of St. Ignatius have done for religious and the clergy and for individuals among the laity, the missions as organized by the Lazarists have done for the people at large. Vincent fully appreciated the value of retreats and his house and the houses of his sons have always been open to laymen and clerics for retreat. From their foundation to the present time innumerable missions have been given throughout the Catholic world and the pioneers in the field have done a goodly share of the work. It has been, however, earnestly pursued by almost all the active orders and, especially in recent years, by zealous members of the diocesan priesthood. St. Vincent always insisted that this is the chief work of his community and should be held in the highest esteem by all its members.

From 1652 to 1660 more than seven hundred missions were given from the house of St. Lazare alone. The number of those given by the missionaries in various dioceses of France cannot be reckoned.

(2) Parishes and Chapels.—It is only with regret that the Lazarist Missionaries accept chapels and parishes. For they wish to be free to go here and there on missions to give the help peculiar to their ministry, and by preaching and hearing confessions to revive if need be or maintain the good effects of the work of the parish priests. They accepted the charge of parishes and chapels only in two circumstances: when they could make of these parishes a residence for other missionaries who would go out preaching missions, or when circumstances made it impossible to refuse. An example of these circumstances is the parish of Richelieu founded by the Cardinal of that name, minister of Louis XIII, and the parish of Sedan. In 1638 Cardinal Richelieu wished to establish the Lazarists not only in the city of his ducal title but also in the Diocese of Luçon of which he had been bishop. By an act of 4 Jan., passed at Ruel, he obtained of Vincent seven priests who were to be sent to Richelieu in the following February, and to whom three others should be added within two years. Four of these the act declares "shall remain at Richelieu to perform the functions of the mission. The three others shall be sent every five years for the same purpose, to every town and village of the duchy, and while awaiting the time to begin their rounds again they shall give missions in the Diocese of Poitiers, or other places in the adjacent country as it shall please His Eminence to arrange. The three remaining priests shall be sent to Luçon for the same purpose and all shall go to the country four times a year at the period most suited for this work, and labour there for six weeks each time. One of the four priests living at Richelieu shall act as pastor with as many assistants as shall be deemed expedient. In the house of Richelieu shall be received gratuitously and for twelve days those who are to be ordained for the Diocese of Poitiers at the four seasons of the year, and for fifteen days such priests of the diocese as the Bishop of Poitiers shall send to make the exercises of the spiritual retreat". On his part the cardinal agrees to have erected and to furnish a suitable house and to obtain the annexation of the parish to the Congregation of the Mission and to procure for it the necessary revenues.

Sometimes special spiritual needs have caused the Lazarists to accept a parish. Hardly was Louis XIII in possession of Sedan when he desired Vincent to send his priests there. The needs of religion were very pressing for, through their continual intercourse with the Huguenots, the number of Catholics was daily diminishing and the true faith almost extinguished. The parish of Sedan was at first transferred to the Mission by the Archbishop with the consent of the Abbot Mouzon and the religious of the abbey, and Louis XIII gave an annual income of 2,500 livres for the administration of the parish and the support of the missions. Besides a priest to officiate at Balan, there were to be at Sedan a parish priest, seven other priests, and two brothers. At least four of the priests were to remain in charge of the work of the parish and four others were to preach missions to the people of the surrounding country. Three more priests were added in 1680, because since its foundation in 1644 the number of communicants had increased by two-thirds. Soon, of more than 10,000 inhabitants among whom at first not more than 1,500 Catholics could be counted, hardly a third part remained heretics. It was by means of the pacific method always recommended by St. Vincent, that the Lazarists thus diminished the number of Protestants and increased so wonderfully the number of Catholics. Instead of controversies which often embitter hearts, they preferred the explanatory system which gave solid and practical instruction to Catholics and Protestants alike. At the same time they extended their labours

to the districts surrounding Sedan almost depopulated by war and they helped the people by exhortations and alms. Their charity thus helped their preaching and gained the hearts of those that were least disposed. At Sedan as elsewhere they aided the Protestants as well as the Catholics as Brother Sirven testifies whose eulogium Vincent wrote in a letter to Laudin in Mans, 7 Aug., 1660: "The whole city and surrounding country regret him, even the heretics who were edified by his modesty and aided by his charity."

(3) The Seminaries.—The Congregation of the Mission founded by St. Vincent has for its chief object together with the missions devotion to the service of ecclesiastics. In France in his day there were in the cities a certain number of well educated and distinguished clergymen, but the great majority especially in the country places had no practical means of formation. Many zealous priests of this period, Condren and Berulle of the Oratory, Bourdoise of St. Nicholas, above all Olier of St. Sulpice were preoccupied with the matter. Vincent used to say, as it is of the utmost importance for a military commander after he has conquered a country to leave behind him garrisons to maintain his conquest, so when apostolic men have led the people to God, or brought them back to Him, it is a vital matter to preserve this conquest, by procuring worthy and zealous priests to labour among them. He arranged with the Bishop of Beauvais as early as 1628 for a retreat for those to be ordained in that city. During the days preceding ordination they were assembled for exercises of piety and for immediate preparations for the pastoral ministry. These exercises were established at the house des Bons Enfants, afterwards at St. Lazare for the Diocese of Paris. The archbishop made them obligatory for all who received orders in Paris. At Rome, enjoined by the pope, they have been held at the house of the Lazarists at Montecitorio up to the present day. At Paris in the house des Bons Enfants in February, 1642 Vincent de Paul established an ecclesiastical seminary and gave it a rule for the exercise of piety and for the order of studies. It is no doubt the same that was put in practice by the Lazarists when they began the theological seminary at Annecy in 1641, and in the seminary at Alet. It was in substance that which is in vogue in the seminaries of France at the present day. The rule, as given in Maynard (op. cit., II, 211), exhibits an excellent compromise between the secular and the cloistered life and a wise mingling of study, piety, and discipline. The object is to fit the cleric for his sacred functions. In the seminary as conceived and actually established by St. Vincent students of classics were separated from students of theology. He withdrew the former pupils at Bons Enfants and placed them in a separate establishment at St. Lazare, in what constituted the preparatory seminary of St. Charles. The beneficial effect was immediately apparent.

As early as 1647, Vincent de Paul could write what he afterward embodied in his "Constitutions": "Our institute has but two chief ends, the instruction of the poor country people and the seminaries." After the first successes of Vincent and Olier there was a rivalry among the bishops to endow their dioceses with these most useful establishments. In 1643 the Lazarists were entrusted by Alain de Solminhac, Bishop of Cahors, with a mission house and the direction of the seminary of that city. In 1644 the Bishop of Saintes placed them in charge of his seminary; in 1645 those of Mans, of St. Malo and St. Méen were confided to them; that of Agen in 1650, and of Montaubon in 1660. After the death of the saint until the time of the Revolution the following seminaries were directed by the Lazarists: Narbonne and Metz (1661); Amiens, Troyes, and Noyon (1662); Saint-Brieuc (1666); Marseilles (1672); Saint-Flour (1674); Sens (1675); Arras (1677); Béziers and Alet (1678); Beauvais (1679); Tours, Chartres, Toul, and Auxerre (1680); Poitiers, Boulogne, and Châlons (1681); Bayeux and Bordeaux (1682); Sarlat (1683); Pau (1684); Manosque (1685); Saint-Pol-de-Léon (1689); Notre-Dame-de-la-Délivrande (1692); Vannes (1701); Angoulême (1704); Avignon (1705); Notre-Dame-de-Buglose (1706); Toulouse (1707); Poitiers (1710); Saint-Servan (1712); Pamiers and Tours (1715); Mornant (1717); Chartres (1719); Villefranche (1723); Figeac (1735); Arles (1752); Lurs (1753); La Rochelle and Metz (1763); Rodez (1767); Luçon (1771); Cambrai (1772); Albi (1774); Nancy (1780); Soissons (1786); finally, Castres (1788), the last seminary that was given to the Congregation before the Revolution. In all 43 theological and 9 preparatory seminaries (Maynard, II, p. 234). The Lazarists soon spread outside of France. In Italy, in 1641, a papal Bull authorized an establishment in Rome, and the Duchess of Aiguillon gave them a donation to devote their time to missions for the rural population, to labour for the clergy, the spiritual retreats for those to be ordained, etc. In 1697 the pope gave them the house and church of Sts. John and Paul on the Cœlian Hill, but this has been exchanged for St. Sylvester's on the Quirinal. In 1645 they were called to Genoa, to Turin in 1655, to Naples in 1668. In St. Vincent's time they went to preach in Ireland and in the Hebrides; later Charles II called them to London for his chapel as Louis XIV had done in France for his chapel at Versailles. In Poland, in the time of John Casimir and his queen Louise Marie de Gonzaga, they were called to Warsaw in 1651, to Krakow in 1656, to Culm in 1677, to Vilna in 1687, and to many other cities, so that before the Revolution Poland was one of the most flourishing provinces. In Spain they were established in Barcelona and from there settled in several other cities. They reached Portugal in 1718 though not recognized by the king, John V, who up to this time was opposed to their dependence upon the superior general in Paris, but who afterwards favoured them and built them the magnificent house of Rilhafolles in the suburbs of Lisbon, a house which was confiscated by the Revolution. At the Revolution of 1834 there were six establishments of the Portuguese tongue.

(4) Foreign Missions among the Infidels.—Foreign missions had a place in the schedule of apostolic works drawn up by St. Vincent de Paul, and although this sort of labour did not develop among his sons before the Revolution to so great an extent as it did in the nineteenth century, yet from the beginning they gave themselves to this work. In 1645 the missionaries set out for Barbary, as they then called it. The regencies of Tunis and Algiers in the power of the Turks were a den of pirates where a great number of Christians taken prisoners by Turkish Corsairs were held captives. The Lazarists did mission work there, and from time to time they even fulfilled the duties of consul, when it was too difficult to find a layman for this office. Some were imprisoned by the Deys of Algiers, some were put to death at the cannon's mouth as John Le Vacher and Francillon. They kept this duty till, finally, in 1830, France destroyed that stronghold of pirates. The Lazarists of the seventeenth century also preached the Gospel in the Island of Madagascar, and in the eighteenth century in Bourbon Island and the Isle de France. They passed over into China, at first one by one, like Appiani and Pedrini during the nunciature of Cardinal de Tournon, and like Mullener who became Vicar Apostolic of Se-Tchuen. They were called to Macao, a possession of the Portuguese, by the Portuguese Government in 1784, and directed many houses of education there. After the suppression of the Society of Jesus and despite the refusal of the superior general because of the inadequate number of subjects, through an agreement between the King of France and the Propaganda at Rome, the Lazarists were charged with the duty of

taking the places, so far as they could, which had been held by the Jesuits in the Levant and in China (1782–1783). Father Viguier, a Lazarist, took possession of the mission at Constantinople and 8 May, 1785, another Lazarist, Father Raux, took possession of the mission of Pekin. At the outbreak of the French Revolution there were in France, Spain, Portugal, and the Palatinate along with the missions outside Europe about one hundred and fifty Lazarist establishments.

Under the Revolution.—Even before the Revolution in France many nations had been the prey of internal dissensions. In the first place must be mentioned Poland whose discords were leading it to dismemberment and ruin. In 1772, in the first partition of Poland, twelve houses of the Lazarists passed under foreign dominion, Austrian, Prussian, or Russian. The Polish houses which became Austrian disappeared before the exactions of Joseph II of Austria. The King of Prussia, who when taking his share of Poland had promised to respect religious institutions, soon began confiscating ecclesiastical property. Nevertheless, in 1789 the Polish province of the Lazarists still numbered twenty-two houses. A second and a third division took place in 1793 and in 1795, among Austria, Prussia, and Russia, leaving nothing of unhappy Poland. In the part that fell to Russia the Polish Lazarists constituted a new province called the Lithuanian, remaining as far as possible in communication with the superior general in Paris. The Polish uprisings of 1830 and 1863 drew down upon the Catholics the rigours of the Prussian and Russian Governments. The Lazarist houses at Culm, Gnesen, and Posen were suppressed by the laws of 1836. The houses in Russia, much more numerous, were destroyed by the Government in 1842 and 1864. It was only later, under the Austrian dominion, that the Polish Lazarists could reorganize. They have establishments on Austrian territory in Galicia and Bukowina. In the different states of Italy, where the princes of the House of Bourbon reigned, life was no longer an easy matter for religious communities. In the Kingdom of Naples they were forced under penalty of suppression to stop all intercourse with the houses of the community in foreign states and especially with the superior general. This state of affairs continued from 1790 till 1815. About 1789 the houses of the congregation in Italy were divided into two provinces: the province of Rome with twelve houses and the province of Lombardy with fifteen houses which included the foundations at Barcelona, Palma, and Barbastro in Spain. In Paris on the day after the taking of the Bastille the mob made an attack upon the house of St. Lazare which was one of the chief religious establishments in Paris. The furniture was broken and thrown out of the windows, the priests and students were obliged to disperse. The missionaries returned and banded together there some days afterwards, but they had to separate again in 1792, and to abandon this house in which St. Vincent had lived and died, and which was the central house of the congregation. The other house of the Lazarists in Paris, the old Collège des Bons Enfants, became the scene of still more dramatic events in 1792. On the second and third of September of this year massacres occurred in different establishments in Paris in which the Revolutionists had locked in the priests. The Abbey, Carmel, and St. Firmin served as prisons. In the last house more than seventy priests were cruelly massacred, among others the Lazarist superior of the establishment, Father Louis Joseph François and his confrère, Henry Gruyer. The superior general of St. Lazare, Cayla, at the Assembly, refused the oath of the Civil Constitution of the clergy. Among the members of his congregation several published learned protests against it and all refused it except a few, three of whom afterwards became Constitutional bishops. A goodly number died martyrs to their fidelity to the Church of Rome. Some of these martyrs were François and Gruyer, massacred at St. Firmin in Paris, Matthew Caron, John Colin and John Gallois at Versailles. Many perished on the scaffold: Francis Bergon at Cahors, John Guibaud at Mans, Louis Hayer at Niort, Francis Martelet at Besançon. In addition, several succumbed in prison: Nicholas Bailly, Paul Brochois, Victor Julienne, and Angelus Bernard Lamourette, nephew of the Constitutional bishop, or on the prison-ships of Rochefort and at the Isle Madame, as John Janet and Nicholas Parizot; or at Sinnamari, as Claude Cuin.

Such is the tribute which the Congregation of the Mission paid during the bloody Revolution. As a result of the legislation concerning the Constitutional Church and the decrees of suppression of religious orders, all the establishments of the Lazarists in France were destroyed. At that time they had in France provinces comprising 78 houses with 824 members. Obliged to flee, the superior general, Cayla, took refuge in Rome, where he died 12 February, 1800. His death at a period when the scattered members of the congregation could not come together to elect his successor, began an interregnum which was full of difficulties. There were vicars-general; ordinarily two vicars-general governed simultaneously, one for the Lazarists in France and the foreign missions and as superior of the Daughters of Charity, the other had authority over the Lazarists of other countries. This provisional organization lasted until 1827, when a superior general was finally named. During these twenty-seven years the vicars general were as follows. On the death of the superior general, Felix Cayla, in 1800, Francis Brunet, his companion in exile at Rome and his assistant, was appointed vicar-general. Returning to France in 1804 Brunet lodged at the house of the Daughters of Charity and died there in 1806. Claude Placiard, his successor, who seemed destined for a longer career, died the next year after an illness of three days. He was succeeded by Dominic Hanon. The zeal with which the latter strove to maintain the authority which the superior general used to exercise over the Daughters of Charity drew upon him the animosity of the imperial power and he was imprisoned in the fortress of Fenestrelle. He did not regain his liberty until 1814 when he returned to Paris where he died in 1816. The next year he had as his successor Charles Verbert, who lived till 1819. On his death Charles Boujard was invested with the vicar-generalship, like his four predecessors, and it was under his government, lasting about eight years, that the congregation succeeded in reorganizing, and noticeably increased. These five vicar-generals were French and resided in Paris. The Italian vicars-general residing in Rome were Dominic Sicardi from 1804 to 1818 and Antony Baccari from 1819 to 1827. Even under the provisional régime of the vicars-general, the work of preaching, of the seminaries, and of the foreign mission was gradually re-established. In France as early as 1819 Verbert saw gathered around him a considerable body of young men and of ecclesiastics already formed and could state that the Lazarists had houses at Amiens, Soissons, Sarlat, Montauban, Vannes, Valfleury, St. Etienne (Circular letters, II, 351). At the same period some of the houses in Italy that were suppressed by the Revolution reopened. There were six houses in Spain, six also in Portugal, counting the college at Macao which was a Portuguese possession. The province of Poland or of Warsaw numbered twelve houses. The Lithuanian province because of political circumstances had but little intercourse with the superiors of the congregation. The foreign missions had to suffer too from the critical conditions brought about by the Revolution in those countries whence they drew their supply of missionaries. This period of expectation was followed by a period of expansion.

After the French Revolution.—After the sanguinary crisis of the Revolution, the way was gradually paved for the restoration of the congregation. It was not until 1827, however, that its abnormal situation ceased when the two vicars-general Bonjard in France and Boccari in Rome having resigned, Pope Leo XII, by a Brief of 16 Jan., 1827, nominated Peter Dewailly superior general. In 1804 an imperial decree dated 27 May re-established the Congregation of the Lazarists; in 1816, under the Government of the Restoration a royal ordinance recognized it in the condition in which it had been placed by the Act of 1804. It was especially on the basis of these two decrees that the Council of State of 16 Jan., 1901, considered the Congregation of St. Lazare as legally recognized in France. The old house of St. Lazare having been transferred by the State to the public service, the Government handed over to the use of the congregation a piece of property situated at Rue de Sèvres 95, the Hôtel des Lorges, and here Verbert, the vicar-general, entered with his community still small in number, 19 Nov., 1817. Some adjoining ground on the Rue de Sèvres was bought partly by King Charles X for the building of a chapel, which was blessed by Mgr. de Quélen, Archbishop of Paris, 1 Nov., 1827. The following is a list of the superiors general who have been elected by the general assemblies held in Paris down to 1910. After Peter Dewailly died, 23 Oct., 1828, the general assembly of 15 May, 1829, selected as his successor Dominic Salhorgne. He had the consolation of seeing the relics of St. Vincent which had to be hidden during the Revolution brought back in solemn state to his religious family in 1830. Under the weight of age and infirmities he resigned in 1835. The general assembly named as his successor John Baptist Nozo who was succeeded in 1843 by John Baptist Etienne whose long and most successful generalship continued until his death in 1874. Then Eugene Boré was elected, a man well known in the world of literature and science. Death claimed him after four years, and in 1878 the general assembly made Anthony Fiat his successor, and he is now, 1910, at the head of the congregation.

The work of the congregation has remained unchanged save for adaptations to new circumstances. Missions at home are no less necessary than formerly. A special consideration makes them more than ever the objects of solicitude. It is that the people of our democratic age have acquired an influence and an authority which they never exercised before. Besides missions to the people, the congregation has adapted its methods in seminaries to new conditions. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries clerics received their formation chiefly at the universities or in the colleges of the chief cities; clerics who did not study there unfortunately but too often did not study at all. In this state of affairs it sufficed to provide seminaries as ecclesiastical homes for clerics who went out to follow the courses in the universities and colleges of the city. In the seminary there was a course in liturgy; the students were helped to make for themselves a practical abridgment of moral theology and when the time came they were aided by the exercises of the retreat to prepare for ordinations. Two or three priests at most sufficed for such establishments. To-day all is changed in this regard. Seminarians ordinarily spend all their time within the walls of the seminary. The seminary gives them ecclesiastical instruction in philosophy, history, exegesis, canon law, and theology, teaching that they could not find outside save in a few universities. Seminary life no longer lasts for some months only, as it usually did in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but for several years, so that the faculty required for a seminary, whether it be composed of members of a community or of the secular clergy, must be much more numerous and specially equipped for scientific training. The Congregation of the Mission had then to adapt itself to the new order of things. Finally, as to the foreign missions, new facilities of travel and communication, and new means of influence and of intercourse with pagan or savage peoples have given a new character to the work of evangelization, requiring missionary bodies to change their methods to meet these changed conditions.

IV. Literary and Scientific Activity.—*Teaching.*—The method of teaching which prevails in Lazarist colleges and seminaries, is that of explaining a well chosen text of some approved author from whose opinions even the professor is not allowed to depart, except by the express permission of his superiors. Such a text is placed in the hands of the pupils, who learn a portion of it, and receive explanations and comments from the professor. Individual research is encouraged but within limits suggested by the practical character of Lazarist college and seminary training. Conformably to the commands and recommendations of Leo XIII and Pius X, philosophy and theology are taught in accord with the doctrines of St. Thomas and of his most authorized interpreters. Novelties in doctrine are distinctly discouraged, while professors are bidden to make themselves acquainted with modern errors, for refutation. *Writings.*—The life of Lazarists is above all, an active life, in college, in the seminary, and on the missions, hence their writings have been called forth for some practical utility, or as a result of their scientific explorations and their journeys as missionaries. The following are noteworthy as writers: (1) Theology.—Collet, Peter, a Frenchman (b. 1693; d. 1770), professed theology with success in Paris. When Tournely died (1729) leaving unfinished a course of theology which the university and the seminaries held in high esteem, Cardinal Fleury, then prime minister, invited Collet whose talents he knew, to continue and complete the work, which Collet did with much success, publishing "Continuatio Prælectionum Theologicarum Horatii Tournely" in 8 volumes (Paris, 1733–1760). He made an abridgment of this work as a class book of theology for seminaries. "Institutiones theologicæ quas a fusioribus suis editis et ineditis ad usum Seminariorum contraxit Petrus Collet" (Paris, 1744, 5 vols.). Whilst engaged in this great work, Collet composed more than forty volumes on different theological, canonical, liturgical, and devotional subjects. Brunet, Francis Florentin (b. in France, 1731; d. 1806), wrote a "Parallèle des Religions" in 5 volumes 4° (Paris, 1792), which by its abundant researches paved the way for the comparative histories of religion now so much in vogue. Morino, John, visitor of the Neapolitan province, issued in 1910 the seventh edition of his Moral Theology. MacGuiness, John, a native of Ireland and professor in the Irish College in Paris, has recently published a second edition of a complete course of theology. McNamara, Thomas, a pioneer Irish Vincentian, published many books of great utility to the clergy, the best known of these is "Programme of Sermons and Instructions", which is still much used.

(2) Works on Canon Law and Liturgy.—De Martinis (b. in Italy, 1829; died 1900), Archbishop of Laodicæa, published "Juris Pontificii de Propaganda Fide, Pars Prima continens Bullas, Brevia, Acta S.S. a Congregationis institutione ad præsens, juxta temporis seriem disposita" (Rome, 1888–1897, 7 vols., in quarto), a collection of documents emanating from the Propaganda in every respect superior to any preceding collection. Baldeschi, Joseph (b. in Italy, 1791; d. 1849), published an "Espositione delle Sacre Ceremonie" (Rome, 1830, 4 vols., 24mo.), which has been translated into various tongues. Mancini, Calcedonio (d. 1910) began at the Lazarist house of Montecitorio, Rome, in 1887, the publication of a monthly review,

"Ephemerides Liturgicæ", which is still issued. Buroni, Joseph (b. in Piedmont, 1821), besides theological and liturgical writings, has published several philosophical works, the chief is "Dell' Essere e del Conoscere" (Turin, 1877); he had previously issued a large portion of it under the title "Della Filosofia di Antonio Rosmini saggio di Giuseppe Buroni" (1877–80). (3) Languages.—Led by their ministry to speak the languages of the nations they evangelized the Lazarists have issued divers works in or concerning these languages. Caulier, Philip Albert (b. in France, 1723; d. 1793), composed an abridged catechism in the language of Madagascar, and wrote a Malagasy grammar for the Antanosy dialect. Gonsalves, Joachim Alphonsus, published among other works in the Chinese language, "Lexicon Magnum Latino–Simicum ostendens etymologiam, prosodiam et constructionem vocabulorum" (Macao, 1841, in folio). Viguier, Peter Francis (b. France, 1745; d. 1821), published "Elements of the Turkish Language, or Analytical Tables of the ordinary Turkish Language with developments" (Constantinople, Printing Press of the Palais de France, 1790, 4°). Coulbeau, John Baptist (b. in France, 1843), has published in the *glez* language or primitive Ethiopian tongue, the "Missal of the Ethiopian Rite" (Kerew, Printing Press of the Catholic Mission, 1890) and other works. He also published other books in Armarigna, the present idiom of Abyssinia, for example "Dialogues on the Things of Faith" (Kerew, Printing Press of the Catholic Mission, 1891). Schreiber, Jules, compiled a manual of the Tigrai language spoken in Central and Northern Abyssinia (Vienna, 1887) and Gren, John (b. in Germany, 1842; d. 1907), "La Lengua Quichua", a dialect of the Republic of Ecuador (Freiburg, 1896, in 12mo). More than half a million Indians in Ecuador, says the author, understand no language but the Quichua. He also wrote the first grammar and dictionary of this language. Bedjan, Paul, a Persian Lazarist, has written and published many works for the use of his fellow countrymen. During twenty years he printed more than forty volumes in the Syriac and Neo-Aramaic, reproducing almost all the ancient MSS. hitherto unpublished in the various branches of ecclesiastical science and history. The latest is the most curious and important, the hitherto unpublished autobiography of Nestorius, "Nestorius, Le Livre d'Heraclide de Damas édité par Paul Bedjan, Lazariste" (Leipzig, 1910, in 8°).

(4) Travels and Scientific Explorations.—Huc, (q. v.) Evariste-Régis (b. in France, 1813; d. 1860), published "Travels in Tartary, Thibet, and China" (Paris, 1850, 2 vols. in 8°), which was immediately translated into many languages. Later he published a sequel, "The Chinese Empire" (Paris, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo), and finally "Christianity in Tibet, Tartary, and China" (Paris, 1854, 4 vols. 18mo). David, Armand (b. in France, 1826; d. 1900), corresponding member of l'Institut de France, travelled in the East and Far East. Commissioned by the Museum of Natural History of Paris to make explorations, he enriched the collection by numerous discoveries. He wrote "Journal of Travel in Central China and in Eastern Tibet" which appeared in "Nouvelles Archives du Muséum", VIII, IX, and X, "Journal of my Third Tour of Exploration in the Chinese Empire" (Paris, 1875, 2 vols. 8°). Besides numerous studies edited by him, there are several works published at the expense of the French Government describing the scientific discoveries of David: "The Birds of China with Atlas of 124 plates" (Paris, 1877): "Plantæ Davidianæ ex Sinarum Imperio par Frarichet" (Paris, 1884, 2 vols. 4°), etc. Boccardi, John Baptist, has published astronomical studies of observations made at the Vatican Observatory and at Catania. He is the director of the Royal Observatory of Turin (1910). Many of his studies have appeared in the "Bulletin Astronomique de l'Observatoire de Paris", 1898, 1899. See "Notices Bibliographiques sur les Écrivains de la Congrégation de la Mission" (Angoulême, 1878, 8°). The English edition of the "Annals of the Cong. of the Miss.", Nos. 38 and 39 (1903), contains in thirty closely printed pages a list of books published by the Lazarists in various languages.

V. Present Status.—*The Lazarists in Europe.*—The mother-house, the residence of the superior general of the whole congregation, is at Paris, 95 Rue de Sèvres. This central residence is also a house of formation with its internal seminary, or as it is often less accurately called, its novitiate and scholasticate. A second house of formation is established at Dax, a city a little south of Bordeaux. In 1900 there were about fifty establishments in France, missions, seminaries, and colleges. Since 1902 and 1903 the greater number of these establishments had to be abandoned when a large number of the establishments of communities were closed, and when congregations not authorized by the State were suppressed. France has hitherto supplied almost exclusively subjects for the Lazarists' missions in China, Persia, the Levant, Abyssinia, and the different countries of South America. In Germany, where the Lazarists had been established since 1832, they were expelled by the Kulturkampf (1873), and since then they have establishments on the frontier of their country in Belgium and Holland. There are establishments in Syria, and in Central America at Costa Rica. In Austria there are two centres of activity for the Lazarists, one at Gratz for the houses of Austria and Hungary, the other, Polish in language, at Krakow for the establishments of Galicia and Bukowina, and for the colonies of Polish emigrants to America. In Spain, where the works of the Lazarists are in a flourishing condition, the houses are divided into two provinces, Madrid and Barcelona. The Spanish Lazarists furnish to a great extent labourers for several of the old Spanish colonies, Cuba and Porto Rico, Mexico, and the Philippine Islands. They were twice expelled from their country by the revolutions of 1835 and 1868. They have been recognized by the Governments since the Concordat of 1851. In Portugal where they had six houses before the political and religious revolution of 1835, they have gradually been restored both on the mainland and in the Madeira Islands, where they are engaged in their former works. The Congregation of the Mission in Italy has felt the political vicissitudes of that country in the nineteenth century, the Napoleonic wars with their suppression of religious houses, the confiscation of ecclesiastical property by the Italian princes in 1848, 1860, and 1873. At the present time there are 38 houses divided into three provinces, Turin, Rome, and Naples. As to Belgium and Holland, it is chiefly since the difficulties in France that the Lazarists have secured in these countries houses for the missions and especially for the training of their young men. The congregation has taken up again work in Northern Africa, in Algiers. There is a vicariate Apostolic in southern Madagascar and another in Abyssinia, and there are establishments at Alexandria in Egypt. They have also founded schools in the Levant, Turkey in Europe, and Turkey in Asia. There are prominent colleges in Constantinople, in Smyrna, and in Antoura near Beirut. They have also other establishments for missions and education, near Constantinople, at Bebeck, in the Archipelago at Santorin, in Macedonia, Salonica, at Cavalla and at Monastir near Salonica; at Zeitenlik they maintain a seminary for the Bulgarian Rite, the hope for the religious regeneration of that country. In Syria they are engaged in the same work in various houses. In Persia where the Lazarists have had establishments since 1840, and where, since 1842,

the Holy See selected from their number the prefects Apostolic and the Apostolic delegate for that country, they exercise the apostolate by preaching and by works of charity. One of the Lazarist missionaries in Persia said forty years ago: "No mission is so militant and perhaps also so difficult as this."

In China, which is one of the widest fields for apostolic labour, the Lazarists are in charge of the important missions of Peking and of several vicariates Apostolic. Sent to China towards the close of the eighteenth century, during the early part of the nineteenth century they passed through most trying times. Persecutions burst forth sometimes in certain localities, sometimes everywhere. In 1820 Francis Régis Clet (q. v.), a Lazarist, died a martyr, and in 1840 Jean-Gabriel Perboyre (q. v.) had a like fate and like honour. Both have been beatified. The work of spreading the Gospel was not interrupted, however. Apostolic work has been prosperous. Instead of the old residence of Petang at Peking a new and much more commodious residence has been erected on a large tract of land given by the Chinese Government and a new cathedral was begun in December 1888. This important work was begun and finished by the bishop, Mgr Tagliabue, and Rev. A. Favier who after became Bishop of Peking. Around the cathedral of Peking are grouped the theological and preparatory seminaries, a printing office, schools, and charitable institutions. Apostolic zeal has not grown lax. In 1908 the Lazarists of the Vicariate of Peking had the joy of numbering more than thirty thousand baptisms of adults. The total for the last five years was fully, if not beyond, one hundred thousand conversions. The Lazarists in China have six other vicariates Apostolic with their centres at Young-Ping-Fou and Ching-Ting-Fou in Tche-Ly; Ning-Po in the Province of Tche-Kiang; Kiou-Kiang, Fou-Tcheou-Fou and Ki-Ngan-Fou in the Province of Kiang-Si. In the missions entrusted to the Lazarists in China there are at present one hundred and forty-five European Lazarists and thirty-five Chinese Lazarists, eleven secular priests from Europe and eighty-nine native secular clergy. The Lazarists in China have two internal seminaries or novitiates. The procurator of these missions resides at Shanghai.

Such are the works of the Congregation of the Mission carried on by its 3249 members (1909), priests, students, lay brothers, and novices. It may be added that wherever they are, there is commonly to be found the other congregation founded by St. Vincent, the Daughters or Sisters of Charity (*Cornettes*). Such is the case in Europe, in America, and even on the foreign missions as in Madagascar, Persia, Syria, China. They number (1910) more than 30,000 and labour also in places where the Congregation of the Mission is not established.

The English Speaking Lazarists.—(1) The Irish Province.—During St. Vincent's lifetime his priests were sent to Ireland at the request of Innocent X, to help the persecuted Catholics. Eight priests went to Limerick and Cashel. In Cashel and the surrounding towns they gave missions and heard eighty thousand general confessions. In Limerick too their success was most marked and its memory is not yet dead. But new and terrible persecutions under Cromwell, forced the missionaries to go into hiding and ultimately to fly the country. A lay brother who had accompanied them died a martyr's death. When Maynooth College was founded in 1798, Father Edward Ferris, an assistant of the superior general, was allowed by his superiors to come to the aid of the new college. Archbishop Troy of Dublin had asked for him and made him dean of the new seminary. A few years later he took the chair of moral theology which he held until his death, 26 November, 1809. There is a tradition that his copy of the "Rules" of the congregation, found at Maynooth after his death, gave the first impulse to what resulted in the establishment of the community in Ireland. Early in the last century when the lack of church accommodation had been partially supplied, the desire of establishing Lazarists or some kindred institute for missions in Ireland was expressed by Dr. Doyle who had known them in Coimbra, by Dr. Maher who had been with them at Montecitorio and by Father Fitzgerald, O.P., of Carlow College, but nothing was done. In 1832 four young men at Maynooth approaching ordination, impressed by the dangers surrounding the ministry, and the importance of working for God and the salvation of souls, agreed that a community life was desirable for them. They were James Lynch, Peter Richard Kenrick, Anthony Reynolds, and Michael Burke, all of the Diocese of Dublin. On consulting with the senior dean, they were directed to the Congregation of the Mission. The dean, Father Philip Dowley, soon after became their leader. He had just been made vice-president of the college but resigned. About this time they were joined by Father Thomas McNamara, a valuable recruit, as his powers of organization contributed greatly to the success of the missions and other works of the congregation in Ireland. With the approval of Archbishop Murray a small college was opened in Dublin to serve as a preparatory seminary. Another newly-ordained priest, Rev. John McCann, supplied the funds for the purchase of Castleknock. In 1838 the little church in Phibsborough, a suburb of Dublin, was placed in the hands of Dr. Murray of Dublin, to which he soon added a foundation for two annual missions. It was for missions they had banded together, but though they gave three in their neighbourhood, other works took up all their energies. By this time they had lost Father Anthony Reynolds by death. Father Peter Richard Kendrick joined his brother, then Bishop of Philadelphia, and subsequently became Archbishop of St. Louis. Overtures were made to the congregation in Paris for the aggregation of the Irish community and this was soon accomplished; two of the Fathers beginning their internal seminary course or novitiate in Paris and finishing it in Ireland under Father Girard were delegated by the superior to form these postulants.

Father Hand who had early joined the community left before this time to found All Hallows College at Drumcondra for the foreign missions. The first mission of these Lazarists was given in Athy in Dublin Diocese. It was the introduction of the modern mission into Ireland. At this and the following missions the people attended in thousands and the confessionals were thronged night and day. The church at Phibsborough has given place to a fine Gothic structure. Here the devotion to the Sacred Heart was promoted most vigorously after the consecration of Ireland to the Sacred Heart by the bishops in 1873. Here too the care of the poor led Father John Gowan, C.M., to found a flourishing community of sisters called Sisters of the Holy Faith (q. v.) recently approved by Rome. The beginnings in Cork were similar to those of Dublin. A priest of high standing desired to open a house for missionaries, on the model of the congregation but with some modifications. He began by opening a day college. He was the Rev. Michael O'Sullivan, vicar-general of the diocese. For some years the college succeeded, but afterwards did not get on so well. He then offered the college to the superior at Castleknock and entered as a member of the community. Two who as superiors had a large share in the development of the Cork foundation afterwards became bishops, Dr. Lawrence Gillooly (1819–1895), Bishop of Elphin, and Dr. Neil McCabe, Bishop of Ardagh. In 1853 a church in Sheffield where there was plenty of work among the poor was confided to the congregation.

St. Vincent himself had sent a member of his community to the French consul in London in the hope of

getting some foothold for his community in England where they might aid the persecuted Catholics, but in vain. Sheffield was the first foundation in England and it has become a mission centre partly endowed by the Duke of Norfolk. A house was established in Mill Hill, London, in 1889, and it is now a parish, and has the direction of the provincial house of the Sisters of Charity. A normal college at Hammersmith was entrusted to the Lazarists in 1899. In Scotland, Fathers Duggan and White laboured in St. Vincent's time, sent thither by him. Father Duggan worked zealously in the Hebrides travelling from place to place until his labours were cut short by death. Father White's busy life of missionary travel on the mainland of Scotland was interrupted by his imprisonment in Cromwell's time; on his release with the condition that if he be caught preaching or baptizing he would be hanged without trial, he resumed his work undaunted in the mountain districts. But it was not until 1859 that the first Scotch house was established at Lanark. The magnificent church destroyed by fire in 1907 has been rebuilt and the work of giving missions has gone on uninterruptedly.

In 1840, the houses of Ireland were formed into a Province and Rev. Philip Dowley (1788–1864), was appointed visitor. He was succeeded in 1864 by Father Thomas MacNamara (1809–1892), a man of great zeal and learning, who did much for the spiritual welfare of the deaf-mutes in Ireland and was head of the Irish College from 1868 to 1889. Father Duff (1818–1890) became visitor in 1867. He was followed, in 1888, by Father Morrissey who resigned in 1909, after a most successful career and was succeeded by Rev. Joseph Walsh. The novitiate was started in 1844 at Castleknock. Prior to that, and even to some extent afterwards, the novices were trained at the mother-house in Paris. In 1873, a new site was secured and the novitiate transferred thither. It is known as St. Joseph's Vincentian Novitiate, Blackrock, near Dublin. In 1858 the Irish College in Paris (q. v.), founded in the last years of the sixteenth century, was transferred to the Irish Vincentians. Father Lynch, the leading spirit of the young priests who founded the congregation in Ireland, was consecrated bishop while head of this college; going first to Scotland, and afterwards to the See of Kildare and Leighlin. Armagh seminary was confided to them by Dr. Dixon in 1861. About 1888, the Irish Lazarists were made spiritual fathers at Maynooth, then according to Cardinal Newman the most important ecclesiastical seminary in Catholic Christendom. In 1875, a training school was begun at Drumcondra, Dublin, and in 1883 it was superseded by the newly founded normal college entrusted to the Irish Lazarists by the Government. In the space of twenty-six years it has sent out over 2300 Catholic teachers. All Hallows College (q. v.) was placed under the care of the Lazarists in 1892. The Australian mission of the Irish Province was begun in 1885 with a most successful series of missions from their new mission house in New South Wales. At the urgent request of Bishop Patrick Joseph Byrne they assumed charge of St. Stanislaus College, Bathurst, New South Wales, which had been founded some years previously. A mission centre and parish were established at Malvern near Melbourne in 1892. The Irish Province numbers (1910) 125 priests, 30 lay brothers, and 20 scholastics.

(2) The United States Province.—The Congregation of the Mission was brought to the United States in 1816 by Bishop Dubourg (q. v.) of New Orleans. His diocese comprised both upper and lower Louisiana as it was then called. Upper Louisiana to which he sent the Lazarists included what became afterwards the States of Arkansas, Missouri, and Illinois and all the territory north and west of these states. There were but four priests there at this time and three of them died soon afterwards. He succeeded after some difficulty in getting three Lazarist priests, with a brother, to head a band of twelve apostolic workers for his vast territory. They were Rev. Felix de Andreis (q. v.), Joseph Rosati, John Baptist Acquaroni, and Brother Blanka. Bishop Ryan of Buffalo wrote of them as coming "to do for religion and the Church in the distant and still undeveloped West what a Carroll, a Cheverus, a Flaget, and other great and holy men had done and were doing in other parts of the country" (Early Lazarist Missions and Missionaries, 1887). They embarked 12 June, 1816, on an American brig bound for Baltimore, reaching there 26 July. They were welcomed at St. Mary's Seminary by Father Bruté. On their way to St. Louis, they stopped all winter at Bardstown, where Father de Andreis taught theology in St. Thomas' Seminary. He had already taught it with great success at the College of the Propaganda in Rome. He was, however, eager to go and preach the Gospel to the poor savages and studied the Indian language with this design. On 8 Jan., 1818, Father de Andreis settled down as pastor of St. Louis and vicar-general of the diocese, an appointment he had received on leaving Rome. He writes: "It will not be easy to establish our missionaries on the same footing as in Italy. Here we must be like a regiment of cavalry or flying artillery ready to run wherever the salvation of souls may require our presence." Several of those who came from Europe at Bishop Dubourg's invitation joined the little community. Father Joseph Cosetti died on the eve of his reception into the internal seminary. Father Andrew Ferari, F. X. Dahmen, a subdeacon, and Joseph Tichitoli, a subdeacon, were admitted to the novitiate on 3 Dec., 1818, in St. Louis.

Early in 1818 the beginnings of an establishment were made at the Barrens, Perry Co., Missouri, and thither the novitiate was transferred and placed under Father Rosati. In 1820, a small log house twenty-five by eighteen feet was occupied by priests, seminarians, and brothers. In 1820, shortly after writing to Father Rosati of his joy at the near prospect of going to work among the Indians, Father de Andreis died in the odour of sanctity. The process of his beatification has been begun (1910). In a few years a large brick building arose and gradually the splendid group of buildings, church, mother-house of the Lazarists of the West, and apostolic college were added. The early days were full of missionary activity for the new community. They gave the first real impetus to the progress of the Church in Illinois. Missouri, Arkansas, Indiana, Mississippi, and Texas were the scenes of missionary journeys. Here and there churches were established but these were generally relinquished, as diocesan priests were found to take them. Father Rosati, who had been appointed superior by Father de Andreis, wrote in 1822: "We are, 19 March, ten priests, three clerics, and six brothers." He refused the post of Vicar Apostolic of Florida and only the peremptory command of the pope made him accept the coadjutorship of New Orleans. Though overburdened with work he continued still to hold the office of superior of the Lazarists until 1830 when Father Tornatore arrived from Rome.

In the year 1835 the province of the United States was formed. Rev. John Timon, born at Conewago, Penn., in 1797, was appointed visitor. He became first Bishop of Buffalo, dying in 1867. With Father Odin (q. v.), afterwards Archbishop of New Orleans, he had done great work in Texas where the Lazarists succeeded in having the State restore to the Church the property it had taken when Texas separated from Mexico. The parish of La Salle, Illinois, a centre for the missionary labours of the Lazarists, was established in 1838 and they still minister to the faithful there. The same year, 1838, a school was begun at Cape Girardeau, Missouri, by Father Odin, where

a church had been opened two years before. This was the commencement of St. Vincent's College, Cape Girardeau. In 1893, the theological department of the Cape was transferred to the Kenrick Seminary in St. Louis directed by the Lazarists with Aloysius J. Meyer as superior. In 1900 a preparatory seminary was added to the theological department in St. Louis. The Seminary of the Assumption of Bayou La Fourche was placed in the hands of the Lazarists by Bishop Blanc. It was destroyed by fire. Rebuilt in New Orleans it was not occupied until the Lazarists opened there the seminary of St. Louis, but the fewness of the candidates for the priesthood did not justify a separate institution and it was closed again in 1907. Since 1849 St. Stephen's Church in New Orleans with its schools, hospitals, and orphan asylum has been cared for by the Lazarists. They also have charge of St. Joseph's, established in 1858 and St. Catherine's, for the coloured people of the whole city.

Between the years 1842 and 1847 the Bishops of Cincinnati, Louisville, Philadelphia, and New York urged the visitor to take charge of their respective seminaries, to which by the advice of his council he consented. These seminaries remained in the charge of the Lazarists for a few years, but most of them were given up owing to the withdrawal of European Lazarists to their own land where religious disturbances had ceased, and the promotion of members to the episcopacy. The New York seminary, after its removal from La Fargeville to Fordham was accepted by the Lazarists at the request of Bishop Hughes. Father Anthony Penco, who was made superior, did not approve of the seminarians teaching in the college, so the community retired from the work. For eleven years the Lazarists had charge of the diocesan seminary at Philadelphia. They had been invited there by Bishop Francis Patrick Kenrick. His former professor at the Propaganda, Father Tornatore, presided for a time over the seminary. The community withdrew from the seminary, in 1854, when Father Thaddeus Amat (q. v.) the superior was made Bishop of Monterey, Cal. The College or Seminary of Our Lady of the Angels was founded in 1856 by Rev. John Joseph Lynch, who left it when called to become Bishop and Archbishop of Toronto. It became the Niagara University in 1883. Its deceased presidents have been Rev. John O'Reilly (b. 1802; d. 1862), Rev. Thomas J. Smith, afterwards visitor, Rev. R. E. V. Rice (b. 1837; d. 1878), and Rev. P. V. Kavanaugh (b. 1842; d. 1899). The Immaculate Conception parish in Baltimore was founded by the Rev. Mark Anthony in 1850. He was succeeded by the saintly Father Joseph Giustiniani (b. 1811; d. 1886) who built the present beautiful church and schools. In 1850 the parish at Emmitsburg, Md., was placed in charge of the Lazarists and there resided the Rev. Mariano Maller, first director from St. Vincent's priests of the Sisters of Charity when Mother Seton's Sisters were affiliated to the central house in Paris. Father Maller's successors in the office of director of the Daughters of Charity of the province of the United States were Rev. Francis Burlando (b. 1814; d. 1873), 1853–1873; Rev. Felix Guedry (b. 1833; d. 1893), 1873–1877; Rev. Alexis Mandine (b. 1832; d. 1892), 1877–1892; Rev. Sylvester V. Haire, 1892–1894; Rev. Robert A. Lennon, 1894–1907; Rev. James J. Sullivan, 1907. This province was divided in 1910, Rev. J. J. Sullivan becoming director of the western with headquarters at St. Louis, Mo., and the Rev. John P. Cribbins director of the eastern and residing at Emmitsburg, Md. St. Vincent's Church, Germantown, was established in 1851 by Father Domenec, who was consecrated Bishop of Pittsburg in 1860. The mother-house for the United States was transferred from St. Louis to Germantown in 1868. There magnificent buildings in Chelten Avenue have been erected, including a house of studies, an internal seminary, and an apostolic school, as well as a beautiful church.

Father Philip Borgna laboured in Brooklyn at St. Mary's Church, Williamsburg, during the year 1843–44. A later date, 1868, saw the beginnings of St. John the Baptist's Church and College, the growth of which has been constant. The first president was Father John Theophilus Landry (b. 1839; d. 1899). The diocesan seminary of Brooklyn (1891) has been under the care of the Lazarists since its establishment. In 1865 Los Angeles college was opened. From 1875 in Chicago dates St. Vincent's Church and College, now De Paul University. In 1888 the province of the United States was divided; the western, with the mother-house at the old St. Mary's Seminary, Perryville, Missouri; the eastern retaining as the newer mother-house, St. Vincent's Seminary, Germantown. In 1905 Holy Trinity College, with an especially fine equipment for engineering, was built at Dallas, Texas, and St. Thomas' Seminary at Denver, Col., in 1907. A mission house was opened at Springfield, Mass., in 1903 and another at Opelika, Alabama, 1910. Mission bands are also stationed at Germantown, Pa., and at Niagara, N. Y., in the East, and at St. Louis and Perryville, Mo., in the West.

Since Father Timon the visitors have been: Rev. Mariano Maller (b. 1817; d. 1892), 1847–1850; Rev. Anthony Penco (b. 1813; d. 1875), 1850–1855; Rev. John Masnou [pro-visitor] (b. 1813; d. 1893), 1855–1856, recalled to Spain and made visitor there; Rev. Stephen V. Ryan (b. 1825, d. 1896), 1857–1867, when he was made Bishop of Buffalo; Rev. John Hayden (b. 1831; d. 1872), 1867–1872; Rev. James Rolando (b. 1816; d. 1883), 1872–1879; Rev. Thomas J. Smith (b. 1832; d. 1905), 1879–1905. In 1888 the Rev. James McGill became head of the eastern province; at his resignation (1909), the Rev. P. McHale became visitor. In the West Father Smith's successors have been Rev. William Barnwell (b. 1862; d. 1906, a few months after his appointment) and the present visitor the Rev. Thomas Finney. The two provinces number over two hundred priests who have charge of six colleges, one preparatory seminary, two apostolic schools for students aspiring to become Lazarists, four theological seminaries, about fifteen churches, and about eighty lay brothers and scholastics. Lazarists from the Polish province have churches for their fellow countrymen, at Conshohocken and Philadelphia, Penn., at Derby and New Haven, Conn., whence also they go to preach Polish missions. The Polish Lazarists are also preparing to build a college at Erie, Penn., 1910. Two Lazarists from Barcelona province in 1908 began work for the Spanish in Philadelphia, where they have a church and conduct night classes, and an employment agency. The establishments of the Lazarists at Ponce and San Juan, Porto Rico, as well as those at Manila, Calbayog, Cebu, Jaro, and Nueva Caceres in the Philippine Islands may also be mentioned in connexion with the Lazarists of the United States.

ABELLY, *Vie du Vénérable Serviteur de Dieu, Vincent de Paul* (Paris, 1664); BOUGAUD, *L'Histoire de Saint Vincent de Paul*, tr. BRADY (New York, 1899); MAYNARD, *Saint Vincent de Paul*, new edition, 4 vols.; HÉLYOT, *Histoire des Ordres Religieux et Militaires* (8 vols., Paris, 1792); *Dictionnaire des Ordres Religieux* (3 vols., Paris, 1848); HENRION, *Tableau des Congrégations Religieuses* (Paris, 1831); PIOLET, *Les Missions Catholiques Françaises* (Paris, 1874); *Annales de la Congrégation de la Mission 1834–1910:* there are Italian, German, Spanish, and Polish editions, and an English edition, 1894–1910; *Mémoires de la Congrégation de la Mission; Pologne, Madagascar, Algérie* (4 vols., Paris, 1866); FAVIER, *Pekin* (Peking, 1897); POSSET, *Vie de M. Etienne* (Paris, 1881); BOYLE, *St. Vincent de Paul and the Vincentians in Ireland, Scotland, and England, 1638–1909* (London, 1909); [BURLANDO], *Sketches of the Life of Very Reverend Felix de Andreis* (Baltimore, 1861: enlarged edition, St. Louis, 1900); RYAN, *Early Lazarist Missions and Missionaries* (in U. S.), (1887).

A complete bibliography is to be found in the *Annals of the Congregation of the Mission*, No. 40 (Emmitsburg, Md., 1903). See also bibliography under VINCENT DE PAUL, ST.

B. RANDOLPH.

Missionaries of St. Charles Borromeo, CONGREGATION OF, founded by John Baptist Scalabrini, Bishop of Piacenza, Italy (d. 1 June, 1905); approved in principle by Leo XIII in a Brief dated 25 November, 1887; constitution definitively approved by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, 3 October, 1908. The expediency of providing for the spiritual—and also, in some degree, for the temporal—needs of Italian emigrants to America was forcibly brought home to Bishop Scalabrini by the pathetic spectacle of a number of such emigrants waiting in the great railway station of Milan. Acting upon this inspiration, and encouraged by Cardinal Simeoni, then Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda, the bishop acquired at Piacenza a residence which he converted into "The Christopher Columbus Apostolic Institution", forming there a community of priests which was to be the nucleus of a new congregation.

This congregation, which was henceforth to be known as the "Missionaries of St. Charles Borromeo", was to be governed by a superior-general, dependent upon the Congregation of Propaganda; its aim was to maintain Catholic faith and practice among Italian emigrants in the New World, and "to ensure as far as possible their moral, civil, and economical welfare"; it was to provide priests for the emigrants, as well as committees of persons who should give the good advice and practical direction needed by poor Italians newly arrived in foreign ports; to establish churches, schools, and missionary homes in the various Italian colonies in North and South America, and to train youths for the priesthood. The members of the congregation promise obedience to their superiors in the congregation and the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

Seven priests and three lay brothers of Bishop Scalabrini's institute left Italy, on 12 July, 1888, of whom two priests and one lay brother were bound for New York, five priests and two lay brothers for various parts of Brazil. On this occasion, Cesare Cantú, the famous Italian historian, addressed to the Bishop of Piacenza some memorable words of congratulation, asking leave to add to the bishop's blessing on the departing missionaries, "the prayers of an old man who admires a courage and an abnegation so full of humility". A welcome had already been assured these first missionaries of the congregation by a commendatory letter (1 June, 1888) of Leo XIII addressed to the American bishops.

Immediately after their arrival in New York the new missionaries were enabled to secure a favourable site in Centre Street, where there was a colony of Italians, and in a short time a chapel was opened; soon after this the church of the Resurrection was opened in Mulberry Street; lastly, a building in Roosevelt Street, which had been a Protestant place of worship, became the property of the mission fathers who transformed it into the church of St. Joachim, the first specially Italian church in the Diocese of New York. The Society of St. Raphael (see EMIGRANT AID SOCIETIES) was organized at Ellis Island. The good work thereafter spread rapidly through the continent. The United States and Canada now (1910) contain 21 parish churches, besides several chapels, served by the congregation; in Brazil the fathers have charge of 13 parish churches, mostly with schools attached, and 2 important orphanages. The two provinces (Eastern and Western) of the congregation in the United States number 45 priests and 3 lay brothers, while the single province of Brazil numbers 35 priests and 5 lay brothers.

VICTOR CANGIANO.

Missionaries of St. Francis de Sales of Annecy. —Amid the many activities to which St. Francis devoted himself, he long had the desire to found a society of missionary priests. This wish, however, was not to find its realization until nearly two centuries after his death. At that time Monseigneur Riley, a successor of the Saint in the See of Annecy, broached the subject of such a society to Father Mermier, who had been considering the same idea. Accordingly, Father Mermier put the design into execution. In 1830 the institute was formed with La Feuillette as the site for the mother-house. This was solemnly blessed by the bishop on 8 August, 1837, and the congregation canonically instituted by him on 8 October, 1838. The society was not to be a mere association of priests, but a new religious congregation, bound by simple vows. Hence Father Mermier, the first superior-general, offered himself and his companions to the pope for foreign missions. In 1845 his offer was accepted by the Propaganda, and the first missionaries of St. Francis de Sales set out for India. The work has prospered and since that time more than 100 priests and seminarians have been sent out by the congregation, besides many lay brothers. More than 200 nuns of different orders have gone out at the call of the missionaries to help them. The dioceses of Nagpur and Vizagapatam have always been governed by prelates belonging to this institute. At Vizagapatam the first vicar Apostolic was Mgr Neyret (1850); he was succeeded by Mgr Tissot, first bishop of the diocese. The present occupant of the see is Mgr Clerc. The first Bishop of Nagpur was Mgr Riccaz; after him came Mgrs Pelvat, Crochet, Bonaventure, and Coppel. In England the fathers have three missions in the Diocese of Clifton. Since the persecution of 1903, the congregation has been obliged to leave Savoy for England, where the juvenate, the novitiate, and the house of studies are successfully carried on. The superiors-general since the foundation are: the Very Rev. Fathers Mermier, Gaiddon, Clavel, Tissot, Gojon, and Bouvard.

Echos Salésiens. Revue mensuelle (Fribourg, 1908–10); *Almanach de St. François de Sales* (Lyons, 1900).

LOUIS VALLUET.

Missionary Rector. See RECTOR.

Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle, otherwise known as the PAULIST FATHERS, a community of priests for giving missions and doing other Apostolic works, especially for making converts to the Catholic Faith. It was founded, in Rome and in New York, in 1858, by Father Isaac Thomas Hecker, with whom were associated Augustine F. Hewit, George Deshon, Francis A. Baker, and Clarence A. Walworth. All of these had been members of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer, and owing to certain misunderstandings had been suspected of disloyalty to their order and accused of disobedience.

In order to set matters right and to explain their case to the superior general, Father Hecker went to Rome, and on 29 August, 1857, three days after his arrival, was expelled from the Redemptorists. This action was appealed to the Holy See and was not approved. Father Hecker and the above named priests were then at their own request dispensed from their vows, and proceeded to form the new community. Hecker received letters from Propaganda, strongly recommending him and his associates to the bishops of the United States. This is the official origin of the Paulists.

But long before this, however, the Holy Spirit gave Father Hecker distinct and unmistakable intimations —to use his own words—that he was "set apart to undertake in some leading and conspicuous way the conversion of this country". He adds that he "made an explicit statement of these supernatural visitations to various persons, singly and in common, always under compulsion of obedience or necessity". These advisers included Cardinal Barnabo, the Prefect of Propaganda at this time, and several of the most approved directors of souls in Rome. They unanimously decided that he acted wisely in following this interior supernatural guidance.

During the summer of 1858 a practical beginning of their apostolate was made by the Paulists in New York, to which diocese they were made heartily welcome by Archbishop John Hughes. He gave them a parish in what was then a suburb and is now the heart of the city. As they had given missions as Redemptorists in all parts of the country, they were well and favourably known to the bishops and clergy and were very popular with the people. They were all men of ability, quite above the ordinary intellectual standard, powerful preachers, and of mature spirituality. Father Hecker especially was known as a remarkable man, a leader in Catholic thought, of profoundly interior spirit of prayer, joined to such a zeal for souls as characterizes only the saints. They were all Americans and all converts, and under their founder's inspiration, they soon developed their high gifts of preaching, of writing, and of the guidance of souls. To provide a house and church the new community, having but a handful of parishioners, appealed to their friends everywhere for financial help. The response was generous, and they built in West 59th Street, a convent and church combined, which in later years, when the present church was erected, was used wholly for their dwelling. This is the mother-house. In course of time foundations were made in San Francisco and Berkeley, California; Chicago, Illinois; Winchester, Tennessee; and Austin, Texas. The novitiate and house of studies is in Washington, D. C., the scholastic training being affiliated to the courses of the Catholic University.

A programme of rule was drawn up at the time of the founding of the community, in 1858, and approved by Archbishop Hughes. This served all needful purposes for twenty years, when it was much enlarged. It is still in process of experiment before being presented to the Holy See for canonical approbation. Its spiritual features are substantially the same routine of devout exercises, in private and in common, observed by the original fathers while Redemptorists. Although the Paulists do not make vows of religion, they undertake to observe the evangelical counsels as fervently as if canonically bound to do so. This is expressed in the formula of profession as a "wholehearted determination to obey the rules, to aspire after Christian and religious perfection, to devote oneself energetically to the labours of the Apostolic ministry, and to persevere in the same vocation to the end of life". The training of the members is provided for in the exercises of the novitiate and house of studies. Permanency in the community is secured by this original training, and the act of profession witnesses to a well matured purpose of striving after perfection and to a sincere love of community life. To this bond of union is joined that of zeal for souls actuating the members of the institute individually and in common. Father Hecker's estimate of the fundamental principle of the Paulist life is as follows: "The desire for personal perfection is the foundation stone of a religious community; when this fails, it crumbles to pieces." And again: "The main purpose of each Paulist must be the attainment of personal perfection by the practice of those virtues without which it cannot be secured—interior fidelity to grace, prayer, detachment and the like."

In the external order, the Paulist vocation is primarily, as was the original vocation of Father Hecker, the conversion of non-Catholics. It embraces all branches of the Catholic apostolate, lecturing and preaching, printing and distribution of missionary literature, and private conference with earnest inquirers. The spread of Catholicism holds the first place both in their prayers and in their active life; it outranks in importance all other external labours. It is on this account that Paulists are most commonly known both in and out of the Church as convert makers. Missions for non-Catholics are systematically given, being very often joined to Catholic missions, though not seldom given separately. The effects of this apostolate have justified Father Hecker's lifelong contention that America is a ripe field for the zeal of Catholic missionaries. Many thousands of converts have been made, some immediately, more after prolonged examination of the claims of the Church, and multitudes of half-hearted and indifferent Catholics have been restored to the practice of their religion, a result which so invariably follows these lectures as to give them a very high place in the work of "stopping the leaks".

In the year 1894, the Paulists introduced missions to non-Catholics among the diocesan clergy, beginning with the Diocese of Cleveland. This work has now been extended into over twenty-five American dioceses, and also into England and Australia. The number of secular priests actively engaged in these diocesan apostolates is very considerable. For the training, and in many cases for the support, of these bands of convert-makers, members of the Paulist community brought about the establishment of the Catholic Missionary Union, a corporation whose board of directors is controlled by members of the hierarchy. Under its direction, but administered wholly by Paulists, the Apostolic Mission House was opened on the Catholic University grounds, Washington, D. C., in 1903, and from its classes most of the diocesan missionaries have been recruited. The present sovereign pontiff wrote to Cardinal Gibbons a letter of approval of this institution in September, 1908.

With the same end in view the Paulists have vigorously engaged in the apostolate of the press. The first fathers printed and circulated their sermons in the earliest years of the community, and in 1865 Father Hecker started the "Catholic World Magazine", then the only Catholic monthly in the country; and this was immediately followed by an organized propaganda of missionary books, pamphlets, and tracts, most of which were either distributed to Protestants gratis or disposed of at nominal prices—a work highly praised by the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, and still energetically carried on. The Paulist Fathers also consider it part of their vocation to influence the secular press in the interests of Catholic truth. The preaching of missions to Catholics also has engaged much of the zeal of the Paulists.

No innovation on traditional Catholic methods, least of all on the Catholic spirit, has ever been observed in their public utterances or ministrations, though the personal tone and character of the Paulists has imparted to their discourses and writings a peculiar zest. Parish work has occupied many members of the institute, characterized by special care in preparing and preaching sermons, the training of children, the relief of the poor, the beauty and dignity of ceremonial, and the proper rendering of the official music of the Church. The making of converts is a prominent feature of their parish activities. Constant endeavours are made to attract non-Catholics to the sermons and the public services of the Church, as well as to private conference, and converts are always under instruction.

The number of Paulists is now 67, of those not yet ordained, 23. The increase, though not numerically great, has been continuous, the larger number of the novices being attracted by the non-Catholic missions.

HEWIT, *Memoir of Reverend Francis A. Baker* (New York, 1866); ELLIOTT, *The Life of Father Hecker* (New York, 1898).

WALTER ELLIOTT.

Mission Helpers of the Sacred Heart. See INSTITUTE OF THE MISSION HELPERS OF THE SACRED HEART.

Mission Indians (OF CALIFORNIA).—A name of no real ethnic significance, but used as a convenient popular and official term to designate the modern descendants of those tribes of California, of various stocks and languages, evangelized by the Franciscans

in the latter part of the eighteenth and early part of the nineteenth centuries, beginning in 1769. The historic California missions were twenty-one in number, excluding branch foundations, extending along the coast or at a short distance inland from San Diego in the south, to Sonoma, beyond San Francisco Bay, in the north. Besides these, two others, established in 1780 in the extreme south-eastern corner of the present state, had a brief existence of less than a year when they were destroyed by the Indians. As their period was so short, and as they had no connexion with the coast missions, they will be treated in another place (see YUMA INDIANS).

I. MISSION SITES.—The following are the twenty-one missions in order from south to north, with name of founder, location, and date of founding. In several cases the mission was removed from the original site to another more suitable at no great distance. It will be noticed that the northward advance does not entirely accord with the chronological succession:

1. San Diego (de Alcalá): founder, Fr. Junípero Serra, 1769. Indian name of site, Cosoy. At Old Town, suburb of present San Diego, in county of same name. Removed 1774 to Nipaguay (Indian name), north bank of San Diego, six miles above present city. 2. San Luis Rey (de Francia): Fr. Fermín Francisco Lasuen, 1798. Indian name, Tacayme. Four miles up San Luis Rey River, south side, San Diego Co. (a) San Antonio de Pala, branch mission: Fr. Antonio Peyrá, 1816. At Pala, about 20 miles above, north side of same river, in same county. 3. San Juan Capistrano: Serra, Nov., 1776. Indian name, Sajirit or Quanis-savit. At present San Juan, Orange Co. 4. San Gabriel (Arcangel): Serra, Sept., 1771. Indian name, Sibagna, or Tobiscagna. San Gabriel River, about ten miles east of Los Angeles, Los Angeles Co. 5. San Fernando (Rey de España): Lasuen, Sept., 1797. Indian name, Pashecgna. At present Fernando, Los Angeles Co. 6. San Buenaventura: Serra, 1782. Indian name, Miscanaga. Ventura, Ventura Co. 7. Santa Barbara: Palou, 1786. Indian name, Taynayan. Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara Co. 8. Santa Inés: Tapis, 1804. Indian name, Alajulapu. North side Santa Inez River, about present Santa Inez, Santa Barbara Co. 9. Purísima Concepción: Palou, 1787. Indian name, Algsacupí. Near present Lompoc, Santa Barbara Co. 10. San Luis Obispo (de Tolosa): Serra, 1892. Indian name, Tishlini. In present San Luis Obispo town and county. 11. San Miguel: Lasuen, July, 1797. Indian name Vahiá (Vatica), or Chulam (Cholame). West bank Salinas River, at present San Miguel, San Luis Obispo Co. 12. San Antonio (de Padua): Serra, July, 1771. Indian name, Teshhaya, or Sextapay. East side San Antonio River, about six miles from present Jolon, Monterey Co. 13. (Nuestra Señora de la) Soledad: Palou, Oct., 1791. Indian name, Chuttusgelis. East side Salinas River, about four miles from present Soledad, Monterey Co. 14. San Carlos (Borromeo, de Monterey), *alias* Carmelo: Serra, 1770. Indian name (second site), Eslenes (Esselen?). First at present Monterey, but removed in same year to Carmelo River, a few miles distant, Monterey Co. 15. San Juan Bautista: Lasuen, 24 June, 1797. Indian name, Popelout, or Popeloutchom. West side San Benito River, about present San Juan and six miles from Sargent, in San Benito Co. 16. Santa Cruz: Palou, Sept., 1791. Indian name, Aulintac. Present Santa Cruz, Santa Clara Co. 17. Santa Clara (de Asís): Serra, 1777. Indian name, Thamien. First established near Guadalupe River, about head of San Francisco Bay. Removed in 1781 three miles to present site of Santa Clara, Santa Clara Co. 18. San José: Lasuen, 11 June, 1797. Indian name, Oroysom. East of San Francisco Bay, about fifteen miles north of San José City near present Irvington, in Alameda Co. 19. San Francisco (de Asís), *alias* Dolores: Serra, Oct., 1776. Within present limits of San Francisco City. 20. San Rafael (Arcangel): Payeras, 1817. Indian name Awániwi (Nanaguami). North of San Francisco Bay, at present San Rafael, Marin Co. 21. San Francisco Solano, *alias* Sonoma: Altimira, 1823. Indian name, Sonoma (?). North of San Francisco Bay, at present Sonoma, Sonoma Co.

II. TRIBES AND LANGUAGES.—Nowhere in North or South America was there a greater diversity of languages and dialects than in California. Of forty-six native linguistic stocks recognized within the limits of the United States by philologists, twenty-two, or practically one-half, were represented in California, of which only six extended beyond its borders. Seven distinct linguistic stocks were found within the territory of actual mission colonization, from San Diego to Sonoma, while in the border territory north and east, from which recruits were later drawn, at least four more were represented. As most of the dialects have perished without record, it is impossible to say how many there may have been originally, or to differentiate or locate them closely. As tribal organization such as existed among the Eastern Indians was almost unknown in California, where the *ranchería*, or village hamlet, was usually the largest political unit, the names commonly used to designate dialectic or local groups are generally merely arbitrary terms of convenience. For the linguistic classification the principal authorities are Kroeber, Barrett, and other experts of the University of California.

1. *Pomo, or Kulanapan, Stock.*—The Indians of this stock bordered on the northern frontier of the mission area, and although no mission was actually established in their territory in the earlier period, numbers of them were brought into the missions of San Rafael and San Francisco Solano. Broadly speaking, the Pomo territory included the Russian River and adjacent coast region with all but a small portion of the Clear Lake basin. Barrett has classified their numerous local bands and *rancherías* into seven dialectic divisions, but all probably mutually intelligible. Of their southern bands, some of the Gallinomero (or Kainomero), of lower Russian River, were brought into San Rafael mission and the Gualala also were represented either there or at Sonoma. The so-called "Diggers" of the present mission schools at Ukiah and Kelseyville are chiefly Pomo.

2. *Yukian Stock.*—The Yuki tribes were in four divisions, two of which were north of the Pomo territory and therefore beyond the sphere of mission influence. The two southern bodies, originally one, speaking one language with slight dialectic variations, and commonly known as Wappo (from Spanish *guapo*), occupied (a) a small territory south of Clear Lake and east from the present Kelseyville; (b) a larger territory including upper Napa River and a portion of Russian River, and extending approximately from Geyserville to Napa. They were probably represented at Sonoma mission, as they probably are also under the name of "Diggers" in the present mission school at Kelseyville.

3. *Wintun, or Copehan, Stock.*—This stock held all (excepting the Wappo projection) between the Sacramento River and the main Coast Range from San Pablo (San Francisco) and Suisun Bays northwards to Mount Shasta, including both banks of the river in its upper course. The various dialects are grouped by Kroeber into three main divisions or languages, of which the southern, or Patwin, includes all south from about Stony Creek, and possibly also those of Sonoma Creek on the bay. Indians of these southern bands were brought into the missions of Sonoma, San Rafael, and even San Francisco (Dolores) across the bay. At Sonoma mission, among others, we find recorded the Napa and Suisun bands. According to Kroeber the whole region of Putah Creek was thus left vacant until repopulated after 1843 by Indians who had originally been taken thence to Sonoma mission.

4. *Moquelumnan, or Miwok, Stock.*—The numerous bands of this stock occupied three distinct areas, viz., (a) Northern: A very small territory south-east of Clear Lake and about the heads of Putah Creek, in Lake Co., occupied by a band known as Oleomi, or Guenock (?), speaking a language apparently distinct from the others of the stock. They seem mostly to have been gathered into Sonoma mission. (b) Western: A larger territory lying north of San Francisco Bay to beyond Bodega Bay, and extending from the coast eastwards to beyond Sonoma, included within the present Marin and lower Sonoma Counties. The various bands of this area spoke the same language in two slightly different dialects (three, according to Merriam) and were gathered into the two missions of San Rafael and Sonoma, both of which were established within their territory. In 1824 nearly 500 Indians of this group were brought back from San Francisco and San José to reside in the new mission of Sonoma. The whole group was known as Olamentke by the Russians. Among the principal bands or villages were Bolina, Tamal, Chokuyem, Licatuit, Petaluma, Sonoma, Soclan, Olompali, Cotati, Guymen, with others of less note. The celebrated fighting chief, Marin, was of the Licatuit band. (c) Eastern: The main area, occupying nearly the whole region east of San Joaquin River to the heads of the tributary streams, from Cosumnes River on the north to Fresno River on the south. Their numerous bands, collectively known usually as Miwok, spoke four different

dialects, of which that of the north-western plains section may be considered a distinct language. Although no missions were established in the territory of the Miwok, large numbers of them were brought into San Juan Bautista, Santa Clara, and San José.

5. *Costanoan Stock.*—The territory of this linguistic group extended from the coast inland to the San Joaquin River, and from San Francisco and Suisun Bays on the north southwards to about the line of Point Sur, including the seven missions of San Francisco (Dolores), San José, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, San Juan Bautista, San Carlos, and Soledad. Although there was no true tribal organization, a number of divisional names are recognized, probably corresponding approximately to dialectic distinctions. On the peninsula, and later gathered into San Francisco mission were the Romonan (at present San Francisco), Ahwaste, Altahmo, Tulomo, and Olhone, or Costano proper, all apparently of one language in different dialects. The Saclan, about Oakland, were in the same mission. The Karkin along Carquinez straits and the Polye further south were gathered into San José. Santa Clara had two native dialects, while Santa Cruz apparently had another. About San Juan Bautista was spoken the Mutsun dialect, known through a grammar and phrase book written by the resident missionary, Father Arroyo de la Cuesta, in 1815, and published in Shea's "American Linguistics" in 1861. Eastward were the Ansaima and about the mouth of the Salinas were the Kalindaruk. At San Carlos the principal band was the Runsen, of which a remnant still exists, and at Soledad were Chalone, besides others of Esselen, Salinan, and Yokuts lineage.

6. *Esselen Stock.*—The Esselen, or Ecclemach, constituting a distinct stock in themselves, occupied a small territory on Carmel and Sur rivers, south of Monterey Bay, until gathered into San Carlos, and perhaps into Soledad mission.

7. *Salinan Stock.*—This stock centred upon the waters of the Salinas, chiefly in Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties, from the seacoast to the Coast Range divide, and from the head streams of the Salinas down (north) nearly to Soledad. San Antonio and San Miguel missions were within their territory. Nothing definite is known of their divisions, excepting that there seem to have been at least three principal dialects or languages, viz., of San Miguel, of San Antonio, and of the Playanos, or coast people. Besides those native to the region, there were also Yokuts from the east and Chumash from the south in the same missions.

8. *Yokuts, or Mariposan, Stock.*—The Indians of this stock had true tribal divisions, numbering about forty tribes, and holding a compact territory from the Coast Range divide to the foothills of the Sierras, including the upper San Joaquin, Kings River, Tulare Lake, and most of Kern River, besides a detached tribe, the Cholovone, about the present Stockton. Together with the Miwok and eastern Costanoan tribes, they were known to the Spaniards under the collective name of Tulareños, from their habitat about Tulare lake and along San Joaquin River, formerly Rio de los Tulares. Their numerous dialects varied but slightly, and may have been all mutually intelligible, the principal difference being between those of the river plains and of the Sierra foothills. Although outside of the mission territory proper, the Yokuts area was a principal recruiting ground for the missions in the later period, hundreds of Indians, and even whole tribes, being carried off, either as neophyte subjects or as military prisoners of war, to San José, San Juan Bautista, Soledad, San Antonio, San Miguel, San Luis Obispo (?), and probably other neighbouring missions. One Spanish expedition, about 1820, carried off three hundred men, women, and children from a single *rancheria* to San Juan Bautista, where their language was afterwards recorded by Father La Cuesta. The Tachi and Telamni from Tulare lake and eastward were brought into San Antonio. A few are now gathered upon Tule River reservation, while a few others still remain in their old homes.

9. *Chumashan Stock.*—The Indians of this stock held approximately the territory from San Luis Obispo Bay south to Point Mugu, including the Santa María, Santa Inés, and Santa Clara Rivers, the adjacent eastern slope of the Coast Range divide and the islands of Santa Cruz, Santa Rosa, and San Miguel. The missions San Luis Obispo, Purísima, Santa Inés, Santa Barbara, and San Buenaventura were all within this area. They seem to have been represented also at San Miguel. There were at least seven dialects, viz., at each mission, on Santa Cruz, and on Santa Rosa. That of San Luis Obispo was sufficiently distinct to be considered a language by itself.

10. *Shoshonean Stock.*—This is the first stock within the mission area which extended beyond the limits of California, the cognate tribes within the state being an outpost of the same great linguistic group which includes the Piute, Ute, Comanche, and Pima of the United States, the Yaqui, Tarumari, and famous Aztec of Mexico. The five missions of San Fernando, San Gabriel, San Juan Capistrano, San Luis Rey, and its branch mission of San Antonio de Pala, were all in Shoshonean territory, and the great majority of the Mission Indians of to-day are of this stock. Those within the mission sphere were of five languages, each with minor dialectic differences, nearly equivalent to as many tribes, as follows:—(a) Gabrielino: from about Santa Monica southward nearly to San Juan Capistrano, and from the coast back to the foothills of the San Bernardino range, together with Santa Catalina island. It was spoken in slightly different dialects at San Fernando (Fernandeño) and San Gabriel. The names Kij, Kizh, and Tobikhar have been used to designate the same group. (b) Luiseño: from the Gabrielino border about Alisos creek southwards along the coast to the Yuman frontier beyond Escondido, including lower San Luis Rey River, Temecula, Santa Rosa, San Jacinto, and probably the islands of San Nicolas and San Clemente. Spoken in slightly different dialects at missions of San Luis Rey (Luiseño, Kechi) and San Juan Capistrano (Juaneño, Gaitchim, Netela, Acagchemem). (c) Panakhil, or Agua Caliente, occupied a limited territory on the heads of San Luis Rey River, and now at Pala and Los Coyotes reserves. (d) Cahuilla, or Kawia: the eastern slopes of the San Jacinto Range from about Salton northwards to Banning, together with the head waters of Santa Margarita River. First visited by Father Francisco Garcés in 1776. (e) Serrano: in San Bernardino mountains and valley on Mohave River and northwards to Tejon and Paso Creeks of San Joaquin Valley; the Beñeme of Father Garcés in 1776 and the Takhtam of Gatschet. Some of them were gathered into San Gabriel. Three dialects.

11. *Yuman Stock.*—This stock also has its main home beyond the eastern boundaries of the state, and includes the Mohave, Walapai, and others. San Diego mission was within its territory, as also the two short-lived missions on the Colorado. Nearly all the present Mission Indians not of Shoshonean stock are Yuman. Those within the mission sphere were of two languages, viz., Yuma in the east, about the junction of the Gila and Colorado rivers; and Diegueño in the west, in two main dialect groups: (a) Diegueño proper, along the coast, including San Diego, and (b) Comeya, farther inland.

Very little is in print concerning the languages of the mission territory. For vocabularies and grammatic analysis the reader may consult Bancroft's volume on "Myths and Languages", Power's "Tribes of California", Gatschet in "Wheeler's Rept.", and above all, Barrett and Kroeber in the University of California publications (see bibliography), with other works

and collections therein noted. Among the important single studies are a "Grammar of the Mutsun Language" by Fr. Arroyo de la Cuesta, published in Shea's "American Linguistics", IV (1861); a Chumashan (?) catechism and prayer manual by Fr. Mariano Payeras of Purísima, about 1810, noted by Bancroft; and a MS. grammar and dictionary of the Luiseño language, by Sparkman, now awaiting publication by the University of California. The missionaries were more than once urged in prefectual letters to acquire the native languages in order better to reach the Indians, and in 1815 the official report states that religious instruction was given both in Indian and Spanish.

III. Arts, Custom, and Ritual.—The Indians of California constituted a culture body essentially distinct from all the tribes east of the Sierras. The most obvious characteristic of this culture was its negative quality, the absence of those features which dominated tribal life elsewhere. There was practically no tribal organization and in most cases not even a tribal name, the *rancheria*, or village settlement, usually merely a larger family group, being the ordinary social and governmental unit, whose people had no common designation for themselves, and none for their neighbours excepting directional names having no reference to linguistic or other affiliation. Chiefs were almost without authority, except as messengers of the will of the priests or secret society leaders. The clan system is held by most investigators to have been entirely wanting, although Merriam claims to have found evidence of it among the Miwok and Yokuts. Excepting basketry, all their arts were of the crudest development, pottery being found only in the extreme south, while agriculture was entirely unknown. Both mentally and physically they represented one of the lowest types on the continent. The ordinary house structure throughout the mission area was a conical framework of poles thatched with rushes and covered with earth, built over a circular excavation of about two feet deep. The fire was built in the centre, and the occupants sat or lay about it, upon skins or sage bushes, without beds or other furniture. The Gallinomero, north of San Francisco Bay, built a communal house of L shape, with a row of fires down the centre, one for each family. The "sweat-house", for hot baths and winter ceremonies, was like the circular lodge, but much larger. The dance place or medicine lodge was a simple circular inclosure of brushwood open to the sky, with the sacrifice poles and other ceremonial objects.

Agriculture being unknown, the food supply was obtained in part by hunting and fishing, but mostly by the gathering of wild seeds, nuts, and berries. The islanders lived almost entirely by sea-fishing, while about San Francisco they depended mainly on the salmon. The Chumashan coast tribes fished from large dugout canoes. Hunting was usually confined to small game, particularly rabbits and jackrabbits, the larger animals being generally protected by some religious taboo. On account of a prevalent ritual idea which forbade the hunter to eat game of his own killing, men generally hunted in pairs and exchanged the result. Grasshoppers were driven into pits and roasted as a dainty. Among vegetable foods the acorn was first in importance, being gathered and stored in large quantities, pounded into meal in stone mortars or ground on metates, leached with water to remove the bitterness, and cooked as mush (porridge) or bread. Wild rice was also a staple in places, while in the blossom season whole communities lived for weeks upon raw clover tops. The men went nearly or entirely naked, excepting for a skin robe over the shoulders in cold weather. Women usually wore a short skirt with fringes of woven or twisted bark fibre. Both sexes commonly kept their hair at full length, but bunched up behind. Some bands shaved one side of the head. Tattooing was practised by both sexes to some extent. Shell beads were used for necklace purposes, and eagle and other feathers for head adornments. Dance-leaders and priests at ceremonial functions wore feather crowns and short skirts trimmed with feathers. Light sandals were sometimes worn. Musical instruments were the rattle, flute, and bone whistle. The drum was unknown. Weapons were the bow and arrow, wooden club, stone knife, and a curved throwing stick for hunting rabbits. Cremation was universal, excepting in the Chumashan. Marriage and divorce were simple, and polygamy was frequent.

Of the mythology and ceremonial of the coast tribes of the mission area northwards from Los Angeles we know almost nothing, as the Indians have perished without investigation, but the indications are that they resembled those of the known interior and southern tribes. For these our best authorities are the missionary Boscana, Powers, Merriam, and especially the ethnologists of the University of California. The southern tribes—Juaneño, Luiseño, Diegueño, etc.—base their ritual and ceremonial upon a creation myth in which Ouiot, or Wiyot, figures as the culture hero of an earlier creation in which mankind is not yet entirely differentiated from the animals, while Chungichnish (Chinigchinich of Boscana) appears as the lord and ruler of the second and perfected creation, which, however, is a direct evolution from the first. The original creators are Heaven and Earth, personified as brother and sister. The rattlesnake, the tarantula, and more particularly the lightning and the eagle, are the messengers and avengers of Chungichnish. In the Diegueño myth the whole living creation issues from the body of a great serpent.

The principal ceremonies, still enacted within recent memory, were the girls' puberty ceremony, the boys' initiation, and the annual mourning rite. In the puberty ceremony the several girls of the village who had attained the menstrual age at about the same time were stretched upon a bed of fresh and fragrant herbs in a pit previously heated by means of a large fire, and, after being covered with blankets and other herbs, were subjected to a sweating and starving process for several days and nights while the elders of the band danced around the pit singing the songs for the occasion. The ordeal ended with a procession, or a race, to a prominent cliff, where each girl inscribed symbolic painted designs upon the rock. The boys' initiation ceremony was a preliminary to admission to a privileged secret society, the officers of which constituted the priesthood. A principal feature was the drinking of a decoction of the root of the poisonous *toloache*, or jimson-weed (*datura meteloides*), to produce unconsciousness, in which the initiate was supposed to have communication with his future protecting spirit. Rigid food taboos were prescribed for a long period, and a common ordeal test was the lowering of the naked initiate into a pit of vicious stinging ants. A symbolic "sand painting", with figures in vari-coloured sand, was a part of the ritual.

The corpse was burned upon a funeral pile immediately after death, together with the personal property, by a man specially appointed to that duty, the bones being afterwards gathered up and buried or otherwise preserved. Once a year a great tribal mourning ceremony was held, to which the people of all the neighbouring *rancherías* were invited. On this occasion large quantities of property were burned as sacrifice to the spirits of the dead, or given away to the visitors, an effigy of the deceased was burned upon the pyre, and the performance, which lasted through several days and nights, concluded with a weird night dance around the blazing pile, during which an eagle or other great bird, passed from one to another of the circling dance priests, was slowly pressed to death in their arms, while in songs they implored its spirit to carry their messages to their friends in the other world. The souls of priests and chiefs were supposed to ascend

to the sky as stars, while those of the common people went to an underworld, where there was continual feasting and dancing, the idea of future punishment or reward being foreign to the Indian mind. The dead were never named, and the sum of insult to another was to say "Your father is dead."

In connexion with childbirth most of the tribes practised the *couvade*, the father keeping his bed for some days, subjected to rigid diet and other taboos, until released by a ceremonial exorcism. Besides the great ceremonies already noted, they had numerous other dances, including some of dramatic or sleight-of-hand character, and, among the southern tribes, a grossly obscene dance which gave the missionaries much trouble to suppress. Among the Gallinomero, and perhaps others, aged parents were sometimes choked to death by their own children by crushing the neck with a stick. Ordinary morality could hardly be said to exist even in theory. Infanticide and abortion were so prevalent that even the most strenuous efforts of the missionaries hardly succeeded in checking the evil. In this and certain other detestable customs the coast tribes were like the California Indians generally, whom Powers characterizes, in their heathen condition, as perhaps the most licentious race existent. Even before the arrival of the missionaries, their blood, like that of all the coast tribes as far north as Alaska, had been so poisoned by direct or transmitted contact with dissolute sealing and trading crews, that the race was already in swift decline. The confiscation of the missions and the subsequent influx of the gold-hunters doomed the race to extinction.

Gerónimo Boscana

IV. Vital Statistics.—By the confiscation of the missions (1834-38) the Indians lost their protectors together with their stock and other movable property, and by the transfer of California to the United States in 1848 they were left without legal title to their lands, and sank into a condition of homeless misery under which they died by thousands and were fast approaching extinction. With the exception of occasional ministrations by secular priests or some of the few remaining missionaries, they were also left entirely without spiritual or educational attention, notwithstanding which the Christian Indians continued to keep the Faith and transmitted the tradition to their children. At last, as the result of a governmental investigation in 1873, a number of village reservations were assigned by executive proclamation in 1875 to the southern remnant, the northern bands being already extinct. By subsequent legislation there are now established some thirty small "Mission Indian" reservations, all in western and central San Diego and Riverside Counties, California, with a total population, in 1909, of 2775 souls, representing five tribes and languages, viz., Luiseño, Serrano, Cahuilla, Agua Caliente, and Diegueño. The largest groupings are at Morongo adjoining Banning (chiefly Cahuilla) 238; Pala (Luiseño and Agua Caliente) 226; Pechanga (Luiseño) 170; and Santa Ysabel No. 3 (Diegueño) 165 They are practically all Catholics and besides twelve government day-schools with a total enrolment of 286 there are 17 Catholic schools served by secular priests under the diocese of Los Angeles, with a total enrolment in 1909 of 1894 pupils. Of these the largest are at Pala (260), La Jolla (195), Pauma (180), Soboba, or San Jacinto (163), Campo (125), and Martínez (125). All are day-schools, excepting St. Boniface boarding-school at Banning with 100 pupils. About the same time Catholic mission work was begun among the remnant tribes on the northern border of the original mission territory. In 1870 the mission of St. Turibius was founded by Father Luciano Osuna, north of Kelseyville in Lake County. In 1889 Saint Mary's mission was established near Ukiah in Mendocino County. The Indians of both stations are locally called "Diggers", but are properly Pomo and Yukai and some of the older ones still have recollection of the early mission fathers. They are in charge of the Friars Minor and Capuchins. All these northern missions are in the Archdiocese of San Francisco.

According to a careful estimate made by Merriam, the original Indian population of the mission territory, eastwards to the San Joaquin and lower Sacramento rivers, was approximately 50,000 souls. About 30,000 were domiciled in the missions at the time of confiscation. Following the ruin of the missions and the invasion of the Americans, they died in such thousands that of all those north of the present Los Angeles, comprising perhaps four-fifths of the whole, not 300 are believed to survive to-day. The southern tribes, being of manlier stock and in some degree protected by their desert environment, have held themselves better, and number to-day on the "Mission Indian" reservations, as already stated, 2,775 souls, a decrease, however, of 152 in nine years. The Mission Indians of California have dwindled to fewer than one-sixteenth of their original number, and indications point to their extinction. (See California.)

Ames, *Report in regard to condition of Mission Inds.* in *Rept. Comsner. Ind. Aff. for 1873* (Washington, 1874); H. H. Bancroft, *Hist. California*, I and II (San Francisco, 1886); Idem, *Native Races*, I: *Wild Tribes* (San Francisco, 1886); Idem, *Native Races*, III: *Myths and Languages* (San Francisco, 1886); Barrett, *Ethno-Geography of the Pomo and Neighboring Indians* in *Univ. of California Pubs.* in *Am. Arch. and Ethnology*, VI, no. 1 (Berkeley, 1908); Idem, *Geography and Dialects of the Miwok Indians, ibid.*, no. 2 (Berkeley, 1908); Barrows, *Ethno-Botany of the Coahuilla Inds.* (Chicago, 1900); Bartlett, *Personal Narrative of Explorations* (New York, 1854); Boscana, *Chinigchinich (San Juan Capistrano Inds.)*, translation published in Robinson, *Life in California* (New York, 1846); *Bureau of Am. Ethnology Seventh ann. rept. (Indian linguistic families)* (Washington, 1891); *Bur. Cath. Ind. Miss., ann. repts. of Director* (Washington); Coues (ed.), *On the Trail of a Spanish Pioneer (Fr. Garcés)* (New York, 1900); *Comsnr. of Ind. Affairs, ann. repts. of* (Washington); Dubois, *Religion of the Luiseño Inds.* in *Univ. of Cal. Ethn. pubs.*, VIII, no. 3 (Berkeley, 1908); Duflot de Mofras, *Exploration du territoire de l'Orégon, des Californies, etc.* (Paris, 1844); Engelhardt, *Franciscans in California* (Harbor Springs, 1897); Forbes, *California* (London, 1839); Hodge (ed.), *Handbook of Am. Inds. (Bull. 30, Bur. Am. Ethn.)* (Washington, 1907–11); Hrdlicka, *Physical Anthropology of California* in *Univ. of Cal. Hrdlicka pubs.* in *Am. Arch. and Ethn.*, IV (Berkeley, 1906); Jackson, *Ramona* (Boston, 1885); Kappler, *Ind. Affairs; Laws and treaties.* (Washington, 1903); Kroeber, papers in *Univ. of Cal. pubs.* in *Am. Arch. and Ethn.* (Berkeley), viz., *Languages of the (South) Coast of California;—Types of Ind. Culture in California* (II, 1904); *Yokuts Language—Shoshonean Dialects of California;—Ind. Myths of South Central Cal.—Religion of the Ind. of California* (IV, 1907); *Ethnography of the Cahuilla Inds.;—A Mission Record of the Cal. Inds.—Evidences of . . . Miwok Ind.* (VI, 1908); *Shoshonean Dialects of Southern California* (VIII, 1909); Merriam, papers in *Am. Anthropologist*, new series (Lancaster), viz., *Indian Population of California* (VII, 1905); *Mewan Stock of California* (IX, 1907); *Totemism in California* (X, 1908); E. B. Powers, *Missions of California* (San Francisco, 1897); S. Powers, *Tribes of California* in *Cont. to N. Am. Ethn.*, III (Washington, 1877); Robinson (anon.), *Life in California* (contains also Boscana's account) (New York, 1846); Rust, *Puberty Ceremony of the Mission Inds.* in *Am. Anthropologist*, new series, VIII (Lancaster, 1906); Shea, *Catholic (Indian) Missions* (New York, 1854); Smith, *In re Cal. Missions Inds. to date* (Sequoya League Bull. 5 in *Out West*, separate), (Los Angeles, 1909); Sparkman, *Culture of the Luiseño Inds.* in *Univ. of Cal. Pubs., Am. Arch. and Ethn.*, VII (Berkeley, 1910); Taylor, *Indians of California;* articles in *Cal. Farmer* (San Francisco, 1860–1); Waterman, *Mission Indian Creation Story* in *Am. Anthropologist*, new series, XI (Lancaster, 1909); Idem, *Religious Practices of the Diegueño Inds., Univ. of Cal. pubs.* in *Am. and Ethn.*, VIII (Berkeley, 1910);

WHEELER (in charge), *Rept. upon U. S. Geographical Surveys etc.*, VII, *Archæology* [California Indian papers by GATSCHET (languages), HENSHAW (*Voyage of Cabrillo*) and YARROW], (Washington, 1879); ROYCE AND THOMAS, *Indian Land Cessions* in *Eighteenth Rept. (part 2) Bur. Am. Ethnology* (Washington, 1899).

JAMES MOONEY.

Missions, CATHOLIC.—The history of Catholic missions would necessarily begin with the missionary labours of Christ, and would cover a very considerable portion of the history of the Catholic Church. The principal chapters of this history will be found elsewhere in THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA, in the articles devoted to the various countries, provinces, dioceses, vicariates, religious orders, and congregations, notable missionaries, etc. The present article will be confined to a short general survey of the missionary activity of the Catholic Church at the present day. The subject, as thus limited, may conveniently be considered under the following heads: I. Organization of Catholic Missions; II. Receipts and Expenditure; III. Utility and Object of Mission Statistics; IV. Statistics.

I. ORGANIZATION.—The main direction of the Catholic missions is vested in the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda under the supreme jurisdiction of which stand most of the missions of the Catholic world (see PROPAGANDA, CONGREGATION OF). This congregation determines the ecclesiastical rank of each mission (prefecture, vicariate, diocese), assigning to it a superior according to this rank, and undertakes the duty of supplying missionaries wherever their services are necessary. For the training of Catholic missionaries numerous secular seminaries have been instituted; the most important are: the Urban (so called after its founder, Urban VIII), English, Irish, Scotch, American, and Canadian Colleges at Rome; Pontifical Seminary of Kandy; Leonine Seminary of Athens; the seminaries at Milan, Lyons, and Paris (this last is the headquarters of the famous Society of Foreign Missions); Josephinum College, Columbus, Ohio, U. S. A.; American College, Louvain; English Colleges at Valladolid and Lisbon; Scotch College at Valladolid; Irish College, Paris; All Hallows, Dublin; St. Joseph's Seminary, Mill Hill, London; St. Joseph's, Rozendaal, Holland; St. Joseph's, Brixin, Tyrol; General College of Pulo Pinang. The religious orders —Benedictines, Dominicans, Franciscans, Jesuits, Augustinians, etc.—which continue with unabated zeal to labour for the propagation of the Gospel, are assisted by a series of new orders and congregations. It will be sufficient to cite here the names of the societies most widely engaged in foreign missions, and to refer the reader to the special articles for particulars: Congregation of the Holy Ghost and the Immaculate Heart of Mary; Congregation of the Mission (Lazarists); Oblates of Mary Immaculate; Society of Mary; Oratorians and Oblates of St. Francis de Sales; Redemptorists; Paulists; Congregation of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary; Priests of the Foreign Missions (Missions Etrangères). For a fuller list see "Missiones Catholicæ", 853–8. Among the colleges of the regular orders specially devoted to the training of missionaries may be mentioned: the College of St. Fidelis (Capuchin), College of St. Anthony (Franciscan), College of St. Isidore (Irish Franciscan), and the College of the Irish Augustinians, at Rome; Seminary of Scheut, near Brussels (Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary); the colleges of the Society of African Missionaries (White Fathers); the Veronese Institute and the colleges of the Society of the Divine Word.

II. RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE.—Of late years the support formerly lent by various European states to missionary enterprises has been considerably diminished, and the missions are to-day largely dependent for their support on the voluntary contributions of the faithful. For the collection of these offerings missionary societies have been founded in the different Catholic countries. The most important of these societies are: the Society of Foreign Missions (Missions Etrangères), founded at Paris, 1820; Society for the Propagation of the Faith, founded at Lyons, 1822; Leopoldinische Stiftung, founded at Vienna, 1829; Bavarian Ludwig-Missionsverein (1839); Society of the Holy Childhood (Paris, 1843); Society of the Holy Land (1895). To arrive at even an approximate estimate of the total sum contributed by Catholics towards their foreign missions is impossible. To regard the sums collected by a few of the leading missionary societies as the total Catholic contribution towards the missions, and to take such total as indicative of Catholic interest in the propagation of the Gospel (as is too commonly done to-day by some controversialists), is manifestly indefensible. Not only are no statistics of receipts available for many of the missionary societies, but no estimate can be made of the great sums expended by all the religious orders and congregations (which are in turn practically dependent on voluntary contributions) on the preparation of their members for missionary labours and on the missions themselves.

Again, the numberless contributions made directly to the missions, offerings given to non-missionary orders or secular priests to be forwarded to the heads of certain missions, legacies and similar gifts, never appear in the statistics of receipts furnished by the collecting societies. So important a portion of the total amount do these contributions form that Baumgarten ("Die kathol. Kirche u. ihre Diener in Wort u. Bild", III, Munich, 1903, p. 399) declares that we must multiply the sum collected by the missionary societies by four or five to arrive approximately at the sum contributed towards Catholic missions. Those who contrast the apparent totals of the sums contributed by Catholics and Protestants towards their respective missions thus fail to take into account all the data for the comparison. Krose (op. cit. in bibliography, p. 38) quotes the case of two similarly situated states of about the same size, Catholic Belgium and Protestant Holland, whose respective contributions towards foreign missions were 1,019,474 (only the sum collected by a few of the leading missionary societies) and 701,000 francs. The same writer points out (loc. cit.) that, even accepting the known Catholic contributions as the total, and accepting the Protestant total at the figure given by their own statisticians, the German Catholics contributed 15 pfennig *per capita* towards their missions, and the German Protestants 12 pfennig, although the latter are, as a class, the wealthier. This last circumstance, indeed, merits special attention, if we would not accept a single large donation of a millionaire as indicative of more widespread missionary zeal than a thousand humble subscriptions of the poor. The astonishing success of the Catholic missions during the nineteenth century, although most of the property of the missionary orders was confiscated or secularized, was entirely due to the extraordinary zeal and self-sacrifice of the Catholic missionaries in the face of innumerable difficulties. Regular contributions to the missionary societies and the centralization of the missions fund are highly desirable: men are, as a rule, ready to subscribe freely to conspicuously successful missions, while the less prosperous, in which the missionaries have to face perhaps greater obstacles and disappointments, receive but faint support.

III. UTILITY AND OBJECT OF MISSION STATISTICS.—Scientifically compiled statistics render self-deception impossible, preventing us from being unduly elated or disheartened by isolated successes or reverses. They tend, also, to lessen the heated controversies which, unfortunately, too frequently centre around the Christian missions. The duty of supplying the public with accurate and complete statistics rests with the mission-

aries themselves. A report of comparative failure does not prejudice their cause: the more numerous the difficulties with which they have to contend, the more conspicuous is their self-sacrifice. As, however, statistics now receive the attention of all denominations, words of explanation should be added concerning local difficulties, and in cases where a non-Catholic might be misled. Thus, e.g., a non-Catholic might not know that a Catholic priest may not, in general, baptize a pagan child without its parents' consent, nor an adult without proper instruction.

The object of mission statistics is to supply the reader with such information as will enable him to judge how far the work of the mission has been successful. The special points on which exact information is most desirable may be grouped under four heads: (1) Number of Christians; (2) Personnel of the Mission; (3) Mission Establishments; (4) Administrative Statistics.

(1) *Number of Christians.*—In recording the number of Christians, a distinction should always be drawn between converted heathens and Christian settlers. While, in most missionary countries, the latter class may constitute so small a proportion of the totals as to be negligible, there are many countries in which the number is sufficiently large to create a false idea of the progress of the mission, if this distinction be not observed in the statistics. A distinction between Christians and catechumens is equally necessary, and under the former head none but the baptized should ever be included. By catechumens are to be understood only such heathens as are actually being instructed for baptism: as they constitute the harvest of the mission, they should never be excluded (as is now too often the case) from the statistics.

(2) *Personnel of the Mission.*—The statistics concerning the personnel of the mission should state how many are priests, the term *missionary* being used exclusively of such. How many of the missionaries are natives should also be indicated, since this information reveals the progress made towards the ideal of all missionary work, the establishment of a native priesthood. Besides the number of missionaries, exact information should be given concerning the male and female auxiliaries, who are engaged as catechists, as teachers, or to care for the sick; likewise concerning all the lay brothers and sisters (not, however, mere servants) who are employed directly or indirectly in the work of evangelization.

(3) *Mission Establishments.*—In this category may be classed the mission-stations, churches, chapels, schools of every kind, hospitals, and charitable establishments. Chief stations are most simply distinguished from sub-stations by confining the former term to stations which have at least one resident missionary, and the latter to stations where Divine service is periodically or constantly held by a non-resident missionary. To attempt to restrict the term *chief station* to centres of unusual missionary activity must lead to great uncertainty, as it would be hopeless to expect that any uniform dividing-line could be universally observed. Again, the name *sub-station* should never be applied to places where instruction alone is given: the number of such might easily assume proportions which would almost necessarily lead to misapprehension of the exact position of Christianity in the country. Outposts, such as those here indicated, should (if given) be kept separate from the stations. The schools and educational establishments possess a peculiar interest, since in many lands the task of reclaiming adults of a low cultural level, whose minds are obsessed with superstitions and brutalized by crime, is a well-nigh impossible one. The statistics should always distinguish between male and female, elementary and secondary, Catholic and non-Catholic pupils, and also between ordinary pupils

STATISTICAL TABLE OF

Geographical Divisions	Catholics		Catechumens	Missionaries		
	Total	Of European Race		Total	Native	Lay Brothers
Japan and Dependencies	126,773	About 1,000	24,672*	233	43	99
China ,, ,, (including Macao)	1,026,168	,, 14,000	426,480	1,811	550	291*
Further India	1,060,369	,, 12,000	22,576*	1,253	652	164*
East Indies	56,217	,, 25,911	1,133	78	1	32
India and Ceylon	2,242,922	,, 80,000	55,443	2,804	1,755	517
Anterior Asia	629,797	,, 5,000	..	2,937	2,256	1,811
Mindanao	157,640	..	..	33	..	16
Total for Asia	5,299,886	137,911	530,304*	9,149	5,257	2,930*
Australia and Oceania	170,054	..	..	392	9	291*
South Africa	92,840	45,000	3,930	313	1	445
Central ,,	231,358	..	272,929	587	2	309
N. W. ,,	74,032	15,000	17,480	378	7	88
N. E. ,,	145,359	50,000	..	347	111	403
African Islands	310,342	20,000	259,870*	217	2*	112*
Total for Africa	853,931	130,000	554,209*	1,842	123*	1,357*
South America	401,796*	150,000	..	476*	..	239*
Central ,, West Indies	350,953	20,000	..	186	..	46*
N. America Negroes	112,700	..	..	59	..	..
,, ,, Indians	110,711	..	..	138*	..	..
Total for America	976,160*	170,000	..	859*	..	285*
Total of Missions (1)	7,300,031*	437,911	..	12,242*	5,389*	4,863*
Philippines	6,702,402	About 10,000	..	1,100	..	..
Africa (Seychelles, Cape Verde Isles, Angola)	1,038,132	,, 15,000	..	..	..	..
South and Central America Negroes	3,500,000	..	..	..	..	..
South America Indians	3,200,000	..	..	..	..	..
Central ,, ,,	1,300,000	..	..	..	..	..
Mexico Indians	4,500,000	..	..	..	..	..
West Indies Negroes	1,750,000	..	..	..	..	..
Total of Missions (2)	21,990,534	25,000*	..	..	..	..
Total (1) *and* (2)	29,290,565*	462,911*	..	..	..	..

and orphans. It is also advisable to specify the teaching staff (European and native) and the number of pupils receiving instruction in handicrafts and agriculture. A seminary, if such exists, should receive special mention, since it has an important bearing on the formation of a native priesthood. Other institutions may be given under one head, as in many cases one building serves for various purposes.

(4) *Administrative Statistics.*—The figures dealing with the actual ministry of the missionaries are of course the surest indication of the progress of Christianity. In giving the number of baptisms, adults should always be distinguished from children, the number baptized *in articulo mortis* being given in both cases. The number of Easter and of devotional communions (given separately) are of special importance as indicating approximately the number of Christians who have reached the use of reason and the fervour of religious life. Such concrete figures give a better idea of the spirituality of the newly-converted than long dissertations on their zeal. Naturally, explanations of local conditions must accompany the figures, which might otherwise lead to misconception.

IV. Statistics of the Catholic Missions.—In dealing with mission statistics, it is a matter of the utmost importance to make clear from the first in what precise sense the word *mission* is to be understood. In canon law the term signifies all districts which are subject to the Congregation of Propaganda, and it might thus include territories (e. g., until November, 1908, England and the United States) with which the idea of mission is never associated in ordinary speech. We also find two clearly defined meanings commonly assigned to the word by popular usage. By missionary activity is often understood all efforts directed towards the propagation of the Faith, whether among heathens or among non-Catholics; more usually, however, the word *mission* is confined to the work of bringing pagans into the Church. In view of this difference in the use of the term *mission*, our statistics will contain a statement of the present condition of (1) the Catholic missions in lands prevailingly or exclusively pagan, and (2) the Catholic missions in lands which have been won to Christianity since the Reformation. As the negroes of the United States are admitted into the statistics of Protestant missions, the inclusion of this second class is necessary to supply a uniform basis of comparison between Catholic and non-Catholic missionary activity.

With reference to the accompanying table it may be stated that the imperfect state of the figures available and considerations of space render it impossible to include all the particulars above advocated. An asterisk denotes that the returns are incomplete. No figures have been given where returns for a very small percentage of the missions are available. For fuller information the reader is referred to the works cited in the bibliography and to the articles on the various countries in The Catholic Encyclopedia.

CATHOLIC MISSIONS

Auxiliaries		Chief and Sub-stations	Churches and Chapels	Schools	Pupils		Charitable Institutions	Baptisms		
Religious Women	Catechists				Ordinary	Orphans		Adult Heathens	Children in Extremis	Catholic Children
416	314*	287	291	113*	6,389*	2,097	22	5,757	4,194	4,230
3,846*	6,992*	13,046	6,025	4,821	118,013	23,380	..	71,963	..	..
3,169*	1,914	5,081	4,475	3,138	90,325	14,038	234	13,680*	76,808*	34,568*
408	75	156	76	96	9,285	588	..	..	..	..
2,933	..	4,677	4,980	3,636	212,944	11,586	..	16,127	28,120	..
1,224*	..	1,713	1,769	1,090	67,118*	1,962	..	..	..	..
..	..	176	176	153	..	..	..	..	..	..
11,996*	..	25,136	17,792	13,047*	504,074*	53,651*	..	..	..	..
531*	592*	547*	553*	497*	20,634*	959*	..	..	..	..
1,667	..	258	269	299	17,021	952*	11*			
323	2,565	1,569(?)	1,384(?)	1,210*	66,872	6,996*	211*	..	..	..
304	338	334	228	337	19,071*	1,673*	96*	..	..	..
969	..	200	230	191	17,717*	482*	33*	..	..	..
405*	1,329*	1,341*	1,307*	1,355*	73,132*	173(?)	23(?)	..	..	..
3,668*	4,232*	3,702*	3,418*	3,392*	193,813*	10,276*	374*	..	..	..
435*	..	418*	340*	299*	18,898*	..	..	..	..	..
263*	..	284	282	265	35,071*	..	12*	..	..	..
..	..	..	75	134	9,050*	..	24	1,081*	..	4,735*
391	..	306	197	72	6,240*	..	..	468*	..	1,395*
1,089*	..	1,008*	894*	770	69,259*	..	..	..	..	..
17,284*	..	30,393*	22,657*	17,706*	787,780*	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..

Huonder, *Der einheimische Klerus in den Heidenländern* (Freiburg, 1909); Idem, *Deutsche Jesuitenmissionäre des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts* (Freiburg, 1899); Idem, *Kathol. u. protestantische Missionsalmosen* (Freiburg, 1910); Krose, *Katholische Missionsstatistik* (Freiburg, 1908); Stocklein, *Der neue Welt-Bott mit allerhand Nachrichten deren Missionären S. J.* (Augsburg, 1726); Kalkar, *Den kathol. Missions-Historie* (Copenhagen, 1826); Hazart, *Kerkelijke Historie van de geheele wereldt* (4 vols., Antwerp, 1667–71); Hahn, *Geschichte der kathol. Missionen* (5 vols., Cologne, 1857–65); Mullbauer, *Geschichte der kathol. Missionem in Ostindien* (Freiburg, 1852); Louvet, *Les Missions Catholiques au XIX^e Siècle* (Lyons, 1894); Delplace, *Le Christianisme au Japon* (2 vols., Brussels, 1909–10); Suau, *La France à Madagascar* (Paris, 1910); Piolet, *Les Missions Catholiques Françaises au XIX^e Siècle* (6 vols., Paris, s. d.); Le Blant, *Les martyrs de l'Extrême-Orient et les persécutions antiques* (Arras, 1877); Launay, *Histoire générale de la Société des Missions Etrangères* (3 vols., Paris, 1894); Henrion, *Histoire des Missions Catholiques* (Paris, 1847); Louvet, *La Cochinchine religieuse* (2 vols., Paris, 1885); Depierre, *Situation du Catholicisme en Cochinchine à la fin du XIX^e Siècle* (Saigon, 1900); *Missions Dominicaines dans l'extrême Orient* (2 vols.,

Paris, 1865); DJUNKOVSKY, *Dictionn. des Missions Catholiques* (2 vols., Paris, 1864); HUC, *Le Christianisme en Chine, en Tartarie et au Tibet* (Paris, 1857–58), tr. HAZLITT (London, 1857; New York, 1887); CORDIER, *Relations de la Chine avec les puissances étrangères* (Paris, 1901); VICTOR BERNARDIN DE ROUEN, *Hist. univ. des missions franciscaines* (Paris, 1898); WOLFERSTAN, *The Catholic Church in China from 1860–1907* (St. Louis, 1910); ENGELHARDT, *Missions and Missionaries of California* (San Francisco, 1908); CAMPBELL, *Pioneer Priests of North America* (2 vols., New York, 1908–10); MORICE, *History of the Catholic Church in Western Canada* (2 vols., Toronto, 1910); CASARTELLI, *Catholic Missions* (London, 1891); MARSHALL, *Christian Missions* (London, 1862); SATOW, *The Jesuit Mission Press in Japan: 1591–1610* (London, 1888); DE SMET, *Western Missions and Missionaries* (New York, 1859); IDEM, *Oregon Missions* (New York, 1847); *Jesuit Relations* (Cleveland, 1896–1901). See also in VACANT, *Dict. de théol. cath.* (Paris, 1903—), LE ROY, s. v. *Afrique*, I, 528–50; ANDRÉ, s. v. *Amérique*, I, 1051–74; PISANI, s. v. *Asie*, I, 2079–2119; FOURNET, s. v. *Canada*, II, 1453–92.

Mission Statistics: KROSE, *Katholische Missionsstatistik* (Freiburg, 1908); *Atlas des Missions de la Société des Missions Etrangères* (Paris, 1894); *Katholischen Missionen* (Freiburg, 1873); *Notizia statistica delle missioni Cattoliche in tutto il mondo* (Rome, 1843); GRUNDEMANN, *Kleine Missions-Geographie und -Statistik* (Stuttgart, 1901); WERNER, *Orbis terrarum catholicus* (Freiburg, 1890) and the Catholic directories for the various countries.

Publications by Religious Orders: *Conspectus omnium missionum Ordinis Fratrum Minorum an. 1904–05* (Quaracchi, 1905); *Annales de la Congrégation de la Mission* (Paris, annually); *Missions Belges des Pères de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Brussels) (continuation of the *Précis historiques*); *Annales Apostoliques de la Congrégation du S. Esprit et du S. Cœur de Marie* (Paris, 1886—); *St. Joseph's Foreign Missionary Advocate* (London, quarterly); *Société des Missions Etrangères* (Paris, 1876—); *Analecta Ordinis Minorum Cappucinorum* (Rome, annual); *Monatshefte U. L. Frau vom heiligsten Herzen Jesu* (Hitrup, 1884—); *Missions en Chine et au Congo* (Bruxelles, 1889—); *El Correo Sino-Annamita. Correspondencia del Sagrado Orden de Predicadores en Formosa, China y Tung-King* (Manila, annual).

THOMAS KENNEDY.

Missions, CATHOLIC INDIAN, OF CANADA.—The French discoverers of Canada did not fail to impress the aborigines they met with a vague idea of the religion they professed. Thus, on 3 July, 1534, when Jacques Cartier reached Baie des Chaleurs, he presented the Indians with prayer beads, and shortly afterwards erected a large cross with the inscription "Vive le Roi de France", thereby combining patriotism with religion. In his second expedition (1535) he was accompanied by two chaplains, who, of course, could not impart much instruction to the Eskimos, Micmacs, Algonquins, and Hurons with whom they came into contact, yet must have indicated in some way the interest the newcomers took in their spiritual welfare. Moreover this important voyage ultimately resulted in the conversion and baptism of Donnacona, the Quebec chief kidnapped to France by the discoverer. Likewise, when the Sieur de Monts established his colony (1604) in what was to become known as Acadia, he had with him priests who soon turned their attention to the surrounding tribes. In the course of time a few Micmacs received baptism (1610), and their companions ever manifested the greatest attachment for the compatriots of their missionaries. Two priests, Father Pierre Biard and Edmond Massé, left Dieppe for Port Royal (26 January, 1611), and started their ministrations among the natives by a wise show of prudence, which some were tempted to regard as an excessive dilatoriness in admitting into the Church. Four years later more important missions were commenced on the arrival at Quebec, then founded seven years, of Fathers Denis Jamay, Jean Dolbeau, and Joseph Le Caron, Recollects, accompanied by a lay brother. While the first-named remained at the French fort, Father Dolbeau went to instruct the Montagnais who repaired to Tadoussac at the mouth of the Saguenay, and Father Le Caron went to the Hurons in the West. Champlain, in order to secure the friendship of the latter, the most numerous of the Indian bands in his vicinity, deemed it good policy to espouse their cause against their inveterate enemies, the powerful Iroquois of the South. This step eventually embroiled the French colony in incessant hostilities. Well meant though it undoubtedly was, and perhaps necessary under the circumstances, the French leader's intervention in the inter-tribal politics of the natives likewise resulted in their paying more heed to the war songs and the satisfaction of their passions than to the question of their spiritual advancement. Le Caron worked faithfully, evangelizing the savages and paving the way for other priests by the preparation of a dictionary of the Huron language. Having made a trip to France, he returned (1623) with Father Nicholas Viel and Brother Gabriel Sagard, the future historian of the early Catholic missions in Canada.

Yet the results of the Recollects' labours were but indifferent. So these religious generously yielded their places to the Jesuits, who reached Quebec on 19 June, 1625, the first to arrive being Fathers Jérôme Lalemant, E. Massé, and Jean de Brébeuf. Father Massé had already laboured among the Micmacs of what is now Nova Scotia. He renewed his exertions in their midst, while Brébeuf succeeded Le Caron at the head of the Huron mission, whither he was accompanied by three other priests from France (1626). One of these, a zealous Franciscan, Father de la Roche Dallion, directed his steps towards the Neutral nation, on which he could make no impression. He finally left (1627), while Brébeuf's Jesuit companion had also to return East in the course of the same year. Brébeuf laboured heroically amidst the most discouraging apathy, if not hostility, of the Hurons. In 1633, after a temporary absence from his post, he returned West with Fathers Antoine Daniel and Ambroise Devost. Incredible hardships led them to the village of Ihonatiria, where they met a pleasant reception. Thence they visited hamlet after hamlet, teaching and exhorting the Indians, at first with no very great success. In the East Fathers Dolbeau and Jamay, with Brother Duplessis, were displaying their zeal on behalf of the roving Montagnais and Algonquins of the Saguenay, Ottawa, and Lower St. Lawrence. In 1636 Father Dolbeau had even extended his activities to the outlying bands of the Labrador Eskimos. Thus were missions established at Tadoussac for the Montagnais; at Gaspé for that tribe and the Micmacs; for the latter alone at Miscou, New Brunswick, and at Three Rivers for the Montagnais and the Algonquins. As a rule, those Indians, though lower than the Hurons in the social scale, showed themselves more amenable to Christian ideals.

To the west of these, missionary operations were thenceforth to be concentrated chiefly with a view towards the conversion of tribes of the Huron confederacy. By the end of 1635 Fathers Daniel and Devost, going to Quebec, met two priests proceeding to the north, and at Three Rivers Father Isaac Jogues, newly arrived from France. This missionary soon after left with a party of Hurons with whom he was to make his apprenticeship of the hardships in store for him. From the central mission of St. Joseph, or Ihonatiria, some twenty-eight towns were visited, the inhabitants of which proved as fickle as they were superstitious. Hence continual dangers for the missionaries nearly culminated in their death at the hands of those for whose salvation they were devoting themselves. In 1638 there were nine priests working zealously in thirty-two villages of some twelve thousand souls. Gradually they established the residences of the Conception, St. Mary's, and St. Joseph's, named after the one at Ihonatiria. Thence they visited the Petuns (1639), and in 1641 Fathers Charles Raymbault and Isaac Jogues went among the Ottawas. Then, smallpox having made its appearance among the Hurons, fresh dangers ensued for the missionaries, ever considered the cause of such visitations. They now turned their attention to the Neutrals, a powerful nation settled on the peninsula between Lakes Erie and Ontario, where they experienced new insults, and met with very few consolations (1640–41). Though they thus visited eighteen villages, trying to win over the people by

their gentleness and their devotion to their interests, they were everywhere greeted with maledictions and raillery. Nevertheless it would seem as if their patience and fortitude must have at length struck those uncouth savages, for in 1645 they invited them to their country, promising a better reception for the tireless apostles. The days of the Neutrals, however, were numbered; the Iroquois were to be the unconscious executors of the justice of God upon them.

To the north of Huronia lay the territory of the Algonquins who counted at that time no less than one hundred and four distinct groups. One of these, the Nipissings, was visited by Fathers Claude Pijart and Raymbault (1640), who were cordially received. Though they soon made a number of baptisms, their success was scarcely commensurate with their exertions. Little by little, however, the Nipissings tired of the missionaries, and, as if by way of punishment, they were in 1650 exterminated by the Iroquois. Unfortunately good and bad alike had too often to suffer by the invasions of those warlike aborigines. In the summer of 1652 Father Jogues and Brother René Goupil were surprised by a party of that nation, who shockingly mutilated and shamefully tortured the former, and put the latter to death (see Goupil and Jogues). In common with practically all the missionaries of the time, Father Jogues was a native of France; an Italian, Father Francis Joseph Bressani, was soon to walk in his footsteps (see Bressani). Nothing daunted by torments which, humanly speaking, should have proved fatal, Bressani, after his experience with the Mohawks, returned to Canada (1645) and consecrated his unfailing energies to the welfare of the Hurons, who could not help regarding him as a hero. Meantime, constantly harassed by the Iroquois, who had burnt several of their villages, the Hurons were rapidly marching to their doom. Yet, thanks to the fearlessness of their spiritual guides, mission work grew apace among them. Indeed about 1648 Father Bressani felt warranted to write that "whereas at the date of their arrival they found not a single soul possessing a knowledge of the true God, at the present day, in spite of persecution, want, famine, war, and pestilence, there is not a single family which does count some Christians." Better still, the converts were living up to the Christian standard of morality, and the general tone of the nation's society was gradually undergoing a decided change for the better. But the implacable Iroquois would not allow them to profit peacefully by the ministrations of their priests. One by one their villages were attacked and destroyed. In the spring of 1648 St. Joseph's was annihilated and its missionary, Father Daniel, killed while comforting his flock. Next came the turn of the fortified town of St. Louis where the lion-hearted Brébeuf and his companion, Father Lalemant, were martyred (see Brébeuf). St. Ignatius village suffered a similar attack, and most of its inhabitants were butchered. Then St. Mary's was assailed by the enemy; but, warned in time, it succeeded in repulsing the attack. Numerous Huron villages were successively razed, and many of their people massacred, while others were led off to the land of the invaders, there to undergo torture, perpetual captivity, or death.

No wonder, then, if the Hurons lost heart and sought safety in flight and dispersion. Their devoted pastors followed them in their exile. They at first gathered remnants of their once powerful nation on an island in Lake Huron, called to-day Christian Island, while the Petun village of Etharita succumbed under the blows of the southern aborigines, and with it Father Charles Garnier who, though in the grasp of death, dragged himself to minister to the spiritual needs of his afflicted flock. His companion, Father Noel Chabanel, was at the same time the victim of an apostate Huron who flung his body into the river. The one consolation in the midst of these ruins was the constancy with which the converts stuck to their faith, even when in the land of their executioners. So thoroughly did they share the fortitude of their pastors, that many of them not only confessed their faith in Christ at the peril of their lives but even exhorted their persecutors to embrace it themselves. Some of the fugitives went west, while others found a temporary refuge on the desert islands of Lake Huron, or among the Neutrals who had soon themselves to flee for their lives. Meanwhile the exiles of Christian Island, after untold sufferings, retired in the spring of 1650 to the neighbourhood of Quebec, finally settling at the Lorette Mission (see Huron Indians). Their chief occupation having ceased with the practical extinction of the Hurons as a people, the Jesuit missionaries now turned their attention to the fierce Iroquois, repeating the prodigies of self-denial with which their victims had been favoured. Against their tenacious perseverance and devotion to duty no bigotry can stand. To Protestants as well as to Catholics they are nothing short of heroes of Christian fortitude. To the west of Huronia proper was the land of the Petuns who boasted nine or ten villages with a population of perhaps ten thousand in 1640. Two missions, that of St. John's and that of St. Mathias, had been established among them. These Indians were commencing to yield to the influence of grace when they, too, had to retire before the victorious march of the ruthless Iroquois. In 1652 we find them at Michillimakinac, whence they set out on a series of peregrinations which landed them among tribes of the United States, by whom they were ultimately absorbed. The other remnant of the Huron nation fared better. About 1665 they enjoyed the ministrations of an able and pious priest, Father Joseph M. Chaumonot, a pioneer missionary who had given no less than fifty-three years of his life to the ill-fated Hurons (d. 1692).

Considered as a nation, the Hurons had been wiped off the face of the earth. Such of the priests as were not required for missionary work within what is now the American Union then turned their attention toward the more pacific tribes nearer home. The Micmacs had from the first accepted Christianity (see Micmacs). On 29 July, 1657, Gabriel De Queylus, Gabriel Souart, and Dominique Galinier, members of a newly founded ecclesiastical society, the Sulpicians, accompanied by M. d'Allet, a deacon of the same institute, arriving at Quebec, immediately proceeded to the village of Ville-Marie, now Montreal, where they replaced the Jesuits in the charge of the local parish. Though more especially destined for work among the whites, the Sulpicians did not overlook the salvation of the native tribes. Thus, ten years after their arrival in Canada (1667), they ministered to the Ottawas and other Algonquin groups. Bishop De Montmorency-Laval, the first prelate in the colony, entrusted to them the care of a mission established at Quinté Bay on Lake Ontario, for the benefit of the Cayugas, an Iroquois tribe, and many adopted Hurons settled in their midst. Their success with the adult population was not complete; but their very presence paved the way towards establishing missionary stations all along the western shore of Lake Ontario (1669). Soon after, the Sulpicians were succeeded in that field by the Recollects who had just returned to Canada. Father Louis Hennepin and others laboured with energy, but harvested only tares, and the natives gradually returned south; all traces of a mission on the Canadian side of the lake disappeared.

It was then that, quite a number of Iroquois of the American Union having been won over to the Faith, a step was taken by their spiritual advisers of which the results were to last to our day. To withdraw them from the dangers of their pagan environment, the Jesuits induced them (1668) to settle at La Prairie,

near Montreal, whence they moved (1676) to Sault St. Louis, and then to Caughnawaga. One of the chief reasons for that migration was the prevailing excesses, principally owing to the intoxicants dealt out by the Dutch. The French colony itself was not free from that greatest of curses for the American aborigine. But, in addition to the solemn promise to abstain therefrom which was exacted of all the newcomers into the model settlement, the stopping of the evil was more easy on Canadian than on American (or, as it was then, English) soil. As a matter of fact, the missionaries of New France, and especially their valiant head, Bishop Laval, fought it with unflagging perseverance, appealing to the French authorities whenever their representatives on the St. Lawrence proved unwilling to stay the spread of this scourge. In their new home at Sault St. Louis the Iroquois Christians gave great consolations. Thus one of the former torturers of Father de Brébeuf, Garonhiagué by name, became one of the most zealous catechists of the new mission, and the war-chief Kryn shone by his virtues as much as by his courage. But the best known example of Christian efflorescence in that settlement was Catherine Tegakwitha, a native virgin surnamed the "Lily of the Mohawks", who died in 1678 after a short life passed in the practice of heroic virtues. About that time events shaped themselves in such a way as to further increase the extent of the missionary field in the East. The Abenakis, an Algonquin nation, ever a staunch ally of the French, though most of its tribes were considerably nearer to the English, were attracting the attention of Father Gabriel Druillettes, who visited them repeatedly in their original homes. These natives were soon to swell the ranks of the Canadian Indians under the care of the Jesuits. After a series of hostilities in the course of which the English had at one time to agree to pay them tribute, the Abenakis were defeated on 3 Dec., 1679. Rather than remain neighbours to the victors, most of them immediately made their way to Canada and Acadia, where they have since remained.

The following year (1680) two Jesuits, the brothers Vincent and Jacques Bigot, were appointed to watch over the spiritual interests of the newcomers. These, gathered at the village of Sillery, joined St. Joseph's Mission which in 1681 counted already some five hundred or six hundred inhabitants, as yet unbaptized, but animated by excellent dispositions. Their congeners in Acadia, having heard of the welcome extended to them, asked for, and were granted, 1 July, 1683, a land concession of thirty-six square miles on the Chaudière River, to which they flocked in large numbers. This was given the name of St. Francis' Mission. For over twenty years the Bigot brothers devoted their energies to the welfare of the Indians of both missions, and their zeal was rewarded by complete success. In 1708 other aborigines of the same stock were settled at Bécancourt, with a view to serve as a rampart against the Iroquois. They "were all Christians, and practised with much edification the precepts of Christianity" (Charlevoix, "Journal Hist.", V, p. 164). Twelve years later (1720) they numbered about five hundred souls. A short time before (1716), the mission of Oka, or Lake of the Two Mountains, was established, where Christianized Iroquois and remnants of the Algonquin nation were gathered under the guidance of the Sulpicians. In these various foundations the secular authorities generously seconded the efforts of the missionaries by the grant of large tracts of land for the benefit of their charge.

Now that the French were more or less at peace with the Iroquois, and friendly with the other tribes in the East, they dreamt of fresh conquests in the West. The "Western Sea" (Pacific Ocean) was especially the object of their ambition. They commissioned the Sieur Pierre Gaulthier de Laverendrye to undertake an expedition in that direction, and in the summer of 1735 Father Jean Pierre Aulneau, S.J., accompanied him to the Lake of the Woods previous to attempting his ultimate mission, the conversion of the Mandans of the Upper Missouri. With a party of twenty Frenchmen, he was treacherously slain on an island of the same lake by the Sioux on 8 June of the following year. Father Claude Godefroy Coquart, of the same order, took his place (1743) as chaplain of the exploring expedition, and dwelt a short time at the present Portage la Prairie, but could accomplish nothing for the Western Indians. The mission of Michilimakinac, at the west end of Lake Huron, was then the base of operations for such expeditions. Thence also the Jesuits scoured the woods in quest of souls to save, and Ross Cox says that the impression they made on their wayward wards was such that, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, the descendants of the latter had not forgotten "the good white fathers who, unlike other white men, never robbed or cheated them" ("Adventures on the Columbia River", New York, p. 149). But, with the exception of the reservations of the Abenakis and the Micmacs in the far East, all under the care of the Jesuits, most of the Catholic missions in Canada were along the St. Lawrence. Quite a few were at the various localities then called the Posts of the King, the Malbaie, Tadoussac, Mingan, Chicoutimi, and other places, concerning which Father Coquart addressed a memoir to the Intendant of New France under date 5 April, 1750.

Shortly before, a Sulpician, Father Francis Picquet, had started a movement among the aborigines, the results of which were most remarkable. In a village called Ogdensburg he established a reduction, the success of which soon attracted widespread attention. In the space of four years he grouped over three thousand Indians and opened for their benefit the missions of La Présentation, La Galette, Sugatzi, L'Ile au Galop, and L'Ile Picquet, on the St. Lawrence. So great was his success and so considerable the extent of his operations that (1749) it took the Bishop of Quebec ten days to inspect his central establishment officially. Two years later Father Picquet visited the Indians on Lake Ontario, whence he repaired to the land of the Senecas. When Quebec was captured in 1759, that missionary had converted large numbers of heathens. Unfortunately, the ensuing unsettled state of the country put a stop to his activities, and in May, 1760, he had to leave Ogdensburg, never to return. Another Sulpician, Father Jean Mathevet, after having mastered the language of the Abenakis, of which he compiled a dictionary, was then ministering to the mixed congregation of Oka (1746–81), together with Father Vincent Guichart, whose missionary labours extended from 1754 to the time of his death in 1793. Perhaps the most famous Canadian missionary of that period was Father Jean-Baptiste Labrosse, a Jesuit, who exercised his ministry all through Lower Canada and New Brunswick during no less than thirty-five years, being with the Montagnais and the Malecites from 1754–82, when he died regretted by all for his unremitting charity. Two events then conspired to interrupt the progress of the Catholic missions in Canada. These were the change of political masters, owing to which several members of the clergy returned to France, and the suppression, in 1773, of the Jesuit Order. By the fortieth clause of the Montreal capitulation England had granted religious liberty to the Indians as well as to the whites then in the colony. Yet some of the instructions soon after sent to her representatives on the banks of the St. Lawrence were openly against the spirit, if not the letter, of that treaty. The officials were told that "all missionaries among the Indians, whether established under the authority or appointed by the Jesuits, or by any other

ecclesiastical authority of the Romish Church, [must] be withdrawn by degrees, and at such times and in such a manner as shall be satisfactory to the Indians and consistent with the public safety, and Protestant missionaries appointed in their places" (Royal Instructions to Sir George Prevost). The natives refused to part with their priests on any consideration, thereby showing the extent of the influence these had acquired over them. After the suppression of the Society of Jesus the care of the Indians fell entirely on the shoulders of the Sulpicians and of such of the secular clergy as could be spared for that work. Among the former we may mention Father Thavenet, who laboured, mostly at the Oka mission, from 1793 to 1815. Of the latter one of the most prominent was a refugee from the horrors of the French Revolution, Abbé le Courtois, who reached Canada on 26 June, 1794, and died on 18 May, 1828, after having devoted himself to the service of the northeastern and St. Lawrence aborigines.

Meantime an event had taken place in the West which was portentous of the most important results for Catholic influence among the natives of North America. The Earl of Selkirk having founded, in 1812, a colony of Scotch Presbyterians and Irish Catholics at the junction of the Assiniboine and Red Rivers, was violently opposed by the representatives of the Northwest Company. This opposition resulted (19 June, 1816) in the Battle of Seven Oaks, in which twenty-two whites, including the governor of the colony, lost their lives. As it was evident to the noble founder that no permanent success could be achieved without the aid of religion, he obtained from the Bishop of Quebec two missionaries, Father Joseph-Norbert Provencher and Joseph Nicholas S. Dumoulin, who, on 16 July, 1818, arrived to found the church of St. Boniface, opposite Fort Douglas, the headquarters of the traders in the country. One of the chief objects of the new mission was the conversion of the aborigines of the Middle West of Canada. Father Dumoulin tried to meet the wishes of his bishop in this respect; but, owing to the fact that he could give only half of his time to the Indians, he accomplished little enough. In fact, such was the rebellious temper of his native charges, that he was twice shot at by one of them. Scarcely anything could be done to better their lot until 1831, when Father George A. Belcourt arrived among them from Lower Canada. The newcomer, an able man, immediately commenced to acquire a thorough knowledge of the language of the Saulteux, or Chippewas, which he reduced to writing and of which he composed a dictionary. In 1833 he established on the Assiniboine an Indian village, known as St. Paul's Mission, where he strove to teach farming as well as the elements of the Christian doctrine. Owing perhaps to his insistence on the former, his success was far from complete. In the summer of the same year, Father Jean-Baptiste Thibault reached the Middle West; though less brilliantly endowed than Belcourt, he was to prove more successful as a missionary. The latter was then journeying to Rainy River, where he found the Indians "little disposed to leave the bottle for the word of God", according to the founder of the Red River Missions, now Bishop Provencher. In the course of 1838 Belcourt established a second post at the confluence of the English and Winnipeg Rivers. This was Wabassimong, which soon acquired a degree of celebrity, though it had to be abandoned in 1847. In 1842 a new and larger field was opened to the zeal of the missionaries, the Far West, to-day Alberta, where Father Thibault preached the Gospel to the Crees and Blackfeet who repaired to Fort Edmonton. Without becoming at once converts to our holy faith, these aborigines were persuaded by the preaching of the Canadian priest to the extent of definitively rejecting the advances of the Methodist minister who had preceded him in that distant region. Then Thibault journeyed even farther west, and founded the mission of St. Ann, whence he and other priests thenceforth attended, with some measure of success, to the spiritual wants of the surrounding tribes. He next went (1844) as far as Cold Lake, Lac la Biche and even Ile à la Crosse, where the Déné Indians received him with open arms.

A short time before (1842) another Canadian missionary, Father Modeste Demers, began work throughout British Columbia, or New Caledonia, as that country was then called, going as far as Stuart Lake, where he accomplished wonders. As early as 1838, after having crossed the entire continent from Quebec, Father Demers had reached the Columbia valley, where he was everywhere received as the special envoy of the Almighty, and produced among the populous tribes of the Pacific an impression which powerfully worked for unity when, later on, the ministers of various sects made their appearance. In the spring of the following year, Father Jean Baptiste Z. Bolduc reintroduced Christianity on Vancouver Island, where it had been planted at the time of the occupation of Nootka by the Spaniards (1789–95). In 1845–47 Father John Nobili, a Jesuit, retraced Demers' itinerary, and finally went even so far as Babine Lake in the course of his missionary excursion. Meantime a new worker, Father Jean E. Darveau, was in a fair way towards materially improving the spiritual condition of the hardened Saulteux of what is to-day Northern Manitoba, when he was murdered, 4 June, 1844, by Indians who sided with a Protestant catechist stationed at Le Pas, Lower Saskatchewan, where the priest intended to start a permanent mission. East of the Manitoban lakes, Father Dominique Du Ranquet, S.J., inaugurated in April of the same year the missionary station of Walpole Island, on Lake Superior, whence he visited various posts, and in the following July another Jesuit, Father Choné, took up his residence at Wikwemikong, on Manitoulin Island, where a secular priest had preceded him. No less than twenty-one posts on the island, Georgian Bay from Mississagué to Owen Sound, as well as Lake Nipissing and Beausoleil Island, were attended from that mission. Great was the opposition of the Protestant ministers (among whom was James Evans, the inventor of the Cree syllabics); but the Jesuits held their own, and managed to organize the flourishing Christian settlements of Garden River and Pigeon River (1848). The latter station was transferred in 1849 to Fort William by Fathers Choné and Frémiot. Thence these missionaries ministered to the Indians of Port Arthur, Prince's Bay, Royal Island, and Lake Nepigon. Still further east, in the very land of the Abenakis, less consoling events had taken place some time previously. An Indian known by the name of Masta had been educated in the United States, whence he returned in 1830 to St. Francis Mission with the title and attributes of a Protestant minister. After much opposition at the hands of his fellow Abenakis he succeeded, by dint of skilful intrigue and with the connivance of the Canadian authorities, in putting up a Protestant chapel in the very midst of the Indian village (1837). Three years later Father J. A. Maurault was sent thither by Bishop Signay to learn the language of the natives, and in 1847 he actually became their missionary. Thenceforth the Abenaki preacher saw whatever influence he had gained wane until he had to leave the scene of his exploits. At the same time a still better known priest was commencing his apostolic career at Oka, Father J. A. Cuocq, an able Sulpician, who was to consecrate his energies for over half a century to the welfare of the Mohawks and Algonquins, whose languages he eventually mastered.

A new era dawned for the Indian missions of

Canada. At the request of Mgr Bourget, Bishop of Montreal, four Oblates of Mary Immaculate reached the St. Lawrence from France (1841) and immediately began preaching missions, not only to the whites, but also to the Indians of Lower Canada. Several missionaries of the new order, Fathers Louis Déléage, Flavien Durocher, and Jean-N. Laverlochère, soon distinguished themselves. Hearing of their success, Bishop Provencher begged for the co-operation of their brethren in religion. On 25 Aug., 1845, Father Pierre Aubert and Brother Antonin-Alexandre Taché arrived at St. Boniface, and, while the older missionary was sent to Wabassimong, Brother Taché left after his ordination (22 Oct., 1845) for the distant post of Ile à la Crosse. There he had for a superior Father Louis Laflèche, who had established that mission in the course of the preceding year. Both priests did a vast amount of good to the native population. In 1846 two other Oblates, Father Henri Faraud and a companion, reached the Canadian West. In the north Father Taché gradually extended his field of action. He visited (1847), first of all missionaries, the shores of Lake Athabasca, where Father Faraud was to inaugurate the Nativity Mission on 8 September, 1849. On 24 June of the following year Father Taché was appointed coadjutor to Bishop Provencher, and temporarily left the Ile à la Crosse mission in the hand of newcomers, Fathers Maisonneuve and Tissot, whose inexperience was somewhat resented by the Indians. Hence Bishop Taché had to return to them after his consecration (23 Nov., 1851), and for several years the young prelate continued among them the labours which pertain more to the province of a simple priest than to that of a bishop. Father Henri Grollier, a young Oblate who was to become the Apostle of the Arctic Circle, came to swell the ranks of the missionaries (June, 1852), while Father Albert Lacombe started on his long career as an itinerant missionary over the Saskatchewan plains. Father Grollier soon went to Lake Athabasca, where he was for some time Father Faraud's companion. Then he founded the mission of Fond du Lac, on the same body of water (1853), while Father René Rémas established that of Lac la Biche. The principal event of 1854 was the arrival in the Canadian Northwest of Father Vital J. Grandin, a young Oblate who was to do yeoman service in the cause of the missions there. The new recruit was sent to Lake Athabasca, to relieve Father Faraud, who established (1856) St. Joseph's Mission on Great Slave Lake. Illustrative of the result of the Oblates' exertions in the north, we may say that, by the end of 1856, there remained of the seven hundred and thirty-five natives who formed the population of Ile à la Crosse, only one hundred and forty-eight heathens.

In the far East other Oblates were emulating those of the Canadian Northwest; in addition to those already mentioned there were Fathers André Garin and Charles Arnaud, then Fathers Louis Babel and Jean-Pierre Guéguen. These missionaries repeatedly visited in succession Tadoussac, Les Escoumains, Maskuaro, Mingan, Portneuf, and Les Ilets. As a rule their efforts were crowned with success. Not only did they teach their neophytes the rudiments of the Christian doctrine, but they even imparted to them some knowledge of the secular sciences, and enhanced the attractiveness of the Catholic worship by solemn processions and other pious devices. As early as 30 Sept., 1850, one of them, Father Arnaud, at this writing (1910) still actively engaged in the eastern field, wrote of the natives of Les Ilets: "They are the best instructed on the coast; they all know how to read and write. It is inspiring to see them in the church, the men on one side and the women on the other, prayer-book in hand, vying with each other, as it were, in modesty and fervour. Another spectacle scarcely less striking is that of the little children in prayer after the evening service, when every mother teaches the members of her family how to pray to the Great Spirit" (Rapport sur les Missions de Québec, March, 1851, p. 36). A regular house of the Oblates was established (1851) at Rivière au Désert, now Maniwaki, and later on (1862) others were erected at Bethsiamits and Ville-Marie (Pontiac), whence, as well as from the residences on the St. Lawrence, not only the roving bands of the interior, Montagnais, Algonquins, and Nascapis, but even such as resorted to the trading-posts of Abbittibbi, Albany, and Moose Factory, on Hudson Bay, were visited by the "Black-Robes". In spite of their precarious circumstances, those aborigines often enough repaid by a faithful discharge of thier religious duties the devotedness of their spiritual guides. The same may be said of the Indians of the inhospitable steppes of the Far North, where the Tachés, Farauds, Grandins, Grolliers, and a host of others were gladly undergoing the pangs of hunger, and setting at defiance the rigours of Arctic winters and the fatigues of endless marches on snowshoes, for the sake of the souls entrusted to their care. Their courage and devotion to duty were so great, and their successes so striking, that they often elicited flattering encomiums from Protestant traders and explorers. On 30 November, 1859, Father Grandin was consecrated Bishop of Satala and coadjutor to Bishop Taché; yet he remained in the north, spending most of his time in incessant travelling. His presence there was all the more necessary as the preceding year had witnessed the arrival in the Mackenzie district of the first Protestant clergyman, the forerunner of numerous Anglican missionaries in the north. Father Grollier was immediately dispatched to Fort Simpson, the headquarters of the enemy, where, in spite of the inducements offered by the local Protestant trader, he had the consolation of seeing the great majority of the natives side with the representative of Catholicism. He then founded (1858) the missionary post of Our Lady of Good Hope, likewise on the Mackenzie and just within the Arctic Circle. Then he even went down as far as the first Eskimo village (Sept., 1860), while Father Gascon, a new recruit, was protecting the savages of the Liard River against the wiles of the preacher. Simultaneously the difficult station of Lake Caribou, just southwest of the Barren Grounds, was established under Father Végreville.

The year 1862 saw the beginning of what was to become a most important establishment under the title of the Divine Providence, on the Mackenzie, where Fathers Gascon and Petitot made the very first clearings. That same year a Protestant minister, Mr. Kirkby, despairing of success east of the Rocky Mountains, crossed that range into the Yukon. Hearing of this, an intrepid missionary, Father Séguin, immediately followed; but the conflict was unequal; the preacher, besides the powerful influence of the traders, had resources of which the priest could not dispose. Above all, he had the advantage of priority, and, despite two other visits of the Catholic missionaries, that of Father Petitot (1870) and that of Bishop Clut with Father Lecorre (1872), the Loucheux of the Far Northwest were, to a great extent, lost to the Church. Things were brighter on the Saskatchewan and in the adjoining region, where new posts, denoting constant progress, were being established on all sides. Even martyred Darveau's old mission of Duck Bay had been in a sense revived, though transferred to the northern extremity of Lake Manitoba under the name of St-Laurent. A still more important event was the erection of the Athabasca and Mackenzie districts into a separate vicariate Apostolic, with Father Faraud (consecrated 30 Nov., 1864) as first titular. The new prelate was (1866) given a coadjutor in the person of Bishop Isidore Clut. With this perfected organization the northern missions, served by such sterling missionaries as Fathers

Séguin, Grouard, and the learned explorer, linguist, and ethnographer, Father Petitot, managed, in the teeth of opposition and extreme poverty, not only to hold their own, but to increase the number of their stations and converts. In the course of 1866 Father Petitot procured for the natives of Great Bear Lake the visit of the first minister of the Gospel they had ever seen in their dreary wastes. In the south Fathers Lacombe, Gasté, Leduc, Fourmond, Bonnald, and others were neither less active nor less successful. While in the far East secular priests were looking after the spiritual interests of the Abenakis, the Oblates continued their visits to the Indians north of the St. Lawrence, and the Jesuits to the natives of the Lake Superior basin.

On the Pacific Coast, the work of evangelization inaugurated by Father Demers likewise advanced. That missionary, having been made Bishop of Vancouver Island (1847), called to his aid the Oblates lately established in Oregon. The stations of Esquimalt, Sanish, and Cowitchen, and the conversion of hosts of aborigines were the immediate results. From the island missionary work spread to the adjacent mainland. On 8 Oct., 1859, Father Charles M. Pandosy founded the Okanagan mission, and Fathers Casimir Chirouse, Léon Fouquet, Paul Durieu, and other Oblates powerfully helped their superior, Father Louis-Joseph D'Herbomez, in regenerating the Indians of the Lower Fraser. Most consoling were the results of their zeal, and it is doubtful if a more thorough change from habitual intemperance and other vices was ever effected in North America than that which rejoiced the hearts of the Oblates in British Columbia.

On 20 Dec., 1863, Father d'Herbomez became the first bishop of the mainland, and this circumstance gave a new impetus to the evangelization of that immense country. Shushwaps and Chilcotins were then granted the same spiritual advantages as had been for some time enjoyed by the natives of the Lower Fraser valley, for the special benefit of whom the mission of St. Mary's had been established (1861). In the course of 1868 Bishop d'Herbomez himself visited the whole of the northern interior of British Columbia, as far as Babine Lake, doing much good to the Dénés and other Indians he met. Fathers Le Jacq and McGuckin walked in his footsteps until the former established (1873) the mission of Stuart Lake, which was to become the great centre of missionary activities in the north of the Pacific province. In June, 1875, Father Pierre-P. Durieu was named coadjutor to Bishop d'Herbomez. On Vancouver Island a devoted secular priest, Father August Brabant, had long been battling at his own personal risk against the apathy of the less religiously inclined Indians of the west coast. He was finally successful, while secular priests, Fathers J. N. Lemmens, Joseph Nicolaye, and others, were gradually taking the places of the Oblates who had been the pioneers of the island diocese. In 1871 the Holy See formed the Province of St. Boniface with Archbishop Taché as metropolitan and three suffragans, Bishop Grandin, now titular of St. Albert, and the vicars Apostolic of Athabasca-Mackenzie (Mgr. Faraud) and of British Columbia (Mgr. d'Herbomez). The archdiocese lost importance as a missionary country in proportion as it saw the wave of white immigration roll over the soil tilled by so many devoted workers. The districts of the Saskatchewan, Athabasca, and the Mackenzie were long to remain rich fields for apostolic men zealous for the lowest in the social scale. That the difficulties and even dangers attending the evangelization of the Indians had not disappeared from those territories was made evident by the drowning in Lake Athabasca (1873) of a veteran of the northern missions, Father Emile Eynard, an ex-official of the French Government, the freezing (1874) of Louis Dazé, a lay missionary of the St. Albert diocese, and the fate which befell Brother Alexis (July, 1875), killed and eaten by an Iroquois companion.

Yet there is no denying that local conditions were little by little undergoing some alterations. On the plains of what is now southern Alberta and southern Saskatchewan white immigration had commenced. At that time treaties were made with the Indians, entailing the establishment of new missionary posts and of industrial schools. While some of these were assigned to Protestant sects, the Church could not be content with a second place in a country where she had done most of the pioneer work. In spite of occasional ill-will on the part of those in power, she readily adapted herself to the new circumstances. Thus were founded the important Indian schools of (1) Dunbow, Alberta (1884); (2) Qu'Appelle, Saskatchewan (1884); (3) St. Boniface (1890); (4) Duck Lake, in Saskatchewan (1897), and other similar institutions for the benefit of the Indian youth. British Columbia already possessed the Indian industrial schools of St. Mary's, William's Lake, Kamloops, and Kootenay, all in the hands of the Catholic missionaries and nuns. Then came the Saskatchewan Rebellion (1885), which resulted not only in the destruction of seven Catholic missions, but even in the death at the hands of pagan Crees (2 April) of Fathers Fafard and Marchand, young Oblates then in charge of the posts of Frog Lake and Onion Lake respectively. Quite a few of the misguided Indians, however, eventually profited by these troubles, since their condemnation to death or confinement led them to join the Church they had so grievously injured.

Thenceforth the roving life of the pioneers became more or less a thing of the past for the missionaries of the western prairies, who, penned up with their charge in well-defined reservations, continued their ministrations without that element of romance which breaks the monotony of the daily routine and contributes to the making of history. It may now suffice for us to mention the labours of Fathers Gasté at Lake Caribou; Bonnald at Cumberland; Grouard (who replaced Bishop Faraud, d. Oct., 1892), at Lac la Biche and Athabasca; of Father Pascal (appointed vicar Apostolic of the newly created district of the Saskatchewan, 19 April, 1891), at Lake Athabasca and elsewhere; of Father Séguin, on the Lower Mackenzie, and of many other equally deserving missionaries. Even the lonely missions of the great northern stream and tributaries have had a share in the material progress so noticeable in the south. Thanks to the initiative of Bishop Grouard, a steamer has been built which annually saves to those poor missions large sums of money formerly paid to the Hudson Bay Company for their periodical outfitting. In the far East a new impetus was imparted to the missions of the faithful Micmacs by the arrival of the Capuchin Fathers in October, 1894, at Ste-Anne de Restigouche. In British Columbia material circumstances were never quite so precarious as in Mackenzie. Owing to the efforts of Bishop Durieu, the spiritual conditions of the Indians of the mainland of that province have ever been exceptionally bright. With the aid of such tried co-workers as Fathers Le Jacq, Fouquet, Chirouse junior, and others, the wonders of the Paraguayan Reductions have been reproduced, if not surpassed, among the Indians of the Pacific. Others working there were Rev. A. G. Morice, who directed Stuart's Lake mission during nineteen years and invented an Indian syllabary now widely known in the North; N. Coccola, who did wonders in the Kootenay; Fr. Thomas, and V. Rohr.

Of a native population of 111,043, Canada officially counts to-day 40,820 Catholic Indians thus distributed: Prince Edward Island, 274; New Brunswick,

1871; Nova Scotia, 2103; Quebec, 7926; Ontario, 6319; Manitoba, 1734; Saskatchewan, 2939; Alberta, 1873; Northwest Territories, 2252; Yukon Territory, 59, and British Columbia, 11,470. These are the official figures, which represent only the treaty Indians. In so far at least as the present vicariates Apostolic of Athabasca and of Mackenzie are concerned, they are manifestly out of proportion with the actual population, since the Catholic Indians and halfbreeds of those territories alone are locally estimated at 11,000 and 5,000 respectively, with perhaps 500 native Protestants. 55,000 is a fairly accurate figure for the total of the Catholics among the Canadian Indians.

For books bearing on the Catholic missions in Canada see the bibliography after the article HURON. Also:—

BEGG, *History of British Columbia* (Toronto, 1894); BEGG, (a namesake of foregoing), *The Creation of Manitoba* (Toronto, 1871); IDEM, *History of the North-west*, 3 vols. (Toronto, 1894); BENOIT, *Vie de Mgr Taché*, 2 vols. (Montreal, 1904); BOULTON, *Reminiscences of the Northwest Rebellions* (Toronto, 1886); BURTIN, *Vie de Catherine Tekahgwita* (Montreal); DUGAS, *Monseigneur Provencher* (Montreal, 1889); IDEM, *Histoire véridique des Faits qui ont préparé le Mouvement des Métis* (Montreal, 1905); IDEM, *Histoire de l'Ouest Canadien de 1822 à 1869* (Montreal, 1906); HARGRAVE, *Red River* (Montreal, 1871); HILL, *Manitoba* (Toronto, 1890); JONES, *Relation inédite du R. P. Pierre Laure, S.J.* (Montreal, 1889); IDEM, *The Aulneau Collection* (Montreal, 1893); JONQUET, *Monseigneur Grandin* (Montreal, 1903); LINDSAY, *Notre-Dame de la Jeune Lorette* (Montreal, 1900); MARTIN, *Hurons et Iroquois* (Paris, 1898); MAURAULT, *Histoire des Abénakis* (Sorel, 1866); MORICE, *Au Pays de l'Ours noir* (Paris, 1897); IDEM, *History of the Northern Interior of British Columbia* (Toronto, 1904); IDEM, *Dictionnaire historique des Canadiens et des Métis français de l'Ouest* (Quebec, 1907); IDEM, *History of the Catholic Church in Western Canada*, 2 vols. (Toronto, 1910); MULVANY, *The History of the Northwest Rebellion of 1885* (Toronto, 1886); PAQUET, *Fragments de l'Histoire religieuse et civile de la paroisse de St Nicolas* (Lévis, 1894); PETITOT, *Chez les Grands Esquimaux* (Paris, 1887); IDEM, *En route pour la Mer Glaciale* (Paris, 1888); IDEM, *Quinze Ans sous le Cercle Polaire* (Paris, 1889); IDEM, *Autour du Grand Lac des Esclaves* (Paris, 1891); IDEM, *Exploration de la Région du Grand Lac des Ours* (Paris, 1893); PIOLET, *Les missions catholiques françaises au XIX^e siècle*, VI (Paris, s. d.), 51–164; SOMERSET, *The Land of the Muskeg* (London, 1855); SOULERIN, *Le Père Laverlochère* (Paris, s. d.).

Periodicals: *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi* (Lyons); *Missions de la Congrégation des Oblates de Marie Immaculée* (Paris, 1862–1910); *Notices nécrologiques des O. M. I.* (Paris); *Rapports sur les Missions du Diocèse de Québec* (Quebec).

A. G. MORICE.

Missions, CATHOLIC INDIAN, OF THE UNITED STATES.—The spiritual welfare of the native tribes of America was a subject of deep concern to the Governments of Catholic Spain and France from the very discovery of the Western Continent. To this fact all the early patents bear witness. That granted to Ayllon in 1532 for exploration and settlement along the Florida coast, as quoted by Shea, is typical: "Whereas our principal intent in the discovery of new lands is that the inhabitants and natives thereof, who are without the light or knowledge of faith, may be brought to understand the truth of our holy Catholic Faith, that they may come to a knowledge thereof, and become Christians and be saved, and this is the chief motive that you are to bear and hold in this affair, and to this end it is proper that religious persons should accompany you, by these presents I empower you to carry to the said land the religious whom you may judge necessary, and the vestments and other things needful for the observance of Divine worship; and I command that whatever you shall thus expend in transporting the said religious, as well as in maintaining them and giving them what is needful, and in their support, and for the vestments and other articles required for the Divine worship, shall be paid entirely from the rents and profits which in any manner shall belong to us in the said land." With few exceptions secular priests and missionaries accompanied every Spanish expedition of discovery. The first Mass celebrated within the present limits of the United States was probably that offered up by the priests of Ponce de León's expedition at the south-western point of Florida in 1521. The next was celebrated by the noted Dominican Antonio de Montesinos, the earliest opponent of Indian slavery, at Ayllon's temporary colony of San Miguel de Guandape in Virginia in 1526, eighty years before the founding of Jamestown.

I. SOUTH-EASTERN STATES (VIRGINIA TO ALABAMA, INCLUSIVE).—The whole south-eastern portion of the United States, extending westwards to or beyond the Mississippi, was known in the early Spanish period under the general name of Florida. Although at least fifteen priests had lost their lives in this region with the expeditions of Narváez and De Soto in 1527–28 and 1539–42, an attempt to evangelize the native tribes was made in 1549 by the Dominican Luis Cancer, the apostle of Guatemala, under a royal commission granted at his own request for the conversion of Florida. Forced by the obstinacy of the ship-captain to land at Tampa Bay among the fierce Calusa, instead of being given an opportunity to search out a friendly tribe, Father Cancer and his two companions had hardly touched the shore when they were killed by the assembled savages in sight of the ship, being thus the first missionary martyrs of the eastern United States. St. Augustine, Florida, the first permanent settlement in the eastern United States, was founded by Menéndez in 1565. In the next year, at the request of the King of Spain, three Jesuits were sent out, one of whom, Father Pedro Martínez, having landed with a small party on Cumberland Island on the Georgia coast, was attacked and murdered by the savages. The other two Jesuits, Father Juan Rogel and Brother Francisco de Villareal, after spending a winter studying the language, proceeded to work among the Calusa tribe in southern Florida. Reinforced by ten more Jesuits in 1568, they went over to Havana to establish there a school for Indian boys from Florida. Father Juan Bautista Segura, as Jesuit vice-provincial, then took charge of the Florida mission, establishing stations among the Calusa, Tegesta, and Tocobaga tribes of the south and west coasts, while Father Antonio Sedeño and Brother Domingo Báez began the first Georgia mission on Guale (St. Simon's?) Island among the Yamasee, in whose language Brother Báez prepared a grammar and a catechism. In 1569 Father Rogel with several other Jesuits began work in South Carolina among the Orista (Edisto) and others in the neighbourhood of the Spanish post of Santa Elena. After about a year, the results proving unsatisfactory, both the Orista and the Guale missions were abandoned, the missionaries returning to Havana with a number of boys for the Indian school.

In 1570 Father Segura, accompanied by Father Luis de Quiros and seven (?) novices and lay brothers, all Jesuits, together with four instructed Indian youths, undertook a mission among the Powhatan Indians in what is now Virginia. The guide and interpreter on whom they depended to bring them into touch with the natives was a young Indian of the region, who was the brother of a local chief and had been brought off by a Spanish expedition nine years before, educated under the Dominicans in Mexico and Spain, and baptized under the name and title of Don Luis de Velasco. Their destination was Axacan (Oshacon)—supposed by Shea to have been on the Rappahannock—but more probably situated farther south. They met with friendly reception, and a log chapel was erected (September, 1570), but, before the winter was over, Don Luis proved treacherous, and under his leadership the Indians attacked the mission (February, 1571) and massacred the entire party with the exception of one Indian boy, who was spared, and finally escaped to tell the tale. The massacre was avenged on the principals by Menéndez a year later. In consequence of the small result in Florida the Jesuits were shortly afterwards transferred to the more promising field of Mexico. Years afterwards, on

the establishment of the Catholic colony of Maryland, some attention was given to the neighbouring Indians of Virginia (see below). In 1577 several Franciscans under charge of Father Alonso de Reynoso arrived at St. Augustine and began work among the Timucua Indians near the city, of whom a number were soon regular attendants at the parish church. Fifteen years later four Franciscan priests and two lay brothers were at work in the towns of the Timucua and Yamasee from St. Augustine northwards into Georgia. In 1593 twelve more were sent out in charge of Father Juan de Silva, including the noted Father Francisco Pareja, to whom we are indebted for our most complete account of the Timucua people and language and for several devotional works, the first books printed in any Indian language of the United States.

In 1597 a chief of the Yamasee organized a conspiracy which seems to have included also a part of the Timucua tribe about St. Augustine. Five missions, stretching from St. Augustine to Ossabaw island in Georgia, were attacked and five of the six missionaries murdered, Father De Avila (or Dávila), although badly wounded, being rescued. The advance of the Indians was finally checked by some Spanish troops, after all the Yamasee missions had been destroyed. The missions among the more peaceful Timucua about the lower Saint John's River, Florida, continued to flourish, being in 1602 four in number, besides temporary stations, with 1200 Christian Indians. Other Franciscans arriving, the Yamasee missions were re-established in 1605, the Potano tribe on the Suwanee river almost entirely Christianized two years later, and a beginning made among the lower Creek bands. In 1633 missionaries were sent to the powerful Apalachee of western Florida in response to repeated requests from that tribe. In 1655 there were 35 Franciscan missions in Florida and Georgia with a Christian Indian population of 26,000 souls. This was the zenith of their prosperity. Two years later the Apalachee, in consequence of the unjust exactions of the governor, became involved in a war with the Spaniards, which compelled the abandonment of the eight flourishing missions in that territory. The fathers embarked for Havana, but were all drowned on the passage. In 1674, through the efforts of Bishop Calderón, the Apalachee mission was restored, and several new foundations established. In 1684 the Diocesan Synod of Havana promulgated regulations for the government and protection of the mission Indians. In the same year the Governor of Florida, alarmed at the growing strength of the English colony of Carolina, undertook to remove the Indians of the northern missions to more southern settlements with the result that the Yamasee again revolted and, being supplied with guns by the English, attacked and destroyed the mission on Saint Catherine island, Georgia, and carried off a troop of Christian Indians prisoners to sell as slaves in Carolina. In 1696 an attempt to establish missions about Cape Cañaveral resulted in the killing of a religious and six companions. A like attempt in the next year among the fierce Calusa south of Tampa Bay also proved abortive.

For years the English slave-traders of Carolina had made a business of arming certain tribes with guns and sending them out to make raids upon other tribes to procure slaves for Carolina and the Barbadoes. The Spanish Government, on the contrary, refused guns even to the Christian Indians. The War of the Spanish Succession gave an opportunity for an attack upon the Florida missions. In May, 1702, the heathen Lower Creeks, armed and instigated by Governor Moore of Carolina, attacked Santa Fé, occupied by the Timucua, and burnt the church. In October of the same year a combined English and Indian land expedition, co-operating with a naval force, attacked the mission towns north of St. Augustine, burned three of them with their churches, made prisoner the missionaries, and then, proceeding farther southward, burned the town of St. Augustine with the Franciscan church and convent and one of the finest libraries then in America. The fortress held out until relieved by a Spanish fleet. In January, 1704, Moore, at the head of about fifty Carolina men and a thousand or more well-armed Creek, Catawba, and other savages, ravaged the Apalachee country, destroyed ten of the eleven missions towns, slaughtered hundreds of the people, including a number of warriors who made a stand under the Spanish lieutenant Mexia, and carried off nearly 1400 Christian Indians to be sold as slaves in Carolina or distributed for torture or adoption among the savages. The missions, with their churches, gardens, and orange groves, were utterly demolished, the vestments and sacred vessels destroyed or carried off, and numbers of the neophytes burned at the stake. Four of the mission fathers were also killed (two being tortured and burned at the stake), and their bodies hacked to pieces by deliberate permission of Moore himself, who gave up Lieutenant Mexia and four Spanish soldiers to the same fate.

This was practically the end of the Florida missions, although for more than twenty years thereafter efforts were made, with some temporary success, to gather together again the remnants of the Apalachee, Timucua, and other Christian tribes, and in 1726 there were still counted more than 1000 Christian Indians. With the establishment of the English Georgia colony and the ensuing war of 1740 the attempt was abandoned, and the mission territory reverted to its original wild condition. In 1753 only 136 Indians remained in four mission stations close to St. Augustine. In 1743 the Jesuit Fathers José María Monaco and José Xavier de Alana began a mission near Cape Florida among the utterly savage Aïs and Jobé with such success that a community of Christian Indians was built up, which continued until the Seminole War (1817–18).

II. Maryland.—The English Catholic colony of Maryland, founded in 1634, was served in its first years by the Jesuits, who made the Indians their special care. Under the superior, Father Andrew White, and his companions, several missions were established among the Piscataway (Conoy) and Patuxent of lower Maryland, west of Chesapeake Bay, and considerable attention was also given to the Potomac tribe in Virginia. The principal mission was begun in 1639 at Kittamaquindi, or Piscataway, near the mouth of the creek of that name. Other stations were Mattapony on the Patuxent, Anacostan (Anacostia) adjoining the present Washington, and Potopaco (Port Tobacco), where nearly all the natives were baptized. In 1642, during an extended visit among the Potomac, on the Virginia side, Father White baptized the chief and principal men, with a number of others. The work was much hampered by the inroads of the hostile Susquehanna from the head of the bay, and was brought to a sudden and premature close in 1645 by the Puritans and other malcontents, who, taking advantage of the Civil War in England, repaid the generosity which had given them asylum in Maryland by seizing the Government, plundering the churches and missions and the houses of the principal Catholics, and sending Fathers White and Copley to England to be tried for their lives, while Father Martwell, the new superior, and two other missionaries escaped to Virginia. Later efforts to revive the mission had only temporary success owing to the hostility of the Protestant Government and the rapid wasting of the native tribes. Before 1700 the remnant of the Piscataway removed bodily from Maryland and sought refuge in the north with the Delawares and Iroquois, among whom they have long since become entirely extinct. To Father White's anonymous "Relatio itineris ad Marylandiam" (translation published in 1833 and again in 1874) we are indebted for the best account

of the western Maryland tribes. He also composed an Indian catechism, still extant, and a manuscript grammar of the Piscataway language, now unfortunately lost, the first attempt at an Indian grammar by an Englishman and antedating Eliot's Bible by at least a dozen years. (See PISCATAWAY INDIANS.)

NEW ENGLAND.—The earliest Christian mission on the soil of New England was that of Saint-Sauveur begun among the Abenakis in connexion with a French post on Mount Desert Island, Maine, by Father Pierre Biard and three other Jesuits in 1613. Both post and mission were destroyed a few months later by the English captain Argall, Brother Du Thet being killed in the attack and Fathers Biard and Quentin carried prisoners to Virginia. In 1619 the Recollects arrived to minister to the French fishermen scattered along the coast, and gave attention also to the Indians, chiefly in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. In 1633 they were succeeded by the Capuchins, who made their headquarters at Port Royal (Annapolis), Nova Scotia, and had stations as far south as the Kennebec, the principal one being among the Penobscot, near the French Fort Pentagouet (Castine), at the mouth of the Penobscot. In 1655 the post was seized by the English, and the resident missionary, Father De Crespy, carried off. Although restored to France by treaty in 1667, the mission languished, and in 1693 was consigned to the Jesuits, who made the new mission of Sainte Anne (established by Father Louis Thury in 1684 higher up the river, near the present Oldtown) their chief residence among the Penobscot. The Capuchins had laboured also among the Etchemin (see MALISEET INDIANS) on the northern frontier of Maine, their chief station being at Medoctec on the Saint John, established by Father Siméon in 1688 and revived by the Jesuits in 1701. In 1646 the noted Jesuit, Gabriel Druillettes, was sent from Quebec, and established at Norridgewock (Indian Old Point) on the Kennebec the Assumption mission, which for nearly eighty years thereafter held its place as the principal of the Abenaki missions. The most noted worker at this post was Sebastian Rasle (Râle, Rasles), who laboured with the utmost zeal from 1695 until his heroic death in 1724 at the age of sixty-six.

The chronic warfare throughout all this period between the rival French and English colonies, in which the native tribes almost solidly took the side of the French, exposed the Indian missions to the constant attacks of the English and made the missionaries marked men, both as Catholic priests and as supposed agents of the French Government. In consequence many fugitives from the Abenaki bands retired to Canada, where they were joined by refugees from the Pennacook and other southern New England tribes, driven out by King Philip's War of 1675–76. In 1683 these were gathered by the Jesuit Father Jacques Bigot, into the new mission of Saint François de Sales (St. Francis) on the Chaudière, near Quebec. In 1700 the mission was removed to its present location. In spite of repeated demands by the New England Government (1698, 1701, 1712), the Abenaki refused either to send their missionaries away or to accept Protestant teachers. Realizing the danger, the Jesuits urged that the Abenaki Indians and missions be removed to a safer location in Canada, but the project was not favoured by the Canadian Government. In 1704–5 two New England expeditions ravaged the Abenaki, burning Norridgewock, with its church, and looting the sacred vessels. In 1713 some Indians removed to the St. Lawrence and settled at Bécancour, where their descendants still remain. Norridgewock was rebuilt, and in 1722 was again destroyed by the New England men. As part of the plunder the raiders carried off the manuscript Abenaki dictionary (preserved at Harvard and published in 1833), to which Father Rasle had devoted thirty years of labour, and which ranks as one of the greatest monuments of our aboriginal languages. Earlier in the year the mission village and fine church on the Penobscot, placed under Father Lauverjat, had been destroyed by another party, following which event Massachusetts had summoned the Indians to deliver up every priest among them and had set a price on Rasle's head. Although repeatedly urged to seek safety in Canada, he refused to desert his flock. At last the blow fell. On 23 August, 1724, the New England men with a party of Mohawk Indians surprised Norridgewock while most of the warriors were away, killed several of the defenders, and plundered and burned the church and village. The devoted missionary, now old and crippled, was shot down at the foot of the cross, scalped, his skull crushed and his body almost hacked in pieces. A monument to his memory was erected on the spot in 1833, the year in which the greater monument, his Abenaki dictionary, was published.

Mission work was continued in some measure, although under difficulties, among the Indians of the Penobscot and the St. John, but most of the Norridgewock band retired to Saint Francis, which thus became one of the most flourishing missions in Canada. In 1759 it was attacked by a strong New England force under Colonel Rogers and completely destroyed, with its church and records, two hundred Indians being killed. The mission was re-established near the present Pierreville, Quebec, and still exists, numbering about 350 mixed bloods, while Bécancour has about 50 more. The Abenaki bands which remained in Maine espoused the cause of the Americans in the Revolution, and in 1775 made application to the new Government for the return of their French priests. The Massachusetts commissioners, although willing, were unable to supply them, but a later application to Bishop Carroll resulted in the appointment of the Sulpician Father, François Ciquard, to the Penobscot at Oldtown about 1785. For nearly ten years he ministered to them and the Passamaquoddy, when he was transferred to the Maliseet on the Saint John. After various changes the Maine missions reverted again to the Jesuits in the person of Father John Bapst, who arrived at Oldtown in 1848. The most distinguished of the later missionaries is Eugene Vetromile, S.J. (d. 1881), author of several works on the Abenaki tribe and language. The two tribes are entirely Catholic.

III. NEW YORK AND PENNSYLVANIA.—A large part of what is now New York State was held by the five confederated tribes of the fierce and powerful Iroquois (q. v.), numbering nearly two thousand fighting men. Through the unfortunate circumstances of Champlain's allying himself with a party of their enemies in 1609, they conceived a bitter hostility to the French which they gratified with deadly effect after procuring guns from the Dutch thirty years later. For this reason, and from the additional fact that their territory was within the sphere of English influence, no permanent Catholic mission was ever established within their limits, although several attempts were made, and large numbers were drawn off from the confederacy and formed into mission settlements under French control. So far as is known, the first missionary to enter this region was the Recollect father, Joseph de la Roche de Daillon, of the Huron mission in Ontario, who in 1626 made a perilous exploration of the country of the Neuter Nation, adjoining the Iroquois in western New York. In 1642 the heroic Jesuit, Isaac Jogues, was captured with two white companions and several Hurons by an Iroquois war party and taken to the Mohawk town of Caughnawaga (*alias* Ossernenon) near the present Auriesville, where the Hurons were burned at the stake, and the three Frenchmen cruelly tortured and mutilated, though not put to death. Father Jogues had his nails torn out, two fingers crushed by the teeth of the savages, and one thumb sawn off. One of his companions, the novice René

Goupil, was killed shortly afterwards for making the sign of the cross over a sick child. The third Frenchman, Couture, was finally adopted. After a terrible captivity of fifteen months during which he baptized many prisoners at the stake as well as dying infants, besides acquiring a knowledge of the language, Father Jogues was rescued by the Dutch and finally found his way to France. In the meantime another Huron missionary, Father Joseph Bressani, had been captured by the same Mohawks, tortured in even more terrible fashion at the same town, and likewise ransomed through the kindness of the Dutch (1644). In the summer of 1644 Father Jogues was back again in Canada, assisting in negotiating an uncertain peace with the Mohawks. In May, 1646, he was sent with a single white companion to the Mohawk country to consummate the agreement. This done, he returned to Canada to make his report, and then, with another Frenchman and a Huron guide, set out once more for the Mohawk to establish a mission. They were intercepted on the way by a war party of the same perfidious Mohawks, and carried to Caughnawaga, where, after various cruelties, all three were put to death on 18 October, 1646, the head of Father Jogues being set upon the palisades of the town, and his body thrown into the Mohawk River. The site of the Indian town is now the property of the Society of Jesus, and a memorial chapel marks the spot of their martyrdom.

In August, 1653, Father Joseph Poncet, S.J., was captured near Montreal by a Mohawk war party, carried to their towns, and there terribly tortured, but finally sent back with overtures of peace. Of the five confederated Iroquois tribes, the Onondaga, Oneida, and Cayuga were also now for peace with the French, and only the Seneca (who, however, nearly equalled all the others together) held back. Father Poncet reached Montreal late in the year, and peace was made. Father Simon Le Moyne, S.J., volunteered to go back to ratify the terms in the Iroquois towns, and arrived in the summer of 1654 at Onondaga, their capital, where he successfully effected his purpose and was invited to select a spot for a French settlement. As a result the Jesuit Fathers Joseph Chaumonot and Claude Dablon established the first Iroquois mission at Onondaga in November, 1654. In all the Iroquois tribes there were numerous Christian Huron captives (see Huron Indians), who gave the missionaries a warm welcome. In 1656 Father Le Moyne was again with the Mohawks. In July, 1655, a party of fifty French colonists with several more Jesuits arrived at Onondaga to found a settlement there, as requested by the Iroquois, although it was strongly felt that the latter were insincere and meditated treachery. Mission stations were established in each of the tribes, but almost before a year had passed the Iroquois raids along the St. Lawrence broke out afresh, and in March, 1658, the mission at Onondaga was abandoned.

Besides the Huron and other Indian captives, Christianity still had many friends among the Iroquois themselves, foremost of all being Garaconthié, the Onondaga chief and orator. Through his influence the Onondaga and Cayuga sought for peace in 1661, and Le Moyne was recalled to Onondaga. In 1666 an expedition under De Courcelles completely humbled the Mohawks. In the same year New York and the Iroquois country passed from Dutch to English control. Following the peace six Jesuit fathers (Jacques Fremin, Jean Pierron, Jacques Bruyas, Julien Garnier, Etienne de Carheil, and Pierre Milet) proceeded to the Iroquois, and, before the end of 1668, regular missions were established in each of the five tribes. Garaconthié publicly declared himself a Christian, and his example was followed by several other chiefs. As converts increased it was realized that the prevailing intemperance and debauchery consequent upon the presence of traders in the Indian towns were a serious obstacle to Christianity, and many of the better-disposed removed to the neighbourhood of the mission settlements in Canada. In this way originated in 1668 the Iroquois mission village of La Prairie (St. François Xavier des Prés), the precursor of the modern Caughnawaga (q. v.). Among the names prominently identified with the mission are those of Fathers Bruyas and Marcoux, Iroquois philologists; Father Lafitau, ethnologist and historian; and the sainted Indian girl, Catherine Tegakwitha. In the same year a Sulpician mission was established among some Christian Iroquois, chiefly Cayuga, Quinté Bay, at Lake Ontario; but after a few years it was absorbed by the Iroquois mission of The Mountain, established in 1676 on the island of Montreal by the Sulpicians. This mission was transferred in 1704 to the Sault au Recollet, north of Montreal, and in 1720 to its present site at Lake of Two Mountains (*alias* Oka, or Canasadaga), on the island of Montreal, a number of Algonquin sharing the village. Among the missionaries was Father Jean-André Cuoq, author of a number of works in the two languages, the most notable of which is a standard Iroquois dictionary.

With the withdrawal of the greater part of the Christian element to Canada and the renewal of war in 1687 all missionary effort in the Iroquois territory was finally abandoned, although Father Milet continued with the Oneida until 1694. In the war of 1687–99 Catholic Iroquois from the Canada missions fought beside the French against their heathen kindred of the confederacy.

At the request of the Iroquois a mission was reestablished at Onondaga and another among the Senecas in 1702 by the Jesuit fathers, Jacques de Lamberville, Julien Garnier, and Vaillant du Gueslis, and had the effect of holding the Iroquois neutral in the next war between France and England, until broken up by the New York Government in 1709. In 1748 the Sulpician father, François Picquet, established the Presentation mission on the St. Lawrence near the French post of Oswegatchie, now Ogdensburg, New York, with the design of drawing off the last remaining Catholic Indians from among the Iroquois. Although raided by the Mohawks in the next year, it was at once rebuilt and grew rapidly until the opening of the war of 1754–63, which brought it to the verge of ruin, most of those who remained joining with others from the Caughnawaga mission (Canada) in 1756 to establish a new settlement under Jesuit auspices at Aquasasne, *alias* St. François Régis, which still exists under the name of St. Regis, on both sides of the New York–Canada boundary where it strikes the St. Lawrence. The Oswegatchie settlement was finally abandoned in 1807. The Catholic Iroquois now number about 4025 out of a total 18,725, Caughnawaga itself with 2175 souls being the largest Indian settlement north of Mexico.

About 1755 the first mission in western Pennsylvania was started among the Delawares at Sawcunk, on Beaver River, where also were some Shawnee and Mingo (detached Iroquois), by the Jesuit Claude-François Virot, but was soon discontinued.

IV. Ohio River and Lake Region.—Under this head we include the states carved out in whole or part from the old "Northwestern Territory", viz., Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. As the mission history of this section is treated in detail under the principal tribal titles, we may confine ourselves here to a brief summary. Excepting southern Illinois and Indiana, all of this vast territory was originally included within the French jurisdiction of Canada, and up to the close of the French period in 1763 was confided generally to the spiritual charge of the Jesuits, who continued in the work into the American period. The first mission west of the Huron country was established in 1660, on Keweenaw Bay, a few miles north of the present L'Anse, Upper Michigan, by the veteran Huron missionary, Father René Menard, in

response to urgent requests from the Chippewas and Ottawas. The next year a call came from some fugitive Hurons, who had fled to Green Bay in Wisconsin, to escape the Iroquois. To the remonstrance of those who knew the dangers of the way he replied, "God calls me. I must go, if it cost me my life." In making a dangerous portage he became separated from his guides and was never seen again, but as the searchers came upon a hostile trail, and his Breviary and cassock were afterwards found with the Sioux, it is believed that he was killed by a lurking enemy. His place was filled by Father Claude Allouez, who, as vicar-general in the West, established the second Chippewa mission in 1665, under the name of Saint-Esprit at La Pointe Chegoimegon, now Bayfield, Wisconsin, on the south shore of Lake Superior. Other missions soon followed at Sault Sainte Marie (Sainte Marie) and Mackinaw (St. Ignace) in Upper Michigan; Green Bay (St-François Xavier), St. Marc, and St. Jacques in Wisconsin, among Chippewas, Ottawas, Hurons, Mascoutens, Kickapoos, Foxes, and Miami. Among the noted Jesuit workers were Fathers Claude Dablon, Gabriel Druillettes, and the explorer Jacques Marquette. In 1688 the mission of St. Joseph was founded by Allouez among the Potawatomi in northern Indiana. The mission at Lapointe was abandoned in 1671 on account of the hostile Sioux, but most of the others continued, with interruption, down to the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1764. In 1727 the Jesuit father, Louis Guignas, founded the mission of St. Michael among the Sioux, on Lake Pepin in Minnesota, which continued until some time after 1736, being abandoned probably on account of the war with the Foxes.

The first mission among the Illinois was that of the Immaculate Conception, founded by Marquette in 1674 near the present Rockford, Illinois, and known later as the Kaskaskia mission. Others were established later at Peoria Lake and at Cahokia, opposite St. Louis, until by 1725 the entire Illinois nation was enrolled as Christian. Among the Jesuit names prominently connected with the Illinois missions are those of Marquette, Rasle, and Jacques Gravier, author of the great manuscript Illinois dictionary.

Missions were also established later among the various branches of the Miami in Indiana as well as among the Potawatomi, which continued to flourish until the decree of expulsion, when the mission property was confiscated, although the Jesuits generally remained as secular priests until their death. Their successors continued to minister to Indians and whites alike till the removal of the tribes, 1820–40.

The majority of the Indians of Michigan and Wisconsin remained in their own homes, with missions maintained either as regular establishments or as visiting stations served by secular priests. Of the later missionaries one of the distinguished names is that of the author and philologist Bishop Frederick Baraga (d. 1865), best known for his grammar and dictionary of the Chippewa language. (See for more recent work, Chippewa Indians; Huron Indians; Illinois Indians; Kickapoo Indians; Mascoutens Indians; Menominee Indians; Miami Indians; Ottawa Indians; Potawatomi Indians; Sioux Indians; Winnebago Indians; Baraga; Gravier; Marquette, Diocese of; Marquette, Jacques.)

V. Lower Mississippi Region: The Louisiana Mission.—The "Louisiana Mission" of the French colonial period included the present States of Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama, with the Tamarois foundation near Cahokia in Illinois, but excluding the Caddo establishments on the disputed Spanish frontier of Texas. For several reasons, rivalries and changes among the religious orders, intrigues of English traders, and general neglect or open hostility of the Louisiana colonial administration, these southern missions never attained any large measure of prosperity or permanent success. In 1673 the Jesuit Marquette had descended the Mississippi as far as the villages of the Arkansas, later known as Quapaw, at the mouth of the river of the same name, making the earliest map of the region and indicating the position of the various tribes, but without undertaking a foundation.

In 1682 the Recollect Franciscan Father Zenobius Membré, with the party of the commander La Salle, descended the Mississippi to its mouth and returned, planting a cross among the Arkansas, and preaching to them and to the Taensa, Natches, and others farther down. In 1683 a French fort was built at the Arkansas, and the commander Tonty set apart a mission site and made formal request for a Jesuit missionary, but apparently without result.

In 1698, under authority of the Bishop of Quebec, the priests of the seminary of Quebec, an offshoot of the Paris Congregation of Foreign Missions, undertook the lower Mississippi field despite the protests of the Jesuits, who considered it partly at least within their own sphere. Early in 1699, three seminary priests having arrived, as many missions were established, viz., among the Tamaroa (Tamarois), a tribe of the Illinois confederacy, at Cahokia, Illinois, by Father Jean-François de St-Cosme; among the Taensa, above the present Natchez, Mississippi, by François-J. de Montigny; and among the Tonica, at the present Fort Adams, Mississippi, by Father Antoine Davion. Father de Montigny shortly afterwards transferred his mission to the kindred and more important Natchez tribe, about the present city of that name, ministering thus to both tribes. Father Davion laboured also with the Yazoo and minor tribes on that river. Other priests of the same society arrived later. In the meantime Iberville, the father of the Louisiana colony, had brought out from France (1700) the Jesuit father, Paul du Ru, who, first at Biloxi, Mississippi, and later at Mobile, Alabama, ministered to the small tribes gathered about the French post, including a band of fugitive Apalachee from the revived Florida mission. In the same year another Jesuit, Father Joseph de Limoges, from Canada, planted a mission among the Huma and Bayagula, Choctaw bands about the mouth of Red River, Louisiana.

In 1702 Father Nicholas Foucault, of the Seminarists, who had established a mission among the Arkansas two years before, was murdered, with three companions, by the savage Koroa of Upper Mississippi while on his way to Mobile. Their remains were found and interred by Father Davion. In 1706 Father St-Cosme, then stationed at the Natchez mission, was murdered by the Shetimasha, near the mouth of the Mississippi, while asleep in a night camp.

The Tonica station was abandoned in 1708, being threatened by the Chickasaw in the English interest. The whole southern work languished, the Indians themselves being either indifferent or openly hostile to Christianity, and when Father Charlevoix made his western tour in 1721 he found but one priest on the lower Mississippi, Father Juif, among the Yazoo. Partly in consequence of Father Charlevoix's report, the Louisiana Company, which had taken over control of the colony, gave permission to the Jesuits to undertake the Indian work, while the French posts and settlements were assigned to other priests. In 1726, therefore, Father Paul du Poisson restored the Arkansas mission, which had been vacant since 1702; Father Alexis de Guyenne undertook the Alibamon, a tribe of the Creek nation, above Mobile, and Father Mathurin le Petit began work among the Choctaw in southern Mississippi. The Ursuline convent foundation at New Orleans in 1727 is due to Jesuit effort. In the next year the Jesuit father, Michel Baudouin, undertook a mission among the warlike Chickasaw.

In 1729 the southern missions were almost ruined by the outbreak of war with the Natchez, provoked by the arbitrary exactions of the French commandant in

their country. The war began on 28 November with a massacre of the French garrison, the first victim being Father du Poisson, who was struck down, and his head hacked off, while on his way to attend a dying man. Father Souel was killed on 11 December by the Yazoo, who then turned upon the French garrison in their country. On New Year's Day, 1730, the Jesuit Father Doutreleau, on his way down the river with some boatmen, was fired upon at close range by some of the same tribe while saying Mass on shore, but escaped although badly wounded. The war involved the whole lower Mississippi, and ended in the extinction of the Natchez as a people. A part of the refugees having fled to the Chickasaw, a war ensued with that tribe in 1736, during which a French expedition was cut to pieces, and the Jesuit chaplain, Father Antoninus Senat, was burnt at the stake.

In 1730 Father Gaston, a newly-arrived Seminarist, had been killed at the Tamarois (Cahokia) mission. In 1754 the last Seminarist was sent out as a parish priest. The Arkansas mission had been killed by official neglect. The missionary among the Alibamon Creeks was driven out by the French commander at Fort Toulouse (Montgomery, Alabama) for his opposition to the liquor traffic. Father Baudouin continued with good effect among the Choctaw for eighteen years until appointed vicar-general in 1757, when his place was filled by Father Nicholas le Febvre until 1764(?). The Alibamon mission was restored and continued under Father Jean Le Prédour from 1754 until the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1764, which brought the "Louisiana Mission" to a close. The Natchez and Yazoo are long since extinct, but a considerable portion of the Choctaw, Quapaw, and mixed-blood Huma still keep the Faith. (See also CADDO INDIANS; CHOCTAW INDIANS; NATCHEZ, DIOCESE OF; QUAPAW INDIANS; TONICA INDIANS; YAZOO INDIANS.)

VI. NORTHERN AND CENTRAL PLAINS.—The earliest labourer here was the Franciscan Father Juan de Padilla, who with four others of his order accompanied the famous expedition of Coronado in 1540–42, and on the return volunteered to remain behind with the Wichita in the "Province of Quivira", probably in southern Kansas. He was killed soon afterwards, apparently by Indians hostile to the Wichita. The latter, reduced to about 300 souls, are represented at the Catholic mission school at Anadarko, Oklahoma (see WICHITA).

The powerful Sioux, or Dakota, whose territory stretched from the Wisconsin border almost to the foot of the Rocky Mountains, were visited by the Jesuit Allouez as early as 1666, but tribal jealousies interrupted friendly communication and prevented any mission establishment. In 1680 the Recollect Franciscan, Father Louis Hennepin, spent some months with them as a captive on the upper Mississippi. In 1690 (?) the Jesuit Father Joseph Marest, and in 1728 the Jesuit Father Ignatius Guignas, made unsuccessful mission attempts in the tribe, and in 1736 the Jesuit Father Jean-Pierre Aulneau (or Amand) was one of a party of twenty-one Frenchmen massacred by them on the Lake of the Woods, just beyond the northern Minnesota boundary. In 1837 a regular mission was established among the eastern Sioux in Minnesota by Father Augustin Ravoux, and in 1848 the noted Jesuit missionary Father de Smet first preached to those west of the Missouri. Nearly one-fourth of the tribe is now Catholic (see SIOUX INDIANS).

The famous Flathead mission in Montana, established by Father de Smet in 1840, the Osage mission, Oklahoma, regularly established about 1847 by the Jesuit Fathers Schoenmaker and Bax, the Kiowa and Quapaw missions, and those among the immigrant Choctaw, Potawatomi, and Miami, also in Oklahoma, those of the Winnebago in Nebraska and the Mandan and associated tribes in North Dakota are all described elsewhere under the tribal titles. Besides these, successful mission schools have been established within the past thirty years, and are now in operation, among the Northern Cheyenne (secular), Assiniboin (Jesuit), Crow (Jesuit), Grosventre (Jesuit), and Piegan Blackfeet (Jesuit) in Montana; the Arapaho and Shoshoni (Jesuit) in Wyoming; and the Southern Ute (Theatine) in Colorado (see UTE INDIANS).

VII. TEXAS, ETC.—Texas as a Spanish colony was connected with Mexico, and was ruled in missionary affairs from Querétaro and Zacatecas, instead of from Havana, as was Florida. Its immense area, four times as great as that of all New England, contained hundreds of petty tribes or bands—so many, in fact, that they have never been counted—speaking scores of languages or dialects, but mostly grouped into a few loose confederacies, based upon linguistic affiliation, of which the principal within the mission sphere may be designated as the Caddo, Hasinai, Karankawa, Tonkawa, Wichita, and Pakawá. Of these, the Caddo group extended into western Louisiana, while the tribes of the Wichita connexion ranged north into Kansas. The total Indian population within the present state limits was probably originally close to 40,000. The beginning of mission work in Texas was made by the Franciscan Father Andrés de Olmos, who in 1544 crossed the Rio Grande and, after gathering a large body of converts, led them back into Tamaulipas, where they were organized into a mission town, Olives. In 1685 the French commander La Salle erected a fort on Matagorda Bay, and two years later, after a succession of misfortunes, started to make his way overland to Illinois, leaving behind about twenty men, including the Recollect missionaries, Fathers Zenobius Membré and Maximus Le Clercq, and the Sulpician Father Chefdeville. A Spanish expedition which arrived later to dispossess the French found only blackened ruins and unburied bones. All but two men had been killed by the Indians, among whom the chalices and Breviaries of the murdered priests were afterwards recovered.

In 1690 a company of Spanish Franciscans from the Querétaro College, headed by Father Damian Mazanet, established a mission among the friendly Hasinai (Asinais, Cenis), in north-east Texas, and projected others, but the work was abandoned three years later. In 1699 the Franciscans of the Zacatecas College began a series of missions along the south bank of the Rio Grande, to which they gathered in a number of Indians of the Pakawá group in southern Texas. These were kept up until 1718, when the chief mission was transferred to San Antonio in Texas.

In 1715 the two colleges combined to restore the Texas missions, urged by the zeal of the venerable founder of the Zacatecas college, Father Antonio Margil. The Hasinai mission (San Francisco) was restored and another, La Purísima, established among the cognate Hainai (Aynais) in the neighbourhood of the present Nacogdoches. Another (N. S. de Guadalupe) was founded by Margil himself among the Nacogdoches band of the Caddo in 1716, and others in 1717 among the Ais (N. S. de Dolores) and Adai or Adayes (San Miguel de Linares), the last being within the limits of Louisiana. In 1719, war having been declared between France and Spain, a French expedition under St-Denis plundered the mission at the Adai. In consequence the missions were abandoned until peace was declared two years later.

In 1718 the mission of San Francisco Solano was transferred to San Antonio de Valero. Other missions were established in the vicinity, making a total of four in 1731, including San Antonio de Padua, the celebrated Alamo. The principal tribes represented were Caddo and Hasinai from the East; Xarame from the Rio Grande; Pakawá (Pacoa) and a few Tońkawa of the immediate neighbourhood. In the meantime a lay brother had perished in a prairie fire, and another, Brother Jose Pita, in 1721, with a small party, had been massacred by the Lipan while on his way to his

station. In 1722 the mission of Guadalupe was established at Bahia, on Lavaca (Matagorda) Bay among the Karankawa. Nine years later it was moved to the Guadalupe River. In 1752 the Candelaria mission was attacked by the Coco, a Karankawa band, and Father José Ganzabal killed. In 1757 the mission of San Sabá was established by Father Alonso Terreros for the conversion of the wild and nomadic Lipan Apache, but they refused to settle in it; the following year the tribes destroyed the mission, killing Father Terreros and two other priests. Another attempted Lipan mission, in 1761, was broken up in 1769 by the Comanche. At this period the Texas missions had reached their highest point, with an Indian population of about 15,000. In 1760 Father Bartolomé García published his religious manual for the use of the San Antonio missions, which remains almost our only linguistic monument of the Pakawá tribes of central Texas. In 1791 another mission was established among the Karankawa.

Although constantly hampered by the Spanish authorities, the missions continued to exist until 1812, when they were suppressed by the revolutionary Government, and the Indians scattered (see PAKAWÁ INDIANS; TONKAWA INDIANS; WICHITA).

VIII. NEW MEXICO AND ARIZONA.—The earliest exploration in this territory was made by the Franciscan Marco de Niza (Marcos of Nizza) in 1539, and the first missions were undertaken in 1542 by the Franciscans who accompanied Coronado. (For the missions among the Pueblo and Hopi see PUEBLO INDIANS.) The most important event in this connexion is the great Pueblo revolt of 1680 in which twenty-one missionaries and some 400 others were massacred.

The missions among the Pima and Papajo of Arizona are of later foundation, beginning about 1732, and originated with the Jesuits, with whom they continued until the expulsion of the order in 1767, when they were taken over by the Franciscans (see PAPAJO INDIANS; PIMA INDIANS).

Attempts to evangelize the powerful tribe of the Navajo in northern Arizona and New Mexico were made by the Franciscans as early as 1746, but without result. Lately the work has been again taken up successfully by German Franciscans. To their scholarship and scientific interest we owe also a monumental "Ethnological Dictionary of the Navaho Language". (See NAVAJO INDIANS.) Secular mission work is also now conducted in the Mescalero tribe of about 450 souls at Tularosa, New Mexico.

IX. THE COLUMBIA REGION.—The first knowledge of Christianity among the tribes of this region came through the Catholic Iroquois and Canadian French employees of the Hudson Bay Company, by whose influence and teaching many of the Indians, particularly among the Flatheads and Nez Percés, were induced to embrace the principles and practices of Catholicism as early as 1820, leading some years later to a request for missionaries, in response to which the Flathead mission in Montana was founded by the Jesuit Father Peter de Smet in 1841, followed shortly afterwards by another among the Cœur d'Alêne in Idaho, established by the Jesuit Father Nicholas Point. In 1839 Father Francis Blanchet, secular, who had come out to attend the Canadian residents, established St. Francis Xavier mission on the Cowlitz, in western Washington, and another on the lower Willamet at Champoeg, Oregon, while about the same time Father J. B. Bolduc began work among the tribes on Puget Sound. In 1844 three Jesuit missions were established among the Pend d'Oreilles and Colvilles of the Upper Columbia, besides three others across the British line. In 1847 the Oblates arrived, and missions were established by Father Pandosy among the Yakima and by Father Ricard near the present Olympia. In 1848 the secular Fathers Rousseau and Mesplée founded a station among the Wasco, at the Dalles of the Columbia, in Oregon. Work was also attempted among the degenerate Chinooks, with little result. The noted Oblate missionary, Father Casimir Chirouse (d. 1892), best known for his later work at Tulalip, reached Oregon in 1847 and began his labours among the tribes of Puget Sound and the lower Columbia about the same period.

With the exception of the Wasco and the Chinooks, these missions or their successors are still in successful operation, numbering among their adherents the majority of the Christian Indians of Washington and southern Idaho. To Fathers Saintonge and Pandosy we are indebted for important contributions to Yakima linguistics. (See CHINOOKS; KALISPEL INDIANS; KUTENAI INDIANS; LAKE INDIANS; LUMMI INDIANS; PUYALLUP INDIANS; SPOKAN INDIANS; TULALIP INDIANS; YAKIMA INDIANS.)

Besides these there are Jesuit missions of more recent establishment among the Nez Percés of Idaho; and among the Umatilla, Klamath, Warmspring, and Siletz Indians in Oregon, besides another among the remnant tribes of Grand Ronde reservation, Oregon, served by a priest of the Society of the Divine Saviour. (See SILETZ INDIANS; UMATILLA INDIANS; WARMSPRING INDIANS; YAMHILL INDIANS.)

X. CALIFORNIA.—For the mission history see CALIFORNIA; and MISSION INDIANS.

For a statement of the present organization of Indian mission work and the sources and methods of financial support, see article INDIAN MISSIONS, BUREAU OF CATHOLIC.

XI. THE MISSIONARY MARTYRS.—The following incomplete and tentative list of missionaries who died by violence or other untimely death in direct connexion with their work will show that even before the establishment of the republic the soil of the United States had been baptized in the blood of Catholic missionaries from ocean to ocean. A few other names are included for special reasons. Those who perished with the exploring expeditions under Narváez, De Soto, and others are not noted.

1542 Padilla, Juan de, Franciscan, killed in Kansas(?).
Escalona, Brother Luis de, Franciscan, killed by Pecos, New Mexico.
La Cruz, Juan de, Franciscan, killed by Tigua, New Mexico.
1549 Cancer, Luis, Dominican, killed by Calusa, Florida.
Tolosa, Diego de, Dominican, killed by Calusa, Florida.
Fuentes, Brother, killed by Calusa, Florida.
1566 Martínez, Pedro, Jesuit, killed by Yamasee, Georgia.
1569(?) Báez, Brother Dom. Agustín, Jesuit, died of fever, with Yamasee, Florida.
1571 Segura, Juan Bautista
Quiros, Luis de
Gómez, Brother Gabriel (novice)
1571 Zerallos, Brother Sancho de (novice)
Solis, Brother
Méndez, Brother
Redondo, Brother
Linares, Brother
} Jesuits, killed by Powhatan, Virginia.
1581 López, Francisco, Franciscan, killed at Tigua, New Mexico.
Santa María, Juan de
Rodríguez (or Ruiz), Brother Agustín
} Franciscans, killed at Tigera, New Mexico.
1597 Corpa, Pedro de
Rodríguez, Blas
Auñon, Miguel de
Velasco, Francisco de
Badajóz, Brother Antonio
} Franciscans, killed by Yamasee, Georgia and Florida.
1613 Du Thet, Brother Gilbert, Jesuit, killed by the English, Maine.

1631 Miranda de Avila, Pedro, Franciscan, killed by Taos, New Mexico.
1632 Letrado, Francisco } Franciscans, killed by
Arvide, Martin de, } "Zipias", New Mexico.
1633 Porras, Francisco, Franciscan, poisoned by Hopi, Arizona.
1642 Goupil, René (novice), Jesuit, killed by Mohawks, New York.
1644 Bressani, Joseph, Jesuit, tortured by Mohawks, but rescued, New York.
1646 Jogues, Isaac, Jesuit, killed by Mohawks, New York.
1653 Poncet, Joseph, Jesuit, tortured by Mohawks, but rescued, New York.
1657 Eight Franciscans drowned, *en route* Florida missions to Havana.
1661 Menard, René, Jesuit, lost, supposed killed by Sioux, Wisconsin.
1675 "Several missionaries", Franciscans (record incomplete), killed by Pueblos; New Mexico.
1675 Marquette, Jacques, Jesuit, died in woods, Michigan.
1680 La Ribourde, Gabriel de, Recollect, killed by Kickapoos, Illinois.
1680 Twenty-two Franciscans killed in general massacre by revolted Pueblos, New Mexico, and Arizona, viz.:
Talaban, Juan
Lorenzana, Francisco Antonio de
Montes de Oca, (Juan?) José de
} Santo Domingo Pueblo, New Mexico.
Pio, Juan Bautista de, Tesuque Pueblo, New Mexico.
Torres, Tomas, Nambe Pueblo, New Mexico.
Morales, Luis de
Pro, Antonio Sánchez de
Baeza, Luis de
} San Ildefonso Pueblo, New Mexico.
Rendon, Matias de, Picuris Pueblo, New Mexico.
Mora, Antonio
Pedrosa, Juan de
} Taos Pueblo, New Mexico.
Maldonado, Lucas, Acoma Pueblo, New Mexico.
Bal, Juan de, Alona (Zuñi) Pueblo, New Mexico.
Figueras, José de
Trujillo, José
Espeleta, José de
Santa María, Agustín de
} Hopi Pueblos, Arizona.
Bernal, Juan (*custos*)
Vera, Juan Domingo de
} Galisteo (Tano) Pueblo, New Mexico.
Velasco, Francisco (Fernando?), de, Pecos Pueblo, New Mexico.
Tinoco, Manuel, San Marcos Pueblo, New Mexico.
Jesus, Simon (Juan?) de, Jemes Pueblo, New Mexico.
1683 (*circa*) Beltran, Manuel, Franciscan, killed by Tanos(?), New Mexico.
1687 Membré, Zenobius, Recollect,
Le Clercq, Maximus, Recollect,
Chefdeville,——, Sulpician,
} killed by Karankawa(?), Texas.
1696 ——, ——, Franciscan, by Ais(?) (Tororo), killed Florida.
1696 Arbizu, José de
Carbonel, Antonio
} Franciscan, killed by Taos, New Mexico.
Corvera, Francisco
Moreno, Antonio
} Franciscans, killed by Tehua, New Mexico.
Casañes, Francisco, Franciscan, killed by Jemes, New Mexico.
1702 Foucault, Nicholas, Sem. For. Missions, killed, by Koroa, Mississippi.
1704 Parga, Juan de
Mendoza, Manuel de
Delgado, Marcos
Miranda, Angel
} Franciscans, tortured and killed by English and Indian allies, Florida.
1706 Delhalle, Nicholas, B.C., Recollect (parish priest, Detroit), killed by Ottawa, Michigan.
St-Cosme, Jean-François de, Sem. For. Missions, killed by Shetimasha, Louisiana.
1708 Gravier, Jacques, Jesuit, died of wound inflicted by Illinois (1705), Illinois.
1715 (*circa*) Vatier, Léonard, Recollect, killed by Foxes, Wisconsin.
1718 Mantesdoca (Mantes de Oca), Brother Luis de, Franciscan, killed in prairie fire, Texas.
1720 (*circa*) Mingües, Juan, Franciscan, killed in massacre by Missouri, Missouri (?).
1721 Pita, Brother José, Franciscan, killed in massacre by Lipan, Texas.
1724 Rasle (Rasles, Râle), Sebastien, Jesuit, killed by English and Indian allies, Maine.
1729 du Poisson, Paul, Jesuit, killed by Natches, Mississippi.
Souel, Jean, Jesuit, killed by Yazoo, Mississippi.
1730 Gaston,——, Sem. For. Missions, killed by Illinois, Illinois.
1736 Senat, Antoninus, Jesuit, tortured and burned with whole party by Chickasaw, Mississippi.
Aulneau (Arnaud), Jean-Pierre, Jesuit, killed with twenty others in massacre by Sioux, on Massacre Island, Lake of Woods, about two miles beyond the Minnesota-Canada line.
1752 Ganzabal, José Francisco, Franciscan, held by Coco (Karankawa), Texas.
1758 (*circa*) Silva, ——, Franciscan, killed by mission Indians, Texas.
Terreros, Alonso G. de, Franciscan,
Santiesteban, José, Franciscan.
} killed in massacre at San Sabá, by mission Indians, Texas.
1775 Jayme, Luis, Franciscan, killed by Diegueño, California.
1780 Díaz, Juan
Morena, Matias
Garces, Francisco
Barraneche, Juan
} Franciscans, killed by Yuma, California.
1812 Quintana, Andrés, Franciscan, killed by Mission Indians, California.
1833 Díaz, ——, killed by Caddo(?), Texas.

Bancroft, histories, *California, Oregon, Washington, New Mexico, Arizona*, etc. (San Francisco, 1886–90); Barcia, *Ensayo Cronológico* (Madrid, 1723); *Bureau Cath. Ind. Missions*, annual reports (Washington); *Jesuit Relations*, ed. Thwaites (73 vols., Cleveland, 1896–1901); Morice, *Catholic Church in Western Canada* (2 vols., Montreal, 1910); Parkman, *Jesuits in North America* (Boston, 1867); Idem, *Pioneers of France* (Boston, 1883); Shea, *Catholic Missions* (New York, 1855); Idem, *Catholic Church in Colonial Days* (New York, 1886); also authorities under cross-referenced articles.

James Mooney.

Missions, Catholic Parochial.—This term is used to designate certain special exertions of the Church's pastoral agencies, made, for the most part, among Catholics, to instruct them more fully in the truths of their religion, to convert sinners, rouse the torpid and indifferent, and lift the good to a still higher plane of spiritual effort. To distinguish them from those missions which represent the apostolic activity of the Church among pagans and heretics, these home missions are known in some communities of English-speaking Catholics as "parochial missions". Such missions usually consist of a systematic course of preaching and instruction, extending over a stated number of days, performed by authorized missionaries. The present article treats of: I. The Necessity and Utility of Popular Missions; II. Origin and History; III. Method.

I. Necessity and Utility.—From the above definition it is evident that the primary object of a popular mission is not the making of converts to the Faith. However, owing to the familiar relations between Catholics and non-Catholics in the United States, this is so common a result that it may be regarded as normally a part of the work in that country, and, beginning from the last decade of the nineteenth century, an

organized missionary movement for the conversion of non-Catholics has been carried on throughout that country. (See MISSIONARY SOCIETY OF ST. PAUL THE APOSTLE.) But the converts whom a pastor most of all seeks during a regular parish mission are among his own people. And it cannot be denied that the clear, forcible, and consecutive exposition of the most important truths of salvation, together with a course of instructions to prepare the people for the worthy reception of the sacraments and enlighten them on the duties of their daily lives, affords a powerful means to renovate a parish spiritually. Everyone finds in these sermons and instructions something that appeals peculiarly to him, and is likely to bear fruit in the future. These missions are for the laity what retreats are for the clergy and religious communities. In fact they are an adaptation to the needs and capacities of the faithful of the spiritual exercises long traditional in the Church, and made use of especially during the Ages of Faith when people were in the habit of retiring to monasteries to devote themselves for a certain period of time to that renewal in the spirit of their mind, which the Apostle recommends: "And be renewed in the spirit of your mind: and put on the new man, who according to God is created in justice and holiness of truth" (Eph., iv, 23, 24). In view, then, of the many benefits that accrue from a retreat, it is no exaggeration to say that, in the ordinary course of Divine Providence, a mission is the greatest grace that God can confer upon any parish. "There is nothing", says St. Alphonsus, "that is better adapted than missions or retreats to enlighten the minds of men, to purify corrupt hearts and to lead all to the exercise of a truly Christian life".

The usefulness of missions, moreover, for the sanctification and salvation of souls has received not a little recognition from various popes during the last two centuries. Paul III recommended the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius as "full of piety and sanctity and very useful and salutary for the edification and spiritual advancement of the faithful". Benedict XIV, after comparing missionaries to those whom the Apostles Peter and Andrew called to assist them in landing their nets, says that for "purifying corrupt morals . . . nothing is more effective than to solicit the aid of others, namely to establish everywhere (that is in every diocese) sacred missions. Nor can this be called a new and uncertain remedy which is proposed for purifying the morals of the people. It is an old one and indeed the only one suitably adapted to cure existing evils, one which many bishops have employed in their dioceses with extraordinary results" ("Gravissimum", 8 Sept., 1745). Pius VI condemned the proposition of those who called missions an empty noise with at most a transient effect (Auct. Fid., prop. 65). Leo XII granted a plenary indulgence to the missions given by the Fathers of the Society of Jesus. Gregory XVI extended this indulgence to the sick who could not attend the missions, but complied with the required conditions at their homes; and in 1834 the same pontiff extended it to all missions, irrespective of the orders to which the missionaries belonged. In 1849 Pius IX wrote to the bishops of Italy urging the work of spiritual exercises and missions, declaring them very useful for fostering piety and exciting confirmed sinners to repentance ("Nostris", 8 Dec., 1849); and he made this appeal again to the bishops of Austria in the "Singulari quidem", 17 March, 1856.

The mission is an appeal to the intellect and the will. The general end to be obtained is the enlightenment of the former and the movement and elevation of the latter. The necessity of these are apparent. It is the experience of missionaries that, owing to the pressing material necessities of modern life, much ignorance prevails among the Catholic laity as a class in matters pertaining to their religion. It is true, there is no dearth of good reading matter whereby the deficiencies of religious education might to some extent be supplied, but it is equally true that such reading is sadly neglected. To supply this defect is one of the aims of the mission. The missionary comes to instruct, to present the truths of salvation clearly, forcibly, consecutively, and in such language as shall reach the entire audience. The end of man, the need of grace, the Divine Attributes, the essential parts of the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist, and the conditions required for their worthy reception; matrimony, the laws of the Church governing it, and the right way of preparing for it and entering it—such are some familiar themes of the mission. In times like the present, and in the social conditions of modern life, the ordinary "cure of souls" hardly suffices to protect souls against the deadly influences of constant friction with a materialistic world, and against the all-pervading atmosphere of sensuality and worldliness. Passing their lives face to face with extraordinary spiritual perils, Catholics in the twentieth century need the extraordinary succour and protection which are furnished only by the mission. Thus the instructions given to the intelligences of the faithful at a mission are of no less importance than the sermons which are addressed to their wills. The duties and responsibilities of parents towards their children, and of children towards their parents, the mutual obligations of employers and employed, as the Church views them, are by no means to be taken for granted as fully grasped even by the more intelligent among average well-meaning Catholics.

Here, lastly, it is important to note one vital purpose which the parochial, or popular, mission serves in many dioceses of the United States. With a rapidly increasing Catholic population, the organization of new parishes is a frequent necessity. It is not assumed by any means that the majority of the faithful are grievous sinners, nor do the diocesan clergy lose sight of the truth that the popular mission is no less efficacious for making the good better, and stimulating further effort on the part of those who are already willing, than for reclaiming those who have taken the broad path of evil. In this view, it is the common practice to commence the life of a new parish with a mission conducted by priests of some specially chosen missionary institute. In such a mission the fervour of the new parishioners is not only increased, but effectively applied to the purpose of solidifying and organizing their corporate religious life. One chief means to this end is the erection of pious confraternities for which the mission affords opportunity. Thus the League of the Sacred Heart, the Holy Name Society, the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin, or the Rosary Confraternity becomes at the very outset the instrument of incalculable spiritual benefit, and a fulcrum by means of which the efforts of the new pastor attain more than double the results which might otherwise have been expected of them.

II. ORIGIN AND HISTORY.—In substance, missions are coeval with Christianity. The Founder of the Church was also its first missionary. His life was a missionary life, "teaching daily in the temple", "preaching to the multitude from the ship", and, at the close of His life's work, entrusting its continuation to His Apostles—"Going therefore, teach ye all nations; . . . Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt., xxviii. 19, 20). Obedient to this injunction, the history of the Church has become a history of missionary activity, whether by it be understood the prolonged missionary labour among heathen tribes, or the exercise of regular mission work among the faithful.

It is true that until the beginning of the seventeenth century there existed no organized form of popular missionary work exactly as it is now understood. But even in the early ages of the Church we find such eminent saints and doctors as the two Gregories (of Nazi-

anzus and of Nyssa), Basil, and Chrysostom, Ambrose, Leo, Augustine, and Gregory the Great making special efforts on special occasions to strengthen faith and foster piety by extraordinary series of instructions, exhortations, and devotions. The good work of the wandering Celtic missionaries in the sixth and seventh centuries—e. g., Sts. Columbanus, Gall, Kilian, Fridolin—may also be taken as, in some sense, an early type of the popular mission. Sts. Bernard, Peter Damian, Peter the Hermit, and the other great preachers of the Crusades were eminent popular missionaries, and their appeals to the Christian zeal of Europe were splendid instances of popular missions adapted to the conditions of the age. With the rise of the mendicant orders began a new era in the history of missionary endeavour. The Dominicans and Franciscans were popular missionaries in the truest sense of the word. They went from town to town preaching to the people everywhere, in the public places as well as in the churches. They preached chiefly to the masses, the poor people, using simple, unadorned language. As a consequence, the people followed them in crowds, drawn by their simple eloquence. Their strict rule of life and renunciation exercised during the Middle Ages a most salutary social influence over the enslaved and unprivileged classes of the population. In the fourteenth century we have the eminent Dominican preachers, Tauler and Henry Suso; in the fifteenth, St. Vincent Ferrer and Savonarola; in the sixteenth, Louis of Granada. The acme of Franciscan preaching was reached by the Observants in the fifteenth century, especially in Italy and Germany. Famous popular missionaries of the Franciscan Order were Sts. Bernardine of Siena, John Capistran, and Peter of Alcantara. By the middle of the sixteenth century the Society of Jesus took up this work. St. Ignatius combatted chiefly the errors of the Reformers. In 1592 the Ven. César de Bus (q. v.) founded the "Prêtres seculiers de la doctrine chrétienne", a congregation devoting itself entirely to the work of catechizing and preaching the Christian doctrine.

All these saints, religious institutes, and preachers may be said to have represented the work of popular missions in its rudimentary form. That work was not reduced to a system until the foundation of the Congregation of Priests of the Mission early in the seventeenth century by St. Vincent de Paul. The circumstances which led to St. Vincent's taking up this work, together with a full account of his institute (commonly called the Lazarists) and its methods, will be found under MISSIONS, CONGREGATION OF PRIESTS OF THE. The holy enterprise of St. Vincent de Paul had France for its birthplace; in Italy, a century later (1732), St. Alphonsus founded his congregation (see REDEEMER, CONGREGATION OF THE MOST HOLY). Their primary occupation is the apostolic ministry in the preaching of missions and retreats to all classes of Catholics, but especially to the most neglected. The congregation spread rapidly throughout Europe. About one hundred years later Venerable Gaspar Bufalo (d. 1837) founded in Rome the Congregation of the Most Precious Blood (see PRECIOUS BLOOD, CONGREGATION OF THE MOST), to devote itself exclusively to parochial mission work. The causes which have led to the rapid diffusion of this newly organized mission work in the last three centuries are not far to seek. Owing to the changed conditions, intellectual, social, as well as religious, the older style of popular preaching had become inadequate to the exigencies of the age. The increasing number of sects with itinerant representatives, and a corresponding spread of religious indifference, called for specially organized effort on the part of the Church.

The work, once begun, was soon taken up by other orders whose primary end was different. Notable among these were the Jesuits, who were the foremost labourers in the field, the Dominicans, Franciscans, Capuchins. The apostolic labours of these missionaries were everywhere blessed with remarkable success. In France, the birthplace of popular missions, the Lazarists and the Jesuits were the pioneers of a missionary activity which stirred up the faithful to greater zeal and devotion in every part of the country. Other orders and congregations gradually came to their assistance, and, though there was a slight falling off in this respect during the period of the French Revolution, yet, in the reign of Napoleon I, the emperor himself arranged for missions in the dioceses of Troyes, Poitiers, La Rochelle, and Metz, to be conducted at the expense of the Government. After the Restoration in 1815, a new impetus was given to missionary work by the Abbé Forbin-Janson, who, with his friend the Abbé de Rauzan, founded the Missionaires de France, and by Charles de Mazenod, who founded the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, at Marseilles, in 1815. In Germany parochial missions had been given sporadically, chiefly by the Jesuits and the Redemptorists, before 1848; after that date they became more general. The bishops everywhere encouraged and urged them. The Cardinal Archbishop of Mechlin, in 1843, maintained that the people of every parish are entitled, at least *ex caritate*, to have the benefit of a mission. During this period the German Church could pride itself on many eminent missionaries—Redemptorists, Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans—who devoted themselves entirely to popular mission work: the names of Fathers Roh, Klinkhofström, Pottgieser, and others are still held in benediction. On the expulsion of the Jesuits, Redemptorists and other orders from the German Empire, in 1872, there was a short interruption, but the work was soon taken up and carried on with the richest results by the congregations which had been permitted to remain. The Redemptorists, on their return in 1894, entered the field with renewed vigour.

In Italy systematic mission work was introduced by the Lazarists during the lifetime of their founder. With the rise of the Redemptorists, the Passionists, the Fathers of the Precious Blood, and several other congregations, the work spread rapidly over the entire peninsula, and, in spite of the disturbances of the nineteenth century, popular missions have flourished there. In Austria they developed during the reign of Maria Theresa, but under her successor, Joseph II, missions were to a great extent prohibited, and missionaries banished. The Redemptorists were recalled, but could labour only on condition of submitting to official persecution. It was only after the Revolution of 1848 had spent itself that the Redemptorists, Jesuits, Capuchins, and Franciscans could carry on the work of missions unmolested, especially in Bohemia and the Tyrol, in Westphalia, Bavaria, and Würtemberg. On the expulsion of the Jesuits and Redemptorists, missions were again prohibited. Later, however, Capuchins and Franciscans took up the work, and diocesan priests also entered the field as missionaries and directors of retreats. In 1786, St. Clement Mary Hofbauer, second founder of the Redemptorists, with his friend Thadäus Hübl, founded a house of the congregation in Warsaw, where King Stanislaus Poniatowski placed the German national church of St. Benno at their disposal. The labours of St. Clement and his companions at Warsaw from 1786 to 1808 were crowned with extraordinary success.

After the death of St. Alphonsus, his missionaries evangelized the deserted Catholics in the Russian Provinces of Courland and Livonia, on the invitation of Monsignor Saluzzo, Apostolic Nuncio in Poland. In Belgium and in Holland the missionary spirit has, with one or two slight interruptions, always been active. The Lazarists laboured in Great Britain as early as 1640, and until the penal laws made organized mission work impossible. It was not until about 1850 that the work was effectively begun in that country. In Ireland, missions were recommended by national and

provincial synods—e. g., by the Plenary Synod of Thurles, in 1850; by the Synods of Cashel, 1853, and of Tuam, 1854, and the Plenary Synod of Maynooth, 1875. In England they were recommended by the Provincial Council of Westminster, in 1852, and again in 1859; in Scotland by the Plenary Council of 1886. The Plenary Council of Australia, held at Sydney in 1885, and, in Canada, the Provincial Council of Quebec, in 1863, strongly urged parochial missions.

In the United States there was no systematic popular missionary work until about 1860, though missions had been given earlier. The Lazarist Fathers arrived in 1816, the Redemptorists in 1832, and the Passionists in 1852; but, although missions and spiritual retreats are the special work of these congregations, the scarcity of priests in this country compelled them at first to postpone such work to the ordinary spiritual wants of a scattered population. In 1839 Gregory XVI sent the Abbé Forbin-Janson on a missionary tour through the United States, where, for two years, he gave missions to the people and retreats to the clergy, bringing the faithful to the sacraments in numbers which since then have scarcely been equalled. In the Second Provincial Council of Cincinnati (1858), the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (1866), and the Tenth Provincial Council of Baltimore (1869), parochial missions are strongly recommended. Among the more active missionaries of this period, Fathers Smarius, Weninger, Damen, D. Young, O.P., and Hewit are still gratefully remembered.

With the increase in the number of priests, the parochial mission has, during the last century, become an extremely influential element in the life of the Catholic Church in the United States. Besides the Lazarists, Redemptorists, and Passionists already mentioned, Dominicans, Augustinians, Paulists, and Marists have been active in this field. To supply the lack of missionaries of the regular institutes, a highly satisfactory expedient has been devised in "diocesan apostolates". These groups of priests, selected from the secular clergy, are trained for mission work with special reference to the conversion of non-Catholics. They are exempted from ordinary pastoral work, and held in readiness to give missions whenever needed. Under various names—as "Apostolic Missionary Band", "Diocesan Mission Band", etc.—the system has become established in the Archdioceses of New York, St. Louis, St. Paul, and San Francisco, and the Dioceses of Alton, Burlington, Oklahoma, Peoria, Pittsburg, Providence, Richmond, San Antonio, Scranton, and Wheeling. In the average American parish there is a mission every three years, in some every second year, and many make it an annual event. In 1903 Pope Leo XIII addressed a letter to the Church in the Philippine Islands, in which he strongly recommended the giving of missions. For an account of the Church Extension Society founded by the Rev. Francis Kelley, of Lapeer, Mich., and organized at Chicago, 19 October, 1905, for the development of the missionary spirit among the faithful and the support of the Church in poor or pioneer localities, see SOCIETIES, CATHOLIC.

III. METHOD.—While all missionary bodies pursue the same end, their methods of conducting missions vary according to the genius of each institute and its traditions. In general, however, it may be said that purely dogmatic sermons are avoided, as well as mere appeals to the emotions and the assumption that all that is, is bad. The aim is rather to seek the virtue that lies in the middle course of sound doctrine and wholesome religious sentiment. It is with this end in view that the subjects of the mission sermons are chosen, and, as the number of sermons is limited, only the most practical topics, bearing on the everyday lives of the people, are selected. If the mission lasts two weeks, the first week is usually for women exclusively and the second for men. If it is to continue four weeks, the first week is for married women, the second for unmarried women, the third for married men, and the fourth for unmarried men. As far as time will permit, the sermons usually deal with the following general subjects, which are varied to some extent according to circumstances: Salvation, Sin, Repentance, Hell, Death, Judgment, Heaven—with special instructions on matrimony, temperance, Christian education, etc. The instructions deal also with the essentials of the sacrament of penance, certain commandments of God and of the Church, Holy Communion, the Mass, devotion to the Blessed Virgin, prayer, duties of parents and children, etc. The style of these instructions is simple and didactic.

AERTNYS, *Theologia Pastoralis* (Paderborn, 1901), 31,257-60; REMINGER, *Pastoraltheologie* (Freiburg im Br., 1893), 526-28; *Theol. prakt. Quartalschrift* (1891), 814; (1892), 55,317; BUSS, *Die Volksmissionen ein Bedürfniss unserer Zeit* (Schafhausen, 1851); HUFNER, *Volksmissionen und Missionserneuerung* (Dulmen i. W., 1910); KASSIEPE, *Die Volksmission* (Paderborn, 1909); HILARION, *Le Missionaire, ou l'art des missions* (Paris, 1879); BOYLE, *St. Vincent de Paul and the Vincentians in Ireland, Scotland and England, A. D. 1628-1909* (London, 1909); *Irish Eccl. Record* (3rd S.), XVI, 577-92; XVII, 417-26; *Am. Eccl. Review*, XI (1894), 81-111, 161-219; BOUGAUD, *History of St. Vincent de Paul*, tr. BRADY (2 vols., New York, 1899). See also the biographies of Sts. Alphonsus Liguori, Philip Neri, John of the Cross, Dominic, Francis, Ignatius Loyola, etc.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

Mississippi, one of the United States of America, takes its name from the Mississippi River that forms its western boundary from 35° to 31° N. lat. The Act of Congress of 1 March, 1817, creating the state, fixed its boundaries as follows: "Beginning on the Mississippi River at a point where the southern boundary of the State of Tennessee strikes the same, thence east along the said boundary line to the Tennessee River, thence up the same to the mouth of Bear Creek, thence by a direct line to the north-west corner of the County of Washington, thence due south to the Gulf of Mexico, thence westwardly, including all of the islands within six leagues of the shore, to the most eastern junction of Pearl River with Lake Borgne, thence up said River to the thirty-first degree of North latitude, thence west along said degree of latitude to the Mississippi River, thence up the same to the beginning." The state in its extreme length is 330 miles; its greatest width is 188 miles; its area 46,340 square miles. It has a coast-line on the Gulf of Mexico of about 75 miles. By government surveys begun in 1803, the state is divided into sections and townships.

Topography.—It contains no mountains, but there is a decided difference of levels between the alluvial lands lying between the Mississippi and Yazoo Rivers and the other sections of the state, which may be generally characterized as the uplands of the state. The latter comprise approximately five-sixths of the entire area of the state, constituting a plateau of an undulating character, the level of which gently descends in a general southerly direction to the coast. Its general elevation above the level of the Gulf of Mexico near the coast-line is about 150 feet, and the middle northern and north-eastern portions are from about 150 to 500 and 600 feet above the level of the Gulf of Mexico. The drainage on the west is the Mississippi River and its principal tributaries the Yazoo, Tallahatchie, Coldwater, Sunflower, Big Black, and Womochitto Rivers; in the middle part the Pearl, which empties into Lake Borgne, and in the eastern part, the Tombigbee River, the Chicksawha River, and the Escatawpa River, and in the south the Wolf, Pascagoula, Biloxie, Abolochitto, and Catahoula Rivers. The upland sections of the state are undulating, and successive ridges divide the area between the water courses. The north-eastern portion contains a large area of prairie formation which overlies a cretaceous sub-stratum, commonly known as rotten limestone. The middle comprises a large area of uplands with a sub-stratum of clay for-

mation. The southern portion is generally sandy and loamy.

The Yazoo-Mississippi Delta constitutes the cotton-producing region of the state, the finest and most fertile cotton lands in the world, not excepting the valleys of the Nile and the Ganges. It begins at the Tennessee line and follows on its eastern boundary a line of hills or bluffs to Vicksburg, and is bounded on the west by the Mississippi River. It lies low and its general average level is not higher than the high-water level of the Mississippi. It comprises an estimated area of 4,480,000 acres or 6480 square miles. It is now protected by a scientifically constructed system of levees extending on the Mississippi River from the Tennessee line to the hills at Vicksburg, and up the Yazoo River and its tributaries above the danger points. The levees are maintained by local assessments by the two levee boards in the delta and by appropriations from the Federal Government, made for the improvement of the rivers and for the maintenance of the levees. The cost of maintaining this levee system is great, but is far more than compensated for by the protection secured for this large area of cotton lands. These levees are substantially constructed of earth from 15 to 30 feet high with bases broad in proportion. With the levee system, it is the general opinion of levee engineers that any general overflow of the delta is impossible. In very high water an occasional break in a levee, called a "crevasse", may overflow a small local area, but with the present scientific skill and equipment, these breaks are generally closed promptly, with but little damage to land affected. The water level in the Mississippi and in the rivers of the delta varies very much during the year. The highest water is from January to April, followed often, in the Mississippi, by what is termed the June rise which is caused by the melting of the snow and ice in the upper Mississippi and in its tributaries. There are good landings at various points on the Mississippi River, among them being Greenville, Vicksburg, and Natchez.

Climatic Conditions.—The climate is mild and temperate. In the summer, breezes from the Mexican Gulf in the middle and southern portions, and variable winds elsewhere in the state, render the heat moderate and tolerable. In the southern portion the temperature rarely falls as low as +32° Fahr., and generally does not exceed 95° Fahr. In the middle part the maximum is about 98° and the lowest is rarely lower than +20°. In the northern portion the temperature rarely falls to +10°, and for a few days, in an exceptionally cold winter, may go to +5°. There is a fair and moderate rainfall extended through the year, with a greater fall during the winter and spring. Near the coast the fall is about 65 inches per annum, and elsewhere it averages about 50 inches annually. The state is as healthy in all of its climatic and other conditions as any of the adjacent states. In the low-lying portions that are not well drained there are some malarial fevers, but these conditions are being steadily improved. The death rate for the state does not exceed, annually, 1·20 per cent. Yellow fever, that was the scourge of the state for years in recurring epidemics, no longer exists, since the discovery of the mosquito theory, except in rare and sporadic form. The yellow fever experts are unanimous in the opinion that with ordinary precautionary measures there can never be another yellow fever epidemic in the South.

Geology.—The geology of the state is not complicated and is similar to that of adjacent states. There are four groups of cretaceous strata: (1) The Entaw or Coffee group; (2) The Tombigbee group; (3) The Rotten Limestone group; (4) The Ripley group. Seven groups of the Tertiary strata have been distinguished as follows: (1) The Flat Woods group; (2) The La Grange group; (3) the Buhrstone group; (4) The Claiborne group; (5) The Jackson group; (6) The Vicksburg group; (7) The Grand Gulf group.

Fauna and Flora.—In Mississippi we meet with all the different animals that are found in the gulf states. There are about forty different species of mammalia in the state. Among them is the American opossum, which is abundant, and is highly prized as an article of food. The deer and the black bear, that once existed in great numbers, are disappearing owing to the clearing up of the country and the inefficient enforcement of the game laws. About one hundred and fifteen varieties of birds are found, about twenty of which are migratory, coming from the north during the fall and winter months. The mocking bird, exclusively a southern bird, and the most remarkable songster in the world, is found in the state, especially in the middle and southern portions, in great numbers. The wild turkey, a native of this country, is found in nearly all parts of the state. Quail are also very abundant. The game laws are more effective and are more vigorously enforced than heretofore. More than fifty species of reptilia are found here, prominent among them being the alligator (*A. Mississippiensis*), existing mainly in the middle and southern portions of the state on the rivers and lakes. It attains a maximum length of from 14 to 15 feet. There are at least sixty species of fish, the majority of which are edible. The oysters and crustaceans of the gulf exist in great quantities and are of the finest quality for food.

Seal of Mississippi

The state, in almost its entire area, was covered originally with a magnificent growth of forest trees. More than one hundred and twenty species exist at present. Among them are fifteen varieties of oak, including live oak and white and red oaks which are the most valuable. Cypress is still abundant in the river bottoms and on the lakes. Besides several species of hickory, the black walnut, chestnut, sweet gum, red cedar, red gum, elms of various varieties, maple, ash, sycamore exist here, among many other valuable varieties, all of large growth and valuable as timber. The long-leaf pine, the most valuable tree for timber for various uses, abounds in the southern portions of the state. The short-leaf pine, not quite so valuable, is widely distributed throughout the middle and northern sections. Next to cotton, timber is the most valuable product of the state. The value of the pine timber in the state was estimated in 1880, approximately, at $250,000,000. Allowing for the cutting since that time and also for the increase in the price of lumber, a conservative approximate estimate of its value should not be less than $300,000,000 at the present time.

Agriculture.—This is the principal industry in the state; of the male population 77.7% and of the female 71.8% are engaged in agricultural pursuits. Fully one half of the state is of extraordinary fertility. The only portion that is unproductive is the small strip of territory known geographically as Flat Woods, where only the bottom lands are fertile. Cotton is the principal product, being probably three times greater than the other industries of the state combined. The value of the cotton crop as shown by the census of 1900 was $54,032,341. The crop of 1879–1880 was valued at $46,000,000, showing an increase during that period of over $8,000,000. Among other minor products are Indian corn, oats, hay, peas of every variety, wheat, cane, sorghum, rice, potatoes, and almost every variety of orchard and garden product. In the southern

part of the state, sub-tropical and several varieties of tropical fruits are successfully cultivated. The Yazoo-Mississippi Delta is the most remarkable agricultural section of the state. Its area is 6480 square miles, or 4,147,200 acres. With an alluvial soil that is practically inexhaustible, its cotton production exceeds that of any other land in the world. Its land produces from three quarters to a bale and a half an acre, and with careful tillage and in a good cotton year as much as a bale and three quarters to two bales to the acre. The increase in the value of the lands in the Delta, both timber and cultivated, is remarkable. In 1881 the state sold 1,500,000 acres of timber lands, by levee tax titles, which have been held valid, for six and one half cents per acre. These lands are now worth, on an average, $20 per acre. Twenty years ago, cotton lands could be bought for from $15 to $25 an acre that are now worth from $50 to $75 per acre. The population of the delta is 195,346; of this number 24,137 are whites and 171,209 are negroes. The negroes generally cultivate the cotton farms and the large cotton plantations of the state, while the small farms are cultivated by white labour.

Population.—The population of the state, as shown by the census of 1900, is 1,551,270, of which 641,200 are white and 907,630 are negroes, with 2203 Indians and 237 Chinese. A small percentage of the population is foreign born. There are 5345 males and 2536 females foreign born; total, 7981. Of these 7625 are white. The total number of males of voting age is 349,179. Of these 150,530 are whites and 197,936 are negroes. There are 118,057 illiterate males of voting age, and of these 105,331 are negroes and 12,293 are whites. Illiteracy in the total population amounts to 32%. The illiteracy of the entire white population is 8% and of the total negro population, 49.1%. Under the influence of the extensive school facilities provided at the expense of the state, the percentage of illiteracy is steadily decreasing.

Administration.—The civil government of the state is structurally similar to that of the other states. There are three departments—executive, legislative, and judicial. The state officers and members of the legislature are elected by the people every four years. There are three supreme court judges, thirteen circuit court judges and eight chancellors, all appointed by the governor with the approval of the senate. The elective franchise contains the following conditions, viz: a voter must be twenty-one years old, he must be able to read or to understand the state Constitution when read to him (that is, a layman's and not an academician's understanding of the Constitution); he must have resided in the state two years and in the precinct one year, and have paid all taxes, including an annual poll tax of $2 for two years preceding the election. Conviction of certain crimes against honesty entails the disfranchisement of a voter. This qualified suffrage has given the state a large white majority in its electoral body. The validity of these suffrage qualifications has been sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Williams *vs.* The State of Mississippi, decided by a unanimous court in 1896. The state maintains institutions for the insane, the blind, and the deaf and dumb, affording ample facilities for both races. There is also a state hospital at Natchez and one at Vicksburg.

Education.—The public educational system of the state consists of a common school system in which each county is a school-district, and in which many of the municipalities constitute separate school-districts. This system is maintained at the public expense, by state, county, and school district; and separate educational facilities are extended to all of the educable children of both races in the state. In addition, the state maintains the Industrial Institute and College for girls, at Columbus, and maintains, in large part, the University at Oxford, the Agricultural and Mechanical College at Starkville. For coloured students the state maintains the Alcorn Agricultural and Mechanical College near Brunisburg and and Rodney College near Rodney, both in Claiborne County. The total number of children enrolled during 1906–1907 was 482,208, and the average attendance for the same period was 285,047. The total average attendance in 1905–1906 was 267,898, showing an increase in 1906–1907 of 17,149. There are 7241 schools in the school districts, and 117 schools in the separate school districts. In the session of 1906–1907, there was a larger attendance of negro pupils than white pupils by 15,335. For the session of 1906–1907, $2,631,790.35 of public money went to the support of schools, as compared with $2,432,426.33 for 1905–1906. There are the following private institutions for white students: Jefferson College, near Natchez; Rust University, Holly Springs; Millsaps College and Bellehaven College, Jackson; Blue Mountain College, Blue Mountain; Mississippi College, Clinton; East Mississippi College, Meridian; Stanton College, Natchez. There are other private schools of lesser prominence.

Penitentiary System.—During the period of military government in the South, a prison system known as convict leasing was established in this and other southern states, and was continued in Mississippi until 1890, when it was abolished and the present system was adopted of working the prisoners on state lands at agricultural pursuits for the exclusive benefit of the state, and under exclusive official control. The state owns 20,900 acres of cotton and farm lands upon which the entire prison population of about 1200 prisoners are worked. The penitentiary lands cost originally $145,600 and are now worth at least $600,000. The annual cash income to the state from the labour of the prisoners is not less than $150,000. In addition to this, valuable improvements are constantly being made on the property by the prisoners. The present system is a satisfactory solution of the convict problem, in which all conditions, moral and sanitary, are obtained. Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, and Louisiana have adopted this system.

Transportation.—The railroad mileage in the state amounts to 3759 miles, according to the Report of the State Railroad Commission of 1908. The state is well supplied with water transportation, having the following navigable rivers: Mississippi, Yazoo, Tallahatchie, Sunflower, Pearl, Pascagoula, Big Black, Tombigbee, and some minor streams that are navigable during a portion of the year. There are deep-water harbours on the gulf coast at Horn Island opposite Pascagoula, and Ship Island opposite Gulf Port. There is a depth of water at the pier of the Gulf and Ship Island Railroad at Gulf Port of 23 feet at low tide, and 30 feet in the protected roadstead inside of Ship Island, which is accessible by tugs and lighters through a deep-water channel. There are also harbours at Bay of St. Louis and Biloxi.

History.—In 1540 Hernando De Soto, one of the most adventurous of the Spanish explorers, discovered the Mississippi River, and his expedition reached the present limits of this state, and remained until his death in 1542. The expedition, under the leadership of Moscoes, was withdrawn in 1543, descending the river to the sea and thence along the coast to Mexico. It is difficult to trace the exact route of De Soto. It is known, however, that he passed through Florida and Georgia as high as 35° N. lat., then went to the vicinity of Mobile and then north-west to the Mississippi River. In 1682 La Salle and Fonti descended to the mouth of the Mississippi River and claimed the entire region for the King of France. In 1698 D'Iberville came to Mississippi, authorized by the French king to colonize the lower Mississippi. He went to Ship Island and Cat Island, to the mainland on Biloxi Bay, to Bay of St. Louis, and to Mobile. The

colony did not prosper. D'Iberville returned to France, leaving his two brothers, Sauvollé and Bienville, in charge of the country. In 1699 D'Iberville returned and built a fort on the Mississippi about 400 miles below Natchez. He sent Fonti on an expedition to Natchez, who built Fort Rosalie near Natchez. At that time Louisiana belonged to France, and Florida to Spain by claim of discovery. In 1763 Spain ceded Florida to Great Britain. The northern line of Florida was claimed by Spain from the mouth of the Yazoo River east to the Chattahouchie River, a claim that was not conceded north of 31° N. lat. In 1772 Richard and Samuel Swaze of New Jersey formed a permanent settlement on the Homochitto River in Adams County. In 1781 Spain, then at war with England, expelled the English from Florida, and took possession of that country. Florida was conceded to extend to 31° N. lat. and westward to the Perdido River. All south of that parallel and west of the Perdido River belonged to France. All east of the Mississippi River and north of 31° N. lat. was territory of the United States and was claimed by the State of Georgia.

In 1798 the Territory of Mississippi, established by Act of Congress, was bounded as follows: On the west by the Mississippi River, on the south by parallel 31° N. lat., on the north by a line running east from the mouth of the Yazoo River to the Chattahouchie River and along the latter river on the east. In 1802 the State of Georgia ceded to the United States its claim to all territory north of 31° N. lat. as far as the Tennessee line, and in 1804 Congress attached all north of 31° N. lat. and south of the Tennessee line to the Territory of Mississippi. In 1803 the Louisiana Purchase was effected. In 1812 Congress added what was then termed the District of Mobile to the Territory of Mississippi, being all that territory extending from the Pearl to the Perdido rivers, bounded on the north by 31° N. lat. and on the south by the Mexican Gulf. By the treaty of Madrid of 27 October, 1795, Spain had conceded that the southern boundary of the United States should extend to parallel 31° N. lat., thereby waiving all claim north of that line. By the treaty of 22 February, 1819, Spain ceded all Florida, including the whole territory south of parallel 31° N. lat. and east of the Mississippi River, to the United States. But the United States was then in possession of Florida east of the Perdido River, by conquest; General Jackson, having in 1818 invaded east Florida, conquered the Indians and expelled the Spaniards. Before that time the United States claimed *de jure* all west of the Perdido under the Louisiana Purchase. The present territory of Mississippi was acquired and claimed as follows: That portion south of 31° N. lat. and west of the Perdido River, and extending to Pearl River, was claimed by original title under the Louisiana Purchase. From parallel 31° N. lat. to the line from the mouth of Pearl River, east to the present Alabama line, by occupancy and proprietary right, and all north of parallel 31° N. lat. to the Tennessee line was territory of Georgia, and was ceded by that state to the United States. This is the *de jure* derivation of the titles of the United States Government. The State of Mississippi was created by Act of Congress of 1 March, 1817.

On 9 January, 1861, Mississippi passed the Ordinance of Secession and joined the Southern Confederacy immediately upon its establishment. The state furnished 80,000 troops to the Confederacy during the war, with a total population of 70,295 white males between the ages of eighteen and forty-five years. There were 545 whites and 79,000 negroes from the state enlisted in the Federal Army. Upon the surrender of the Confederacy the state was placed under military rule. In June, 1865, a provisional government was established by President Johnson, with William L. Sharkey as provisional governor. A civil state government was established by an election by the people in October, 1865, under the auspices of President Johnson's plan of Reconstruction, with Benjamin G. Humphreys as governor. Under the Reconstruction Acts of Congress of March, 1867, the Humphreys government was abolished and a temporary military government established in its place until the Reconstruction government was established, under the Acts of Congress, with James L. Alcorn as governor, who was inaugurated 10 March, 1870. This Reconstruction period, with unlimited negro suffrage, lasted until 1876, when the white man regained control of the state. The ordinary annual expenses of the state government increased from $463,209.71 in 1869, to $1,729,046.34 in 1871, under negro rule. In 1876, under white rule, the expenses of the state were reduced to $591,709.00 per annum. During the Reconstruction period taxation had reached the point of confiscation, and one-fifth of all the lands in the state had been forfeited to the state for taxes.

From 1876 to 1890, by various extra-legal methods the white men managed to maintain control of the state, and the constitutional convention of 1890 enacted a constitution that placed limitations on the elective franchise. The state suffered severely during the Civil War, being the theatre of extensive military operations. During the Reconstruction period there was an enormous loss in property values. At present the state is in a highly prosperous condition, and each year witnesses its steady improvement and development.

The Diocese of Natchez (q. v.) includes the entire state; the Catholic population in 1910 amounted to 25,701, including 2017 coloured and 233 Indian Catholics.

Laws of the State Affecting Religion.—The State Constitution of 1890 provides that no testamentary bequests of any property, real or personal, can be made to any religious or charitable uses. The statutes regulate by limitations the character of property that religious societies or associations, or ecclesiastical bodies, may own and hold, viz.: a church, a residence for a priest or minister, and a school or seminary each for male and female scholars, and also a cemetery; and a religious denomination may, in addition, own such colleges or seminaries of learning as it may deem proper, and also a place of residence for its superior clergymen. These limitations apply to all religious denominations, societies and ecclesiastical bodies, without discrimination. All divorce and marriage laws, and cognate laws, apply without discrimination to all citizens of the state irrespective of their religious beliefs and affiliations. All qualifications of the elective franchise and for office are of uniform character. So also are all laws regulating grand and petit jury duty, and road and street duty, and military service, and exempting all ministers of the Gospel from these duties. The State Constitution of 1890 provides that no religious tests as a qualification for office shall be required, and that no preference shall be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship. Absolute freedom in all matters of religion, or modes of worship, it is declared by the Constitution, "shall be held sacred". The Bible is not to be excluded from the public schools, meaning the schools maintained by the state. Secular and business pursuits, not of a necessary character, are prohibited on Sunday. Blasphemy and profanity in any public place is prohibited. The Senate and the House, as a matter of custom, are opened with prayer by some minister of the Gospel, on the invitation of the presiding officer of the body. The following legal holidays are designated by the statutes of the state, viz.: 1 January, 22 February (Washington's Birthday), 26 April, Memorial Day, 3 June, Jefferson Davis Day, 4 July, and Christmas Day.

The laws of the state do not preserve the inviolability of the confessional as matter of evidence. The only privileged communications are those between a

client and his lawyer. There is a general law by which the governor may grant charters of incorporation to religious congregations or societies. All property owned by religious denominations is exempt from taxation. The only Catholic who has held a state office in Mississippi is the Hon. Frank Johnston, who was attorney-general in the years 1893, 1894, 1895 under appointment by the governor to fill an unexpired term. (See NATCHEZ, DIOCESE OF.)

CLAIBORNE, *Mississippi as a Province, Territory and State* (1880); ROWLAND, *Official and Statistical Register* (1904); GOODSPEED, *Memoirs of Mississippi* (1891); RILEY, *Publications of Mississippi Historical Society* (1898–1909); JOHNSTON, *Suffrage and Reconstruction in Mississippi*, Vol. VI, in *Miss. Hist. Soc. Pub.* (1902); LYNCH, *Bench and Bar of Mississippi* (1881); GARNER, *Reconstruction in Mississippi* (1901); GAZARRÉ, *History of Louisiana;* LOWRY AND MCCARDLE, *Mississippi;* ROWLAND, *Mississippi Territorial Archives, 1798–1803* (1905); MONETTE, *Valley of the Mississippi;* JENKINS, *Mississippi River*, Vol. VI, in *Miss. Hist. Soc. Pub.* (1902).

For an elaborate citation of various printed works on Mississippi as a province and territory, see ROWLAND, *Mississippi*, I (1907); STONE, *Studies on the American Race Problem* (1908).

FRANK JOHNSTON.

Missouri, STATE OF.—The State of Missouri was carved out of the Louisiana Territory, and derives its name from the principal river flowing through its centre. The name (pronounced *Miz-zoo'ri*) signifies "big muddy" in the Indian language. Geographically, Missouri is the central commonwealth of the Federal Union.

BOUNDARIES AND AREA.—The boundaries are the State of Iowa on the north; Arkansas on the south; on the east the Mississippi River separates it from Illinois, Kentucky, and Tennessee; on the west it is bounded by Nebraska, Kansas, and the new State of Oklahoma. It lies between 40° 30′ and 36° 30′ N. lat., except that a small projection, between the Rivers St. Francis and Mississippi, extends about 34 miles farther south between Tennessee and Arkansas. The area of the state is 69,415 square miles.

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS.—The Missouri River follows the western boundary of the state as far south as Kansas City; then turning east, it flows across the state and empties itself into the Mississippi about twelve miles above St. Louis. The portion of the state lying north of the Missouri is a great extent of gently rolling prairie, intersected here and there by streams which are lined with timber and flow south into the Missouri or east into the Mississippi. The western portion of the state, north of the Missouri River, is generally level, but rises to about one thousand feet above sea-level in the north-western corner of the state. The eastern portion, north of the Missouri River, is more broken, with some hilly land bordering the Mississippi and Missouri rivers. The portion of the state south of the Missouri is more rolling; it is well wooded, especially in the south-east, with some swamp lands in the extreme south-eastern section. The Ozark Mountains break into the south central part of the state, but rise to no considerable height (highest elevation 1600 feet). West of these mountains the land is rolling, but arable and fertile, being especially adapted to fruit-growing. It is in this section that the famous Missouri red apples are grown in the greatest quantities.

POPULATION.—According to the first federal census of Missouri, taken in 1810, the state had then 20,845 inhabitants. The census of 1910 places the population at 3,293,335. According to the Missouri Bureau of Labor Statistics for 1909, the population of the state at the beginning of that year was 3,925,335.

RESOURCES.—*Agricultural and Farm Products.*—The value of the output of farm crops alone for the year 1908 was $171,815,553. Of the total crop valuation $98,607,605 consisted of Indian corn, in the production of which Missouri is the first state in the Union. The greater portion of the crop is consumed by live stock within the state; this portion is not estimated in the surplus given below. The surplus in live stock for the year ending 31 December, 1908, consisting of cattle, horses, hogs, mules, and sheep, was 7,097,055 head, valued at $112,535,494. Missouri is constantly gaining as a wool-producing state; in 1908 there was $1,306,922 worth of wool sold. The farm-yard products are important items in the agricultural statistics; the surplus of poultry, eggs, and feathers for the year 1908 was $44,960,973. Missouri has never been considered an important dairying state, but since 1904 there has been a remarkable growth in this industry. The statistics in 1904 show an estimated total value from the dairies of $4,900,783, while the statistics of 1908 give a total value of $20,651,778. The cotton crop of 1908 brought $3,723,352.

Mines and Timber.—In 1907 the Federal authorities ranked Missouri the chief lead-producing state of the Union. The returns from the smelters for 1908 show that the state mined enough lead ore to produce 122,451 tons of primary lead. The total valuation of the lead produced in 1908 was $8,672,873. For 1908 the State Mining Department placed the production of zinc ore at 197,499 tons, and its value at $6,374,719. Nickel, copper, and cobalt are among the valuable minerals produced in Missouri. According to the United States geological survey of 1907, Missouri and Oregon were the only states producing nickel: 400 tons of metalic nickel, 200 tons of metallic cobalt, and 700 tons of metallic copper were produced in 1908. Iron ore to the value of $218,182 was produced in the year 1908. There was an output of $26,204 in silver. In the production of clay and shale goods Missouri held seventh rank in 1908. In cement the state also held seventh place. The total output in lime, cement, brick, and tiling for 1908 aggregated a value of $8,904,013. Petroleum wells exist in one or two counties close to the Kansas border, and some natural gas has been found in the state. Coal exists in abundance, the value of the output in 1908 being $5,644,330. The products of the forests of Missouri produced in 1908 over 450,000,000 feet of assorted lumber with an estimated valuation of $8,719,822, while over $4,000,000 worth of railroad ties were also produced in that year.

SEAL OF MISSOURI

COMMERCE.—The following table of surplus products, given out by the Bureau of Labour Statistics in 1909, is a concise statement of the surplus of the state which was added to the commerce of the world during 1908.

RÉSUMÉ OF VALUATIONS BY GROUPS

Commodity	Value
Live stock	$112,535,494
Farm crops	34,991,518
Mill products	30,283,689
Farmyard products	44,960,973
Apiary and cane products	117,694
Forest products	22,958,014
Dairy products	8,260,711
Missouri "Meerschaum" products	424,449
Nursery products	1,061,173
Liquid products	1,210,739
Fish and game products	636,629
Packing-house products	1,872,318
Cotton products	3,723,352
Medicinal products	95,398
Vegetable and canned goods	6,692,426

Commodity	Value
Fresh fruit	$5,089,384
Wool and mohair	1,308,812
Mine and quarry products	24,992,789
Stone and clay products	8,904,013
Unclassified products	4,623,953
Total value	$314,743,528

MEANS OF COMMUNICATION.—Although the Mississippi River runs the full length of the eastern boundary of the state, and the Missouri flows directly through the state, neither of these streams is of any considerable commercial value as a means of communication or transportation. Railroad facilities, however, are ample, there being 7991 miles of main line with about 3000 miles of sidings. There are 63 steam systems operating in the state. There are one railroad bridge, one street-car bridge, and one combination railroad, street-car, and passenger bridge across the Mississippi River at St. Louis, and a municipal free bridge for the accommodation of railroads, electric roads, wagons, and foot traffic, is in process of construction.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM. — *State University.* — The State University of Missouri was established by legislative act approved on 11 February, 1839, and the university was located at Columbia, Boone County, on 24 June, 1839. The corner-stone of the main building was laid on 4 July, 1840. Courses of instruction in academic work were begun on 14 April, 1841, and a Normal Department was established in 1867 and opened in September, 1868. The College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts and the School of Mines and Metallurgy were made departments of the university in 1870, the School of Mines and Metallurgy being located at Rolla. The law department was opened in 1872, the medical department in 1873, the engineering department in 1877, and the department of journalism in 1908. In 1888 the Experiment Station was established under Act of Congress, and the Missouri State Military School in 1890. For the scholastic year 1908 there were enrolled in the entire university 3033 students. The officers of instruction and administration consisted of 104 professors, 64 instructors, and 54 assistants. Apart from the above-mentioned institutions, which are all under the supervision of the University of Missouri proper, the state maintains the Lincoln Institution at Jefferson City for the education of negro children in agriculture and mechanic arts.

Public Schools.—The state is divided into 10,053 school districts. The total number of teachers in the public schools in the year 1908 was 17,998, the total number of pupils being 984,659. For the year ending 1 July, 1908, the public schools cost the tax-payers $12,769,689.93. The law requires that every child with sound body and mind, from six to fourteen years of age, attend either a public or private school during each school year. Missouri has the largest permanent interest-bearing school-fund of any state in the Union. This fund in 1908 amounted to $14,014,335.45. Apart from the primary and high schools there are six state normal institutions, of which one is located in each of the following cities: Columbia (Teachers' College), Kirksville, Warrensburg, Cape Girardeau, Springfield, and Maryville.

FIRST SETTLERS.—The first settlement was made at Ste. Genevieve in 1735 by the French, and the second by the French at St. Louis in 1764. The Spanish also came up the river in search of gold, and St. Louis was soon a busy trading centre for the citizens and the Indians inhabiting the surrounding territory. From the eastward soon came emigrants from other states—especially Kentucky, Tennessee, and the Virginias—and later came the emigrants from foreign shores, particularly the Germans, Irish, and some Scotch. The later growth of the state has been made up of settlers from almost all of the states lying to the eastward, but more particularly from those mentioned, with many from Maryland and the Carolinas. There are settlements of Italians, Hungarians, and Bohemians, but on the whole these nationalities make up only a small part of the population. St. Louis is a cosmopolitan city, but the predominant strains of foreign blood are German and Irish.

ADMISSION TO THE UNION.—Missouri was admitted into the Union conditionally on 2 March, 1820, and was formally admitted as a state on 10 August, 1821, during the presidential administration of James Monroe. At a convention held at St. Louis on 19 July, 1820, the people passed on the Act of Congress, which was approved in March of the same year, and a constitution was drawn up and a new state established. Under this constitution, in August, 1820, the people held a general election, at which state and county officers were chosen and the state government organized. The constitution now in force was adopted by vote of the people on 30 October, 1875, and came into operation on 30 November of the same year.

NOTABLE EVENTS IN POLITICAL HISTORY.—The admission of Missouri as a state provoked much bitter discussion in Congress, and terminated in what has since been known as "The Missouri Compromise". This bill provided that Missouri should be admitted as a slave state, but forever prohibited slavery in the remainder of the Louisiana Territory lying north of 36° 30′ N. lat., which line is the southern boundary of Missouri. The matter of slavery was the cause of many controversies during the early history of the state, and during the Civil War over 100,000 soldiers were contributed to the Union army and 50,000 to the Confederacy.

MATTERS DIRECTLY AFFECTING RELIGION.—*Freedom of Worship.*—Section 5, Article 2, of the Constitution of 1875 provides "that all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to their own conscience; that no person can, on account of his religious opinions, be rendered ineligible to any office of trust or profit under this State, nor be disqualified from testifying, or from serving as a juror; that no human authority can control or interfere with the rights of conscience; that no person ought, by any law, to be molested in his person or estate, on account of his religious persuasion or profession; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, nor to justify practices inconsistent with the good order, peace or safety of this State, or with the rights of others." The recognition of a God herein manifested does not in any way prejudice the interests of atheists. That a man is an atheist or has peculiar religious opinions does not prejudice him as a witness (11 Mo. App. 385). Sunday regulations are not void on account of peculiar religious opinions of certain citizens (20 Mo. 214); nor can a contract be voided by one voluntarily entering into it on the ground that it requires him to live up to certain religious beliefs (Franta v. Bohemian Roman Catholic C. U., 164 Missouri, 304). The Constitution also provides that no person can be compelled to erect, support, or attend any place or system of worship, or to maintain or support any priest, minister, preacher, or teacher of any sect, church, creed, or denomination of religion; but if any person shall voluntarily make a contract for any such object, he shall be held to the performance of the same; that no money shall ever be taken from the public treasury directly or indirectly, in aid of any church, sect, or denomination of religion, or in aid of any priest, preacher, minister, or teacher thereof as such; and that no preference shall be given to nor any discrimination made against any church, sect, or creed of religion, or any form of religious faith or worship; that no religious corporation can be established in this state, except such as may be created under a general law for the purpose only of holding the title to such

real estate as may be prescribed by law for church edifices, parsonages, and cemeteries.

Sunday Observance.—The law provides that the Sabbath shall not be broken by the performance of any labour, other than works of necessity, on the first day of the week, commonly called Sunday, and the master is held to account for compelling or permitting his servants or apprentices to labour on that day. But any member of a religious society which observes any other day than Sunday as the Sabbath, is not bound to observe Sunday as such. Horse-racing, cock-fighting, and playing games, as well as hunting game, are forbidden on Sunday. The selling of any wares or merchandise, the opening of any liquor saloon, and the sale of fermented or distilled liquors are forbidden on Sunday.

Administering of Oaths.—Every public official is required to take an oath to perform the duties of his office and to support the Constitution of the United States and of the State of Missouri, and all witnesses in every court are required to give their testimony "under oath"; however, any person who declares that he has conscientious scruples against taking any oath or swearing in any form, is permitted to make his solemn declaration or affirmation concluding with the words "under the pain and penalty of perjury". Where it appears that the person to be sworn has any particular mode of swearing in addition to or in connexion with the usual form of administering oaths, which to him is a more solemn and binding obligation, the court or officer administering the oath is required to adopt the form most binding on the conscience of the person to be sworn. Any person believing in any other than the Christian religion, is sworn according to the prescribed ceremonies of his own religion, if there be any such (sec. 8840 to 8845 R. S. 1899).

Use of Prayer in Legislature.—There is no statutory provision for a chaplain for either branch of the legislature, but the rules of these bodies provide for a chaplain for each, who is paid out of a contingency fund. The chaplain is elected by the legislative body for each session. No Catholic priest has ever been elected to this position.

Seal of Confession.—Section 4659 R. S. 1899 provides that a minister of the Gospel or a priest of any denomination shall be incompetent to testify concerning the confession made to him in his professional character in the course of discipline enjoined by the rules or practice of such denomination.

Matters Affecting Religious Work.—*Incorporation of Churches.*—No religious corporation can be established in this state except such as may be created under the general law for the purpose only of holding the title of such real estate as may be necessary for churches, schools, parsonages, and cemeteries. There is no constitutional or statutory recognition, as in some states, of any churchman in his official capacity. The property of a diocese, for example, is vested in the individual and not in the bishop as such.

Exemption from Taxes and Public Duties.—The constitution of the state exempts from taxation church property to the extent of one acre in incorporated cities or towns, or within one mile from such cities or towns. Church property to the extent of five acres more than one mile from incorporated cities or towns is exempt from taxation. These exemptions are subject to the provision that such property is used exclusively for religious worship, for schools, or for purposes purely charitable.

The law also provides that no clergyman shall be compelled to serve on any jury. Ministers of the Gospel may select such books as are necessary for the practice of their profession, and the same are exempt from attachment under execution. It is not lawful for any city or municipality to exact a tax or licence fee from any minister of the Gospel for authorizing him to follow his calling.

Marriage and Divorce.—Marriages are forbidden and void between first cousins, or persons more nearly related than first cousins, such as uncles and nieces, etc. Any judge of a court of record or justice of the peace, or any ordained or licensed preacher of the Gospel, who is a citizen of the United States, may perform a marriage ceremony. A licence of marriage is required, and no licence will be issued to a male under the age of twenty-one or to a female under eighteen without the consent of the father of the minor or, if the father cannot act, of the mother or guardian. The law requires that the person performing the marriage ceremony shall return a certificate of the service to the state authorities. The causes for divorce are enumerated in the statute, and, besides the usual clause, it is provided that a divorce may be granted when it is proved that the offending person "has been guilty of conduct that makes the condition of the complaining party intolerable". This clause makes it possible to secure a divorce on any grounds that the judge considers sufficient, and is thought to be the source of some abuse. Residence of one year in the state is required before a petition for divorce may be filed. There is no statutory prohibition against divorced persons marrying at any time after a decree of divorce has been granted.

Catholic Education.—Every parish of any considerable size in the state maintains a parochial school. There are 228 parochial schools in the state with 38,098 children in attendance. Each diocese has its own school-board, and a uniform system of text-books is used throughout the diocese. There are eight colleges and academies for boys with 1872 students in attendance, and 38 academies and institutions of higher education for girls with 4480 pupils in attendance. The St. Louis University, conducted by the Jesuit Fathers, is one of the leading educational institutions of the country. It conducts a school of divinity, a school of philosophy and science, a school of medicine, a school of dentistry, an institute of law, and an undergraduate and academic department. There is a total of 950 lay students in attendance. No parochial or private schools receive any assistance or support from the state, and all citizens are required to contribute to the support of the public schools regardless of whether their children attend a private or a public institution.

Charitable Institutions.—There are in the state 10 orphan asylums with 1248 inmates; 25 hospitals; 2 deaf-mute institutions with 60 inmates; 3 homes for aged persons; 1 industrial and reform school; 1 foundling asylum, and 1 newsboys' home—all under Catholic auspices. The state does not contribute anything to the Catholic orphanages, but the foundling asylum in St. Louis receives some remuneration for keeping waifs who are found by the police and intrusted to that institution.

There is a State Board of Charities and Corrections, of which the governor is a member *ex officio*. This board has general supervision over the charitable institutions conducted by the state. There is a state hospital at Fulton, at St. Joseph, at Nevada, and at Farmington. There is a state Confederate Soldiers' Home at Higginsville, and a State Federal Soldiers' Home at St. James. A school for the deaf is maintained at Fulton, a school for the blind at St. Louis, and a colony for the feeble-minded and epileptic at Marshall. The Missouri State Sanitarium for the treatment of tuberculosis is located at Mt. Vernon on the crest of the Ozarks.

Sale of Liquor.—Intoxicating liquors may be sold only by licensed saloon-keepers. In cities of two thousand or more inhabitants the application for licence must be accompanied by a petition asking that the licence be granted. This petition must be signed by a majority of the tax-paying citizens owning property on the block or square in which the saloon is to be

kept. In cities or towns of less than two thousand inhabitants the petition must be signed by a majority of the tax-paying citizens, and a majority in the block where the saloon is to be kept. The law provides that the licence may be revoked upon the application of any person showing to the county court that the licence-holder does not keep an orderly house, and it is provided that one (1) whose licence has been revoked, (2) who has violated any of the provisions of the licence law, (3) who has sold liquors to any minor, (4) who has employed in his business of saloon-keeper any person whose licence has been revoked, shall not be entitled to a licence. The law prohibits (1) the sale of intoxicating liquors to habitual drunkards, minors, or Indians, (2) the keeping of female employees in saloons, and (3) the keeping, exhibiting, or using of any piano, organ, or any other musical instrument in a saloon. These laws are generally enforced. The law provides that upon application by petition to the county court signed by one-tenth of the qualified voters of any county, who shall reside outside of the cities or towns having a population of 2500 or more, an election shall be held to determine whether or not spirituous liquors shall be sold within the limits of such county. In cities or towns with a population of 2500 or more, the petition is made by one-tenth of the qualified voters to the body having legislative functions therein. If a majority of the qualified voters at such election vote against the sale of intoxicating liquors, no licence can be issued for the sale of liquor within such jurisdiction. Section 3034 R. S. of 1899 provides among other things that nothing in the law shall be so construed as to prevent the sale of wine for sacramental purposes.

Prisons and Reformatories.—The state penitentiary is at Jefferson City; there is a reformatory for boys at Booneville and an industrial home for girls at Chillicothe. The law provides for the appointment of a chaplain for the penitentiary by the warden and the board of inspectors, consisting of the state treasurer, auditor, and attorney-general. The law makes no reference to the religious denomination of the chaplain, but provides that his selection shall be governed by his special qualifications for the performance of the duties devolving upon him. He is required to conduct at least one service each Sunday; to visit convicts in their cells at least once a month, when practicable; to visit the sick in the hospital at least once a day; to hold religious services in the hospital once a week. He shall have charge of the prison library and the purchase of books; he shall officiate at the funeral of each convict, and be present at his burial; he is paid the salary of $1200 per annum. The law further provides that clergymen of every denomination of the City of Jefferson shall at all times have free access to the prison, or may visit any convict confined therein—subject only to such rules as may be necessary for the good government and discipline of the penitentiary—and may administer rites and ceremonies of the Church to which such convict belongs, if it be so desired. There is no statutory provision for a chaplain at the reformatory or the industrial home. Such religious ceremonies as are held at these institutions are conducted by those interested in the work through arrangements made with the officials in charge. Such ceremonies are largely within the discretion of the officials, but the spirit of the law as laid down for the penitentiary prevails. This is also true of the state insane asylum and the reform schools and jails of the cities. In a majority of these institutions religious services are held by Catholic priests at regular intervals, and accommodations are provided for the celebration of Mass and the administration of the sacraments.

Charitable Bequests.—The courts are accustomed to permit every charitable use to stand, which comes fairly within the Statute of Elizabeth. While this statute has not been incorporated in the state laws, its general provisions have been followed by the decisions. A case involving the Mullanphy will, which left a fund to furnish relief "to all poor emigrants and travellers coming to St. Louis on their way bona fide to settle in the West", reported in 29 Mo. 543, brought out an early discussion of charitable bequests; this provision was declared valid, and, as a precedent, has been generally followed. There is no statutory limitation, as in some states, upon the amount that may be bequeathed or devised to charity. The Constitution of 1865 prohibited all bequests and devises of land for religious purposes. A bequest for Masses was held void under this section of the constitution. An outright gift to the Archbishop of St. Louis was also held void because it was shown there was an understanding that the money was to be used for religious purposes (Kenrick vs. Cole, 61 Missouri, 572). This section was omitted from the Constitution of 1875, and the courts have been liberal since in construing such bequests as charitable and therefore valid.

Dioceses and Catholic Population.—The state is divided into three dioceses, those of St. Louis, Kansas City, and St. Joseph. The Diocese of St. Louis comprises all of the eastern half of the state; that of Kansas City the western portion of the state, south of the Missouri River, and the Diocese of St. Joseph the western portion of the state, north of the Missouri River. The Catholic population in 1909 was 452,703. There are about 3000 Catholic negroes in the state, with one church in St. Louis and one coloured priest. There is one coloured Catholic school with 110 pupils, and one orphan-asylum for coloured children, conducted by the Oblate Sisters of Providence.

First Catholic Missions.—The Cross was planted among the Indians who inhabited the region now known as Missouri during the first half of the sixteenth century by De Soto, who was buried in the waters of the Mississippi in May, 1542. Marquette descended the Mississippi as far south as the thirty-fourth degree in 1673, more than a century and a quarter after De Soto had marched northward, and tells us that he preached the Gospel to all of the nations he met. It is thought by some that there was a white settlement at the mouth of the River Des Pères in Missouri, a few miles south of St. Louis, even before the historical settlement of Cahokia, Illinois (the sole centre of civilization in the Mississippi Valley for some time), but the first permanent settlement of which we have any record was made at Ste. Geneviève about 1734. Among the oldest records in the state are those of the Catholic church at Ste. Geneviève. There was also a mission in 1734 at Old Mines, which was a military station in Missouri. Ste. Geneviève and Old Mines were attended by priests from Cahokia. The first mission was established in St. Louis in 1764, and the first church was built in 1770. A mission was established at Carondelet in 1767. Fredericktown, New Madrid, St. Charles, and Florissant were missionary points during the last half of the eighteenth century. The Lazarist Fathers were established at Perryville in 1818, and the Jesuits at Florissant in 1823. The early settlements were made up of French, many of them coming from Canada. A great many German Catholics came to the state during the first part of the nineteenth century, but the first German sermon of which we have any record was preached by Rev. Joseph A. Lutz at St. Louis in 1832. During this same period a large portion of the immigration was made up of Irish Catholics. The names of many of the early settlements bear evidence of the Catholicism of those who were first established there. The later immigration into the state has been made up of almost every nationality, and almost all of the Catholic countries are represented. A famous episode in the state's history was Archbishop Kenrick's successful resistance to the test oath required by the Drake Constitution of

1865. He finally won the case in the Supreme Court of the United States (see OATH, MISSOURI TEST).

PRINCIPAL RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS.—According to the Bulletin issued by the Department of Commerce and Labour Bureau of the Census concerning religious bodies in 1906, the total population of church members in the State of Missouri was 1,199,239, and the principal religious denominations were as follows: Roman Catholics, 382,642; Baptists, 218,353; Congregationalists, 11,048; Disciples or Christians, 166,137; German Evangelical, 32,715; Lutherans, 46,868; Methodists, 214,004; Presbyterians, 71,999; Episcopalians, 13,328; Reformed Bodies, 1284; United Brethren bodies, 3316; other Protestant bodies, 23,166; Latter-day Saints, 8042; all other bodies, 6439. Thus, 33.9 per cent of the total number of church-going people in the state are Catholics, the Baptists having the next highest percentage (18.2), and the Methodists being third (17.8).

HOUCK, *Hist. of Missouri* (Philadelphia, 1908); WILLIAMS, *Hist. of the State of Missouri* (Columbia, 1904); BILLON, *Annals of St. Louis* (St. Louis, 1880); SCHARF, *St. Louis City and County* (Philadelphia, 1883); *Jesuit Relations;* BECK, *Gazetteer of Missouri* (St. Louis, 1875); IRVING, *Conquest of Florida* (New York, 1851); *Constitution of Missouri; Revised Statutes* (1899); *Red Book; Bureau of Labour Statistics* (Jefferson City, 1909); *Manual of the State of Missouri, 1909–10; Bulletin No. 103, Religious Bodies, 1906, Bureau of the Census* (Washington).

JOHN L. CORLEY.

Mithraism.—A pagan religion consisting mainly of the cult of the ancient Indo-Iranian Sun-god Mithra. It entered Europe from Asia Minor after Alexander's conquest, spread rapidly over the whole Roman Empire at the beginning of our era, reached its zenith during the third century, and vanished under the repressive regulations of Theodosius at the end of the fourth century. Of late the researches of Cumont have brought it into prominence mainly because of its supposed similarity to Christianity.

ORIGIN.—The origin of the cult of Mithra dates from the time that Hindus and Persians still formed one people, for the god Mithra occurs in the religion and the sacred books of both races, i. e. in the Vedas and in the Avesta. In Vedic hymns he is frequently mentioned and is nearly always coupled with Varuna, but beyond the bare occurrence of his name, little is known of him; only one, possibly two, hymns are dedicated to him (Rigveda, III, 59). It is conjectured (Oldenberg, "Die Religion des Veda," Berlin, 1894) that Mithra was the rising sun, Varuna the setting sun; or, Mithra, the sky at daytime, Varuna, the sky at night; or, the one the sun, the other the moon. In any case Mithra is a light or solar deity of some sort; but in Vedic times the vague and general mention of him seems to indicate that his name was little more than a memory. In the Avesta he is much more of a living and ruling deity than in Indian piety; nevertheless, he is not only secondary to Ahura Mazda, but he does not belong to the seven Amshaspands or personified virtues which immediately surround Ahura; he is but a Yazad, a popular demigod or genius. The Avesta however gives us his position only after the Zoroastrian reformation; the inscriptions of the Achæmenidæ (seventh to fourth century B. C.) assign him a much higher place, naming him immediately after Ahura Mazda and associating him with the goddess Anaitis (Anahata), whose name sometimes precedes his own. Mithra is the god of light, Anaitis the goddess of water. Independently of the Zoroastrian reform, Mithra retained his place as foremost deity in the north-west of the Iranian highlands. After the conquest of Babylon this Persian cult came into contact with Chaldean astrology and with the national worship of Marduk. For a time the two priesthoods of Mithra and Marduk (magi and chaldæi respectively) coexisted in the capital and Mithraism borrowed much from this intercourse. This modified Mithraism travelled farther north-westward and became the State cult of Armenia. Its rulers, anxious to claim descent from the glorious kings of the past, adopted Mithradates as their royal name (so five kings of Georgia, and Eupator of the Bosporus). Mithraism then entered Asia Minor, especially Pontus and Cappadocia. Here it came into contact with the Phrygian cult of Attis and Cybele from which it adopted a number of ideas and practices, though apparently not the gross obscenities of the Phrygian worship. This Phrygian-Chaldean-Indo-Iranian religion, in which the Iranian element remained predominant, came, after Alexander's conquest, in touch with the Western World. Hellenism, however, and especially Greece itself, remained remarkably free from its influence. When finally the Romans took possession of the Kingdom of Pergamum, occupied Asia Minor and stationed two legions of soldiers on the Euphrates, the success of Mithraism in the West was secured. It spread rapidly from the Bosporus to the Atlantic, from Illyria to Britain. Its foremost apostles were the legionaries; hence it spread first to the frontier stations of the Roman army.

Mithraism was emphatically a soldier religion: Mithra, its hero, was especially a divinity of fidelity, manliness, and bravery; the stress it laid on good-fellowship and brotherliness, its exclusion of women, and the secret bond amongst its members have suggested the idea that Mithraism was Masonry amongst the Roman soldiery. At the same time Eastern slaves and foreign tradesmen maintained its propaganda in the cities. When magi, coming from King Tiridates of Armenia, had worshipped in Nero an emanation of Mithra, the emperor wished to be initiated in their mysteries. As Mithraism passed as a Phrygian cult it began to share in the official recognition which Phrygian worship had long enjoyed in Rome. The Emperor Commodus was publicly initiated. Its greatest devotee however was the imperial son of a priestess of the sun-god at Sirmium in Pannonia, Valerian, who according to the testimony of Flavius Vopiscus, never forgot the cave where his mother initiated him. In Rome, he established a college of sun priests and his coins bear the legend "Sol, Dominus Imperii Romani". Diocletian, Galerius, and Licinius built at Carnuntum on the Danube a temple to Mithra with the dedication: "Fautori Imperii Sui". But with the triumph of Christianity Mithraism came to a sudden end. Under Julian it had with other pagan cults a short revival. The pagans of Alexandria lynched George the Arian, bishop of the city, for attempting to build a church over a Mithras cave near the town. The laws of Theodosius I signed its death warrant. The magi walled up their sacred caves; and Mithra has no martyrs to rival the martyrs who died for Christ.

DOCTRINE.—The first principle or highest God was according to Mithraism "Infinite Time"; this was called Αἰών or Sæculum, Κρόνος or Saturnus. This Kronos is none other than Zervan, an ancient Iranian conception, which survived the sharp dualism of Zoroaster; for Zervan was father of both Ormuzd and Ahriman and connected the two opposites in a higher unity and was still worshipped a thousand years later by the Manichees. This personified Time, ineffable, sexless, passionless, was represented by a human monster, with the head of a lion and a serpent coiled about his body. He carried a sceptre and lightning as sovereign god and held in each hand a key as master of the heavens. He had two pair of wings to symbolize the swiftness of time. His body was covered with zodiacal signs and the emblems of the seasons (i. e. Chaldean astrology combined with Zervanism). This first principle begat Heaven and Earth, which in turn begat their son and equal, Ocean. As in the European legend, Heaven or Jupiter (Oromasdes) succeeds Kronos. Earth is the Speñta Armaiti of the Persians or the Juno of the Westerns, Ocean is Apâm-Napât or Neptune. The Persian names were not for-

gotten, though the Greek and Roman ones were habitually used. Ahura Mazda and Speñta Armaiti gave birth to a great number of lesser deities and heroes: Artagnes (Hercules), Sharevar (Mars), Atar (Vulcan), Anaitis (Cybele), and so on. On the other hand there was Pluto, or Ahriman, also begotten of Infinite Time. This Incarnate Evil rose with the army of darkness to attack and dethrone Oromasdes. They were however thrown back into hell, whence they escape, wander over the face of the earth and afflict man. It is man's duty to worship the four simple elements, water and fire, air and earth, which in the main are man's friends. The seven planets likewise were beneficent deities. The souls of men, which were all created together from the beginning and which at birth had but to descend from the empyrean heaven to the bodies prepared for them, received from the seven planets their passions and characteristics. Hence the seven days of the week were dedicated to the planets, seven metals were sacred to them, seven rites of initiation were made to perfect the Mithraist, and so on. As evil spirits ever lie in wait for hapless man, he needs a friend and saviour who is Mithra. Mithra was born of a mother-rock by a river under a tree. He came into the world with the Phrygian cap on his head (hence his designation as Pileatus, the Capped One), and a knife in his hand. It is said that shepherds watched his birth, but how this could be, considering there were no men on earth, is not explained. The hero-god first gives battle to the sun, conquers him, crowns him with rays and makes him his eternal friend and fellow; nay, the sun becomes in a sense Mithra's double, or again his father, but Ἥλιος Μίθρας is one god. Then follows the struggle between Mithra and the bull, the central dogma of Mithraism. Ahura Mazda had created a wild bull which Mithra pursued, overcame, and dragged into his cave. This wearisome journey with the struggling bull towards the cave is the symbol of man's troubles on earth. Unfortunately, the bull escapes from the cave, whereupon Ahura Mazda sends a crow with a message to Mithra to find and slay it. Mithra reluctantly obeys, and plunges his dagger into the bull as it returns to the cave. Strange to say, from the body of the dying bull proceed all wholesome plants and herbs that cover the earth, from his spinal marrow the corn, from his blood the vine, etc. The power of evil sends his unclean creatures to prevent or poison these productions but in vain. From the bull proceed all useful animals, and the bull, resigning itself to death, is transported to the heavenly spheres. Man is now created and subjected to the malign influence of Ahriman in the form of droughts, deluges, and conflagrations, but is saved by Mithra. Finally man is well established on earth and Mithra returns to heaven. He celebrates a last supper with Helios and his other companions, is taken in his fiery chariot across the ocean, and now in heaven protects his followers. For the struggle between good and evil continues in heaven between the planets and stars, and on earth in the heart of man. Mithra is the Mediator (Μεσίτης) between God and man. This function first arose from the fact that as the light-god he is supposed to float midway between the upper heaven and the earth. Likewise a sun-god, his planet was supposed to hold the central place amongst the seven planets. The moral aspect of his mediation between god and man cannot be proven to be ancient. As Mazdean dualists the Mithraists were strongly inclined towards asceticism: abstention from food and absolute continence seemed to them noble and praiseworthy, though not obligatory. They battled on Mithra's side against all impurity, against all evil within and without. They believed in the immortality of the soul; sinners after death were dragged to hell; the just passed through the seven spheres of the planets, through seven gates opening at a mystic word to Ahura Mazda, leaving at each planet a part of their lower humanity until, as pure spirits, they stood before God. At the end of the world Mithra will descend to earth on another bull, which he will sacrifice, and mixing its fat with sacred wine he will make all drink the beverage of immortality. He will thus have proved himself *Nabarses*, i. e. "never conquered".

THE SACRIFICE OF MITHRA
Vatican Museum, Rome

WORSHIP.—There were seven degrees of initiation into the Mithraic mysteries. The consecrated one (*mystes*) became in succession crow (*corax*), occult (*cryphius*), soldier(*miles*), lion (*leo*), Persian (*Perses*), solar messenger (*heliodromos*), and father (*pater*). On solemn occasions they wore a garb appropriate to their name, and uttered sounds or performed gestures in keeping with what they personified. "Some flap their wings as birds imitating the sound of a crow, others roar as lions", says Pseudo-Augustine (Quæst. Vet. N. Test. in P. L., XXXIV, 2214). Crows, occults and soldiers formed the lower orders, a sort of catechumens; lions and those admitted to the other degrees were participants of the mysteries. The fathers conducted the worship. The chief of the fathers, a sort of pope, who always lived at Rome, was called "Pater Patrum" or "Pater Patratus." The members below the degree of pater called one another "brother," and social distinctions were forgotten in Mithraic unity. The ceremonies of initiation for each degree must have been elaborate, but they are only vaguely known—lustrations and bathings, branding with red-hot metal, anointing with honey, and others. A sacred meal was celebrated of bread and *haoma* juice for which in the West wine was substituted. This meal was supposed to give the participants supernatural virtue. The Mithraists worshipped in caves, of which a large number have been found. There were five at Ostia alone, but they were small and could perhaps hold at most 200 persons. In the apse of the cave stood the stone representation of Mithra slaying the bull, a piece of sculpture usually of mediocre artistic merit and always made after the same Pergamean model. The light usually fell through openings in the top as the caves were near the surface of the ground. A hideous monstrosity representing Kronos was also

shown. A fire was kept perpetually burning in the sanctuary. Three times a day prayer was offered the sun towards east, south, or west according to the hour. Sunday was kept holy in honour of Mithra, and the sixteenth of each month was sacred to him as mediator. The 25 December was observed as his birthday, the *natalis invicti*, the rebirth of the winter-sun, unconquered by the rigours of the season. A Mithraic community was not merely a religious congregation; it was a social and legal body with its *decemprimi*, *magistri*, *curatores*, *defensores*, and *patroni*. These communities allowed no women as members. Women might console themselves by forming associations to worship Anaitis-Cybele; but whether these were associated with Mithraism seems doubtful. No proof of immorality or obscene practices, so often connected with esoteric pagan cults, has ever been established against Mithraism; and as far as can be ascertained, or rather conjectured it had an elevating and invigorating effect on its followers. From a chance remark of Tertullian (De Præscriptione, xl) we gather that their "Pater Patrum" was only allowed to be married once, and that Mithraism had its *virgines* and *continentes;* such at least seems the best interpretation of the passage. If, however, Dieterich's Mithras's liturgy be really a liturgy of this sect, as he ably maintains, its liturgy can only strike us as a mixture of bombast and charlatanism in which the *mystes* has to hold his sides, and roar to the utmost of his power till he is exhausted, to whistle, smack his lips, and pronounce barbaric agglomerations of syllables as the different mystic signs for the heavens and the constellations are unveiled to him.

Relation to Christianity.—A similarity between Mithra and Christ struck even early observers, such as Justin, Tertullian, and other Fathers, and in recent times has been urged to prove that Christianity is but an adaptation of Mithraism, or at most the outcome of the same religious ideas and aspirations (e. g. Robertson, "Pagan Christs", 1903). Against this erroneous and unscientific procedure, which is not endorsed by the greatest living authority on Mithraism, the following considerations must be brought forward. (1) Our knowledge regarding Mithraism is very imperfect; some 600 brief inscriptions, mostly dedicatory, some 300 often fragmentary, exiguous, almost identical monuments, a few casual references in the Fathers or Acts of the Martyrs, and a brief polemic against Mithraism which the Armenian Eznig about 450 probably copied from Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428) who lived when Mithraism was almost a thing of the past—these are our only sources, unless we include the Avesta in which Mithra is indeed mentioned, but which cannot be an authority for Roman Mithraism with which Christianity is compared. Our knowledge is mostly ingenious guess-work; of the real inner working of Mithraism and the sense in which it was understood by those who professed it at the advent of Christianity, we know nothing. (2) Some apparent similarities exist; but in a number of details it is quite as probable that Mithraism was the borrower from Christianity. Tertullian about 200 could say: "hesterni sumus et omnia vestra implevimus" ("we are but of yesterday, yet your whole world is full of us"). It is not unnatural to suppose that a religion which filled the whole world, should have been copied at least in some details by another religion which was quite popular during the third century. Moreover the resemblances pointed out are superficial and external. Similarity in words and names is nothing; it is the sense that matters. During these centuries Christianity was coining its own technical terms, and naturally took names, terms, and expressions current in that day; and so did Mithraism. But under identical terms each system thought its own thoughts. Mithra is called a mediator; and so is Christ; but Mithra originally only in a cosmogonic or astronomical sense; Christ, being God and man, is by nature the Mediator between God and man. And so in similar instances. Mithraism had a Eucharist, but the idea of a sacred banquet is as old as the human race and existed at all ages and amongst all peoples. Mithra saved the world by sacrificing a bull; Christ by sacrificing Himself. It is hardly possible to conceive a more radical difference than that between Mithra taurochtonos and Christ crucified. Christ was born of a Virgin; there is nothing to prove that the same was believed of Mithra born from the rock. Christ was born in a cave; and Mithraists worshipped in a cave, but Mithra was born under a tree near a river. Much has been made of the presence of adoring shepherds; but their existence on sculptures has not been proven, and considering that man had not yet appeared, it is an anachronism to suppose their presence. (3) Christ was an historical personage, recently born in a well known town of Judea, and crucified under a Roman Governor, whose name figured in the ordinary official lists. Mithra was an abstraction, a personification not even of the sun but of the diffused daylight; his incarnation, if such it may be called, was supposed to have happened before the creation of the human race, before all history. The small Mithraic congregations were like masonic lodges for a few and for men only and even those mostly of one class, the military; a religion that excludes the half of the human race bears no comparison to the religion of Christ. Mithraism was all comprehensive and tolerant of every other cult, the Pater Patrum himself was an adept in a number of other religions; Christianity was essentially exclusive, condemning every other religion in the world, alone and unique in its majesty.

Cumont, *Notes sur un temple Mithriaque d'Ostie* (Ghent, 1891); Idem, *Textes et Monuments figurés relat. aux Mystères de Mithra* (2 vols., Brussels, 1896–1899); Idem, *Les Mystères de Mithra* (2nd., Paris, 1902), tr. McCormack (London, 1903); Idem, *Religions Orientales dans le Paganisme Romain* (Paris, 1906); Martindale, *The Religion of Mithra* in *The Month* (1908, Oct., Nov., Dec.); Idem, *The Religion of Mithra* in *Lectures on the Hist. of Religions*, II (C. T. S., London, 1910); Dill, *Roman Society from Nero to M. Aurelius* (London, 1904); St.-Clair-Tisdall, *Mythic Christs and the True;* Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie* (Leipzig, 1903); Ramsay, *The Greek of the early Church and the Pagan Ritual* (Edinburgh, 1898–9); Blotzer, *Das heidn. Mysterienwesen und die Hellenisierung des Christenthums* in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach* (1906–7); Ales, *Mithriacisme et Christianisme* in *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique* (Paris, 1906–7); Wieland, *Anklänge der christl. Tauflehre an die Mithraischen Mystagogie* (Munich, 1907); Gasquet, *Essai sur le culte et les mystères de Mithra* (Paris, 1899).

J. P. Arendzen.

Mitre.—*Form, Material, and Use.*—The mitre is a kind of folding-cap. It consists of two like parts, each stiffened by a lining and rising to a peak; these are sewn together on the sides, but are united above by a piece of material that can fold together. Two lappets trimmed on the ends with fringe hang down from the back. The mitre is, theoretically, always supposed to be white. The official "Cæremoniale Romanum" distinguishes three kinds of mitres: the *mitra pretiosa*, *auriphrygiata*, and *simplex*. The first two differ from each other only in the greater or less richness of the ornamentation; the *mitra simplex*, or simple mitre, is one of white silk or white linen entirely without ornament. The fringe on the lappets at the back should be red. The bishop must wear the *mitra pretiosa* on those days on which the hymn Te Deum is used in the Office, the *mitre auriphrygiata* in the seasons of Advent and Lent, on fast days and during penitential processions, the *mitra simplex* on Good Fridays, at funerals, and at the blessing of the candles on Candlemas-day. When bishops attend a general council, or are present at solemn pontifical acts of the pope, they wear a plain linen mitre, while the cardinals on such occasions wear a simple mitre of silk damask. The right to wear the mitre belongs by law only to the pope, the cardinals, and the bishops. Others require for its use a special papal privilege. This privilege



MITRES OF BL. NICOLÒ ALBERGATI (XV–XVI CENTURY)
CATHEDRAL, BOLOGNA

EPISCOPAL MITRE—CHAPLAINS' MITRES (XIV CENTURY)
MUSÉE DE CLUNY, PARIS

EPISCOPAL MITRES (XV CENTURY)
MUSÉE DE CLUNY, PARIS

EPISCOPAL MITRE (SPANISH, XVI CENTURY)
MUSÉE DE CLUNY, PARIS

is possessed, for example, by numerous abbots, the dignitaries of many cathedral chapters, and by certain prelates of the papal Curia, but, as a rule, the right is more or less limited: for instance, such prelates can only use a simple mitre of white linen, unless the contrary is expressly granted them. The mitre is distinguished from the other episcopal vestments in that it is always laid aside when the bishop prays; for example, at the *orationes* of the Mass, of the Office, in conferring Holy Orders, at the Canon of the Mass, etc. The reason for this is to be found in the commandment of the Apostle that a man should pray with uncovered head (I Cor., xi, 4). The giving of the mitre is a ceremony in the consecration of a bishop. It occurs at the close of the Mass after the solemn final blessing, the consecrator having first blessed the mitre.

Antiquity.—From the seventeenth century much has been written concerning the length of time the mitre has been worn. According to one opinion its use extends back into the age of the Apostles; according to another, at least as far back as the eighth or ninth century, while a further view holds that it did not appear until the beginning of the second millennium, but that before this there was an episcopal ornament for the head, in form like a wreath or crown. In opposition to these and similar opinions, which cannot all be discussed here, it is, however, to be held as certain that an episcopal ornament for the head in the shape of a fillet never existed in Western Europe, that the mitre was first used at Rome about the middle of the tenth century, and outside of Rome about the year 1000. Exhaustive proof for this is given in the work (mentioned in bibliography below), "Die liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient" (pp. 431–48), where all that has been brought forward to prove the high antiquity of the mitre is exhaustively discussed and refuted. The mitre is depicted for the first time in two miniatures of the beginning of the eleventh century; the one is in a baptismal register, the other in an Exultet-roll of the cathedral at Bari, Italy. The first written mention of it is found in a Bull of Leo IX of the year 1049. In this the pope, who had formerly been Bishop of Toul, France, confirmed the primacy of the Church of Trier to Bishop Eberhard of Trier, his former metropolitan, who had accompanied him to Rome. As a sign of this primacy, Leo granted Bishop Eberhard the Roman mitre, in order that he might use



Developement of the Mitre from the Eleventh Century to the Present Time

it according to Roman custom in performing the offices of the Church. By about 1100 -50 the custom of wearing the mitre was general among bishops.

Origin.—The pontifical mitre is of Roman origin: it is derived from a non-liturgical head-covering distinctive of the pope, the *camelaucum*, to which also the tiara is to be traced. The camelaucum was worn as early as the beginning of the eighth century, as is shown by the biography of Pope Constantine I (708–815) in the "Liber Pontificalis". The same head-covering is also mentioned in the so-called "Donation of Constantine". The Ninth Ordo states that the camelaucum was made of white stuff and shaped like a helmet. The coins of Sergius III (904–11) and of Benedict VII (974–83), on which St. Peter is portrayed wearing a camelaucum, give the cap the form of a cone, the original shape of the mitre. The camelaucum was worn by the pope principally during solemn processions. The mitre developed from the camelaucum in this way: in the course of the tenth century the pope began to wear this head-covering not merely during processions to the church, but also during the subsequent church service. Whether any influence was exerted by the recollection of the sacerdotal head-ornament of the high-priest of the Old Testament is not known, but probably not—at least there is no trace of any such influence. It was not until the mitre was universally worn by bishops that it was called an imitation of the Jewish sacerdotal head-ornament.

Granting of the Mitre to Dignitaries other than Bishops.—The Roman cardinals certainly had already the right to wear the mitre towards the end of the eleventh century. Probably they possessed the privilege as early as in the first half of the century. For if Leo IX granted the privilege to the cardinals of the cathedral of Besançon (see Cardinal: I. *Cardinal Priests*) in 1051, the Roman cardinals surely had it before that date. The first authentic granting of the mitre to an abbot dates from the year 1063, when Alexander II conferred the mitre upon Abbot Egelsinus of the Abbey of St. Augustine at Canterbury. From this time on instances of the granting of the mitre to abbots constantly increased in number. At times also secular princes were granted permission to wear the mitre as a mark of distinction; for example, Duke Wratislaw of Bohemia received this privilege from Pope Alexander II, and Peter of Aragon from Innocent III. The right also belonged to the German emperor.

Greek Mitre

Development of the Shape.—As regards shape, there is such difference between the mitre of the eleventh century and that of the twentieth that it is difficult to recognize the same ornamental head-covering in the two. In its earliest form the mitre was a simple cap of soft material, which ended above in a point, while around the lower edge there was generally, although not always, an ornamental band (*circulus*). It would also seem that lappets were not always attached to the back of the mitre. Towards 1100 the mitre began to have a curved shape above and to grow into a round cap. In many cases there soon appeared a depression in the upper part similar to the one which is made when a soft felt hat is pressed down on the head from the forehead to the back of the head. In handsome mitres an ornamental band passed from front to back across the indentation; this made more prominent the puffs in the upper part of the cap to the right and left sides of the head. This calotte-shaped mitre was used until late in the twelfth century; in some places until the last quarter of the century. From about 1125 a mitre of another form and somewhat different appearance is often found. In it the puffs on the sides had developed into horns (*cornua*) which ended each in a point and were stiffened with parchment or some other interlining. This mitre formed the transition to the third style of mitre which is essentially the one still used to-day: the third mitre

is distinguished from its predecessor, not actually by its shape, but only by its position on the head. While retaining its form, the mitre was henceforth so placed upon the head that the *cornua* no longer arose above the temples but above the forehead and the back of the head. The lappets had, naturally, to be fastened to the under edge below the horn at the back. The first example of such a mitre appeared towards 1150. Elaborate mitres of this kind had not only an ornamental band (*circulus*) on the lower edge, but a similar ornamental band (*titulus*) went vertically over the middle of the horns. In the fourteenth century this form of mitre began to be distorted in shape. Up to



Sixteenth-Century Mitre and Infulæ

then the mitre had been somewhat broader than high when folded together, but from this period on it began, slowly indeed, but steadily, to increase in height until, in the seventeenth century, it grew into an actual tower. Another change, which, however, did not appear until the fifteenth century, was that the sides were no longer made vertical, but diagonal. In the sixteenth century it began to be customary to curve, more or less decidedly, the diagonal sides of the horns. The illustration gives a summary of the development of the shape of the mitre. It should, however, be said that the changes did not take place everywhere at the same time, nor did the mitre everywhere pass through all the shapes of the development. A large number of mitres of the later Middle Ages have been preserved, but they all belong to the third form of mitre. Many have very costly ornamentation. For even in medieval times it was a favourite custom to ornament especially the mitre with embroidery, rich bands (*aurifrisia*), pearls, precious stones, small ornamental disks of the precious metals; and even to use painting. Besides several hundred large and small pearls, a mitre of the late Middle Ages in St. Peter's at Salsburg is also ornamented with about five hundred more or less costly precious stones; it weighs over five and a half pounds. Similar mitres are also mentioned in the inventory of 1295 of Boniface VIII. Eight medieval mitres are preserved in the cathedral of Halberstadt. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the mitre was ornamented with rich, heavy embroidery in gold, which gave it a still more imposing appearance. A mitre of the eighteenth century preserved in the cathedral treasury at Limburg-on-the-Lahn is remarkable for the large number of precious stones that adorn it. The original material of the mitre appears to have been white linen alone, but as early as the thirteenth century (with the exception of course of the simple mitre) it was generally made of silk or ornamented with silk embroidery.

The Liturgical Head-Covering in the Greek Rite.—In the Orthodox Greek Rite (the other Greek Rites need not here be considered) a liturgical head-covering was not worn until the sixteenth century. Before this only the Patriarch of Alexandria, who wore one as early as the tenth century, made use of a head-covering, and his was only a simple cap. The Greek pontifical mitre is a high hat which swells out towards the top and is spanned diagonally by two hoops; on the highest point of the dome-shaped top is a cross either standing upright or placed flat.

De Linas, *Anciens vêtements sacerdotaux*, 2e série (Paris, 1862); Bock, *Geschichte der liturg. Gewänder*, II (Bonn, 1866); Rohault de Fleury, *La Messe*, VIII (Paris, 1889); Braun, *Die pontifikalen Gewänder des Abendlandes* (Freiburg im Br., 1898); Idem, *Die liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient* (Freiburg im Br., 1907).

Joseph Braun.

Mittarelli, Nicola Giacomo (in religion Gian Benedetto), monastic historian, b. 2 September, 1707, at Venice; d. 4 August, 1777, in the monastery of

San Michele di Murano near Venice. After joining the Camaldolese Order at the early age of fourteen, he studied theology at Florence and Rome, whereupon he taught philosophy and theology at the monastery of San Michele di Murano. Because he relinquished the scholastic method, his superiors sent him to the monastery of San Parisio in Treviso where he became confessor and archivist. In 1760 he was elected Abbot of San Michele di Murano and in 1765, General of his Order for the space of five years during which he resided in Rome; in 1770 he returned to his monastery where he remained as abbot until his death. His monumental work, in the preparation of which he was assisted by his confrères Costadini and Calogera, is the "Annales Camaldulenses ordinis S. Benedicti, ab anno 907 ad annum 1770" 9 vols. folio (Venice, 1755–73). It follows the plan of Mabillon's "Annales ordinis S. Benedicti". His other works are: "Memorie della vita di San Parisio, e del monastero dei Santi Christina e Parisio di Treviso" (Venice, 1748), "Memorie del monastero della Santa Trinità di Fænza" (Fænza, 1749), "Ad Scriptores rerum Italicarum A. Muratorii accessiones historiæ Faventinæ" (Venice, 1771), "De litteratura Faventinorum" (Venice, 1775), and the posthumous work "Bibliotheca codicum Mss. monasterii St. Michælis de Murano cum appendice librorum 15, sæculi" (Venice, 1779).

FABRONI, *De vita Mittarellii*, prefixed to the last named work of Mittarelli; IDEM, *Vita Italorum doctrina excellentium qui sec. 17 et 18 floruerunt*, V (Pisa, 1778–1804), 369–91; BRAUNMÜLLER in *Kirchenlex;* WEISS in *Biographie Universelle*, XXVIII, 427.

MICHAEL OTT.

Mitylene, a titulary archbishopric in the island of Lesbos. Inhabitated, first by the Pelasgians, then by the Æolians, it was ruled in turn by the Persians, the Athenians, the Macedonians, the Seleucidæ, and the Romans. Included in the empire of the East after the time of Theodosius it suffered much from the different invasions of the Scythians in 376, the Slavs in 769, the Arabs in 821, 881, 1035, the Russians in 864 and 1027. In 1204 after the foundation of the Latin empire, the city became a possession of the French, only to be reconquered in 1248 by John Ducas Vatatzes. It belonged to the Genoese when the sultan, Mahomet II, conquered it in 1462. The home of many famous persons, among them Sappho, Alcæus, and the sage Pittacus, Mitylene was famous for its beauty and for the strength of its walls. St. Paul stopped there during his third journey (Acts, xx, 14). Among its bishops, whose names will be found in part in Le Quien, "Oriens christianus", I, 953–962, are Zacharias Rhetor, or the Scholastic, author of an Ecclesiastical History about the year 536; Saint George who died in exile at Cherson before 821 and whose feast occurs on 7 April and 16 May; another Saint George who died in 843 and is venerated by the Greeks on 1 February with his two brothers, Saint Simeon and Saint David (Analecta bollandiana XVIII, 209 sq.). Until this time Mitylene was only an autocephalous archbishopric; the "Notitia" of Leo the Wise about 900 describes it as a metropolitan see with five suffragans. Dorotheus of Mitylene stands out among the friends of the Union at the Council of Florence of which he wrote a history in Greek (Mansi, XXXI, 463 sq., 997, 1009). The list of the Latin titularies of 1205 to 1412 may be found in Le Quien, III, 991–994; Eubel, I, 370; Gams, 449. The present city of Metilin numbers 15,000 inhabitants, the greater number schismatic Greeks; the 760 Catholics of the island are chiefly grouped about Metilin and are included in the archbishopric of Smyrna. The parish is directed by the Franciscans; the Marist Brothers have a school for boys.

LE QUIEN, *Oriens christianus* I, 953–961; III, 991–994; LACROIX, *Iles de la Grèce* (Paris, 1853), 297–338; CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie*, I (Paris, 1892), 449–74; KODELVEY *Die antiken Baureslen der Insel Lesbos* (Berlin, 1890); WROTH, *Catalogue of Greek Coins of Troas, Eolis, and Lesbes* (London, 1894), 184–215.

S. SALAVILLE.

Mivart, ST. GEORGE JACKSON, PH.D., M.D., F.R.S., V.P.Z.S., F.Z.S., Corresponding member of the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia; Member of the Council of Linnean Society, etc., b. in London, 30 November, 1827, d. there, 1 April, 1900.

Professor Mivart, whom Darwin styled the "distinguished biologist", third son of James Edward Mivart, owner of Mivart's Hotel in Brook Street, was born at 39 Brook St., Grosvenor Square, London. His parents were Evangelicals; and his early education was received at the Clapham Grammar School, at Harrow, and at King's College, London; from which latter institution he intended to go to Oxford. His enthusiasm for architecture led him, at the age of sixteen, to make a tour of Pugin's Gothic churches; and while visiting St. Chad's, in Birmingham, he met Dr. Moore (afterwards President of St. Mary's College, Oscott) who received him into the Catholic Church in 1844. Mivart's conversion is said to have been determined by Milner's "End of Religious Controversy". On his reception he proceeded to Oscott College, where he remained until 1846. On 15 January of that year he became a student at Lincoln's Inn, and was called to the Bar in 1851. He did not, however, follow a legal career, but gave himself to scientific and philosophical studies; and in 1862 was appointed Lecturer on Comparative Anatomy at St. Mary's Hospital Medical School. In 1874, he was appointed professor of Biology at the (Catholic) University College, Kensington. From 1890 to 1893 he gave a course of lectures on "The Philosophy of Natural History" in the University of Louvain. From 1849 he was a member of the Royal Institution; Fellow of the Zoological Society from 1858, and Vice-President twice (1869 and 1882); Fellow of the Linnean Society from 1862; Secretary of the same during the years 1874-80, and Vice-President in 1892. In 1867 he became a member of the Royal Society—elected on account of the merit of his work "On the Appendicular skeleton of the Primates". This work was communicated to the Society by Professor Huxley. Mivart was a member of the Metaphysical Society from 1874. He received the degrees of Doctor of Philosophy from Pope Pius IX in 1876, and of Doctor of Medicine from Louvain in 1884. His communications, dating from 1864, to the "proceedings" of learned Societies—notably. the Royal, the Linnean, and the Zoological—are numerous and of great scientific value. He contributed articles to the "Encyclopædia Britannica," and to all the leading English and American reviews.

In 1871 he published his "Genesis of Species", in which work, foreshadowed by an article in the "Quarterly Review" of the same year, he took his stand as the leading opponent of the Darwinian hypothesis. This estranged him from Darwin and Huxley; but his reputation as a specialist in biological science was in no way impaired by the position he took up. In subsequent editions of his "Origin of Species" Darwin deals at great length with the objections raised by Mivart. His since published "Life and Letters" afford ample evidence of how weighty he felt them to be. Mivart, however, himself professed a theory of evolution; but he unhesitatingly and consistently asserted the irreconciliable difference between the inanimate and animate, as well as between the purely animal and the rational. By maintaining the creationist theory of the origin of the human soul he attempted to reconcile his evolutionism with the Catholic faith. In philosophical problems, towards which he turned more and more in later years, his attitude was rather that of a neo-scholastic as against the post-Cartesian philosophies; and he opposed with success a critical, or moderate realist, system of knowledge to the widely prevalent agnosticism of his time. Towards the close of his life Mivart's philosophical speculations began to verge on an "interpretation" of theological dogma that was incompatible with the Faith. The crisis, however,

did not become acute before his articles in the "Nineteenth Century" ("Modern Catholics and Scientific Freedom" in July, 1885; "The Catholic Church and Biblical Criticism" in July, 1887; "Catholicity and Reason" in December, 1887; "Sins of Belief and Disbelief" in October, 1888; "Happiness in Hell" in December, 1892) were placed on the Index.

His orthodoxy was finally brought into the gravest suspicion by the articles "The Continuity of Catholicism" ("Nineteenth Century", January, 1900) and "Some Recent Apologists" ("Fortnightly Review", January, 1900). In the same month (18 January, 1900), after admonition and three formal notifications requiring him in vain to sign a profession of faith that was sent him, he was inhibited from the sacraments by Cardinal Vaughan "until he shall have proved his orthodoxy to the satisfaction of his ordinary." The letters that passed between Archbishop's House and Dr. Mivart were published by him in the columns of the "Times" newspaper (27 January, 1900); and in March a last article—"Scripture and Roman Catholicism"—repudiating ecclesiastical authority, appeared in the "Nineteenth Century".

Dr. Mivart died of diabetes 1 April, 1900, at 77 Inverness Terrace, Bayswater, London, W., and was buried without ecclesiastical rites. After his decease his friends, persuaded that the gravity and nature of the illness from which he suffered offered a complete explanation of the amazing inconsistency of Dr. Mivart's final position with that which he had maintained during the greater part of his life, approached the authorities with a view to securing for him burial in consecrated ground. Sir William Broadbent gave medical testimony as to the nature of his malady amply sufficient to free his late patient from the responsibility of the heterodox opinions which he had put forward and the attitude he had taken with regard to his superiors. His disease, not his will, was the cause of his aberration. But there were difficulties in the way. Cardinal Vaughan was ill and could not deal directly with the representations made. Misunderstandings arose about the publication of Sir William Broadbent's certificate; and the cardinal counselled a little patience and left the matter to the decision of his successor. So it was that, on the appointment of Archbishop Bourne, the case was reopened; and now the condition of the publication of the facts, at the archbishop's discretion, was accepted by the friends of Dr. Mivart. The burial took place in Kensal Green Catholic cemetery 18 January, 1904. The text of the certificate has not been published; but an account of the matter is to be found in the second volume of "Life of Cardinal Vaughan".

Dr. Mivart's chief works are the following:—"One Point of Controversy with the Agnostics" in Manning: "Essays on Religion and Literature" (1868); "On the Genesis of Species" (London, 1871); "An examination of Mr. Herbert Spencer's Psychology"; "Lessons in Elementary Anatomy" (London, 1873); "The Common Frog" in "Nature series" (1873); "Man and Apes" (London, 1873); "Lessons from Nature" (London, 1876); "Contemporary Evolution" (London, 1876); "Address to the Biological Section of the British Association" (1879); "The Cat" (London, 1881); "Nature and Thought" (London, 1882); "A Philosophical Catechism" (London, 1884); "On Truth" (London, 1889); "The Origin of Human Reason" (London, 1889); "Dogs, Jackals, Wolves and Foxes, Monograph of the Canidæ" (London, 1890); "Introduction Générale à l'Etude de la Nature: Cours professé à l'Université de Louvain" (Louvain and Paris, 1891); "Birds" (London, 1892); "Essays and Criticisms" (London, 1892); "Types of Animal Life" (London, 1893); "Introduction to the Elements of Science" (London, 1894); "Castle and Manor" (London, 1900); "A monograph of the Lories" (London, 1896); "The Groundwork of Science: a study of Epistemology" (London, 1898); "The Helpful Science" (London, 1898); Article "Ape" in "Encyclopædia Britannica"; besides many notes and memoirs not collected, Transactions and Proceedings of the Zoological Society, of the Linnean Society, Proceedings of the Royal Society and articles in the "Popular Science Review," the "Contemporary Review", the "Fortnightly Review", the "Nineteenth Century", the "Dublin Review", etc.

See *Gentleman's Magazine* (1856 and 1900); *Royal Society Year Book* (1901); *Men and Women of the Time* (1895); DARWIN, *The Life and Letters of Charles Darwin* (London, 1887); SNEAD-COX, *The Life of Cardinal Vaughan* (London, 1910); *Oscotian*, Jubilee Number (1888); *The Times* (January 12, 13, 15, 22, 27, 29, and April 2, 3, 4, 1900); *The Tablet* (April 7, 1900); *Nature* (April 12, 1900).

FRANCIS AVELING.

Mixe Indians (also MIJE, Latin, Mi-she), a mountain tribe in southern Mexico, noted for their extreme conservatism, constituting together with the neighbouring Zoque, a distinct linguistic stock, the Zoquean. The Mixe occupy a number of towns and villages in the district of Yautepec, Villa Alta, and Tehuantepec in southern Oaxaca and number altogether about 25,000. They maintained their independence against both the Aztec Empire and the powerful Zapotec with whom they are still at enmity and even yet can hardly be said to have been subdued by the Spaniards, as they hold themselves aloof from the whites, retaining their own language almost to the exclusion of Spanish, keeping their old custons and adhering to many of their ancient rites and superstitions even while giving ostensible obedience to the Church and manifesting a docile attachment to their resident priests. With the other tribes of Oaxaca, the Mixe were brought under subjection by the Spaniards in 1521–4. In 1526 the work of evangelization was begun by the Dominicans under Father Gonzalo Lucero and continued with them, shared after 1575 by the Jesuits until turned over to secular priests under later settled conditions. The work of conversion was slow and uncertain for many years, in consequence of the exceptional attachment of these tribes to their ancient religion. Idols were frequently discovered buried under the cross erected in front of the chapel, so that they might be worshipped in secret under pretense of devotion to the Christian symbol, and heathen sacrifices were even offered up secretly from the very altars, under an impression, intelligible enough to the Indian, that the sacredness attaching to the Christian environment enhanced the efficacy of the pagan rite. This prevails to a great extent to-day.

Physically the Mixe are of good height and strongly built, not handsome in features, but hardy and active, and notable burden carriers. Many wear beards. Although described in ancient times as savage and warlike and addicted to cannibalism, they are commonly regarded to-day as timid, stupid, and suspicious, although industrious. It is probable, however, that the apparent stupidity is rather indifference and studied reserve, and Starr, their most recent visitor, expresses his surprise at their industry, neatness, and general prosperity, in view of what he had previously been told. It is characteristic of their stubborn disposition that their roads almost invariably run straight up and down the mountain instead of zigzagging to lessen the difficulties of the ascent. In the same way they still keep their villages upon the heights, while the other tribes, under Spanish influence, have generally moved their settlements down into the valleys. Their houses vary from light thatched structures in the country districts to well-built log or adobe, roofed with tile, in the towns. They are good farmers, producing corn, sugar, coffee, and bananas, and the women are noted for their pottery and weaving arts, producing beautiful fabrics in silk and cotton, with interwoven animal and bird designs and dyed in fadeless colours. From Starr we have an interesting account of their present

day customs and beliefs, including many pagan survivals, particularly bird and other animal sacrifices. Food is still buried with the dead and libations made to the earth, while offerings are still made secretly at heathen shrines and before idols hidden away in secret caves. One of these was discovered by the parish priest of their principal town a few years ago, and according to reliable testimony instances of cannibal sacrifice have occurred within living memory. Among their numerous dances is a dramatic performance founded upon the story of the Conquest, with characters representing Montezuma, Cortés, and Malinche.

The Mixe language is peculiarly harsh in sound and is spoken in several dialects. Its chief monument is the "Institución Cristiana, que contiene el Arte de la lengua Mije" of the Dominican Father Agustin Quintana (c. 1660–1734). It was published at Puebla in 1729 and reprinted at Oaxaca in 1891.

BANCROFT, *Native Races*, I–III (San Francisco, 1882); IDEM, *Hist. of Mexico* (San Francisco, 1886–8); BARNARD, *Isthmus of Tehuantepec* (New York, 1852); BRINTON, *American Race* (New York, 1891); PIMENTEL, *Lenguas indígenas de México*, II (Mexico, 1865); STARR, *Ethnography of Southern Mexico* in *Proc. Davenport Acad., Sciences*, VIII (Davenport, 1901); IDEM, *Recent Mexican study of the native languages of Mexico* in *Bulletin IV, Dept. Anthropology, Univ. of Chicago* (Chicago, 1900); IDEM, *In Indian Mexico* (Chicago, 1908).

JAMES MOONEY.

Mixed Marriages. See MARRIAGE, MIXED.

Mixteca Indians (also MISTECA, Latin, Mishte-ka), one of the most important civilized tribes of southern Mexico, occupying an extensive territory in western and northern Oaxaca and extending into Guerrero and Puebla. They number in all about 250,000 souls, or somewhat more than the whole Indian population of the United States together. Their eastern and southern neighbours are the rude Mixe and the cultured and powerful Zapotec, with the last named of whom they constitute a distinct linguistic stock, designated as the Zapotecan. The ancient culture and governmental forms of the Mixteca were practically the same as those of the Zapotec. They are now industrious farmers, weavers, and potters, the pottery manufacture, contrary to the Indian custom generally, being in the hands of the men. They stand high for industry and ingenuity, dignified and reliable disposition, hospitality and love of liberty. They were brought under Spanish dominion about the same time as the Zapotec and Mixe, in 1521–4, shortly after which the work of their conversion was begun by the Dominicans and prosecuted with such success that the whole nation may now be considered as Christian, notwithstanding some survivals from pagan times. They are active and enterprising, and have taken prominent part in Mexican politics, being particularly devoted to the Revolutionary cause in 1811. President Díaz of Mexico is of one-fourth Mixteca blood.

San Bartolo, one of their towns, is described by Starr as a delightful place, large and strung along two or three long straight streets. The houses were of poles set upright, with thick thatchings of palms, in yards completely filled with fruit trees, and garden beds of spinach, lettuce, and onions. Beehives in quantity were seen at nearly every house. Almost every woman was clad in native garments, many of which were beautifully decorated. The men wore brilliant sashes, woven in the town. At Teposcolula, "the great convent church historically interesting, is striking in size and architecture. The priest, an excellent man, is a pure-blooded Mixteca Indian, talking the language as his mother tongue. With great pride he showed us about the building, which was once a grand Dominican monastery. . . . The cura had ten churches in his charge. He seemed a devout man, and emphasized the importance of his preaching to his congregation in their native tongue and his. So convinced is he that the native idiom of the people is the shortest road to their heart and understanding, that he has prepared a catechism and Christian doctrine in the modern Mixtec, which has been printed." The Mixteca language is spoken in a number of dialects and in spite of its peculiarly difficult character, has been much studied on account of the importance of the tribe. The standard authority is the "Arte en lengua Mixteca" of Fr. Antonio de los Reyes (Mexico, 1593, and reprinted at Mexico in 1750). The Indian priest author noted by Starr is Fr. Casiano Palacios, whose "Catecismo" was published in Oaxaca in 1896. Pimentel also devotes a chapter to the language. (See also ZAPOTEC.)

BANCROFT, *Native Races*, I–III (San Francisco, 1882); IDEM, *Hist. of Mexico* (San Francisco, 1886–8); BRINTON, *American Race* (New York, 1891); PIMENTEL, *Lenguas indígenas de México*, I (Mexico, 1862); STARR, *Ethnography of Southern Mexico* in *Proc. Davenport Acad. Sciences*, VIII (Davenport, 1901); IDEM, *Recent Mexican study of the native languages of Mexico, Univ. of Chicago, Dept. Anthropology, Bull. IV* (Chicago, 1900); IDEM, *In Indian Mexico* (Chicago, 1908).

JAMES MOONEY.

Mixtecas. See HUAJUÁPAM DE LEÓN, DIOCESE OF.

Moab, Moabites.—In the Old Testament, the word Moab (מואב) designates (1) a son of Lot by his elder daughter (Gen., xix, 37); (2) the people of whom this son of Lot is represented as the ancestor (Ex., xv, 15, etc.), and who are also called "the Moabites" (Gen., xix, 37); and possibly (3) the territory occupied by the Moabites (Num., xxi, 11). Its etymology: "from my father", which is added by the Septuagint to the Hebrew text in Gen., xix, 37, is more probable than any derivation suggested by modern scholars. The origin and race of the Moabites need not be discussed here, since according to Gen., xix they are the same as those of the Ammonites, which have been examined in the article AMMONITES.

From the mountainous district above Segor (Zoar), a town which lay in the plain near the south-eastern end of the Dead Sea (cf. Gen., xix, 30), Lot's children forcibly extended themselves in the region of eastern Palestine. Ammon settled in the more distant north-east country, Moab in the districts nearer to the Dead Sea. These were inhabited by the Emims, a gigantic people, whom, however, the Moabites succeeded in expelling (Deut., ii, 9, 10). Moab's territory was at first of considerable extent, some fifty miles long by thirty broad. It comprised the highlands east of the Dead Sea and the Jordan as far as the mountains of Galaad, together with the level stretch between the highlands and the river, and the well-watered and fertile land at the south end of the Dead Sea. On three sides, it had natural boundaries: on the west, the Dead Sea and the southern section of the Jordan; on the south, the Wady el-Hasy, separating the uplands of Moab from those of Edom; on the east, the Arabian desert. Only on the north, were there no natural features conspicuous enough to form a fixed boundary, and hence Moab's northern frontier fluctuated at different periods between the Arnon, and a diagonal running south-east from the torrent now called Wady Nimrin to the Arabian desert.

The highlands are the great bulk of this territory. They form a table-land about 3000 feet above the Mediteranean, or 4300 feet above the Dead Sea, rising slowly from north to south, having steep western slopes, and separated eastward from the desert by low, rolling hills. The geology of this almost treeless plateau is the same as that of the range of western Palestine; but its climate is decidedly colder. In spring, its limestone hills are covered with grass and wild flowers, and parts of the plateau are now sown with corn. It is traversed by three deep valleys, the middle of which, the Arnon, is the deepest, and it abounds in streams. It is dotted with dolmens, menhirs, and stone circles, and also with ruins of villages and towns, mostly of the Roman and Byzantine periods. In Old Testament times, Moab was an excellent pasture land (IV Kings, iii, 4), and its population was

much more considerable than at the present day, as is proved by the numerous cities, such as Ar Moab, Gallim, Kir Moab, Luith, Nemrim, Segor, Nophe, Oronaim, Qiriat Hussot (A.V. Kirjath-husoth), Aroer, Baalmeon, Beer Elim, Bethgamul, Bethsimoth, Bethphogor, Bosor, Cariath, Dibon, Eleale, Helon, Hesebon, Jasa, Medaba, Mephaath, Sabama etc., which the Bible mentions as at one time or another Moabite.

Shortly before Israel's final advance towards Palestine, the Moabites had been deprived of their territory north of the Arnon by the Amorrhites, coming probably from the west of the Jordan (Num., xxi, 13, 26). Moab's king at the time was Balaac who, in his unfriendliness towards the Hebrew tribes, hired Balaam to curse them, but who failed in this attempt, the expected curses being divinely changed into blessings (see BALAAM). Another fiendish attempt in a different direction was only too successful; the daughters of Moab enticed the Israelites into their idolatry and immorality, and thereby brought upon them a heavy retribution (Num., xxv). Moab's subsequent relations with the Hebrew tribes (Ruben, Gad) who had settled in its ancient territory north of the Arnon, were probably those of a hostile neighbour anxious to recover this lost territory. In fact, in the early history of the Judges, the Moabites had not only regained control of at least a part of that land, but also extended their power into western Palestine so as to oppress the Benjamites. The Moabite yoke over Benjamin was finally put an end to by Aod, the son of Gera, who assassinated Eglon, Moab's king, slaughtered the Moabites, and recovered the territory of Jericho to Israel (Judges, iii, 12–30). To this succeeded a period of friendly intercourse, during which Moab was a refuge for the family of Elimelech, and the Moabitess Ruth was introduced into the line from which David was descended (Ruth, i, 1; iv, 10–22). Saul again fought against Moab (I Kings, xiv, 47), and David, who, for a while confided his parents to a Moabite king (xxii, 3, 4), ultimately invaded the country and made it tributary to Israel (II Kings, viii, 2). The subjugation apparently continued under Solomon, who had Moabite women in his harem and "built a temple for Chamos the idol of Moab" (III Kings, xi, 1, 7). After the disruption, the Moabites were vassals of the northern kingdom; but on the death of Achab, they broke into an open revolt the final result of which was their independence, and the full circumstances of which are best understood by combining the data in IV Kings, i, 1 and iii, 4–27, with those of the "Moabite Stone", an inscription of Mesa, King of Moab, found in 1868 at the ancient Dibon, and now preserved in the Louvre.

It seems that after this, they made frequent incursions into Israel's territory (cf. IV Kings, xiii, 20), and that after the captivity of the trans-Jordanic tribes, they gradually occupied all the land anciently lost to the Amorrhites. Their great prosperity is frequently referred to in the prophetical writings, while their exceeding pride and corruption are made the object of threatening oracles (Is., xv–xvi; xxv, 10; Jer., xlviii; Ezech., xxv, 8–11; Amos, ii, 1–3; Soph., ii, 8–11; etc.). In the cuneiform inscriptions, their rulers are repeatedly mentioned as tribute-payers to Assyria. This was indeed the condition of their continuous prosperity. It can hardly be doubted, however, that they sided at times with other Western countries against the Assyrian monarchs (Fragment of Sargon II; opening chapters of Judith). In the last days of the Kingdom of Juda, they transferred their allegiance to Babylon, and fought for Nabuchodonosor against Joakim (IV Kings, xxiv, 2). Even after the fall of Jerusalem, Moab enjoyed a considerable prosperity under Nabuchodonosor's rule; but its utter ruin as a state was at hand. In fact, when the Jews returned from Babylon, the Nabathean Arabs occupied the territory of Moab, and the Arabians instead of the Moabites were the allies of the Ammonites (cf. II Esd., iv, 7; I Mach., ix, 32–42; Josephus, "Antiq.", xiii, 13, 5, xiv, 1, 4).

As is shown by the Moabite Stone, the language of Moab was "simply a dialect of Hebrew". Its use of the *waw* consecutive connects most intimately the two languages, and almost all the words, inflections, and idioms of this inscription occur in the original text of the Old Testament. The same monument bears witness to the fact that while the Moabites adored Chamos as their national god, they also worshipped Ashtar as his consort. Besides these two divinities, the Old Testament mentions another local deity of the Moabites, viz. Baal of Mount Phegor (Peor: Beelphegor) (Num., xxv, 3; Deut., iv, 3; Osee, ix, 10; etc.). The Moabites were therefore polytheists. And although their religion is not fully known, it is certain that human sacrifices and also impure rites formed a part of their worship (IV Kings, iii, 27; Num., xxv; Osee, ix, 10).

TRISTRAM, *Land of Moab* (London, 1874); CONDER, *Heth and Moab* (London, 1884); BÆTHGEN, *Beiträge z. semitischen Religionsgeschichte* (Berlin, 1888); W. R. SMITH, *Religion of the Semites* (London, 1894); BLISS, *Narrative of an expedition to Moab and Gilead* (London, 1895); G. A. SMITH, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (New York, 1897); LAGRANGE, *Etudes sur les Religions Sémitiques* (Paris, 1903).

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Moabite Stone. See MESA.

Mobile (Fr. MOBILE, Sp. MAUBILA), DIOCESE OF (MOBILIENSIS), suffragan of New Orleans, comprises the State of Alabama (51,540 sq. miles) and western Florida (7281 square miles), and derives its name from Mauvila, the fort and chief city of the Gulf Indians, who with their "emperor", Tuscaloosa, "black warrior", were conquered by the Spanish soldier and explorer, Hernando de Soto, in 1540.

EARLY HISTORY.—De Soto's expedition was accompanied by "twelve priests, eight ecclesiastics and four religious". Mass was certainly offered near the present city of Mobile as early as 1540. From 1540 to 1703 Dominican, Capuchin, and Jesuit missionaries went from post to post along the Mississippi Valley, ministering to the wants of the scattered Spanish, French, and English settlers and to the native Indian converts. The published records of their heroism, sealed at times with the martyrs' blood, are very meagre, their names even, in great part, being lost in the obscurity of that long and troublous period. Not until the beginning of the eighteenth century, have we anything like a historical account of this diocese. "Fort St. Louis de la Mobile" was founded by Iberville, the illustrious French-Canadian explorer (1702), at some distance from the present city of Mobile, the site of which was selected (1710) by Iberville's brother, Bienville. Mobile was formally erected into a parish (20 July, 1703), subject to the Seminary of Foreign Missions in Paris and Quebec.

The Rev. Henry Roulleaux de la Vente was the first parish priest (July, 1704), his curate, the Rev. Alexander Huvé. The first entry found in the records of the new parish is that of the baptism of an Apalache girl (6 September, 1703), by the Rev. A. Davion. The Rev. J. B. de St. Cosme was murdered by savages on his way to Mobile from Natchez late in 1706. The last record of the secular clergy (13 January, 1721), that of the Rev. Alexander Huvé, appears in the ancient register of Mobile. The work was then resumed by the religious orders. The Quebec Act of 1774 conferred on the parish priest of Mobile among others, a legal title to his tithes. With the surrender of Mobile to Spain (12 March, 1780), the records are kept in Spanish, and the church in Mobile is definitely known as the church of the Immaculate Conception. Pius VII erected the diocese of St. Louis of New Orleans (25 April, 1793), usually styled Louisiana and the Floridas. The jurisdiction, therefore, of the ordinaries of Quebec and Santiago de Cuba over that immense territory ceased with the selection of its first

bishop, the Right Rev. Luis Peñalver y Cardenas, who arrived in New Orleans 17 July, 1795. From 1792 to 1800 the parish priest of Mobile was the Rev. Constantine McKenna, and its last incumbent under Spanish rule, the Rev. Vincent Genin.

Bishops.—(1) Michael Portier, b. at Montbrison, France, 1795; d. at Mobile, 4 May, 1859. He came to the United States 4 September, 1817. Completing his studies at St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md., he was ordained priest by Bishop Dubourg at St. Louis (1818), and eight years later, in the same city was consecrated titular Bishop of Oleno by Bishop Rosati, and became first vicar Apostolic of the new Vicariate of Alabama and the Floridas. At the time of his accession he was the only clergyman in the vicariate and had practically only three congregations with churches, Mobile, Ala., and the old Spanish cities of St. Augustine, Fla. (founded 1565), and Pensacola, Fla. (founded 1696). The first priest who came to his assistance was the Rev. Edward T. Mayne, a student of Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., sent by Bishop England of Charleston, to take charge of the deserted church of St. Augustine. Bishop Portier began his administration by riding through his vicariate and visited Pensacola, Tallahassee, and St. Augustine, offering the Holy Sacrifice, preaching, and administering the Sacraments as he went. He sailed for Europe (1829) in quest of assistants, and returning with two priests and four ecclesiastics, found the vicariate raised to the Diocese of Mobile. His cathedral was a little church twenty feet wide by fifty feet deep, his residence a still smaller two-roomed frame structure. By 1850 there were churches and congregations in Mobile, Spring Hill, Summerville, Mount Vernon, Fish River, Pensacola, Tuscaloosa, and Montgomery.

He was somewhat relieved in the same year by the detachment of the eastern portion of Florida and its annexation to the newly-created See of Savannah, Ga. To add to his relief the new cathedral of the Immaculate Conception, built mainly through the untiring efforts of the Rev. J. McGarahan, was finished at a cost of over eighty thousand dollars, and consecrated 8 December, 1850. About 1830 Bishop Portier established Spring Hill College and Seminary, at the head of which was the Rev. Mathias Loras until he was consecrated Bishop of Dubuque (10 December, 1837) by Bishop Portier, who also consecrated another president of Spring Hill, the Rev. John S. Bazin, third Bishop of Vincennes, 24 October, 1847. Spring Hill College, for a time in charge of the Eudist Fathers, was taken over by the Jesuit Fathers (1846) and has since been managed successfully by them. Bishop Portier held there a diocesan synod (19 January, 1835). In 1833 he secured from the Visitation convent, Georgetown, a colony of nuns who established in Mobile a house and academy, which is in a very flourishing condition. He brought the Brothers of the Sacred Heart from France (about 1847), and the Sisters of Charity from Emmitsburg, Md., to manage orphan asylums for boys and girls respectively. One of his last acts was the foundation of an infirmary at Mobile conducted by the Sisters of Charity.

(2) John Quinlan, second Bishop of Mobile, b. in County Cork, Ireland, 19 October, 1826; d. at Mobile, 9 March, 1883. He came to the United States, 1844, studied for the priesthood in Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., and was ordained by Archbishop Purcell (1853), with a fellow student, Richard Gilmour, afterwards second Bishop of Cleveland. He was consecrated Bishop of Mobile, 4 Dec., 1859, by Archbishop Blanc in St. Louis' cathedral, New Orleans, La. In his diocese he found twelve churches and fourteen schools for which he had only eight secular priests, and he therefore brought from Ireland eleven young candidates for the priesthood. Two of the priests who came to Bishop Quinlan at this time are zealous workers in the diocese to-day, the Very Rev. C. T. O'Callaghan, D.D., V.G., pastor of St. Vincent's church, Mobile, several times administrator of the diocese, and the Very Rev. D. Savage, D.D., pastor of St. Peter's church, Montgomery, a member of the bishop's council. Bishop Quinlan's administration fell upon the stormy days of internecine strife. After the battle of Shiloh, he hastened on a special train to the blood-stained battle-ground and ministered to the temporal and spiritual wants of North and South. After the war diocesan activities were crippled. Nevertheless, besides repairing ruined churches, Bishop Quinlan built the portico of the Mobile cathedral, founded St. Patrick's and St. Mary's churches in the same city, and established churches in Huntsville, Decatur, Tuscumbia, Florence, Cullman, Birmingham, Eufaula, Whistler, and Toulminville. April, 1876, Bishop Quinlan invited the Benedictines from St. Vincent's Abbey, Pa., to the diocese, and they settled at Cullman. The first abbot of the new settlement was the Rt. Rev. Benedict Menges, O.S.B., succeeded (1905) by Rt. Rev. Bernard Menges, O.S.B., under whose capable management the monastery and college are progressing and extending their influence considerably.

(3) Dominic Manucy, third Bishop of Mobile, b. in St. Augustine, Fla., 20 December, 1823; d. at Mobile, 4 December, 1885. He was educated at Spring Hill College, and ordained (1850) by Bishop Portier, and for twenty-four years laboured in Montgomery and Mobile. He was consecrated at Mobile (8 Dec., 1874), Bishop of Dulma, and appointed vicar Apostolic of Brownsville, Tex., and was transferred to the Diocese of Mobile (9 March, 1884), without being relieved, however, from his duties as vicar Apostolic, but finding the burden too great he resigned and was appointed to the titular see of Maronea.

(4) Jeremiah O'Sullivan, fourth Bishop of Mobile, b. in County Cork, Ireland, 1844; d. at Mobile, 10 August, 1896. He came to the United States, 1863, entered St. Charles College, Ellicott City, Md., whence he proceeded to St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md., was ordained priest (June, 1868) by Archbishop Spalding, and consecrated Bishop of Mobile (20 Sept., 1885), by Cardinal, then Archbishop, Gibbons. The present towers of the Mobile cathedral were built by Bishop O'Sullivan, who successfully strove to restore the ruined financial status of the diocese. A gifted administrator, an admired orator, an extremely zealous and holy bishop, Bishop O'Sullivan travelled and laboured unceasingly in the diocese, and left to posterity a monument of noble results, temporal and spiritual, quietly and unostentatiously achieved.

(5) Edward Patrick Allen, fifth and present Bishop of Mobile, was born in Lowell, Mass., 17 March, 1853, and educated at Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., where he was ordained priest by Bishop Becker, 17 Dec., 1881. He was appointed president of Mt. St. Mary's (1884), and filled that office most acceptably until his consecration as Bishop of Mobile, by Cardinal Gibbons, in the cathedral, Baltimore, Md. (16 May, 1897). Under the able and prudent management of Bishop Allen, the diocese has advanced with great strides, and is still developing at a rapid growth. Many churches and missions have been erected, hospitals, orphanages, and schools established, the number of priests more than doubled, and considerable property acquired with a view to the further development of his rapidly increasing charge. The diocese was sorely tried by a fearful storm and tidal wave (Sept., 1906). Many churches either totally or partially destroyed have been rebuilt or repaired. But the complete results of Bishop Allen's prosperous administration are best noticed by a comparison between the standing of the diocese

when he assumed control and its existing admirable state.

STATISTICS.—1897 (year of Bishop Allen's arrival).—Churches with resident priests, 22; parishes with parochial schools, 15; children under Catholic care in colleges, academies, and schools, 2526; hospitals, 2; orphanages, 2; baptisms, infants, 820, converts, 60; marriages, 163; Catholic population, 17,000; priests, secular and religious, 48.

1910.—Priests, secular, 49, religious, 52, total, 101; churches with resident priests, 43; missions with churches, 31; total churches,74; stations, 149; chapels, 25; brothers, 41; religious women, 274; children under Catholic care, 5039; colleges, 3; high school, 1; academies; 7, schools, 31, and orphanages, 3; hospitals, 4; home for aged poor, 1; baptisms, infants, 1478, converts, 552; marriages, 302; Catholic population, 38,000.

Bishop Allen takes a lively interest in the Negro Missions, and is largely responsible for the good work being done by the Josephite Fathers in Mobile and vicinity, Birmingham, and Montgomery. Near the latter city is St. Joseph's College, founded (1901) by the Very Rev. T. B. Donovan, lately deceased, the primary object of which "is to educate young colored men to be catechists and teachers." With Bishop Allen's sanction a colored fraternal organization was instituted in Mobile, 1909, by the Rev. C. Rebescher, which gives promise of universal good.

Benefactors.—The chief benefactors of the diocese were Messrs. Felix and Arthur McGill—the McGill Institute, a high school for boys, bears their name. The Hannan Home for the aged poor is a tribute to the generosity of Major P. C. Hannan, who built it along the lines of Bishop Allen's choosing.

Religious Orders.—In the Diocese of Mobile are the Jesuits, Benedictines, Josephite Fathers, and Brothers of the Sacred Heart. Also the Sisters of the Visitation, Sisters of Charity, Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of Loretto, Sisters of St. Joseph, Sisters of St. Benedict, Little Sisters of the Poor, and Sisters of Perpetual Adoration. There are three Catholic cemeteries, one in Mobile, one in Birmingham, and one in Montgomery. The intrepid Admiral Semmes and Father Ryan, the poet-priest, are buried in the Catholic Cemetery, Mobile. By a singular coincidence the first priest who came to labour in the new Diocese of Mobile and the last and ruling Bishop of Mobile were students of Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Md., while the first Bishop of San Antonio, Tex., the Rt. Rev. Anthony D. Pellicer, and its present coadjutor, the Rt. Rev. John W. Shaw, were native priests of the diocese, both having been consecrated in its cathedral (the former, 8 Dec., 1874, the latter, 14 April, 1910), of which each in turn was pastor.

HAMILTON, *Colonial Mobile* (Boston and New York, 1897); SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (Akron, O., New York, Chicago, 1886, 1892); IDEM, *Defenders of Our Faith* (New York, Chicago, 1886, 1893); MOTHER AUSTIN, *A Catholic History of Alabama and the Floridas*, I (New York, 1908); *Metropolitan Catholic Almanac and Laity's Directory* (Baltimore, 1850 sqq.); *Official Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee, New York, 1910); REGER, *Die Benedictiner im Staate Alabama* (Baltimore, 1898).

THOMAS J. EATON.

Mocissus, a titular metropolitan see of Cappadocia. Procopius (De ædif., V, iv) informs us that this fortified site, in north-western Cappadocia, was constituted metropolis of Cappadocia Tertia by Justinian, when he divided that province into three parts. The emperor gave it the name of Justinianopolis. Nothing is known of its history, and its name should perhaps be written *Mocessus*. There is no doubt that the site of Mocissus, or Mocessus, is that occupied by the modern town of Kir-Sheir, chief town of a sanjak in the vilayet of Angora, which possesses 8000 inhabitants, most of them Mussulmans. In the neighbourhood of Kir-Sheir there are some important ancient ruins. This metropolis figures in the "Notitiæ episcopatuum" until the twelfth or thirteenth century. Only a few of its titulars are known: the earliest, Peter, attended the Council of Constantinople (536); the last, whose name is not known, was a Catholic, and was consecrated after the Council of Florence by Patriarch Metrophanes of Constantinople.

LE QUIEN, *Oriens christ.*, I, 407; SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geog.*, s. v.; RAMSAY, *Asia Minor*, 300.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Mocoví Indians.—The name is also written MACOBIO, MBOCOBI, MOCOBIO. They are a warlike and predatory tribe of Guaycuran stock, and are closely related linguistically to the Toba, Mbaya, and Abipon, their usual allies, settled principally along the middle and upper Vermejo River, in the Chaco region of northern Argentina, although they formerly extended their forays as far south as Santa Fé and even to the gates of Buenos Aires. In habit of life and general characteristics they resembled the rest of the tribes just mentioned, but were distinguished even beyond them, as Dobrizhoffer says, "in atrocity and steady hatred to the Spaniards. They seemed to conspire to ruin Tucuman, proving themselves formidable, not to solitary estates merely, but to whole cities". They entirely destroyed the town of Concepcion and massacred its inhabitants.

This special hostility to the people of Tucuman was due to the fact that years before a large number of Mocoví, who had been induced through the efforts of the Jesuit Fathers Altamirano and Diaz to come in from the war-path and had been organized into the mission of San Xavier, had been treacherously seized and distributed as slaves by the governor of that province. They received a temporary check in 1710 from Governor Urizar, who led a great expedition of over three thousand men against the Chaco tribes, with the result that several tribes made peace, while the Mocoví retired to the south-west and continued their raids in that quarter. Thirty years later, during a period of truce, some of the Mocoví became acquainted with the Jesuits of the College of Santa Fé, through whose influence they were won to friendship with the Spaniards, and the chiefs Aletin and Chitalin consented to receive Christian instruction together with their people. As a result the Mocoví mission colony of San Xavier was established in 1743 by Father Francisco Burges Navarro, thirty leagues from the city, and from a small beginning increased rapidly by accessions from the roving bands of the tribe, who were, from time to time, won over by the persuasions of the new converts. Prisoners captured in the various expeditions were also brought into the new mission, while many voluntarily took refuge there to escape pursuit.

The Mocoví proved devout, tractable, and willing workers, and particularly competent musicians under the instruction of the German Father Florian Pauke, who organized a band and chorus whose services were in demand on church occasions even in Buenos Aires. With bell in hand, the chief himself, Aletin, acted as crier every morning to call his people to Mass, and took the lead in every task of difficulty. A third chief, who had long held out against the Spaniards and made war upon his mission kinsmen in revenge for their abandonment of the old life, finally came in voluntarily. In 1765 a second Mocoví mission, San Pedro y Pablo, was established by Father Pauke with another portion of the tribe which had until then continued hostile.

At the time of the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767 the two missions contained about 1200 Mocoví, of whom all but a few were Christians. Deprived of their accustomed teachers, most of them finally rejoined their wild kinsmen in the forests of the Chaco.

In 1800 the tribe was still loosely estimated at 2000 warriors or over 6000 souls. They are now reduced far below that number, but retain their tribal organization and habits, though no longer hostile, and range generally along the western banks of the Parana. The best study of their language is Father Tavolini's "Introducción al Arte Mocoví". (See also TOBA.)

BRINTON, *American Race* (New York, 1891); CHARLEVOIX, *Hist. of Paraguay*, tr. (2 vols., London, 1769); DOBRIZHOFFER, *Account of the Abipones* (3 vols., London, 1822); HERVÁS, *Catalogo de las Lenguas*, I (Madrid, 1800); D'ORBIGNY, *L'Homme Américain* (2 vols., Paris, 1839); TAVOLINI, *Introducción al Arte Mocoví* in *Biblioteca Linguistica del Museo de la Plata: Seccion del Chaco*, I (La Plata, 1893).

JAMES MOONEY.

Modalism. See MONARCHIANISM.

Modena, ARCHDIOCESE OF (MUTINENSIS), in central Italy, between the rivers Secchia and Panaro. The city contains many fine buildings. The Romanesque cathedral, begun in 1099, consecrated by Lucius III in 1184, bears on its interior façade scenes from the Old and from the New Testament sculptured in white marble, and the high altar possesses a Purification by Guido Reni; the inlaid work of the choir, by the Lendinara brothers (1465), is very beautiful; in the belfry, called the Ghirlandina, is kept the famous wooden pail taken from the Bolognese after the battle of Zappolino (1325); this pail is the subject of the heroic-comic epic of Tassoni, "La Secchia Rapita"; the pulpit is a noteworthy work of Arrigo del Campione. Notable churches of Modena are San Agostino, which contains the tombs of the historians Sigonius and Muratori; San Pietro, with its beautiful specimens of the art of Giambellini, Dossi, and Francia; San Stefano della Pomposa, of which Muratori was provost, and others, all rich in works of art. The magnificent Ducal Palace, built in 1635 by Duke Francesco I, according to the plans of Avanzini, besides a valuable gallery of pictures, contains frescos by Franceschini, Tintoretto, Dossi, and others, and a library with more than three thousand manuscripts. The Royal, Communal, and Capitular archives possess many important documents. The university was founded by Duke Francesco III in 1738, but Modena, as early as 1182, had a *studium generale* which rivalled that of Bologna. The citadel, pentagonal in shape, dates from 1635; its walls and bastions were transformed into a public promenade in 1816. There has been a military school for infantry and for cavalry in the royal palace of Modena since 1859; it was established by the last duke, Francesco V. The various beneficent institutions of this city are united in the *Opera Pia Generale*.

At the time of the Gallic War, Mutina, the Latin name of Modena, was already in the power of the Romans, who were besieged there in 223 B. C. A Roman colony was taken from Modena, 234 B. C., and a decade later, the town was in the power of the Ligurians for a year. It was there, also, that Spartacus defeated the consul Cassius in 71 B. C. The famous *bellum Mutinense* (42 B. C.) decided the fate of the republic at Rome. During the Empire Modena was one of the most prosperous cities in Italy, but in the war between Constantine and Maxentius, the city was besieged, and fell into great decadence until 698, when it was revived by King Cunibert.

Charlemagne made it the capital of a line of counts, whose authority, however, was before long eclipsed by that of the bishops, one of whom, St. Lodoinus, in 897 surrounded the city with walls, to protect it against Hungarian incursions, while Bishop Ingone was formally invested with the title of count by Emperor Conrad I. Later, Modena was a possession of the Countess Matilda, after whose death (1115) the city became a free commune, and in time joined the Lombard League against Barbarossa. In the struggle between the popes and Frederick II Modena was Ghibelline, and in conflict with the Guelph cities; nevertheless, it harboured a strong Guelph party, under the leadership of the Aigoni family, while the Ghibellines were led by the Grasolfi. In 1288, to put an end to internal dissensions, Modena gave its allegiance to Obizzo II of Este, Lord of Ferrara, who also became master of Reggio in 1291. After the death of his son Azzo VIII (1308), Modena became free again, but lost a part of its territory. On the arrival of Henry VII, the town received an imperial vicar; in 1317, it welcomed a pontifical legate, choosing later for its lord John of Bohemia, while, in 1336, it was ceded by Manfredo Pio of Carpi to Obizzo III of Este and Ferrara in whose family it remained until 1859. Among his successors were Nicolò III, who recov-

FAÇADE (XII CENTURY), THE CATHEDRAL, MODENA

ered Reggio and the Garfagnana for Modena. Borso, a natural son of Nicolò III, received the title of Duke of Modena from the emperor in 1452, and later that of Duke of Ferrara, from Paul II. In the sixteenth century, in the palace of the Grillenzoni family, there flourished an academy of letters. The city submitted to Julius II in 1510, but was restored to the Duke of Parma in 1530 by Charles V at the death of Alfonso II; however, in 1597 Ferrara returned to immediate dependency upon the Holy See, but Modena, with Reggio and its other lands, as a fief of the Empire, passed to Cesare, cousin of Alfonso II.

From that time a new era began for Modena, henceforth the home of a court devoted to the arts and letters, and solicitous for the public weal. The son of Cesare, Alfonso III, after a reign of only one year (1529), became a Capuchin monk in the convent of Castelnuovo di Garfagnana, founded by him, and died in 1614. Alfonso IV, in 1662, was succeeded by the young Francesco II, whose regents were his mother Laura and his great-uncle Cardinal Rinaldo. He built the Ducal Palace and the citadel and added Coreggio to his territory. As Francesco II died without progeny (1658), Modena came into the possession of his uncle Rinaldo, a cardinal also, who married

Carlotta of Brunswick, and after a reign frequently troubled by French incursions, left the ducal throne to his son Francesco III in 1737, when the latter was fighting against the Turks in Hungary. Francesco III also governed Milan for Maria Theresa. Ercole III, who by his marriage acquired the duchy of Massa and Carrara, succeeded to that of Modena in 1780, and at the approach of Napoleon, sought refuge at Venice. Modena became the capital of the Cispadan, united later to the Cisalpine republic, and eventually was incorporated into the Kingdom of Italy. In 1803 Ercole received, as compensation for the loss of Modena, Breisgau and Ortenau. His daughter and only child, Maria Beatrice, married the Archduke Ferdinand of Austria, and their son Francesco IV, in 1814 received the Duchy of Modena, while Maria Beatrice governed Massa and Carrara until her death. In 1831 occurred the famous conspiracy of Ciro Menotti on the night of the third and fourth of February; it was discovered, and Menotti was imprisoned, taken to Milan by the duke, who had been constrained to flee to that city by the revolt of Bologna, and was hanged on 16 May, after the duke's return to Modena. In 1846 Francesco V succeeded to the duchy, and in the troubles of 1848 was compelled to seek refuge in Austria, but returned in the following year. In 1859, however, having declared for Austria, he was again obliged to leave his states, and the provisional government, under Carlo Farini, decreed the annexation of Modena to the Kingdom of Italy.

Among the famous men of Modena are the astronomer Geminiano Montanari, the anatomist Gabriele Falloppio, the great Austrian general Montecucoli, Cardinal Savoleto, Sigonius, Muratori, Tiraboschi, and the poet Tassoni. According to local tradition, the first Bishop of Modena was St. Cletus—probably sent there by Pope Dionysius about 270. After him, there is mention of another bishop, Antonius or Antoninus, to whom reference is made in the life of St. Geminianus his predecessor; this great bishop and protector of the city sheltered in 334 St. Athanasius and died in 349. Other bishops of Modena were St. Theodulus (about 398), formerly a *notarius* or secretary of St. Ambrose; St. Geminianus II (III according to Cappelletti) who is said to have induced Attila to spare Modena (452); St. Lupicinus (749), in whose time the famous abbey of Nonantola was founded by Duke Anselm of Friuli; and Ægidius (1097), who began the construction of the cathedral. In 1148 the Diocese of Modena was suppressed for a time on account of discord with the Abbots of Nonantola. William, bishop in 1221, frequently served the popes, Honorius III and Gregory IX, as legate, especially among the Prussians, the Livonians, the Esthonians, etc.; eventually he resigned his see to devote himself to the conversion of those peoples (cf. Balan, "Sulle legazioni compiute nei palsi nordici da Guglielmo vescovo di Modena," ibid., 1872). Bonadaneo Boschetti, bishop in 1311, was driven from his diocese by the Ghibellines; Nicolò Boiardo (1401) did much for ecclesiastical discipline; Nicolò Sandonnino (1479) was pontifical legate in Spain; Giovanni Morone (1529) founded the seminary, and is famous for missions on which he was sent to Germany in the beginnings of Lutheranism. Under him, through the "Accademia", Protestantism obtained a footing in Modena, and was eradicated with difficulty; Ægidio Foscarari (1550), to whom the Council of Trent entrusted the correction of the Roman Missal and the preparation of its Catechism for Parish Priests; Roberto Fontana (1646) and Giuseppe M. Folignano (1757) both restorers of the episcopal palace, while the second did much for the endowment of the seminary.

In 1821 the Abbey of Nonantola, a *prælatura nullius diœceseos*, was united to the Diocese of Modena; and the latter, a suffragan of Milan until 1852, was then raised to the dignity of a metropolitan see, with Carpi, Guastalla, Massa, and Reggio Emilia for its suffragans. The Abbey of Nonantola was famous, once, as a center of discipline and ecclesiastical learning, and through it a great impetus was given to agriculture in the surrounding country. Politically, Nonantola entered into an alliance with Bologna to preserve its independence, especially against Modena, but like the latter it became a possession of the house of Este in 1411. Until 1449 the administration of Nonantola was confided to commendatory abbots, one of whom was St. Charles Borromeo. The literary treasures of the abbey gradually found their way into the various libraries of Italy.

The Archdiocese of Modena, with Nonantola, contains 179 parishes, in which there are 220,400 faithful, with 455 secular and 50 regular priests; 8 religious houses of men, and 13 of women; 5 schools for boys and 7 for girls; 60 seminarians; 450 churches or chapels.

Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XV; Tiraboschi, *Memorie storiche modenesi* (Modena, 1793–94); Idem, *Storia della Badia di Nonantola* (Modena, 1784), also *Biblioteca modenese* (1781–86); Baraldi, *Compendio storia della città di Modena* (Modena, 1846); Scharfenberg, *Geschichte der Herzogtümer Modena und Ferrara* (Mainz, 1859); Sandonini, *Modena sotto il governo dei papi* (Modena, 1879); *Monumenti di storia patria per le provincie modenesi* (Parma, 1861—).

University of Modena.—At the end of the twelfth century there existed at Modena in Italy, a flourishing school of jurisprudence. Pilius, who established himself there as a teacher in 1182, compares its renown to that of Bologna. During the whole of the thirteenth century professors of great repute taught there, with only a brief interruption between 1222 and 1232, though even during that interval Albertus Papiensis and Hubertus de Bonaccursis still lectured. Other famous professors of this period were Martinus de Fano, Guilelmus Durantis, Albertus Galeottus, Guido de Suzaria, Nicolaus Matarellus, and, probably, Bonifacius a Mutina, who afterwards became Bishop of Modena (1337) and of Bergamo (1340). In the fourteenth century the Studium fell into decay, in spite of the efforts which the commune of Modena put forth to maintain it. A communal enactment provided, in 1328, that three professors—one each for law, medicine, and the training of notaries—were to be engaged by contract every year; this statute is the only extant documentary evidence that medicine as well as law was taught at Modena, and the Modenese School was never called a Studium Generale. Its decay was hastened, not only by political vicissitudes, but by the creation of other universities in the neighbouring states. With the restitution of Ferrara to the Papal States (1597), Modena became the capital of the House of Este, and once more there was a possibility of reviving the extinct Studium. This was not realized, however, until a century later (1678).

This new university, which owed much to the priest Cristoforo Borghi, was joined to the college (*convitto*) of the Congregation of St. Charles. It was inaugurated in 1683 by Duke Francis II. In 1772, Francis III increased the number of chairs, took steps to secure able professors, and endowed it with the property of the suppressed Society of Jesus. His most important service was the drafting of a constitution for the university. With the French invasion of 1796 the University of Modena was reduced to the rank of a lyceum, and in 1809 nothing remained of it but the faculty of philosophy. When Francis IV recovered his throne (1815) he restored the university, but the disturbances of 1821 caused him to modify its organization by distributing the students in various *convitti* scattered through his states. In 1848, however, the earlier organization was revived. In 1859 the provisional Government suppressed the theological faculty, and in 1862 the courses in philosophy and literature disappeared. The university now has faculties of jurisprudence, medicine, surgery, science

(mathematics, natural sciences, and chemistry), schools of pharmacy, of veterinary medicine, and of obstetrics.

It numbers 51 instructors with 12 assistants, who treat 95 different subjects; the attendance in 1908, was 431; in 1909, 422. Annexed to the university are the museum of experimental physics, founded, in 1760, by Fra Mario Morini; the chemical laboratory and cabinet founded by Michele Rosa; the museum of natural history founded, in 1786, by a bequest of Giuseppe M. Fogliani, Bishop of Modena; the museum of anatomy founded by Torti in 1698, and Ant. Scarpa in 1774; the cabinet of *materia medica* founded in 1773 by Gius. M. Savanti; the laboratories of pathological anatomy, experimental physics, and pharmaceutical chemistry; the botanical garden founded by Francis III in 1765; an observatory, a veterinary institute and museum, clinics, and a library. Besides those already mentioned, the following professors of this university have attained high distinction: Virginio Natta, O.P., O. Gherli, O.P., Scozia (afterwards minister to Francis IV), Girolamo Tiraboschi (historian of Italian letters), Agostino Paradisi, Guiliano Cassiani, Padre Pompilio Pozzetti, the Abbate Spallanzani, Bonaventura Curti, G. B. Venturi, Bernardino Ramazzini (seventeenth century), Gio. Cinelli, Luigi Emiliani, Paolo Gaddi, and the later deceased Galvagni.

VACCA, *Cenno storica della R. Università di Modena* (Modena, 1872); *Annuario della R. Univ. di Modena* (Modena, 1865); CAMPORI, *Informazioni della R. Univ. di Modena* (Modena, 1861); *Notizie storiche circa l'Univ. di M.* in *Opuscoli religiosi, letterari e morali* (July, August, 1863); DENIFLE, *Die Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400*, I (Berlin, 1885), 296 sqq.

U. BENIGNI.

Modernism.—ORIGIN OF THE WORD.—Etymologically, modernism means an exaggerated love of what is modern, an infatuation for modern ideas, "the abuse of what is modern", as the Abbé Gaudaud explains (La Foi catholique, I, 1908, p. 248). The modern ideas of which we speak are not as old as the period called "modern times". Though Protestantism has generated them little by little, it did not understand from the beginning that such would be its sequel. There even exists a conservative Protestant party which is one with the Church in combating modernism. In general we may say that modernism aims at that radical transformation of human thought in relation to God, man, the world, and life, here and hereafter, which was prepared by Humanism and eighteenth-century philosophy, and solemnly promulgated at the French Revolution. J. J. Rousseau, who treated an atheistical philosopher of his time as a modernist, seems to have been the first to use the word in this sense ("Correspondance à M. D.", 15 Jan., 1769). Littré (Dictionnaire), who cites the passage, explains: "Modernist, one who esteems modern times above antiquity". After that, the word seems to have been forgotten, till the time of the Catholic publicist Périn (1815–1905), professor at the University of Louvain, 1844–1889. This writer, whilst apologizing for the coinage, describes "the humanitarian tendencies of contemporary society" as modernism. The term itself he defines as "the ambition to eliminate God from all social life". With this absolute modernism he associates a more temperate form, which he declares to be nothing less than "liberalism of every degree and shade" ("Le Modernisme dans l'Eglise d'après les lettres inédites de Lamennais", Paris, 1881).

During the early years of the present century, especially about 1905 and 1906, the tendency to innovation which troubled the Italian dioceses, and especially the ranks of the young clergy, was taxed with modernism. Thus at Christmas, 1905, the bishops of the ecclesiastical provinces of Turin and Vercelli, in a circular letter of that date, uttered grave warnings against what they called "Modernismo nel clero" (Modernism among the clergy). Several pastoral letters of the year 1906 made use of the same term; among others we may mention the Lenten charge of Cardinal Nava, Archbishop of Catania, to his clergy, a letter of Cardinal Bacilieri, Bishop of Verona, dated 22 July, 1906, and a letter of Mgr Rossi, Archbishop of Acerenza and Matera. "Modernismo e Modernisti", a work by Abbate Cavallanti which was published towards the end of 1906, gives long extracts from these letters. The name "modernism" was not to the liking of the reformers. The propriety of the new term was discussed even amongst good Catholics. When the Decree "Lamentabili" appeared, Mgr Baudrillart expressed his pleasure at not finding the word "modernism" mentioned in it (Revue pratique d'apologétique, IV, p. 578). He considered the term "too vague". Besides it seemed to insinuate "that the Church condemns everything modern". The Encyclical "Pascendi" (8 Sept., 1907) put an end to the discussion. It bore the official title, "De Modernistarum doctrinis". The introduction declared that the name commonly given to the upholders of the new errors was not inapt. Since then the modernists themselves have acquiesced in the use of the name, though they have not admitted its propriety (Loisy, "Simples réflexions sur le décret 'Lamentabili' et sur l'encyclique 'Pascendi' du 8 Sept., 1907", p. 14; "Il programma dei modernisti": note at the beginning).

THEORY OF THEOLOGICAL MODERNISM.—(1) *The essential error of Modernism.*—A full definition of modernism would be rather difficult. First it stands for certain tendencies, and secondly for a body of doctrine which, if it has not given birth to these tendencies (practice often precedes theory), serves at any rate as their explanation and support. Such tendencies manifest themselves in different domains. They are not united in each individual, nor are they always and everywhere found together. Modernist doctrine, too, may be more or less radical, and it is swallowed in doses that vary with each one's likes and dislikes. In the Encyclical "Pascendi", Pius X says that modernism embraces every heresy. M. Loisy makes practically the same statement when he writes that "in reality all Catholic theology, even in its fundamental principles, the general philosophy of religion, Divine law, and the laws that govern our knowledge of God, come up for judgment before this new court of assize" (Simples réflexions, p. 24). Modernism is a composite system: its assertions and claims lack that principle which unites the natural faculties in a living being. The Encyclical "Pascendi" was the first Catholic synthesis of the subject. Out of scattered materials it built up what looked like a logical system. Indeed friends and foes alike could not but admire the patient skill that must have been needed to fashion something like a co-ordinated whole. In their answer to the Encyclical, "Il programma dei Modernisti", the Modernists tried to retouch this synthesis. Previous to all this, some of the Italian bishops, in their pastoral letters, had attempted such a synthesis. We would particularly mention that of Mgr Rossi, Bishop of Acerenza and Matera. In this respect, too, Abbate Cavallanti's book, already referred to, deserves mention. Even earlier still, German and French Protestants had done some synthetical work in the same direction. Prominent among them are Kant, "Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der reinen Vernunft" (1803); Schleiermacher, "Der christliche Glaube" (1821–1822); and A. Sabatier, "Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion d'après la psychologie et l'histoire" (1897).

The general idea of modernism may be best expressed in the words of Abbate Cavallanti, though even here there is a little vagueness: "Modernism is modern in a false sense of the word; it is a morbid state of conscience among Catholics, and especially young Catholics, that professes manifold ideals, opin-

ions, and tendencies. From time to time these tendencies work out into systems, that are to renew the basis and superstructure of society, politics, philosophy, theology, of the Church herself and of the Christian religion". A remodelling, a renewal according to the ideas of the twentieth century—such is the longing that possesses the modernists. "The avowed modernists", says M. Loisy, "form a fairly definite group of thinking men united in the common desire to adapt Catholicism to the intellectual, moral and social needs of to-day" (op. cit., p. 13). "Our religious attitude", as "Il programma dei modernisti" states (p. 5, note 1), "is ruled by the single wish to be one with Christians and Catholics who live in harmony with the spirit of the age". The spirit of this plan of reform may be summarized under the following heads: (a) A spirit of complete emancipation, tending to weaken ecclesiastical authority; the emancipation of science, which must traverse every field of investigation without fear of conflict with the Church; the emancipation of the State, which should never be hampered by religious authority; the emancipation of the private conscience, whose inspirations must not be overridden by papal definitions or anathemas; the emancipation of the universal conscience, with which the Church should be ever in agreement; (b) A spirit of movement and change, with an inclination to a sweeping form of evolution such as abhors anything fixed and stationary; (c) A spirit of reconciliation among all men through the feelings of the heart. Many and varied also are the modernist dreams of an understanding between the different Christian religions, nay, even between religion and a species of atheism, and all on a basis of agreement that must be superior to mere doctrinal differences.

Such are the fundamental tendencies. As such, they seek to explain, justify, and strengthen themselves in an error, to which therefore one might give the name of "essential" modernism. What is this error? It is nothing less than the perversion of dogma. Manifold are the degrees and shades of modernist doctrine on the question of our relations with God. But no real modernist keeps the Catholic notions of dogma intact. Are you doubtful as to whether a writer or a book is modernist in the formal sense of the word? Verify every statement about dogma; examine his treatment of its origin, its nature, its sense, its authority. You will know whether you are dealing with a veritable modernist or not, according to the way in which the Catholic conception of dogma is travestied or respected. Dogma and supernatural knowledge are correlative terms; one implies the other as the action implies its object. In this way then we may define modernism as "the critique of our supernatural knowledge according to the false postulates of contemporary philosophy".

It will be advisable for us to quote a full critique of such supernatural knowledge as an example of the mode of procedure. (In the meantime however we must not forget that there are partial and less advanced modernists who do not go so far). For them, external intuition furnishes man with but phenomenal, contingent, sensible knowledge. He sees, he feels, he hears, he tastes, he touches this something, this phenomenon that comes and goes without telling him aught of the existence of a suprasensible, absolute and unchanging reality outside all environing space and time. But deep within himself man feels the need of a higher hope. He aspires to perfection in a being on whom he feels his destiny depends. And so he has an instinctive, an affective yearning for God. This necessary impulse is at first obscure and hidden in the subconsciousness. Once consciously understood, it reveals to the soul the intimate presence of God. This manifestation, in which God and man collaborate, is nothing else than revelation. Under the influence of its yearning, that is of its religious feelings, the soul tries to reach God, to adopt towards Him an attitude that will satisfy its yearning. It gropes, it searches. These gropings form the soul's religious experience. They are more easy, successful and far-reaching, or less so, according as it is now one, now another individual soul that sets out in quest of God. Anon there are privileged ones who reach extraordinary results. They communicate their discoveries to their fellow men, and forthwith become founders of a new religion, which is more or less true in the proportion in which it gives peace to the religious feelings.

The attitude Christ adopted, reaching up to God as to a father and then returning to men as to brothers—such is the meaning of the precept, "Love God and thy neighbour"—brings full rest to the soul. It makes the religion of Christ the religion *par excellence*, the true and definitive religion. The act by which the soul adopts this attitude and abandons itself to God as a father and then to men as to brothers, constitutes the Christian Faith. Plainly such an act is an act of the will rather than of the intellect. But religious sentiment tries to express itself in intellectual concepts, which in their turn serve to preserve this sentiment. Hence the origin of those formulæ concerning God and Divine things, of those theoretical propositions that are the outcome of the successive religious experiences of souls gifted with the same faith. These formulæ become dogmas, when religious authority approves of them for the life of the community. For community life is a spontaneous growth among persons of the same faith, and with it comes authority. Dogmas promulgated in this way teach us nothing of the unknowable, but only symbolize it. They contain no truth. Their usefulness in preserving the faith is their only *raison d'être*. They survive as long as they exert their influence. Being the work of man in time, and adapted to his varying needs, they are at best but contingent and transient. Religious authority too, naturally conservative, may lag behind the times. It may mistake the best methods of meeting needs of the community, and try to keep up worn-out formulæ. Through respect for the community, the individual Christian who sees the mistake continues in an attitude of outward submission. But he does not feel himself inwardly bound by the decisions of higher powers; rather he makes praiseworthy efforts to bring his Church into harmony with the times. He may confine himself, too, if he cares, to the older and simpler religious forms; he may live his life in conformity with the dogmas accepted from the beginning. Such is Tyrrell's advice in his letter to Fogazzaro, and such was his own private practice. (2) *Catholic and Modernist Notions of Dogma Compared.*—The tradition of the Catholic Church, on the other hand, considers dogmas as in part supernatural and mysterious, proposed to our faith by a Divinely instituted authority on the ground that they are part of the general revelation which the Apostles preached in the name of Jesus Christ. This faith is an act of the intellect made under the sway of the will. By it we hold firmly what God has revealed and what the Church proposes to us to believe. For believing is holding something firmly on the authority of God's word, when such authority may be recognized by signs that are sufficient, at least with the help of grace, to create certitude.

Comparing these notions, the Catholic and the modernist, we shall see that modernism alters the source, the manner of promulgation, the object, the stability, and the truth of dogma. For the modernist, the only and the necessary source is the private consciousness. And logically so, since he rejects miracles and prophecy as signs of God's word (Il programma, p. 96). For the Catholic, dogma is a free communication of God to the believer made through the preaching of the Word. Of course the truth from without, which is above and beyond any natural want, is preceded by a certain interior finality or perfecti-

bility which enables the believer to assimilate and live the truth revealed. It enters a soul well-disposed to receive it, as a principle of happiness which, though an unmerited gift to which we have no right, is still such as the soul can enjoy with unmeasured gratitude. In the modernist conception, the Church can no longer define dogma in God's name and with His infallible help; the ecclesiastical authority is now but a secondary interpreter, subject to the collective consciousness which she has to express. To this collective consciousness the individual need conform only externally; as for the rest he may embark on any private religious adventures he cares for. The modernist proportions dogma to his intellect or rather to his heart. Mysteries like the Trinity or the Incarnation are either unthinkable (a modernist Kantian tendency), or are within the reach of the unaided reason (a modernist Hegelian tendency). "The truth of religion is in him (man) implicitly, as surely as the truth of the whole physical universe, is involved in every part of it. Could he read the needs of his own spirit and conscience, he would need no teacher" (Tyrrell, "Scylla and Charybdis", p. 277).

Assuredly Catholic truth is not a lifeless thing. Rather is it a living tree that breaks forth into green leaves, flowers, and fruits. There is a development, or gradual unfolding, and a clearer statement of its dogmas. Besides the primary truths, such as the Divinity of Christ and His mission as Messias, there are others which, one by one, become better understood and defined, e. g. the dogma of the Immaculate Conception and that of the Infallibility of the Pope. Such unfolding takes place not only in the study of the tradition of the dogma but also in showing its origin in Jesus Christ and the Apostles, in the understanding of the terms expressing it and in the historical or rational proofs adduced in support of it. Thus the historical proof of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception has certainly been strengthened since the definition in 1854. The rational conception of the dogma of Divine Providence is a continual object of study; the dogma of the Sacrifice of the Mass allows the reason to inquire into the idea of sacrifice. It has always been believed that there is no salvation outside the Church, but as this belief has gradually come to be better understood, many are now considered within the soul of the Church who would have been placed without, in a day when the distinction between the soul and the body of the Church had not generally obtained. In another sense, too, dogma is instinct with life. For its truth is not sterile, but always serves to nourish devotion. But whilst holding with life, progress, and development, the Church rejects transitory dogmas that in the modernist theory would be forgotten unless replaced by contrary formulæ. She cannot admit that "thought, hierarchy, cult, in a word, everything has changed in the history of Christianity", nor can she be content with "the identity of religious spirit" which is the only permanency that modernism admits (Il programma dei Modernisti).

Truth consists in the conformity of the idea with its object. Now, in the Catholic concept, a dogmatic formula supplies us with at least an analogical knowledge of a given object. For the modernist, the essential nature of dogma consists in its correspondence with and its capacity to satisfy a certain momentary need of the religious feeling. It is an arbitrary symbol that tells nothing of the object it represents. At most, as M. Leroy, one of the least radical of modernists, suggests, it is a positive prescription of a practical order (Leroy, "Dogme et critique", p. 25). Thus the dogma of the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist means: "Act as if Christ had the local presence, the idea of which is so familiar to you". But, to avoid exaggeration, we add this other statement of the same writer (loc. cit.), "This however does not mean that dogma bears no relation to thought; for (1) there are duties concerning the action of thinking; (2) dogma itself implicitly affirms that reality contains in one form or another the justification of such prescriptions as are either reasonable or salutary".

Various Degrees of Modernism and its Criterion.—Modernist attacks on dogma, as we have already remarked, vary according to the degree in which its doctrines are embraced. Thus, in virtue of the leading idea of their systems, Father Tyrrell was an agnostic modernist, and Campbell (a Congregationalist minister) is a symbolic modernist. Again the tendency to innovation is at times not at all general, but limited to some particular domain. Along with modernism in the strict sense, which is directly theological, we find other kinds of modernism in philosophy, politics, and social science. In such cases a wider meaning must be given to the term.

Here, however, it is needful to speak a word of warning against unreasonable attacks. Not every novelty is to be condemned, nor is every project of reform to be dubbed modernist because it is untimely or exaggerated. In the same way, the attempt fully to understand modern philosophic thought so as to grasp what is true in such systems, and to discover the points of contact with the old philosophy, is very far from being modernism. On the contrary, that is the very best way to refute modernism. Every error contains an element of truth. Isolate that element and accept it. The structure which it helps to support, having lost its foundation, will soon crumble. The name modernist then will be appropriate only when there is question of opposition to the certain teaching of ecclesiastical authority through a spirit of innovation. The words of Cardinal Ferrari, Archbishop of Milan, as cited in "La Revue Pratique d'Apologétique" (VI, 1908, p. 134), will help to show the point of our last remark. "We are deeply pained", he says, "to find that certain persons, in public controversy against modernism, in brochures, newspapers and other periodicals, go to the length of detecting the evil everywhere, or at any rate of imputing it to those who are very far from being infected with it". In the same year, Cardinal Maffei had to condemn "La Penta azurea", an anti-modernist organ, on account of its exaggeration in this respect. On the other hand, it is regrettable that certain avowed leaders of modernism, carried away perhaps by the desire to remain within the Church at all costs—another characteristic of modernism—have taken refuge in equivocation, reticence, or quibbles. Such a line of action merits no sympathy; while it explains, if it does not altogether justify, the distrust of sincere Catholics.

Proofs of the Foregoing Views.—But does the principle and the quasi-essential error of modernism lie in its corruption of dogma? Let us consult the Encyclical "Pascendi". The official Latin text calls the modernist dogmatic system a leading chapter in their doctrine. The French translation, which is also authentic, speaks thus: "Dogma, its origin and nature, such is the ground principle of modernism." The fundamental principle of modernism is, according to M. Loisy, "the possibility, the necessity and the legitimacy of evolution in understanding the dogmas of the Church, including that of papal infallibility and authority, as well as in the manner of exercising this authority" (op. cit., p. 124). The character and leaning of our epoch confirm our diagnosis. It likes to substitute leading and fundamental questions in the place of side issues. The problem of natural knowledge is the burning question in present-day metaphysics. It is not surprising therefore that the question of supernatural knowledge is the main subject of discussion in religious polemics. Finally, Pius X has said that modernism embraces all the heresies. (The same opinion is expressed in another way in the encyclical "Editæ" of 16 May, 1910.) And what error, we ask, more fully justifies the pope's statement than that which alters dogma in its root and es-

sence? It is furthermore clear—to use a direct argument—that modernism fails in its attempt at religious reform, if it makes no change in the Catholic notion of dogma. Moreover, does not its own conception of dogma explain both a large number of its propositions and its leanings towards independence, evolution, and conciliation?

Modernist Aims Explained by its Essential Error.—The definition of an unchangeable dogma imposes itself on every Catholic, learned or otherwise, and it necessarily supposes a Church legislating for all the faithful, passing judgment on State action—from its own point of view of course—and that even seeks alliance with the civil power to carry on the work of the Apostolate. On the other hand, once dogma is held to be a mere symbol of the unknowable, a science which merely deals with the facts of nature or history could neither oppose it nor even enter into controversy with it. If it is true only in so far as it excites and nourishes religious sentiment, the private individual is at full liberty to throw it aside when its influence on him has ceased; nay, even the Church herself, whose existence depends on a dogma not different from the others in nature and origin, has no right to legislate for a self-sufficing State. And thus independence is fully realized. There is no need to prove that the modernist spirit of movement and evolution is in perfect harmony with its concept of ever-changing dogma and is unintelligible without it; the matter is self-evident. Finally, as regards the conciliation of the different religions, we must necessarily distinguish between what is essential to faith regarded as a sentiment, and beliefs which are accessory, mutable, and practically negligible. If therefore you go as far as making the Divinity a belief, that is to say, a symbolical expression of faith, then docility in following generous impulses may be religious, and the atheist's religion would not seem to differ essentially from yours.

Modernist Propositions Explained by its Essential Error.—We make a selection of the following propositions from the Encyclical for discussion: (a) the Christ of faith is not the Christ of history. Faith portrays Christ according to the religious needs of the faithful; history represents Him as He really was, that is, in so far as His appearance on earth was a concrete phenomenon. In this way it is easy to understand how a believer may, without contradiction, attribute certain things to Christ, and at the same time deny them in the quality of historian. In the "Hibbert Journal" for Jan., 1909, the Rev. Mr. Robert wished to call the Christ of history "Jesus" and reserve "Christ" for the same person as idealized by faith; (b) Christ's work in founding the Church and instituting the sacraments was mediate, not immediate. The main point is to find supports for the faith. Now, as religious experience succeeds so well in creating useful dogmas, why may it not do likewise in the matter of institutions suited to the age? (c) The sacraments act as eloquent formulæ which touch the soul and carry it away. Precisely; for if dogmas exist only in so far as they preserve religious sentiment, what other service can one expect of the sacraments? (d) The Sacred Books are in every religion a collection of religious experiences of an extraordinary nature. For if there is no external revelation, the only substitute possible is the subjective religious experience of men of particular gifts, experiences such as are worthy of being preserved for the community.

The Modernist Movement.—The late M. Périn dated the modernist movement from the French Revolution. And rightly so, for it was then that many of those modern liberties which the Church has reproved as unrestrained and ungoverned, first found sanction. Several of the propositions collected in the Syllabus of Pius IX, although enunciated from a rationalist point of view, have been appropriated by modernism. Such, for example, are the fourth proposition, which derives all religious truth from the natural force of reason; the fifth, which affirms that revelation, if it joins in the onward march of reason, is capable of unlimited progress; the seventh, which treats the prophecies and miracles of Holy Scripture as poetical imaginings; propositions sixteen to eighteen on the equal value of all religions from the point of view of salvation; proposition fifty-five on the separation of Church and State; propositions seventy-five and seventy-six, which oppose the temporal power of the pope. The modernist tendency is still more apparent in the last proposition, which was condemned on 18 March, 1861: "The Roman Pontiff can and ought to conform with contemporary progress, liberalism, and civilization."

Taking only the great lines of the modernist movement within the Church itself, we may say that under Pius IX its tendency was politico-liberal, under Leo XIII and Pius X social; with the latter pontiff still reigning, its tendency has become avowedly theological.

It is in France and Italy above all that modernism properly so-called, that is, the form which attacks the very concept of religion and dogma, has spread its ravages among Catholics. Indeed, some time after the publication of the Encyclical of 8th September, 1907, the German, English, and Belgian bishops congratulated themselves that their respective countries had been spared the epidemic in its more contagious form. Of course, individual upholders of the new error are to be found everywhere, and even England as well as Germany has produced modernists of note. In Italy, on the contrary, even before the Encyclical appeared, the bishops have raised the cry of alarm in their pastoral letters of 1906 and 1907. Newspapers and reviews, openly modernist in their opinions, bear witness to the gravity of the danger which the Sovereign Pontiff sought to avert. After Italy it is France that has furnished the largest number of adherents to this religious reform or ultra-progressive party. In spite of the notoriety of certain individuals, comparatively few laymen have joined the movement; so far it has found adherents chiefly among the ranks of the younger clergy. France possesses a modernist publishing house (La librairie Nourry). A modernist review founded by the late Father Tyrrell, "Nova et Vetera", is published at Rome. "La Revue Moderniste Internationale" was started this year (1910) at Geneva. This monthly periodical calls itself "the organ of the international modernist society". It is open to every shade of modernist opinions, and claims to have co-workers and correspondents in France, Italy, Germany, England, Austria, Hungary, Spain, Belgium, Russia, Rumania, and America. The Encyclical "Pascendi" notes and deplores the ardour of the modernist propaganda. A strong current of modernism is running through the Russian Schismatic Church. The Anglican Church has not escaped. And indeed liberal Protestantism is nothing but a radical form of modernism that is winning the greater number of the theologians of the Reformed Church. Others who oppose the innovation find refuge in the authority of the Catholic Church.

The Philosophical Origin and Consequences of Modernism.—(1) *The Origin.*—Philosophy renders great service to the cause of truth; but error calls for its assistance too. Many consider the philosophic groundwork of modernism to be Kantian. This is true, if by Kantian philosophy is meant every system that has a root connexion with the philosophy of the Königsberg sage. In other words, the basis of modernist philosophy is Kantian if, because Kant is its father and most illustrious moderate representative, all agnosticism be called Kantism (by agnosticism is meant the philosophy which denies that reason, used at any rate in a speculative and theoretical way, can gain true knowledge of suprasensible things). It is not our business here to oppose the application of the name Kantian to modernist philosophy. Indeed if we compare the two systems, we shall find that they have

two elements in common, the negative part of the "Critique of Pure Reason" (which reduces pure or speculative knowledge to phenomenal or experiential intuition), and a certain argumentative method in distinguishing dogma from the real basis of religion. On the positive side, however, modernism differs from Kantism in some essential points. For Kant, faith is a really rational adhesion of the mind to the postulates of practical reason. The will is free to accept or reject the moral law; and it is on account of this option that he calls its acceptance "belief". Once it is accepted, the reason cannot but admit the existence of God, liberty, and immortality. Modernist faith, on the other hand, is a matter of sentiment, a flinging of oneself towards the Unknowable, and cannot be scientifically justified by reason. In Kant's system, dogmas and the whole positive framework of religion are necessary only for the childhood of humanity or for the common people. They are symbols that bear a certain analogy to images and comparisons. They serve to inculcate those moral precepts that for Kant constitute religion. Modernist symbols, though changeable and fleeting, correspond to a law of human nature. Generally speaking, they help to excite and nourish the effective religious sentiment which Kant (who knew it from his reading of the pietists) calls *schwärmerei*. Kant, as a rationalist, rejects supernatural religion and prayer. The modernists consider natural religion a useless abstraction; for them it is prayer rather that constitutes the very essence of religion. It would be more correct to say that modernism is an offshoot of Schleiermacher (1768–1834), who though he owed something to Kant's philosophy, nevertheless built up his own theological system. Ritschl called him the "legislator of theology" (Rechtf. und Vers., III, p. 486). Schleiermacher conceives the modernist plan of reforming religion with the view of conciliating it with science. Thus would he establish an *entente cordiale* among the various cults, and even between religion and a kind of religious sentimentality which, without recognizing God, yet tends towards the Good and the Infinite. Like the modernists, he has dreams of new religious apologetics; he wants to be a Christian; he declares himself independent of all philosophy; he rejects natural religion as a pure abstraction, and derives dogma from religious experience. His principal writings on this subject are "Ueber die Religion" (1799: note the difference between the first and the later editions) and "Der Christliche Glaube" (1821–22). Ritschl, one of Kant's disciples, recognizes the New Testament as the historical basis of religion. He sees in Christ the consciousness of an intimate union with God, and considers the institution of the Christian religion, which for him is inconceivable without faith in Christ, as a special act of God's providence. Thus has he prepared the way for a form of modernism more temperate than that of Schleiermacher. Though he predicted a continual development of religion, Schleiermacher admitted a certain fixity of dogma. For this reason it seems to us that modernists owe their radical evolutionary theory to Herbert Spencer (1820–1903). It was through the writings of A. Sabatier (1839–1901), a French Protestant of the Broad Church type, that the religious theories we have spoken of, spread among the Latin races, in France and in Italy. It is in these countries, too, that modernism has done greatest harm among the Catholics. Sabatier is a radical modernist. He has especially drawn upon Schleiermacher for the composition of his two works on religious synthesis ("Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion d'après la psychologie et l'histoire", Paris, 1897; "Les religions d'autorité et la religion de l'esprit", Paris, 1902).

The fundamental error of the modernist philosophy is its misunderstanding of the scholastic formula which takes account of the two aspects of human knowledge. Doubtless, the human mind is a vital faculty endowed with an activity of its own, and tending towards its own object. However, as it is not in continual activity, it is not self-sufficient; it has not in itself the full principle of its operations, but is forced to utilize sensible experience in order to arrive at knowledge. This incompleteness and falling short of perfect autonomy is due to man's very nature. As a consequence, in all human knowledge and activity, account must be taken both of the intrinsic and of the extrinsic side. Urged on by the finality that inspires him, man tends towards those objects which suit him, while at the same time objects offer themselves to him. In the supernatural life, man acquires new principles of action and, as it were, a new nature. He is now capable of acts of which God is the formal object. These acts, however, must be proposed to man, whether God deigns to do so by direct revelation to man's soul, or whether, in conformity with man's social nature, God makes use of intermediaries who communicate exteriorly with man. Hence the necessity of preaching, of motives of credibility, and of external teaching authority. Catholic philosophy does not deny the soul's spontaneous life, the sublimity of its suprasensible and supernatural operations, and the inadequacy of words to translate its yearnings. Scholastic doctors give expression to mystical transports far superior to those of the modernists. But in their philosophy they never forget the lowliness of human nature, which is not purely spiritual. The modernist remembers only the internal element of our higher activity. This absolute and exclusive intrinsecism constitutes what the Encyclical calls "vital immanence". When deprived of the external support which is indispensable to them, the acts of the higher intellectual faculties can only consist in vague sentiments which are as indetermined as are those faculties themselves. Hence it is that modernist doctrines, necessarily expressed in terms of this sentiment, are so intangible. Furthermore, by admitting the necessity of symbols, modernism makes to extrinsecism a concession which is its own refutation.

(2) *The Consequences.*—The fact that this radically intrinsic conception of the spiritual or religious activity of man (this perfect autonomy of the reason *vis-à-vis* of what is exterior) is the fundamental philosophical conception of the modernists, as the alteration of dogma is the essential characteristic of their heresy, can be shown without difficulty by deducting from it their entire system of philosophy. First of all, of their agnosticism: the vague nature which they attribute to our faculties does not permit them, without scientific observation, to arrive at any definite intellectual result. Next, of their evolutionism: there is no determined object to assure to dogmatic formulæ a permanent and essential meaning compatible with the life of faith and progress. Now, from the moment that these formulæ simply serve to nourish the vague sentiment which for modernism is the only common and stable foundation of religion, they must change indefinitely with the subjective needs of the believer. It is a right and even a duty for the latter freely to interpret, as he sees fit, religious facts and doctrines. We meet here with the *a priorisms* to which the Encyclical "Pascendi" drew attention.

We wish to insist a little on the grave consequence that this Encyclical puts especially before our eyes. In many ways, modernism seems to be on the swift incline which leads to pantheism. It seems to be there on account of its symbolism. After all, is not the affirmation of a personal God one of these dogmatic formulæ which serve only as symbolic expressions of the religious sentiment? Does not the Divine Personality then become something uncertain? Hence radical modernism preaches union and friendship, even with mystical atheism. Modernism is inclined to pantheism also by its doctrine of Divine Immanence, that is, of the intimate presence of God within us. Does this God declare Himself as distinct from

us? If so, one must not then oppose the position of modernism to the Catholic position and reject exterior revelation. But if God declares Himself as not distinct from us, the position of modernism becomes openly pantheistic. Such is the dilemma proposed in the Encyclical. Modernism is pantheistic also by its doctrine of science and faith. Faith having for object the Unknowable cannot make up for the want of proportion that modernists put between the intellect and its object. Hence, for the believer as well as for the philosopher, this object remains unknown. Why should not this "Unknowable" be the very soul of the world? It is pantheistic also in its way of reasoning. Independent of and superior to religious formulæ, the religious sentiment on the one hand originates them and gives them their entire value, and, on the other hand, it cannot neglect them, it must express itself in them and by them; they are its reality. But we have here the ontology of pantheism, which teaches that the principle does not exist outside of the expression that it gives itself. In the pantheist philosophy, Being or the Idea, God, is before the world and superior to it, He creates it, and yet He has no reality outside the world; the world is the realization of God.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL CAUSES OF MODERNISM.—Curiosity and pride are, according to the Encyclical "Pascendi", two remote causes. Nothing is truer; but, apart from offering an explanation common to all heretical obstinacy, we ask ourselves here why this pride has taken the shape of modernism. We proceed to consider this question. In modernism we find, first of all, the echo of many tendencies of the mentality of the present generation. Inclined to doubt, and distrustful of what is affirmed, men's minds tend of their own accord to minimize the value of dogmatic definitions. Men are struck by the diversity of the religions which exist on the face of the earth. The Catholic religion is no longer, in their eyes, as it was in the eyes of our ancestors, the morally universal religion of cultured humanity. They have been shown the influence of race on the diffusion of the Gospel. They have been shown the good sides of other cults and beliefs. Our contemporaries find it hard to believe that the greater part of humanity is plunged in error, especially if they are ignorant that the Catholic religion teaches that the means of salvation are at the disposal of those who err in good faith. Hence they are inclined to overlook doctrinal divergencies in order to insist on a certain fundamental conformity of tendencies and of aspirations.

Then again they are moved by sentiments of liberalism and moderation, which reduce the importance of formal religion, as they see in the various cults only private opinions which change with time and place, and which merit an equal respect from all. In the West, where people are of a more practical turn, a non-intellectual interest explains the success of heresies which win a certain popularity. Consider the countries in which modernism is chiefly promulgated: France and Italy. In these two countries, and especially in Italy, ecclesiastical authority has imposed social and political directions which call for the sacrifice of humanitarian and patriotic ideas or dreams. That there are important reasons for such commands does not prevent discontent. The majority of men have not enough virtue or nobility to sacrifice for long, to higher duties, a cause which touches their interest or which engages their sympathy. Hence it is that some Catholics, who are not quite steady in their faith and religion, attempt to revolt, and count themselves fortunate in having some doctrinal pretexts to cover their secession.

The founder of the periodical "La Foi Catholique", a review started for the purpose of combating modernism, adds this explanation: "The insufficient cultivation of Catholic philosophy and science is the second deep explanation of the origin of modernist errors. Both have too long confined themselves to answers which, though fundamentally correct, are but little suited to the mentality of our adversaries, and are formulated in a language which they do not understand and which is no longer to the point. Instead of utilizing what is quite legitimate in their positive and critical tendencies, they have only considered them as so many abnormal leanings that must be opposed . . ." (Gaudeau, "La Foi Catholique", I, pp. 62–65). Another point is that the intrinsic nature of the movement of contemporary philosophy has been too much despised or ignored in Catholic schools. They have not given it that partial recognition which is quite consonant with the best scholastic tradition: "In this way, we have failed to secure a real point of contact between Catholic and modern thought" (Gaudeau, ibid.). For lack of professors who knew how to mark out the actual path of religious science, many cultured minds, especially among the young clergy, found themselves defenceless against an error which seduced them by its speciousness and by any element of truth contained in its reproaches against the Catholic schools. It is scholasticism ill-understood and calumniated that has incurred this disdain. And for the pope, this is one of the immediate causes of modernism. "Modernism", he says, "is nothing but the union of the faith with false philosophy". Cardinal Mercier, on the occasion of his first solemn visit to the Catholic University of Louvain (8 December, 1907), addressed the following compliment to the professors of theology: "Because, with more good sense than others, you have vigorously kept to objective studies and the calm examination of facts, you have both preserved our Alma Mater from the strayings of modernism and have secured for her the advantages of modern scientific methods." ("Annuaire de l'Université Catholique de Louvain", 1908, p. XXV, XXVI.) Saint Augustine (De Genesi contra Manicheos, I, Bk. I, i) in a text that has passed into the Corpus Juris Canonici (c. 40, c. xxiv, q. 3) had already spoken as follows: "Divine Providence suffers many heretics of one kind or another, so that their challenges and their questions on doctrines that we are ignorant of, may force us to arise from our indolence and stir us with the desire to know Holy Scripture." From another point of view, modernism marks a religious reaction against materialism and positivism, both of which fail to satisfy the soul's longing. This reaction however, for reasons that have just been given, strays from the right path.

PONTIFICAL DOCUMENTS CONCERNING MODERNISM.—The semi-rationalism of several modernists, such as Loisy for instance, had already been condemned in the Syllabus; several canons of the Vatican Council on the possibility of knowing God through his creatures, on the distinction between faith and science, on the subordination of human science to Divine revelation, on the unchangeableness of dogma, deal in a similar strain with the tenets of modernism. The following are the principal decrees or documents expressly directed against modernism. (1) The pope's address on 17 April, 1907, to the newly-created cardinals. It is a résumé which anticipates the Encyclical "Pascendi". (2) A letter from the Congregation of the Index of 29 April, 1907, to the Cardinal Archbishop of Milan with regard to the review "Il Rinnovamento". In it we find more concrete notions of the tendencies which the popes condemn. The letter even goes so far as to mention the names of Fogazzaro, Father Tyrrell, von Hügel, and the Abbate Murri. (3) Letters from Pius X, 6 May, 1907, to the archbishops and bishops and to the patrons of the Catholic Institute of Paris. It shows forth clearly the great and twofold care of Pius X for the restoration of sacred studies and Scholastic philosophy, and for the safeguarding of the clergy. (4) The decree "Lamentabili" of the Holy Office, 3–4 July, 1907, condemning 65 distinct

propositions. (5) The injunction of the Holy Office, "Recentissimo", of 28 August, 1907, which with a view to remedying the evil, enjoins certain prescriptions upon bishops and superiors of religious orders. (6) The Encyclical "Pascendi", of 8 Sept., 1907, of which we shall speak later on. (7) Three letters of the Cardinal Secretary of State, of 2 and 10 October, and of 5 November, 1907, on the attendance of the clergy at secular universities, urging the execution of a general regulation of 1896 on this subject. The Encyclical had extended this regulation to the whole Church. (8) The condemnation by the Cardinal-Vicar of Rome of the pamphlet "Il programma dei modernisti", and a decree of 29 October, 1907, declaring the excommunication of its authors, with special reservations. (9) The decree Motu Proprio of 18 Nov., 1907, on the value of the decisions of the Biblical Commission, on the decree "Lamentabili", and on the Encyclical "Pascendi". These two documents are again confirmed and upheld by ecclesiastical penalties. (10) The address at the Consistory of 16 Dec., 1907. (11) The decree of the Holy Office of 13 Feb., 1908, in condemnation of the two newspapers, "La Justice sociale" and "La Vie Catholique". Since then several condemnations of the books have appeared. (12) The Encyclical "Editæ" of 26 May, 1910, renewed the previous condemnations. (13) Still stronger is the tone of the Motu Proprio "Sacrorum Antistitum", of 1 September, 1910, declared (14) by a decree of the Consistorial Congregations of 25 September, 1910. This Motu Proprio inveighs against modernist obstinacy and specious cunning. After having quoted the practical measures prescribed in the Encyclical "Pascendi", the pope urges their execution, and, at the same time, makes new directions concerning the formation of the clergy in the seminaries and religious houses. Candidates for higher orders, newly appointed confessors, preachers, parish priests, canons, the beneficed clergy, the bishop's staff, Lenten preachers, the officials of the Roman congregations, or tribunals, superiors and professors in religious congregations, all are obliged to swear according to a formula which reprobates the principal modernist tenets. (15) The pope's letter to Prof. Decurtins on literary modernism. (All these documents are contained in Vermeersch, op. cit. infra.)

These acts are for the most part of a disciplinary character (the Motu Proprio of September, 1910, is clearly of the same nature); the decree "Lamentabili" is entirely doctrinal; the Encyclical "Pascendi" and the Motu Proprio of 18 March, 1907, are both doctrinal and disciplinary in character. Writers do not agree as to the authority of the two principal documents; the decree "Lamentabili" and the Encyclical "Pascendi". In the present writer's opinion, since the new confirmation accorded to these decrees by the Motu Proprio, they contain in their doctrinal conclusions the infallible teaching of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. (For a more moderate opinion cf. Choupin in "Etudes", Paris, CXIV, p. 119–120.) The decree "Lamentabili" has been called the new Syllabus, because it contains the proscription by the Holy Office of 65 propositions, which may be grouped under the following heads: Prop. 1–8, errors concerning the teaching of the Church; Prop. 9–19, errors concerning the inspiration, truth, and study of Holy Writ, especially the Gospels; Prop. 20–36, errors concerning revelation and dogma; Prop. 27–28, Christological errors; Prop. 39–51, errors relative to the sacraments; Prop. 52–57, errors concerning the institution and organization of the Church; Prop. 58–65, errors on doctrinal evolution. The Encyclical "Pascendi" in the introduction laid bare the gravity of the danger, pointed out the necessity of firm and decisive action, and approved of the title "Modernism" for the new errors. It gives us first a very methodical exposition of modernism; next follows its general condemnation with a word as to corollaries that may be drawn from the heresy. The pope then goes on to examine the causes and the effects of modernism, and finally seeks the necessary remedies. Their application he endeavours to put into practice by a series of energetic measures. An urgent appeal to the bishops fittingly closes this striking document.

PROTESTANT SOURCES.—KANT, *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der reinen Vernunft* (2nd ed., 1794); FICHTE, *Versuch einer Kritik aller Offenbarung* (1792); SCHLEIERMACHER, *Ueber die Religion, Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern* (4th ed., 1831); IDEM, *Der christliche Glaube nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche, im Zusammenhang dargestellt* (1811–22; 6th ed., 1884); SCHELLING, *Vorlesungen über die Methode des akademischen Studiums* (3rd ed., 1830); HEGEL, *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Religion* (1832), in vols. XI and XII of his complete works; RITSCHL, ALBRECHT, *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung* (3 vols., 1870–1874); IDEM, *Theologie und Metaphysik* (1881); HERMANN, *Die Gewissheit des Glaubens und die Freiheit der Theologie* (2nd ed., 1889); LIPSIUS, *Dogmatische Beiträge* (1878); IDEM, *Philosophie und Religion* (1885); LANGE, *Geschichte des Materialismus* (4th part, 3rd ed., 1876); SCHWARZ, *Zur Geschichte der neuesten Theologie* (3rd ed., 1864); EUCKEN: from among his numerous works on the subject we may mention *Der Wahrheitsgehalt der Religion* (1901); PFLEIDERER, *Die Religion, ihr Wesen und ihre Geschichte* (2nd vol., 1869); IDEM, *Grundriss der christlichen Glaubens- und Sittenlehere* (1880); IDEM, *Entwickelung der protestantischen Theologie seit Kant* (1892); SABATIER, *Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion après la philosophie et l'histoire* (1897); IDEM, *Les religions d'autorité et la religion de l'esprit* [posthumous] (1902); HAMILTON, *Discussion on Philosophy and Literature* (3rd ed., 1866); CAMPBELL, *The New Theology* (London, 1907); HARNACK, *Das Wesen des Christentums* (enlarged ed., Jena, 1908); GORE (anti-modernist), *The New Theology and the Old Religion* (London, 1907); HAKLUYT (anti-modernist), *Liberal Theology and the Ground of Faith* (London, 1908); *Father Tyrrell's Modernism: an expository criticism of "Through Scylla and Charybdis" in an open letter to Mr. Athelstan Riley* (London, 1909).

MODERNIST SOURCES.—MURRI, *Psicologia della religione, note ed appunti*, published under the pseudonym of SOSTENE GELLI (Rome, 1905); IDEM, *Democrazia e christianesimo;* IDEM, *I principi comuni* in *Programma della società regionale di cultura* (Rome, 1906); IDEM, *La Vita religiosa nel cristianesimo: Discorsi* (Rome, 1907); IDEM, *La filosofia nuova e l'enciclica contro il modernismo* (Rome, 1908); FOGAZZARO, *Il Santo* (Milan, 1905); *Il Programma dei Modernisti. Risposta all' Enciclica di Pio X, "Pascendi Dominici gregis"* (Rome, 1908); VOGRINEC, *Nostra maxima culpa! Die bedrängte Lage der katholischen Kirche, deren Ursachen und Vorschläge zur Besserung* (Vienna and Leipzig, 1904); LOISY, *L'Evangile et l'Eglise* (Paris, 1902); IDEM, *Autour d'un petit livre* (Paris, 1903); IDEM, *Simples réflexions sur le décret du Saint-Office "Lamentabili sane exitu", et sur l'Encyclique "Pascendi Dominici gregis"* (Ceffonds, 1908); LEROY, *Dogme et critique* (Paris) [In referring to this book, which has been condemned, we do not wish to make any reflexion on the Catholicity of the author]; TYRRELL, *Lex orandi* (London, New York, Bombay, 1906); IDEM, *A confidential letter to a friend who is a professor of anthropology*, It. tr. (inaccurate) in *Il Corriere della Sera* (1 Jan., 1906); *Letters to His Holiness Pope Pius X by a Modernist* (Chicago, 1910).

CATHOLIC SOURCES.—PORTALIÉ, *Dogme et Histoire* in *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* (Feb. to March, 1904); CAVALLANTI, *Modernismo e Modernisti* (Brescia, 1907); MERCIER, *Le modernisme, sa position vis-à-vis de la science, sa condamnation par le Pape Pie X* (Brussels, 1908); DE TONQUEDEC, *La notion de vérité dans la philosophie nouvelle* (Paris, 1908); LEPIN, *Christologie: Commentaire des propositions 27–38 du décret du S. Office "Lamentabili"* (Paris, 1908); LEBRETON, *L'encyclique et la théologie moderniste* (Paris, 1908); GAUDAUD, *Les erreurs du Modernisme* in *La foi catholique* (1908, 1909); PESCH, *Theologische Zeitfragen, Glaube, Dogmen und geschichtlichen Tatsachen. Eine Untersuchung über den Modernismus*, 4th series (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1908); HEINER, *Der neue Syllabus Pius X* (Mainz, 1908); MICHELITSCH, *Der neue Syllabus* (Graz and Vienna, 1908); KNEIB, *Wesen und Bedeutung der Encyclika gegen den Modernismus* (Mainz, 1908); GODRYEZ, *The doctrine of Modernism and its refutation* (Philadelphia, 1908); RICKABY, *The Modernist* (London, 1908); MAUMUS, *Les modernistes* (Paris, 1909); VERMEERSCH, *De modernismo tractatus et notæ canonicæ cum Actis S. Sedis a 17 April, 1907 ad 25 Sept., 1910* (Bruges, 1910).

A. VERMEERSCH.

Modigliana, DIOCESE OF (MUTILIANENSIS), in the Province of Florence, in Tuscany. The city is situated on the banks of the Tramazzo, and is the Castrum Mutilum of Livy. In the ninth century it was owned by the counts of Ravenna; later it was ruled by the Guidi until 1377, when it owed allegiance to the Florentines. The academy of the Incamminati flourished there in the sixteenth century. The episcopal see dates only from 1850 and was at first suffragan of Faenza. The cathedral, originally a collegiate church, was rebuilt in the sixteenth century and was dedicated by Julius II. The first bishop was Mario Melini. The

diocese is now suffragan of Florence; has 84 parishes, 46,200 parishioners; two religious houses of men, and seven of women; one school for boys, and three for girls.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XVII (Venice, 1857).

U. BENIGNI.

Modra, a titular see of Bithynia Secunda, suffragan of Nicæa. The city of Modra figures only in Strabo (XII, 543), who places it in Phrygia Epicteta, at the sources of the Gallus. It was probably situated at or near Aine Gueul, in the vilayet of Broussa. The region is called Medrena by Theophanes the Chronographer and Constantine Porphyrogenitus (De themat., vi). Several "Notitiæ episcopatuum" mention the See of Medrena, or Mela. The name of this second place is also written Melina, and was called for a time Justinianopolis Nova in honour of Justinian. As from the twelfth century we find only Melagina, Melangeia, or Melania, it is evident that the earlier Mela is the Malagina often mentioned by Byzantine historians as the first large station of the imperial armies in Asia Minor on the road from Constantinople to Dorylæum, and an important strategic point. This city must have been located between Lefke and Vezirkhan, two railway stations on the Constantinople-Bagdad line. The bishops recorded are: Macedonius of Justinianopolis Nova, present at the Council of Constantinople (555); Theodorus of Justinianopolis Nova or Mela, present at Constantinople (680); Nectarius, or Nicetas of Mela, present at Nicæa (787); Constantius of Mela, present at Constantinople (869); Paul of Mela, present at Constantinople (879); John of Malagina (1256); Constantine of Melangeia (thirteenth century); N. of Melaneia (1401).

RAMSAY, *Asia Minor*, 202 sq. See also XANTHOPOULOS in *Echos d'Orient*, V (1901–2), 161 sq.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Modruss. See ZENGG, DIOCESE OF.

Moeller, HENRY. See CINCINNATI, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

Mohammedan Confraternities.—The countries where Mohammedanism prevails are full of religious associations, more or less wrapped in secrecy, which are also political, and which may prove troublesome at some future time. The oldest of them, the Kadriya, dates from the twelfth century of our era, having been called into existence by the necessity of united counsels in order to make head against the Crusades. The name given to it was that of its founder, the Persian Sidi-abd-el-Kader-el-Djilani, who died at Bagdad in 1166. His disciples speak of him as "The Sultan of the Saints". One of the more recent association, and a very aggressive one, is that of the Senoussiya, founded by an Algerian, Sheikh Senoussi (d. 1859). In contrast to the exclusive spirit of the other orders, this one has opened its doors to all of them, allowing them to keep their own names, doctrines, usages, and privileges. The rallying principle of this combination is hatred of Christians; it isolates them in anticipation of the uprising which, on the appointed day of the Lord, will drive them out of "the Land of Islam" (*dar el Islam*, as opposed to *dar el harb*, "Land of the Infidels", or, literally, "Land of the Holy War"). Its motto is: "Turks and Christians, I will break them all with one blow". Those affiliated to the confraternities are called *khouans* (brethren) in North Africa; *dervishes* (poor men) in Turkey and Central Asia; *fakirs* (beggars) in India; *mourids* (disciples) in Egypt, Arabia, and Syria. Since the conquest of Algeria by the French (1830) the reaction has resulted in an immense development of confraternities in all Mohammedan countries. Except among the wealthy and sceptical of the great cities, very few Mussulmans escape the infection of this movement, and M. Pommerol numbers the total membership at 170,000,000. Leaving aside the excellent administrative and financial organization of the confraternities, we will here discuss only their religious side.

As is well known, at the call of the muezzins every Mohammedan is bound to recite daily certain prayers at stated hours. The khouans are also bound to follow these prayers with others, peculiar to their association. Among the chief of these is a kind of litany, called *dikr* (repeated utterance), for which a chaplet is used. Fundamentally, it is the same for all the orders, but with slight variations, by which the initiated are enabled to recognize each other easily. In general, it contains the Mohammedan symbol or Credo: "There is no God but the true God" (*La ilaha ill' Allah*, literally, "No god except God"), which is repeated, say a hundred times. Other terse phrases or invocations are added, such as "God sees me", "God pardon", part of a verse of the Koran, or names of the Divine attributes, as "O Living One", a hundred times, or simply the syllable *Houa* (Him). When the recitation in chorus becomes accelerated, the syllables of *La ilaha ill' Allah* are gradually reduced to *la hou, la ha, la hi*, or even *hou, ha, hi*, or *hou-hou*. The phrase *La ilaha*, etc., must be repeated by the Kadriya one hundred and sixty-five times after each of the five daily prayers; by the Kerzazya, five hundred times; for the Aissaoua, the daily total of repetitions is thirteen thousand and six hundred. Many of the confraternities have mystical tendencies, and make it their object to attain, on certain days and during certain moments, a profound union with God. This union (*ittisâl*), which is described by the Persian and Hindu sufi of the ninth century, resembles the Nirvana of the Buddhists. It is the annihilation of the personality by the identification (*djam* or *ittihâd*) of the subject with God. Sidi-abd-el-Kader-el-Djilani proclaimed that "happiness is in unconsciousness of existence". Sheikh Senoussi defined ecstasy as "the annihilation of a man's individuality in the Divine Essence", and Abd-el-Kerim summed it up in two words, "unconsciousness and insensibility". Such teaching cannot shock Mussulmans, for they venerate madmen as saints, and believe that God dwells in empty brains, which explains why they allow demented persons a liberty which, to us, seems excessive. Sometimes the initiated person endeavours to obtain union with the founder of his order, whom he regards as a superior emanation of the Godhead and His all-powerful intermediary. In this way *Refaya* are made.

As to the method of arriving at this pseudo-ecstatic union: Sufism, which preceded the confraternities, and from which many of them are derived, was content to teach the moral method of renunciation-detachment carried as far as possible. This was the essence of primitive Sufism, which was simply a "way" (*tariqâ*), a method of sanctification, not a dogmatic system or an organization. The confraternities added special exercises, and in this lies the great difference from Christian mysticism. The latter confesses the impossibility of attaining a true mystical state by one's own efforts; God must produce it, and then it comes unexpectedly, whether during prayer or in the midst of some indifferent occupation. The Mussulman thinks otherwise: there is a physical process which consists in the manner of reciting the *dikr* in common and which takes effect especially on Friday, the weekly holy day of Islam. There are various prescriptions as to how the breath should be held and its respiration prolonged. A more important detail is the exhausting bodily exercise which is enjoined to produce a kind of vertigo or hysterical intoxication, followed either by convulsions or by extreme weakness. Thus, among the Kadriya, says Le Chatelier, "the khouans give themselves up to a rhythmical and gradually accelerated swaying of the

upper part of the body which superinduces congestion of the cerebro-spinal system. Under the double influence of this purely physical cause and the concentration of all the intellectual faculties upon the same idea, that of the majesty of God, the phenomena of religious hysteria are produced in many of the adepts. . . . They are much in evidence in the convents of the order" (p. 29). The founder had prescribed that the faithful should confine their recitation to "*ha*, turning the head to the right, *hou*, turning it to the left, *hi*, bowing it, and prolonging each sound as much as the breath permits. It is easy to imagine the effect that may be produced on the most soundly constituted temperament by the repetition of these syllables accompanied with violent movements of the head" (ibid., p. 33). At the present time the Zaheriya go through the same movements with the formula, *La ilaha ill' Allah*, spoken in one breath, and sometimes as often as twenty-one times without a respiration. The Sarehourdiya, founded in the thirteenth century, repeat an indefinite number of times without interruption the phrase *La ilaha*, etc., while raising the head from the navel to the right shoulder, and thus they fall into a dumb state of unconsciousness. The Zaheriya add the left shoulder. The Nakechabendiya sometimes help the process with opium and similar drugs. Among the Beioumiya the body is bent, at each invocation, down to the waist, while the arms are crossed; they are uncrossed while the body is raised again, and then the hands are clapped together at the level of the face.

Some confraternities deserve special mention for the intense nervous paroxysms attained by their members. First, among the Kheluoatiya, founded in the fourteenth century, the members from time to time retire into deep solitude (whence their name, from *kheloua*, retreat); thus separated from the world, the disciple can communicate with others only by signs or in writing; he fasts from sunrise to sunset, and takes only such nourishment as is strictly necessary. By the use of coffee, he reduces his sleep to two or three hours. He recites certain sacred words, such as *Houa* (Him), *Qayyoum* (Immutable), *Haqq* (Truth), which have to be repeated from 10,000 to 30,000 times a day, according to the directions of the initiator. "The upper eyelid is briskly pressed down on the lower, to produce a titillation in the organ of sight which acts on the optic nerve and, through it, on the cerebral system. . . . The word *Qayyoum* is recited, say, 20,000 times, while the disciple sways and bows the head, with closed eyes. The rapidity of repetition cannot exceed once in every second, and the duration of such a prayer is from five to six hours. Supposing that the candidate is given three names to repeat in this way, it must take him eighteen hours a day. . . . The teachers of the order compare the Kheloua initiation to a deadly poison when taken in too large doses at first, and which can be assimilated by progressive use. . . . All the members who make frequent retreats, even if the duration is not prolonged, are seriously affected in mind. Emaciated, haggard-eyed, they return to ordinary life still retaining the traces of their harsh trials. . . . An extreme exaltation, then, is the characteristic of this order, and it, more than any other, must be regarded as the focus of an intense fanaticism" (ibid., 62 sqq.). Another very remarkable confraternity is that of the Aïssaoua, founded in the fifteenth century by Sidi-Mohammed-ben-Aïssa. The *dikr* takes the shape of raucous cries, "to the cadence of a muffled music in rapid time. Inclinations of the body down to the hips, increasing in rapidity, accompany each of these cries, or circular movements of the head, which are also calculated to shake the nervous system. The nervous crises thus superinduced are soon expressed in cerebral intoxication and anæsthesia variously localized in different subjects. As these phenomena are successively recognized by the practised eye of the presiding sheikh, the khouans, at a given signal, pierce their hands, arms, and cheeks with darts. Others slash their throats or bellies with sabres. Some crunch pieces of glass between their teeth, eat venomous creatures, or chew cactus leaves bristling with thorns. All, one after another, fall exhausted, into a torpor which a touch from the *moqaddem* (presiding initiator) transforms, in certain cases, into hypnosis" (ibid., 101).

In another confraternity, that of the Refaya, founded in the twelfth century by Refaï, a nephew of Sidi-abd-el-Kader, most of the dévotees faint when the hysterical intoxication supervenes; others "eat serpents and live coals, or roll themselves about

Dance of Whirling Dervishes
Constantinople

among burning braziers. They accustom themselves moreover, to casting themselves down on the points of darts, to piercing their arms and cheeks, and to being trodden under foot by their sheikh" (ibid., 204, 206). The howling and the whirling dervishes, who give public exhibitions at Constantinople and at Cairo, belong to the Refaya. Their ceremony begins with shouting accompanied by oscillations and leaps keeping time to the beating of drums. "Forming a chain", writes Théophile Gautier, "they produce, from deep down in their chests, a hoarse and prolonged howling: *Allah hou!* which seems to have nothing of the human voice in it. The whole band, acting under a single impulse, springs forward simultaneously, uttering a hoarse, muffled sound, like the growling of an angry menagerie, when the lions, tigers, panthers, and hyenas think that their feeding-time is being delayed. Then, by degrees, the inspiration comes, their eyes shine like those of wild beasts in the depths of a cave; an epileptic froth comes at the corners of their mouths; their faces become distorted and livid, shining through the sweat; the whole line lies down and rises up under an invisible breath, like blades of wheat under a storm, and still, with every movement, that terrible *Allah-hou* is repeated with increasing energy. How can such bellowings be kept up for more than an hour without bursting the osseous frame of the breast and spilling the blood out of the broken vessels?" (Constantinople, xii). The whirling dervishes, founded in the thirteenth century, are Maoulaniya, also called Mevlevis. "They waltz with arms extended, head inclined on the shoulder, eyes half-closed, mouth half-opened, like confident swimmers who are letting themselves be borne away on the stream of ecstasy. . . . Sometimes the head is thrown back, showing the whites of their eyes, and lips flecked with a light foam" (Constantinople, xi). At last they fall on their knees, exhausted, face to the earth, until the chief touches them, sometimes having to rub their arms and legs. No beholder, without previous information, would suspect the religious significance of these physical exercises of the

howling and the whirling dervishes, or that they constitute a process for arriving at union with God. This union does not consist, as with the saints of Christianity, in a higher knowledge and love of God, attained in silence and repose. In the orders which affect ecstasy, the khouan, on the contrary, is satisfied with the preposterous notion of using violent means to produce physiological effects which bring on intoxication to the point of unconsciousness.

RINN, *Marabouts et Khouan* (Algiers, 1884); LE CHATELIER, *Les confréries musulmanes* (Paris, 1887); DE PONT AND COPPOLANI, *Les confréries religieuses musulmanes* (Algiers, 1897); POMMEROL, *Chez ceux qui guettent* (Paris, 1902); PETIT, *Les confréries musulmanes*, an excellent summary (Paris, 1902).

AUG. POULAIN.

Mohammed and Mohammedanism. — I. THE FOUNDER. — Mohammed, "the Praised One", the prophet of Islam and the founder of Mohammedanism, was born at Mecca (20 August ?) A. D. 570. Arabia was then torn by warring factions. The tribe of Fihr, or Quraish, to which Mohammed belonged, had established itself in the south of Hijâs (Hedjaz), near Mecca, which was, even then, the principal religious and commercial centre of Arabia. The power of the tribe was continually increasing; they had become the masters and the acknowledged guardians of the sacred *Kaaba*, within the town of Mecca—then visited in annual pilgrimage by the heathen Arabs with their offerings and tributes—and had thereby gained such preeminence that it was comparatively easy for Mohammed to inaugurate his religious reform and his political campaign, which ended with the conquest of all Arabia and the fusion of the numerous Arab tribes into one nation, with one religion, one code, and one sanctuary. (See ARABIA, *Christianity in Arabia.*) Mohammed's father was Abdallah, of the family of Hashim, who died soon after his son's birth. At the age of six the boy lost his mother and was thereafter taken care of by his uncle Abu-Talib. He spent his early life as a shepherd and an attendant of caravans, and at the age of twenty-five married a rich widow, Khadeejah, fifteen years his senior. She bore him six children, all of whom died very young except Fatima, his beloved daughter.

On his commercial journeys to Syria and Palestine he became acquainted with Jews and Christians, and acquired an imperfect knowledge of their religion and traditions. He was a man of retiring disposition, addicted to prayer and fasting, and was subject to epileptic fits. In his fortieth year (A. D. 610), he claimed to have received a call from the Angel Gabriel, and thus began his active career as the prophet of Allah and the apostle of Arabia. His first converts were about forty in all, including his wife, his daughter, his father-in-law Abu Bakr, his adopted son Ali Omar, and his slave Zayd. By his preaching and his attack on heathenism, Mohammed provoked persecution which drove him from Mecca to Medina in 622, the year of the Hejira (Flight) and the beginning of the Mohammedan Era. At Medina he was recognized as the prophet of God, and his followers increased. He took the field against his enemies, conquered several Arabian, Jewish, and Christian tribes, entered Mecca in triumph in 630, demolished the idols of the Kaaba, became master of Arabia, and finally united all the tribes under one emblem and one religion. In 632 he made his last pilgrimage to Mecca at the head of forty thousand followers, and soon after his return died of a violent fever in the sixty-third year of his age, the eleventh of the Hejira, and the year 633 of the Christian era.

The sources of Mohammed's biography are numerous, but on the whole untrustworthy, being crowded with fictitious details, legends, and stories. None of his biographies was compiled during his lifetime, and the earliest were written a century and a half after his death. The Koran is perhaps the only reliable source for the leading events in his career. His earliest and chief biographers are Ibn Ishaq (A. H. 151=A. D. 768), Wakidi (207=822), Ibn Hisham (213=828), Ibn Sa'd (230=845), Tirmidhi (279=892), Tabari (310=929), the "Lives of the Companions of Mohammed", the numerous Koranic commentators [especially Tabari, quoted above, Zamakhshari (538=1144), and Baidawi (691=1292)], the "Musnad", or collection of traditions of Ahmad ibn Hanbal (241=855), the collections of Bokhari (256=870), the "Isabah", or "Dictionary of Persons who knew Mohammed", by Ibn Hajar, etc. All these collections and biographies are based on the so-called Hadiths, or "traditions", the historical value of which is more than doubtful. These traditions, in fact, represent a gradual, and more or less artificial, legendary development, rather than supplementary historical information. According to them, Mohammed was simple in his habits, but most careful of his personal appearance. He loved perfumes and hated strong drink. Of a highly nervous temperament, he shrank from bodily pain. Though gifted with great powers of imagination, he was taciturn. He was affectionate and magnanimous, pious and austere in the practice of his religion, brave, zealous, and above reproach in his personal and family conduct. Palgrave, however, wisely remarks that "the ideals of Arab virtue were first conceived and then attributed to him". Nevertheless, with every allowance for exaggeration, Mohammed is shown by his life and deeds to have been a man of dauntless courage, great generalship, strong patriotism, merciful by nature, and quick to forgive. And yet he was ruthless in his dealings with the Jews, when once he had ceased to hope for their submission. He approved of assassination, when it furthered his cause; however barbarous or treacherous the means, the end justified it in his eyes; and in more than one case he not only approved, but also instigated the crime.

Concerning his moral character and sincerity contradictory opinions have been expressed by scholars in the last three centuries. Many of these opinions are biased either by an extreme hatred of Islam and its founder or by an exaggerated admiration, coupled with a hatred of Christianity. Luther looked upon him as "a devil and first-born child of Satan". Maracci held that Mohammed and Mohammedanism were not very dissimilar to Luther and Protestantism. Spanheim and D'Herbelot characterize him as a "wicked impostor", and a "dastardly liar", while Prideaux stamps him as a wilful deceiver. Such indiscriminate abuse is unsupported by facts. Modern scholars, such as Sprenger, Nöldeke, Weil, Muir, Koelle, Grimme, Margoliouth, give us a more correct and unbiased estimate of Mohammed's life and character, and substantially agree as to his motives, prophetic call, personal qualifications, and sincerity. The various estimates of several recent critics have been ably collected and summarized by Zwemer, in his "Islam, A Challenge to Faith" (New York, 1907). According to Sir William Muir, Marcus Dods, and some others, Mohammed was at first sincere, but later, carried away by success, he practised deception wherever it would gain his end. Koelle "finds the key to the first period of Mohammed's life in Khadija, his first wife", after whose death he became a prey to his evil passions. Sprenger attributes the alleged revelations to epileptic fits, or to "a paroxysm of cataleptic insanity". Zwemer himself goes on to criticize the life of Mohammed by the standards, first, of the Old and New Testaments, both of which Mohammed acknowledged as Divine revelation; second, by the pagan morality of his Arabian compatriots; lastly, by the new law of which he pretended to be the "divinely appointed medium and custodian". According to this author, the prophet was false even to the ethical traditions of the idolatrous brigands among whom he lived, and grossly violated the easy sexual morality of

his own system. After this, it is hardly necessary to say that, in Zwemer's opinion, Mohammed fell very far short of the most elementary requirements of Scriptural morality. Quoting Johnstone, Zwemer concludes by remarking that the judgment of these modern scholars, however harsh, rests on evidence which "comes all from the lips and the pens of his own devoted adherents. . . . And the followers of the prophet can scarcely complain if, even on such evidence, the verdict of history goes against him".

II. The System.—A. *Geographical Extent, Divisions, and Distribution of Mohammedans.*—After Mohammed's death Mohammedanism aspired to become a world power and a universal religion. The weakness of the Byzantine Empire, the unfortunate rivalry between the Greek and Latin Churches, the schisms of Nestorius and Eutyches, the failing power of the Sassanian dynasty of Persia, the lax moral code of the new religion, the power of the sword and of fanaticism, the hope of plunder and the love of conquest—all these factors combined with the genius of the caliphs, the successors of Mohammed, to effect the conquest, in considerably less than a century, of Palestine, Syria, Mesopotamia, Egypt, North Africa, and the South of Spain. The Moslems even crossed the Pyrenees, threatening to stable their horses in St. Peter's at Rome, but were at last defeated by Charles Martel at Tours, in 732, just one hundred years from the death of Mohammed. This defeat arrested their western conquests and saved Europe. In the eighth and ninth centuries they conquered Persia, Afghanistan, and a large part of India, and in the twelfth century they had already become the absolute masters of all Western Asia, Spain and North Africa, Sicily, etc. They were finally conquered by the Mongols and Turks, in the thirteenth century, but the new conquerors adopted Mohammed's religion and, in the fifteenth century, overthrew the tottering Byzantine Empire (1453). From that stronghold (Constantinople) they even threatened the German Empire, but were successfully defeated at the gates of Vienna, and driven back across the Danube, in 1683.

Mohammedanism now comprises various theological schools and political factions. The Orthodox (Sunni) uphold the legitimacy of the succession of the first three caliphs, Abu Bakr, Omar, and Uthman, while the Schismatics (Shiah) champion the Divine right of Ali as against the succession of these caliphs whom they call "usurpers", and whose names, tombs, and memorials they insult and detest. The Shiah number at present about twelve million adherents, or about one-twentieth of the whole Mohammedan world, and are scattered over Persia and India. The Sunni are subdivided into four principal theological schools, or sects, viz., the Hanifites, found mostly in Turkey, Central Asia, and Northern India; the Shafiites in Southern India and Egypt; the Malikites, in Morocco, Barbary, and parts of Arabia; and the Hanbalites in Central and Eastern Arabia and in some parts of Africa. The Shiah are also subdivided into various, but less important, sects. Of the proverbial seventy-three sects of Islam, thirty-two are assigned to the Shiah. The principal differences between the two are: (1) as to the legitimate successors of Mohammed; (2) the Shiah observe the ceremonies of the month of fasting, Muharram, in commemoration of Ali, Hasan, Husain, and Bibi Fatimah, whilst the Sunnites only regard the tenth day of that month as sacred, and as being the day on which God created Adam and Eve; (3) the Shiah permit temporary marriages, contracted for a certain sum of money, whilst the Sunnites maintain that Mohammed forbade them; (4) the Shi'ites include the Fire-Worshippers among the "People of the Book", whilst the Sunnites acknowledge only Jews, Christians, and Moslems as such; (5) several minor differences in the ceremonies of prayer and ablution; (6) the Shiah admit a principle of religious compromise in order to escape persecution and death, whilst the Sunni regard this as apostasy.

There are also minor sects, the principal of which are the Aliites, or Fatimites, the Asharians, Azaragites, Babakites, Babis, Idrisites, Ismailians and Assassins, Jabrians, Kaissanites, Karmathians, Kharijites, followers of the Mahdi, Mu'tazilites, Qadrians, Safrians, Sifatians, Sufis, Wahabis, and Zaidites. The distinctive features of these various sects are political as well as religious; only three or four of them now possess any influence. In spite of these divisions, however, the principal articles of faith and morality, and the ritual, are substantially uniform.



Page of Koran MS., Sura (Chapter) lv
From a manuscript in the Royal Library, Berlin

According to the latest and most reliable accounts (1907), the number of Mohammedans in the world is about 233 millions, although some estimate the number as high as 300 millions, others, again, as low as 175 millions. Nearly 60 millions are in Africa, 170 millions in Asia, and about 5 millions in Europe. Their total number amounts to about one-fourth of the population of Asia, and one-seventh that of the whole world. Their geographical distribution is as follows:

Asia.—India, 62 millions; other British possessions (such as Aden, Bahrein, Ceylon, and Cyprus), about one million and a half; Russia (Asiatic and European), the Caucasus, Russian Turkestan, and the Amur region, about 13 millions; Philippine Islands, 350,000; Dutch East Indies (including Java, Sumatra, Borneo, Celebes, etc.) about 30 millions; French possessions in Asia (Pondicherry, Annam, Cambodia, Cochin-China, Tongking, Laos), about one million and a half; Bokhara, 1,200,000; Khiva, 800,000; Persia, 8,800,000; Afghanistan, 4,000,000; China and Chinese Turkestan, 30,000,000; Japan and Formosa, 30,000; Korea, 10,000; Siam, 1,000,000; Asia Minor, 7,179,000; Armenia and Kurdistan, 1,795,000; Mesopotamia, 1,200,000; Syria, 1,100,000; Arabia, 4,500,000. Total, 170,000,000

Africa.—Egypt, 9,000,000; Tripoli, 1,250,000; Tunis, 1,700,000; Algeria, 4,000,000; Morocco, 5,600,000; Eritrea, 150,000; Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 1,000,000; Senegambia-Niger, 18,000,000; Abyssinia, 350,000; Kamerun, 2,000,000; Nigeria, 6,000,000;

Dahomey, 350,000; Ivory Coast, 800,000; Liberia, 600,000; Sierra Leone, 333,000; French Guinea, 1,500,000; French, British, and Italian Somaliland, British East African Protectorate, Uganda, Togoland, Gambia and Senegal, about 2,000,000; Zanzibar, German East Africa, Portuguese East Africa, Rhodesia, Congo Free State, and French Congo, about 4,000,000; South Africa and adjacent islands, about 235,000.—Approximate total, 60,000,000.

Europe.—Turkey in Europe, 2,100,000; Greece, Servia, Rumania, and Bulgaria, about 1,369,000.

Total, about 3,500,000.

America and Australia, about 70,000.

About 7,000,000 (i. e., four-fifths) of the Persian Mohammedans and about 5,000,000 of the Indian Mohammedans are Shiahs; the rest of the Mohammedan world—about 221,000,000—are almost all Sunnites.

B. *Tenets.*—The principal tenets of Mohammedanism are laid down in the Koran (q. v.). As aids in interpreting the religious system of the Koran we have: first, the so-called "Traditions", which are supposed to contain supplementary teachings and doctrine of Mohammed, a very considerable part of which, however, is decidedly spurious; second, the consensus of the doctors of Islam represented by the most celebrated imâms, the founders of the various Islamic sects, the Koranic commentators and the masters of Mohammedan jurisprudence; third, the analogy, or deduction, from recognized principles admitted in the Koran and in the Traditions. Mohammed's religion, known among its adherents as Islam, contains practically nothing original; it is a confused combination of native Arabian heathenism, Judaism, Christianity, Sabiism (Mandœanism), Hanifism, and Zoroastrianism.

The system may be divided into two parts: dogma, or theory; and morals, or practice. The whole fabric is built on five fundamental points, one belonging to faith, or theory, and the other four to morals, or practice. All Mohammedan dogma is supposed to be expressed in the one formula: "There is no God but the true God; and Mohammed is His prophet." But this one confession implies for Mohammedans six distinct articles: (a) belief in the unity of God; (b) in His angels; (c) in His Scripture; (d) in His prophets; (e) in the Resurrection and Day of Judgment; and (f) in God's absolute and irrevocable decree and predetermination both of good and of evil. The four points relating to morals, or practice, are: (a) prayer, ablutions, and purifications; (b) alms; (c) fasting; and (d) pilgrimage to Mecca.

(1) Dogma.—The doctrines of Islam concerning God—His unity and Divine attributes—are essentially those of the Bible; but to the doctrines of the Trinity and of the Divine Sonship of Christ Mohammed had the strongest antipathy. As Nöldeke remarks, Mohammed's acquaintance with those two dogmas was superficial; even the clauses of the Créed that referred to them were not properly known to him, and thus he felt that it was quite impossible to bring them into harmony with the simple Semitic Monotheism; probably, too, it was this consideration alone that hindered him from embracing Christianity (Sketches from Eastern History, 62). The number of prophets sent by God is said to have been about 124,000, and of apostles, 315. Of the former, 22 are mentioned by name in the Koran—such as Adam, Noe, Abraham, Moses, Jesus. According to the Sunni, the Prophets and Apostles were sinless and superior to the angels, and they had the power of performing miracles. Mohammedan angelology and demonology are almost wholly based on later Jewish and early Christian traditions. The angels are believed to be free from all sin; they neither eat nor drink; there is no distinction of sex among them. They are, as a rule, invisible, save to animals, although, at times, they appear in human form. The principal angels are: Gabriel, the guardian and communicator of God's revelation to man; Michael, the guardian of men; Azrail, the angel of death, whose duty is to receive men's souls when they die; and Israfil, the angel of the Resurrection. In addition to these there are the Seraphim, who surround the throne of God, constantly chanting His praises; the Secretaries, who record the actions of men; the Observers, who spy on every word and deed of mankind; the Travellers, whose duty it is to traverse the whole earth in order to know whether, and when, men utter the name of God; the Angels of the Seven Planets; the Angels who have charge of hell; and a countless multitude of heavenly beings who fill all space. The chief devil is Iblîs, who, like his numerous companions, was once the nearest to God, but was cast out for refusing to pay homage to Adam at the command of God. These devils are harmful both to the souls and to the bodies of men, although their evil influence is constantly checked by Divine interference. Besides angels and devils, there are also jinns, or genii, creatures of fire, able to eat, drink, propagate, and die; some good, others bad, but all capable of future salvation and damnation.

God rewards good and punishes evil deeds. He is merciful and is easily propitiated by repentance. The punishment of the impenitent wicked will be fearful, and the reward of the faithful great. All men will have to rise from the dead and submit to the universal judgment. The Day of Resurrection and of Judgment will be preceded and accompanied by seventeen fearful, or greater, signs in heaven and on earth, and eight lesser ones, some of which are identical with those mentioned in the New Testament. The Resurrection will be general and extend to all creatures—angels, jinns, men, and brutes. The torments of hell and the pleasures of Paradise, but especially the latter, are proverbially crass and sensual. Hell is divided into seven regions: Jahannam, reserved for faithless Mohammedans; Laza, for the Jews; Al-Hutama, for the Christians; Al-Sair, for the Sabians; Al-Saqar, for the Magians; Al-Jahîm, for idolaters; Al-Hâwiyat, for hypocrites. As to the torments of hell, it is believed that the damned will dwell amid pestilential winds and in scalding water, and in the shadow of a black smoke. Draughts of boiling water will be forced down their throats. They will be dragged by the scalp, flung into the fire, wrapped in garments of flame, and beaten with iron maces. When their skins are well burned, other skins will be given them for their greater torture. While the damnation of all infidels will be hopeless and eternal, the Moslems, who, though holding the true religion, have been guilty of heinous sins, will be delivered from hell after expiating their crimes.

The joys and glories of Paradise are as fantastic and sensual as the lascivious Arabian mind could possibly imagine. "As plenty of water is one of the greatest additions to the delights of the Bedouin Arab, the Koran often speaks of the rivers of Paradise as a principal ornament thereof; some of these streams flow with water, some with milk, some with wine and others with honey, besides many other lesser springs and fountains, whose pebbles are rubies and emeralds, while their earth consists of camphor, their beds of musk, and their sides of saffron. But all these glories will be eclipsed by the resplendent and ravishing girls, or houris, of Paradise, the enjoyment of whose company will be the principal felicity of the faithful. These maidens are created not of clay, as in the case of mortal women, but of pure musk, and free from all natural impurities, defects, and inconveniences. They will be beautiful and modest and secluded from public view in pavilions of hollow pearls. The pleasures of Paradise will

be so overwhelming that God will give to everyone the potentialities of a hundred individuals. To each individual a large mansion will be assigned, and the very meanest will have at his disposal at least 80,000 servants and seventy-two wives of the girls of Paradise. While eating they will be waited on by 300 attendants, the food being served in dishes of gold, whereof 300 shall be set before him at once, containing each a different kind of food, and an inexhaustible supply of wine and liquors. The magnificence of the garments and gems is conformable to the delicacy of their diet. For they will be clothed in the richest silks and brocades, and adorned with bracelets of gold and silver, and crowns set with pearls, and will make use of silken carpets, couches, pillows, etc., and in order that they may enjoy all these pleasures, God will grant them perpetual youth, beauty, and vigour. Music and singing will also be ravishing and everlasting" (Wollaston, "Muhammed, His Life and Doctrines").

The Mohammedan doctrine of predestination is equivalent to fatalism. They believe in God's absolute decree and predetermination both of good and of evil; viz., whatever has been or shall be in the world, whether good or bad, proceeds entirely from the Divine will, and is irrevocably fixed and recorded from all eternity. The possession and the exercise of our own free will is, accordingly, futile and useless. The absurdity of this doctrine was felt by later Mohammedan theologians, who sought in vain by various subtile distinctions to minimize it.

(2) Practice.—The five pillars of the practical and of the ritualistic side of Islam are the recital of the Creed and prayers, fasting, almsgiving, and the pilgrimage to Mecca. The formula of the Creed has been given above, and its recital is necessary for salvation. The daily prayers are five in number: before sunrise, at midday, at four in the afternoon, at sunset, and shortly before midnight. The forms of prayer and the postures are prescribed in a very limited Koranic liturgy. All prayers must be made looking towards Mecca, and must be preceded by washing, neglect of which renders the prayers of no effect. Public prayer is made on Friday in the mosque, and is led by an imâm. Only men attend the public prayers, as women seldom pray even at home. Prayers for the dead are meritorious and commended. Fasting is commended at all seasons, but prescribed only in the month of Ramadan. It begins at sunrise and ends at sunset, and is very rigorous, especially when the fasting season falls in summer. At the end of Ramadan comes the great feast-day, generally called Bairam, or Fitr, i. e., "Breaking of the Fast". The other great festival is that of Azha, borrowed with modifications from the Jewish Day of Atonement. Almsgiving is highly commended: on the feast-day after Ramadan it is obligatory, and is to be directed to the "faithful" (Mohammedans) only. Pilgrimage to Mecca once in a lifetime is a duty incumbent on every free Moslem of sufficient means and bodily strength; the merit of it cannot be obtained by deputy, and the ceremonies are strictly similar to those performed by the Prophet himself (see Mecca). Pilgrimages to the tombs of saints are very common nowadays, especially in Persia and India, although they were absolutely forbidden by Mohammed.

(2) Morals.—It is hardly necessary here to emphasize the fact that the ethics of Islam are far inferior to those of Judaism and even more inferior to those of the New Testament. Furthermore, we cannot agree with Nöldeke when he maintains that, although in many respects the ethics of Islam are not to be compared even with such Christianity as prevailed, and still prevails, in the East, nevertheless, in other points, the new faith—simple, robust, in the vigour of its youth—far surpassed the religion of the Syrian and Egyptian Christians, which was in a stagnating condition, and steadily sinking lower and lower into the depths of barbarism (op. cit., Wollaston, 71, 72). The history and the development, as well as the past and present religious, social, and ethical condition of all the Christian nations and countries, no matter of what sect or school they may be, as compared with these of the various Mohammedan countries, in all ages, is a sufficient refutation of Nöldeke's assertion. That in the ethics of Islam there is a great deal to admire and to approve, is beyond dispute; but of originality or superiority, there is none. What is really good in Mohammedan ethics is either commonplace or borrowed from some other religions, whereas what is characteristic is nearly always imperfect or wicked.

The principal sins forbidden by Mohammed are idolatry and apostasy, adultery, false witness against a brother Moslem, games of chance, the drinking of wine or other intoxicants, usury, and divination by arrows. Brotherly love is confined in Islam to Mohammedans. Any form of idolatry or apostasy is severely punished in Islam, but the violation of any of the other ordinances is generally allowed to go unpunished, unless it seriously conflicts with the social welfare or the political order of the State. Among other prohibitions mention must be made of the eating of blood, of swine's flesh, of whatever dies of itself, or is slain in honour of any idol, or is strangled, or killed by a blow, or a fall, or by another beast. In case of dire necessity, however, these restrictions may be dispensed with. Infanticide, extensively practised by the pre-Islamic Arabs, is strictly forbidden by Mohammed, as is also the sacrificing of children to idols in fulfilment of vows, etc. The crime of infanticide commonly took the form of burying newborn females, lest the parents should be reduced to poverty by providing for them, or else that they might avoid the sorrow and disgrace which would follow, if their daughters should be made captives or become scandalous by their behaviour.

Religion and the State are not separated in Islam. Hence Mohammedan jurisprudence, civil and criminal, is mainly based on the Koran and on the "Traditions". Thousands of judicial decisions are attributed to Mohammed and incorporated in the various collections of Hadith. Mohammed commanded reverence and obedience to parents, and kindness to wives and slaves. Slander and backbiting are strongly denounced, although false evidence is allowed to hide a Moslem's crime and to save his reputation or life. As regards marriage, polygamy, and divorce, the Koran explicitly (sura iv, v. 3) allows four lawful wives at a time, whom the husband may divorce whenever he pleases. Slave-mistresses and concubines are permitted in any number. At present, however, owing to economic reasons, concubinage is not as commonly practised as Western popular opinion seems to hold. Seclusion of wives is commanded, and in case of unfaithfulness, the wife's evidence, either in her own defence or against her husband, is not admitted, while that of the husband invariably is. In this, as in other judicial cases, the evidence of two women, if admitted, is sometimes allowed to be worth that of one man. The man is allowed to repudiate his wife on the slightest pretext, but the woman is not permitted even to separate herself from her husband unless it be for ill-usage, want of proper maintenance, or neglect of conjugal duty; and even then she generally loses her dowry, which she does not if divorced by her husband, unless she has been guilty of immodesty or notorious disobedience. Both husband and wife are explicitly forbidden by Mohammed to seek divorce on any slight occasion or the prompting of a whim, but this warning was not heeded either by Mohammed himself or by his followers. A divorced wife, in order to ascertain the paternity of a possible

or probable offspring, must wait three months before she marries again. A widow, on the other hand, must wait four months and ten days. Immorality in general is severely condemned and punished by the Koran, but the moral laxity and depraved sensualism of the Mohammedans at large have practically nullified Koranic ethics.

Slavery is not only tolerated in the Koran, but is looked upon as a practical necessity, while the manumission of slaves is regarded as a meritorious deed. It must be observed, however, that among Mohammedans, the children of slaves and of concubines are generally considered equally legitimate with those of legal wives, none being accounted bastards except such as are born of public prostitutes, and whose fathers are unknown. The accusation often brought against the Koran that it teaches that women have no souls is without foundation. The Koranic law concerning inheritance insists that women and orphans be treated with justice and kindness. Generally speaking, however, males are entitled to twice as much as females. Contracts are to be conscientiously drawn up in the presence of witnesses. Murder, manslaughter, and suicide are explicitly forbidden, although blood revenge is allowed. In case of personal injury, the law of retaliation is approved.

In conclusion, reference must be made here to the sacred months, and to the weekly hòly day. The Arabs had a year of twelve lunar months, and this, as often as seemed necessary, they brought roughly into accordance with the solar year by the intercalation of a thirteenth month. The Mohammedan year, however, has a mean duration of 354 days, and is ten or eleven days shorter than the solar year, and Mohammedan festivals, accordingly, move in succession through all the seasons. The Mohammedan Era begins with the Hegira, which is assumed to have taken place on the 16th day of July, A. D. 622. To find what year of the Christian Era (A. D.) is represented by a given year of the Mohammedan Era (A. H.), the rule is: Subtract from the Mohammedan date the product of three times the last completed number of centuries, and add 621 to the remainder. (This rule, however, gives an exact result only for the first day of a Mohammedan century. Thus, e. g., the first day of the fourteenth century came in the course of the year of Our Lord 1883.) The first, seventh, eleventh and twelfth months of the Mohammedan year are sacred; during these months it is not lawful to wage war. The twelfth month is consecrated to the annual pilgrimage to Mecca, and, in order to protect pilgrims, the preceding (eleventh) month and the following (first of the new year) are also inviolable. The seventh month is reserved for the fast which Mohammed substituted for a month (the ninth) devoted by the Arabs in pre-Islamic times to excessive eating and drinking. Mohammed selected Friday as the sacred day of the week, and several fanciful reasons are adduced by the Prophet himself and by his followers for the selection; the most probable motive was the desire to have a holy day different from that of the Jews and that of the Christians. It is certain, however, that Friday was a day of solemn gatherings and public festivities among the pre-Islamic Arabs. Abstinence from work is not enjoined on Friday, but it is commanded that public prayers and worship must be performed on that day. Another custom dating from antiquity and still universally observed by all Mohammedans, although not explicitly enjoined in the Koran, is circumcision. It is looked upon as a semi-religious practice, and its performance is preceded and accompanied by great festivities.

In matters political Islam is a system of despotism at home and of aggression abroad. The Prophet commanded absolute submission to the imâm. In no case was the sword to be raised against him. The rights of non-Moslem subjects are of the vaguest and most limited kind, and a religious war is a sacred duty whenever there is a chance of success against the "Infidel". Medieval and modern Mohammedan, especially Turkish, persecutions of both Jews and Christians are perhaps the best illustration of this fanatical religious and political spirit.

SPRENGER, *Das Leben und die Lehre des Mohammed* (Berlin, 1865); WEIL, *Das Leben Mohammed* (Stuttgart, 1864); MUIR, *Life of Mohammed* (London, 1858, 1897); IDEM, *Mohammed and Islam* (London, 1887); SYED AMEER ALI, *A Critical Examination of the Life and Teachings of Mohammed* (London, 1873); IDEM, *The Spirit of Islam; or, The Life and Teaching of Mohammed* (Calcutta, 1902); KOELLE, *Mohammed and Mohammedanism Critically Considered* (London, 1888); NÖLDEKE, *Das Leben Muhammeds* (Hanover, 1863); IDEM, *Islam* in *Sketches from Eastern History* (London, 1892), 61–106; WELLHAUSEN, *Muhammed in Medina* (Berlin, 1882); KREHL, *Mohammed* (Leipzig, 1884); GRIMME, *Mohammed* (2 vols., Münster, 1892–94); MARGOLIOUTH, *Mohammed and the Rise of Islam* (London, 1905); ZWEMER, *Islam a Challenge to Faith* (New York, 1907); CAETANI, *Annali dell' Islam* (Milan, 1905—); MARACCI, *Prodromi ad refutationem Alcorani* (4 parts, Padua, 1698); ARNOLD, *Islam, its History, Character, and Relation to Christianity* (London, 1874); KREMER, *Geschichte der herrschenden Ideen des Islams* (Leipzig, 1868); IDEM *Culturgeschichte des Orients unter den Chalifen* (2 vols., Vienna, 1875–77); HUGHES, *Dictionary of Islam* (London, 1895); IDEM, *Notes on Mohammedanism* (3rd ed., London, 1894); MUIR, *The Coran, its Composition and Teaching* (London, 1878); PERRON, *L'Islamisme, son institution, son état actuel et son avenir* (Paris, 1877); GARCIN DE TASSY, *L'Islamisme d'après le Coran, l'enseignement doctrinal et la pratique* (2nd ed., Paris, 1874); MÜLLER, *Der Islam im Morgen- und Abendland* (2 vols., Berlin, 1885–87); GOLDZIHER, *Muhammedanische Studien* (2 vols., Halle, 1889–98); IDEM in *Die Orientalischen Religionen* (Leipzig, 1905), 87–135; LHEREUX, *Etude sur l'Islamisme* (Geneva, 1904); *Encyclopedia of Islam* (Leyden and London, 1908—); SMITH, *Mohammed and Mohammedanism* (London, 1876); KREHL, *Beiträge zur Muhammedanischen Dogmatik* (Leipzig, 1885); TOOL, *Studies in Mohammedanism, Historical and Doctrinal* (London, 1892); SELL, *The Faith of Islam* (London, 1886); WOLLASTON, *Muhammed, His Life and Doctrines* (London, 1904); IDEM, *The Sword of Islam* (New York, 1905); JOHNSTONE, *Muhammed and His Power* (New York, 1901); *Literary Remains of the Late Emanuel Deutsch* (London, 1874), 59–135; PIZZI, *L'Islamismo* (Milan, 1905); ARNOLD, *The Preaching of Islam, A History of the Propagation of the Muslim Faith* (London, 1896); MACDONALD, *Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence, and Constitutional Theory* (New York, 1903); IDEM, *The Religious Attitude and Life in Islam* (Chicago, 1908); ZWEMER, *The Mohammedan World To-day* (New York, 1906); CARRA DE VAUX, *La doctrine de l'Islam* (Paris, 1909); LAMMENS, *A travers l'Islam* in *Etudes* (Paris, 20 Oct., 1910); MARÈS, *Les Musulmans dans l'Inde, ibid.* (Jan. 5 and 20).

GABRIEL OUSSANI.

Mohileff, ARCHDIOCESE OF (MOHYLOVIENSIS), Latin Catholic archdiocese and ecclesiastical province in Russia. For the few Catholics in Russia before the partition of Poland, some mission stations sufficed. The Jesuits, who came in ambassadorial suites, laboured in Moscow from 1648, and in 1691 built the first Catholic church there. The free exercise of the Catholic religion, granted in 1706 by Peter the Great, was also allowed by his immediate successors, on condition that the missionaries did not attempt to secure converts. The Capuchins, Franciscans, and Dominicans also laboured among the immigrant Catholics with fruitful results. When the Jesuits were suppressed in 1773, many of them found a refuge in Russia. However, no special diocese for Catholics was erected. The partitions of Poland brought under Russian sway many hundred thousand Catholics, whose treatment was in striking contrast to that meted out to the Uniats. While Uniate churches and monasteries were confiscated and delivered to the Orthodox, and such Uniats as refused to join the Orthodox Church were subjected to flogging, imprisonment, and confiscation of property, policy and shrewdness led the empress to treat the Latin Church very differently. Wishing to attach it to herself, she entrusted the Franciscans with the parishes of St. Petersburg and the neighbourhood, permitted the foundation of schools, and released churches and schools from all taxes.

As in the first partition of Poland none of the old Polish sees fell to Russia, the empress decided to found a diocese for her Latin Catholic subjects, and to exclude all foreign priests from Russia. Without consulting the pope, she erected the Diocese of White Russia with Mohileff as its see (1772), and appointed as first bishop

Stanislaus Siestrzencewicz Bohusz, Auxiliary Bishop of Vilna (1773). At first Pius VI refused to recognize this see, mainly on account of the empress's arbitrary action and her persecution of the Uniats, but finally appointed the bishop vicar Apostolic of the new diocese. In 1782 Catharine arbitrarily raised the bishopric to an archdiocese. After some negotiations, the pope recognized the new Archdiocese of Mohileff by the Bull "Onerosa pastoralis officii" of 15 April, 1783, which reserved to the pope the foundation of other dioceses in the territory of the archdiocese, extending from the Baltic to the Pacific Ocean. At the second partition of Poland (1793) five Latin sees fell to Russia, Kamenetz, Kieff, Livonia, Lutzk, and Vilna. Although Catharine had promised in the Treaty of Grodno (1793) to maintain the *status quo* as regards the Catholic Church, she arbitrarily suppressed these dioceses and founded two new ones in places with hardly any Catholics. Part of the property of the suppressed bishoprics was confiscated by the State and the rest given to favourites of the empress.

Catharine's son and successor, Paul I, began, directly after his accession, negotiations with Pius VI, with a view to reorganizing the Latin and Uniat Churches. Four of the five suppressed dioceses (Kamenetz, Vilna, Lutzk, and Livonia, the last under the title of Samogitia) were restored, and the new Diocese of Minsk was founded to replace Kieff. Part of the confiscated property was restored to the Church. The four old dioceses, with the new Diocese of Minsk, were made suffragans of Mohileff, which now became a proper ecclesiastical province. Pius VI confirmed this arrangement on 15 November, 1798, by the Bull "Maximis undique pressi", which forms the substantial basis of the constitution of the Latin Church in Russia to-day. The Archdiocese of Mohileff did not escape the persecutions to which both the Latin and Uniat Churches were almost constantly exposed, especially during the reigns of Nicholas I and Alexander II (see Russia). In the hope of weakening the Catholic religion, which it hated and barely tolerated, the Government regularly selected aged or compliant men for Mohileff, leaving the pope no option but to confirm its choice. The first archbishop, Siestrzencewicz (b. 1730; d. 1 Dec., 1826), was one of its most pliable tools. Sprung from a noble but impoverished family of Lithuanian Calvinists, Siestrzencewicz, after serving in the army, became acquainted with Bishop Massalki of Vilna, and through his influence entered the Catholic Church and became a priest. Massalki, who never recognized Siestrzencewicz's lack of character, made him a canon and Auxiliary Bishop of Vilna.

Ambitious, uninfluenced by motives of honour or conscientious scruples, and greedy for power, Siestrzencewicz's sole aim was to curry favour with the secular authorities and thus secure despotic power over the Catholic Church in Russia. To limit as far as possible the power of his clergy, he persuaded Tsar Paul I to establish the "College of the Roman Catholic Church", to decide, as final court of appeal, all important matters concerning the Catholic dioceses. Its decisions had to receive the approval of the ruling senate, and it was furthermore declared the duty of the clergy to submit unconditionally to the will of the emperor in all matters, secular or ecclesiastical. The presiding officer of the college was Siestrzencewicz, who now established an absolute ecclesiastical despotism, appointing to the council only unworthy and subservient men. He granted unlawful divorces for money, induced Alexander I, Paul's successor, to expel the nuncio (who had reported to Rome the archbishop's unscrupulous conduct), and did not enter the feeblest protest against the expulsion of the Jesuits from the capital in 1815, and from Russia in 1820. Casper Casimir Kolumna Cieciszewski (b. 1745), Bishop of Lutzk, succeeded Siestrzencewicz (28 February, 1827; d. 16 April, 1831). His great age prevented him from doing much in face of the series of oppressive measures of Nicholas I, a fanatical adherent of the Orthodox Church. These measures which were intended to reduce the Catholic Church to a condition of servitude, and if possible to exterminate it completely in Russia, were furthered by the practice of leaving the archdiocese vacant for long periods—e. g. after the death of Cieciszewski and of his successor, Ignaz Ludwig Pawlowski (1841–42; b. 1775).

An expostulatory address presented by Pope Gregory XVI to the tsar during his visit to Rome in 1845 led to a Concordat, ratified by Russia in 1848 and promulgated by Pius IX, in accordance with which the Diocese of Tiraspol, with Saratoff as its see, was founded for the Catholic colonists in Southern Russia and made a suffragan of Mohileff. In December, 1848, Casimir Dmochowski (b. 1772; d. 11 January, 1851) was appointed archbishop. He was succeeded by Ignaz Holowiński (1851–5) and Wenceslaus Żyliński (1856–63), a tool of the government. Persecution, suppression, and confiscation continued even after the Concordat, especially under Alexander II. The Diocese of Kamenetz was arbitrarily suppressed in 1866, and Minsk has been vacant since 1869. Under Nicholas II free exercise of religion was granted in 1905, while the edicts of toleration of 17 April and 17 October, 1905, weakened in some measure the privileged position of the Orthodox Church. These alleviations have, however, been since whittled down by the arbitrary conduct of subordinate officials, acting with the tacit approval of the government. The recent archbishops are: Antonius Fialkowski (1871–83); Alexander Casimir Dziewaltowski Gintowt (1883–9); Simon Martin Kozlowski (1891–9); Boleslaw Hieronymous Klopotowski (1901–03); George Joseph Elesäus a Slupóff Szembek (1903–5); Appolinaris Wnukowski (1909), and Vincentius Kluczński (appointed 5 June, 1910).

II. Statistics.—The suffragans of Mohileff are: Samogitia, Lutzk-Zhitomir, Vilna, and Tiraspol. From 1866 Kamenetz has been administered by the Bishop of Lutzk, and from 1869 Minsk by the archbishop. The ecclesiastical province is the largest in the world, including three-fourths of European (the ecclesiastical province of Warsaw is excluded) and the whole of Asiatic Russia (5,450,400 sq. miles). According to the diocesan statistics for 1910 the archdiocese contains 28 deaneries, 245 parish churches, 399 priests, 1,023,347 Catholics. The administrators of thirty-four other parishes and chapels are immediately under the jurisdiction of the archbishop. Among these the most important are: Chernigoff (10,600), Tashkent (15,000); and in Siberia: Krasnoyarsk (13,000), Tomsk (10,000), Vladivostok (10,500), etc. The see of the archdiocese is St. Petersburg. The archbishop presides over the Roman Catholic Collegium, which regulates the relations between the respective dioceses and the Department of Public Worship, and administers the property of the Catholic Church. The Metropolitan Curia consists of a secretary and four other members; the archdiocesan chapter of a provost, dean, archdeacon, and six canons; the General Consistory of an official (secular administrator for the bishop), vice-official, three assessors, visitor of monasteries, *Defensor matrimoniorum*, and twelve lay members. The Roman Catholic ecclesiastical academy at St. Petersburg has a rector, spiritual director, sixteen clerical and seven secular professors, and 58 students. The seminary has 2 provisors, a rector, spiritual director, inspector, 14 clerical and 5 secular professors, 33 theological students, 59 philosophical, and 31 in the preparatory course. There are no statistics as to the monasteries of the diocese. From 1908 a Catholic monthly has been published at St. Petersburg.

Theiner, *Die neuesten Zustände der kathol. Kirche beider Ritus in Polen u. Russland* (Augsburg, 1841); Lescœur, *L'église cathol. en Pologne sous le gouvernement russe 1772–1876* (Paris, 1876); Pierling, *La Russie et le Saint-Siège* (4 vols., Paris, 1896–1907);

GODLEWSKI, *Monumenta ecclesiastica Petropolitana* (3 vols., St. Petersburg, 1906–9); *Elenchus omnium ecclesiarum et universi cleri archidiœceseos Mohyloviensis pro anno Domini 1910 conscriptus* (St. Petersburg, 1910).

JOSEPH LINS.

Möhler, JOHANN ADAM, theologian, b. at Igersheim (Würtemberg), 6 April, 1796; d. at Munich, 12 April, 1838. The gifted youth first studied in the gymnasium at Mergentheim, and then attended the lyceum at Ellwangen, where he applied himself primarily to philosophical studies. In 1815 he turned to the study of theology, and, after leaving the theological college at Ellwangen, went to Tübingen to continue his studies in the university there under the learned professors Drey and Hirscher. In 1818 he entered the seminary at Rottenburg on the Neckar, was ordained priest on 18 September, 1819, and was sent as curate in charge to Weilderstadt and then to Riedlingen. In 1821 he became *Repetent* (tutor) in the Wilhelmstift at Tübingen, and for more than a year devoted himself almost exclusively to classical literature, particularly to earlier Greek history and philosophy. In this way he acquired the keenness and clearness of judgment, delicacy of diction, skill in exposition, and fine sense of the æsthetic which distinguish all his writings and discourses. Soon, the theological faculty at Tübingen offered him a place as tutor (*Privatdozent*) in church history, to prepare for which he visited the leading German and Austrian universities, meeting there the best-known Catholic and Protestant theologians and pedagogues—Niemeyer, Gesenius, Planck, Schleiermacher, Marheineke, and in particular Neander, who made a powerful impression on the young man.

Thus equipped, he began his lectures, and soon published his first book under the title "Die Einheit in der Kirche oder das Prinzip des Katholizismus, dargestellt im Geiste der Kirchenväter der drei ersten Jahrhunderte" (Tübingen, 1825). It was hailed with enthusiasm, and gave brilliant evidence of the profound knowledge and the remarkable penetration of the young scholar. He was indeed a child of his time, and betrayed certain Febronian views and some sympathy with the pseudo-reformism of the day, which the Hermesians later cast up to him, and which he often regretted. His book, nevertheless, was not merely a highly intellectual, but also a highly moral act, and that for many readers, like Chateaubriand's "Génie du christianisme". Through the whole work there breathes, as it were, a new spirit, "which seems to herald a rejuvenescence of the Church and of theological science". There is here no shallowness or special pleading: one hears the accents of fresh, living, full Christianity, such as the author's profound study of the church Fathers had revealed to him. For him the church unity is twofold in character: a unity of spirit and a unity of body. The former is, first, the mystical unity in the Holy Spirit, which binds all the faithful in one communion; then the mental unity of doctrine, i. e., the comprehensive expression of the Christian mind in opposition to the manifold forms of heresy, and finally unity in multiplicity, i. e., the preservation of individuality within the unity of all the faithful. The unity of the body of the Church reveals itself first in the bishop, in whom is visible the unity of the diocese; to this correspond the wider circles of the metropolitan system and the council of the entire episcopate, and finally the Roman primacy, whose gradual development Möhler illustrates from the history of Christian antiquity and of the Middle Ages. Immediately after the appearance of his book Möhler was offered a place in the University of Freiburg; he refused it, and as a result was appointed extraordinary professor at Tübingen in 1826. After he had, two years later, declined another offer from Breslau, he became at Tübingen ordinary professor in the theological faculty, which conferred on him the Doctorate of Theology. Not long before, he had published his second work: "Athanasius der Grosse und die Kirche seiner Zeit im Kampfe mit dem Arianismus" (Mainz, 1827). It is a pleasing and lively portrait of the great Bishop of Alexandria, the champion of orthodoxy amid the great ecclesiastical conflicts of the fourth century. He portrays him as the hero of his time, with a character that contrasts favourably with the gloomy attitude of Arius and the vacillating weakness of Eusebius of Cæsarea. About the same time (Tübingen theologische Quartalschrift, 1827–8) he depicted in a similar masterly way one of the great figures of the Middle Ages, St. Anselm of Canterbury, as monk, scholar, and defender of ecclesiastical liberty.

His study of ecclesiastical life in early and medieval times led naturally to an examination of the distinctive differences between Catholicism and Protestantism. The results of his investigation he published in "Betrachtungen über den Zustand der Kirche im fünfzehnten und zu Anfang des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts" (Gesammelte Schriften, II, 1–34). He concludes that the Reformation, really necessary in the sixteenth century, did not take place in the right way, but took on rather the character of an entirely revolutionary movement, by which the tranquil development of the medieval Church, with all its good elements, was disturbed and an end put to ecclesiastical unity. In connexion with these investigations he began—as he had seen done in the North German universities and as his Protestant colleague at Tübingen, Professor Baur, had done—lectures on the antithesis between Protestantism and Catholicism, or, as is usually said, on *symbolism*. By this term are meant, in this connexion, the distinctive notes of a given ecclesiastical communion, also certain set formulæ, legally consecrated, and in a general way expressive of Christian faith or of certain fundamental dogmatic ideas; or again, especially since the Reformation (or rather since the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries), the confessions of faith that constitute the form or rule of belief for the faithful of any religious denomination. In this way symbolism, being the science of creeds, is a theological science that compares one religious system with another on the basis of their creeds, and thus demonstrates the truth or falsity of a particular creed. While symbolism—or, as it is now usually called, comparative symbolism—has not long been recognized as a special theological science, there are traces of it even in earliest Christian times. The Reformation created the conditions amid which it grew to maturity; and its first representative was probably the Protestant professor, Leonhard Rechtenbach, in his "Encyclopædia symbolica" (Leipzig, 1612). It is true that, in his opinion, the office of symbolism was merely to make one acquainted with one's own symbolic books, without paying any attention to those of another denomination. The founder of scientific symbolism in its modern sense was the Göttingen professor Planck in his "Abriss einer historischen und vergleichenden Darstellung der dogmatischen Systeme unserer verschiedenen christlichen Hauptpartheien" (Göttingen, 1796), the first effort at a real comprehension of all Christian creeds in their distinctive characteristics. Marheincke went farther in his "Christliche Symbolik oder historisch-kritische und dogmatische komparative Darstellung des katholischen, lutherischen, reformierten, und socinianischen Lehrbegriffes" (Heidelberg, 1810–13). Planck and Marheineke have found imitators, though of less importance, who continue down to the most recent times to treat this from the Protestant standpoint.

For Catholics such studies had naturally had less attraction. When a student at Tübingen, Möhler had heard lectures on symbolism, and had later met many Protestant theologians. He was the first Catholic writer to develop this idea, and became the

founder of this science among Catholics through his classical work, "Symbolik oder Darstellung der dogmatischen Gegensätze der Katholiken und Protestanten nach ihren öffentlichen Bekenntnisschriften" (Mainz, 1832; 13th ed., 1904). He demonstrated that there could be no incompatibility between what was truly rational and what was truly Christian, both finding their sole, direct, and entirely adequate expression in Catholic dogma. He showed also how Catholic doctrine held the middle course between the extremes of Protestantism, e. g., between a supernaturalism and pietism that denied the rights of reason, and a naturalism and rationalism that rejected absolutely the supernatural. With great clearness he exhibited the contradiction between Catholic and Protestant principles; for instance, in the doctrine of Christian anthropology. On this basis he proved that other differences of doctrine regarding the Fall of Man, the Redemption, the sacraments, and even the Church, were only logical consequences of the anthropological views of the leaders of the Reformation. Contradictory as it may seem, it was Möhler's irenic nature that impelled him to publish this work. He was persuaded that a knowledge of the real character of the great religious conflict, based on the genuine and original documents, was a necessary preliminary to any definite appeal to the tribunal of truth. Such investigations seemed to him important, not only for theologians, but also for every true scholar, the truth being nowhere so important as in matters of faith. The work was enthusiastically received, and went through five editions in six years. An English translation by James Burton Robertson appeared in London in 1843 under the title "Symbolism; or Exposition of Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants, as evidenced by their Symbolical Writings" (reprint, London and New York, 1894), and the work was also translated into French and Italian. "What many had thought and felt, but could not clearly understand, much less adequately express, was brought out by Möhler with marvellous insight and in the clearest way" (Kihn). His German diction was also perfect.

The "Symbolik" acted like an electric spark, and stirred up many both in and out of the Church. Naturally, Protestant theologians took up the gauntlet. Marheineke replied with moderation in his work, "Ueber Dr. J. A. Möhlers Symbolik" (Berlin, 1833), and Nitzsch in his "Eine protestantische Beantwortung der Symbolik Dr. Möhlers" (Hamburg, 1835). On the other hand his Tübingen colleague, Professor Baur, abused Möhler in a prolix rejoinder, "Der Gegensatz des Katholicismus und Protestantismus, nach den Principien und Hauptdogmen der beiden Lehrbegriffe. Mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Dr. Möhlers Symbolik" (Tübingen, 1834). Möhler replied with "Neue Untersuchungen der Lehrgegensätze zwischen den Katholiken und Protestanten. Eine Verteidigung meiner Symbolik gegen die Kritik des Herrn Prof. D. Baur" (Tübingen, 1834; 5th ed., with introduction and notes by Schanz, Ratisbon, 1900), to which Baur again replied in the same year. In his reply Möhler was able to state with greater clearness certain points of difference, and to deal more profoundly with certain doubts and criticisms. These additions were edited anew by Raich in "Ergänzungen zu Möhlers Symbolik aus dessen Schrift: Neue Unterschungen" (Mainz, 1889; latest ed., 1906). This controversy with Baur made Tübingen disagreeable to Möhler, and he decided to seek some other academic centre. The Prussian Government sought to attract the celebrated theologian to the Catholic theological faculty at one of its universities. Negotiations were begun and Möhler was not unwilling to go to Bonn. But Professor Hermes, who had Archbishop Spiegel on his side, prevented the execution of this design. Döllinger, his intimate friend, was meanwhile active in his behalf at Munich, and through his influence Möhler was appointed to the Catholic theological faculty at that university to lecture on the exegesis of the New Testament.

He began at Munich with lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, but in the next term he added lectures on Church history and patrology. His intercourse with professors of like mind raised his spirits, and his health, which had failed at Tübingen, improved. He devoted himself with fervour to the preparation of a history of monasticism, with the intention of setting forth the immeasurable influence of the Benedictine Order on Western civilization. While he cherished a warm attachment for the sons of St. Benedict, he was of opinion that the suspension of the Society of Jesus was not, historically speaking, to be regretted. His plan, however, was never realized. After a mild attack of cholera in 1836, he was stricken with a pulmonary ailment which compelled him to cease lecturing and seek health or alleviation at Meran in the Tyrol. After the condemnation of Hermesianism by Gregory XVI, the Prussian Government sought again to secure Möhler for Bonn, hoping perhaps that this would help to allay the controversies that had arisen at Cologne. His love of peace, however, and his delicate health caused him to refuse. Early in 1838 the King of Bavaria bestowed on him the Order of St. Michael, and on 22 March made him dean of the cathedral of Würzburg. Möhler never took up this office, however, for he died a few weeks later in the prime of life, not yet forty-two years of age, deeply lamented by king and people, regretted by his friends and by all who knew him. A monument, subscribed for by almost all Catholic Germany, adorns his grave in the cemetery at Munich, with the inscription: "Defensor fidei, literarum decus, ecclesiæ solamen" (Defender of the faith, ornament of letters, consolation of the Church). The clergy of Würtemberg erected another monument to his memory at his birthplace, at the dedication of which in 1880 his disciple and successor in Tübingen, Bishop Hefele of Rottenburg, paid a noble tribute to his fame.

Möhler, as Kihn has well shown, had an uncommonly attractive personality. He was an ideal priest, almost perfect in stature and comeliness, deeply pious and of childlike modesty, with a heart full of affection and gentleness, penetrated with the desire for peace in personal intercourse and for the restoration of harmony between the different creeds. He exercised a peculiar fascination over all who approached him, and men of every belief and party confidently turned to him on all manner of questions. He charmed his hearers by his dignified bearing, his kindly, intelligent eye, his classic diction, and his ripe knowledge. It may be said that he gave new life to the science of theology; also, and this is greater praise, that he reawakened the religious spirit of the age. He was, in the judgment of a Protestant (Realencyklopädie für prot. Theol., 2nd ed., IX, 662 sqq.), an epoch-making mind and a brilliant light of the Catholic Church; while, according to the same writer, the Evangelical Church, to which he owed much, had to thank him for fresh stimulus and for what it learned from his fine, keen exposition of ecclesiastical development. After his death Döllinger edited most of his minor writings in "Gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze" (2 vols., Ratisbon, 1839–40). They are numerous, the most noteworthy being "Beleuchtung der Denkschrift für die Aufhebung des den katholischen Geistlichen vorgeschriebenen Cölibates", in which he refutes with great earnestness the opponents of priestly celibacy, and proves the sublimity of the virginal life from the idea of the Christian priesthood, from reason, and from the New Testament. Other important studies are: "Hieronymus und Augustin im Streit über Galater 2, 14" (I, 1 sqq.); "Ueber den Brief an Diognetus" (I, 19 sqq.), "Fragmente aus und über Pseudoisidor" (I, 283 sqq.), ripe fruits of his studies of the Fathers

and Church history. He was always greatly devoted to such studies, and in his lectures often drew attention to the literary treasures of Christian antiquity. To him they stood as the unbroken series of witnesses to the doctrine, worship, and constitution of the Church—the successive evidences of her many victories, as he puts it in the introduction to his "Patrologie oder christlichen Literärgeschichte", the first volume of which, dealing with the first three centuries, was edited by Reithmayr with additions of his own (Ratisbon, 1840). Less important is the "Kommentar über den Römerbrief" (Ratisbon, 1845), also edited by Reithmayr after Möhler's death; it is difficult to say how much of it is Möhler's own work. The same may be said of the "Kirchengeschichte von J. A. Möhler" (3 vols., Ratisbon, 1867–8; index vol., 1870), laboriously compiled from class notes by the Benedictine Pius Gams, and later translated into French.

REITHMAYR, Biographical sketch in the fifth edition of the *Symbolik;* IDEM in *Kirchenlex.* (1893), s. v.; KIHN in RAICH, *Ergänzungen* (latest ed., 1906), i–lix; FRIEDRICH, *J. A. Möhler, der Symboliker* (Munich, 1894); KNÖPFLER (Munich, 1896); MONATSIER (Lausanne, 1897); WAGENMANN-HAUCK in *Realencykl. für prot. Theol.*, s. v.; GOYAU (Paris, 1905); SCHMID, *Der geistige Entwicklungsgang Möhlers* in *Hist. Jahrb.* (Munich, 1897), 322–56, 572–99.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Mohr, CHRISTIAN, b. at Andernach, 1823; d. at Cologne, 1888. He practised his profession of sculptor chiefly at Cologne under the cathedral architect Zwirner. After some early ornamental work at Mainz and Coblenz, Mohr settled in Cologne in 1845. He first executed the statuettes on the tomb of Archbishop Conrad of Hochstaden, the founder of the cathedral. Of importance are his figures of Christ, the Evangelists, and fifty-nine angels on the south portal of the cathedral, where the rich variety of the added symbols excites admiration. On the commission of Emperor William I the eight statues in the middle hall were executed. The "St. Peter" for the middle portal won Mohr the first-class medal at the Paris Exhibition of 1855. He also carved the statue of the first Cologne cathedral architect, Gerhard Riele, and that of the veteran painter of the Cologne school, Stephan Lochner. He undertook many commissions outside of Cologne: the panoramic figures for the assembly-hall at Düsseldorf, the thirty-four figures of the emperors for the Rathaus at Aachen, the equestrian statues for the Fürstenbergische Schloss at Herdringen, the portrait effigies of the Princes of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, the figures for the fountain on the market-place at Lübeck, etc. For more than forty years he was thus engaged at Cologne, executing commissions for that city and other places. The cathedral is indebted to him for the best of its sculptural decoration; the Rathhaus for the statues of the emperors, and the Museum for the bust of Michelangelo, which in 1873 secured for Mohr the honour of being made a regular member of the K. K. Akademie of Vienna. Mohr was equally esteemed as an art-collector and connoisseur of classical and German antiquities. His household furniture represented the art of the Dürer period. That he was not opposed to the Renaissance is proved by a beautiful silver epergne in that style. Finally, he appears as a writer on art in the works "Köln in seiner Glanzzeit" and "Kölner Torburgen". For his knowledge and his achievements he was indebted for the most part to his personal exertions, since he was practically self-educated; and, even though in many cases he only executed the plans of Schwanthaler, still numerous independent works display both talent and taste.

Zeitschr. für bildende Kunst, XXIV, 100 sqq.; *Illustrierte Zeitung*, no. 866 (1860).

G. GIETMANN.

Mohr, JOSEPH, b. at Siegburg, Rhine Province, 11 Jan., 1834; d. at Munich, 7 February, 1892. Father Mohr did more than any other within the last century towards restoring to general use, especially in German-speaking countries, those virile melodies and texts sung in the vernacular by the people prior to the Reformation—some dating from the twelfth century—which had been displaced by a sentimental class of hymns more in keeping with modern taste. While at first Father Mohr stood practically alone in the pioneer work of research, he later found powerful assistance in the labours of Rev. Dr. Wm. Bäumker and Rev. Guido Maria Dreves, at that time a Jesuit, both of whom became famous specialists in this field. Among his many works may be mentioned: "Lasset uns beten"; "Treatise on Psalmody"; "Cäcilia", a hymn-book and prayer-book; "Cantate", a hymn and prayer-book; "Psalmi Officii hebdomadæ sanctæ"; "Vesperbüchlein"; "Laudate Dominum", a hymn-book and prayer-book intended more especially for institutions of higher education; "Manuale Cantorum", and "Psälterlein", a hymn-book and prayer-book. Most of these collections—model hymn-books as well as prayer-books—have had large circulations; the "Cantate" has had forty-two editions, and the thirty-third edition of the collection, "Cäcilia", has recently appeared. Several of Father Mohr's collections became the official hymn-books of certain dioceses; others served as the basis for the compilation of official diocesan hymn-books. Mohr had the gift, rare at the present time, of writing genuine hymn-tunes, some of which are in his collections.

Cäcilianvereins-Catalog (Ratisbon, 1870); KORNMÜLLER, *Lexikon der kirchlichen Tonkunst* (Ratisbon, 1895).

JOSEPH OTTEN.

Moigno, FRANÇOIS-NAPOLÉON-MARIE, physicist and author, b. at Guéméné (Morbihan), 15 April, 1804; d. at Saint-Denis (Seine), 14 July, 1884. He received his early education at the Jesuit college at Sainte-Anne d'Auray and entered the novitiate of the order 2 Sept., 1822. He made his theological studies at Montrouge, devoting his leisure to mathematics and physics in which he achieved much success. Upon the outbreak of the Revolution of 1830, he fled with his brethren to Brieg in Switzerland. Here he continued his studies and, being endowed with a remarkable memory, acquired at the same time several foreign languages, including Hebrew and Arabic. In 1836 he was appointed professor of mathematics at the well-known college of Ste-Geneviève, Rue des Postes, in Paris. Here he became widely known not only as a scholar, but also as a preacher and writer of ability. He wrote numerous articles for the press and was much esteemed by the scientific men of the time, including Cauchy, Arago, Dumas, Ampère, etc. He was engaged on one of his best known works, "Leçons de calcul différentiel et de calcul intégral", based chiefly on Cauchy's methods, and had already published the first volume, when he left the Society in 1843. Shortly afterwards he undertook a tour of Europe, contributing numerous letters to the journal "L'Epoque". He acted as chaplain of the Lycée Louis-le-Grand from 1848 to 1851. He became scientific editor of the "Presse" in 1850 and of the "Pays" in 1851 and in 1852 founded the well-known scientific

FRANÇOIS-NAPOLÉON-MARIE MOIGNO

journal "Cosmos". In 1862 he founded "Les Mondes" and became associated with the clergy of St-Germain des Prés. In 1873 he was appointed one of the canons of the chapter of Saint-Denis. Moigno was a man of great industry and throughout his long career was a prolific writer, being distinguished rather as an exponent of science than as an original investigator. He not only wrote a large number of scientific and apologetical works of merit but also translated numerous English and Italian memoirs on science into French. He also edited the "Actualités scientifiques". Among his more important works may be mentioned "Répertoire d'optique moderne" (Paris, 1847–50); "Traité de télégraphie électrique" (Paris, 1849); "Leçons de mécanique analytique" (Paris, 1868); "Saccharimétrie" (Paris, 1869); "Optique moléculaire" (Paris, 1873); "Les splendeurs de la foi" (Paris, 1879–83); "Les livres saints et la science" (Paris, 1884), etc., and numerous articles in the "Comptes Rendus", "Revue Scientifique", "Cosmos", etc.

Cosmos, 3rd series, VIII, 443. HENRY M. BROCK.

Molai (MOLAY), JACQUES DE, b. at Rahon, Jura, about 1244; d. at Paris, 18 March, 1314. A Templar at Beaune since 1265, Molai is mentioned as Grand Master of the Templars as early as 1298. He was, as he described himself at his trial, an unlettered soldier (*miles illetteratus*); profiting, however, by the collective experience of his order, he presided in 1306 or 1307 at the drawing up of a very important plan of crusade and went to Poitiers to lay it before Clement V, who had summoned him from the East. This crusading project, based upon personal knowledge of the Orient and the Italian cities, is considered by Renan superior to any other scheme of its kind formulated during that epoch. In it Molai shows his implicit confidence in the King of France, whose victim he was soon to become. At the same time Molai presented to the pope a memorial against the amalgamation of the Hospitallers and the Templars under discussion since the Council of Lyons and accepted in principle by Gregory X. On learning from Clement V the accusations brought against his order, Molai begged the pope to do justice and returned to Paris. On 13 October, 1307, he was arrested there, together with all the Templars of the central house of Paris, by the lawyer Nogaret. Nogaret's captious interrogatories necessarily disconcerted Molai, who, knowing neither law nor theology, was unable to defend himself.

On 24 October, 1307, on his first appearance before the inquisitor general of the kingdom, Molai pleaded guilty to some of the imputed crimes, notably the alleged obligation of the Templars on joining the order to deny Christ and to spit upon the crucifix; but he refused to admit the crimes against chastity. On 25 October, 1307, he repeated these same admissions and denials. It is supposed that his object in making these partial admissions was to save his comrades from the extreme penalty. In 1308 a commission of inquiry of eight cardinals was appointed by the pope; it was a new form of procedure, and torture was excluded from it. Molai caused to be surreptitiously circulated in some of the dungeons a wax tablet calling upon his brethren to retract their confessions, and in August, 1308, appeared before this commission. What then took place is a most obscure point of history. According to the record of his trial as it appears in the Bull of Clement V, "Faciens misericordiam", Molai would seem to have repeated his admissions of guilt, but, when the Bull was read to him on his appearance before another commission in November, 1309, he was stupefied, made the sign of the Cross twice, and exclaimed: "Would to God that such scoundrels might receive the treatment they receive from the Saracens and Tartars!" From this Viollet concludes that the cardinals of the commission of 1308 attributed to Molai admissions which he had not made. But did they intend to injure him? Quite the contrary, M. Viollet thinks: had they reported that Molai would not repeat the admissions made in 1307, Philip IV the Fair would have had a reason for sending him to the stake as "relapsed"; so, from motives of humanity, they perpetrated a falsehood to save him. Before this commission of 1309 Molai displayed true courage. When they spoke to him of the sodomy of the Templars, and of their transgressions against religious law, he answered that he had never heard of anything of the kind, and asked permission to hear Mass. The trial dragged on. In March, 1313, he, with three other high dignitaries of the order, underwent a last interrogatory in Paris before a new commission of cardinals, prelates, and theologians, authorized to pronounce sentence. He was condemned to imprisonment for life, proudly denying the crimes with which the Temple had been charged. Philip the Fair sent him to die at the stake as "relapsed", and he continued unflinching until the last (see TEMPLARS, KNIGHTS).

Hist. litt. de la France, XXVII, 292–3, 382–6, two chaps. written by RENAN; VIOLLET, *Les Interrogatoires de Jacques de Molay* (Paris, 1910); BESSON, *Etude sur Jacques de Molay* (Besançon, 1877); SCHOTTMÜLLER, *Der Untergang des Templerordens* (2 vols., Berlin, 1887); LAVOCAT, *Procès des Frères de l'ordre du Temple* (Paris, 1888); RASTOUL, *Les Templiers* (Paris, 1905).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Molesme, NOTRE-DAME DE, a celebrated Benedictine monastery in a village of the same name, Canton of Laignes (Côte d'Or), ancient Burgundy, on the confines of the Dioceses of Langres and Troyes. St. Robert, Abbot of St-Michael de Tonnerre, not finding his monks disposed to observe the Rule of St. Benedict in its original simplicity, left them, accompanied by a few monks and hermits, and selected a spot on the declivity of a hill, to the right of the River Leignes, where, having obtained a grant of land from Hugo de Merlennac, they built a house and oratory from the boughs of trees. Here they lived in extreme poverty until a certain bishop visited them, and, seeing their need, sent them a supply of food and clothing. Members of the noblest families, hearing of the saintly lives of these religious, soon hastened from all parts of the country to join them, bringing in many cases their worldly possessions, which, added to numerous other benefactions, enabled them to erect a church, the most beautiful in the country around, and suitable monastic buildings. The increase in numbers and possessions caused a temporary relaxation in fervour, in so far that the monks ceased to relish the work of the fields, being willing to live on the alms given them. Matters having gone even so far as open rebellion, St. Robert and the most fervent religious left Molesme (1098) and founded Cîteaux, which, though intended as a Benedictine monastery, became the first and mother-house of the Cistercian Order. The monks of Molesme, repenting of their faults, begged Urban II to oblige St. Robert to return to them, and this request was acceded to (1099); Robert continued to govern them until his death (1110). Besides Cîteaux, Molesme founded seven or eight other monasteries, and had about as many monasteries of Benedictine nuns under its jurisdiction. The church and monastery were destroyed and their possessions confiscated in 1472 during the war between France and Burgundy. The buildings were again burned by the heretics towards the close of the sixteenth century. In the seventeenth century the fervour of the monastery was renewed on the introduction of the reform of St. Maur (1648). All the glory of Molesme has now vanished. The magnificent church is razed to the ground, and the monastic buildings are used, a small part as a school, and the rest as common dwellings.

MABILLON, *Annales O.S.B.* (Lucca, 1740); *Gallia christ.*, IV (Paris, 1876); GERMAIN, *Monasticon gallicanum* (Paris, 1882); *Voyage littéraire de deux religieux bénédictins* (Paris, 1717); JANAU-

SCHEK, *Originum cisterciensium*, I (Vienna, 1876); MANRIQUE, *Annales cisterc.*, I (Lyons, 1642); MARTÈNE, *Thesaurus anecdotorum*, III (Paris, 1717); LAURENT, *Cartulaire de Molesme* (Paris, 1907).

EDMUND M. OBRECHT.

Molfetta, Terlizzi, and Giovinazzo, DIOCESE OF (MELPHICTENSIS, TERLITIENSIS ET JUVENACENSIS).—Molfetta is a city of the province of Bari, in Apulia, southern Italy, on the Adriatic Sea; its origin is unknown, but many objects of the neolithic, bronze, and the Mycenæan epoch have been found at a place called Pulo, which shows that the site of Molfetta was inhabited in prehistoric times. The town has a beautiful cathedral, and beyond its limits is the sanctuary of the Virgin of the Martyrs containing an image brought to it by some Crusaders in 1188. The first bishop of this city of whom there is any record was John, whose incumbency is referred to the year 1136. The see was at first suffragan of Bari, but in 1484 it became immediately dependent upon Rome. In 1818, it was enlarged with the territory of the suppressed sees of Giovinazzo and Terlizzi, which were re-established in 1835, remaining united, *æque principaliter*. In the opinion of some people, Giovinazzo is the ancient Egnatia; it has been an episcopal see since 1071. Terlizzi was a city in the Diocese of Giovinazzo, and in 1731, to put an end to certain questions of its independence, it was declared an episcopal see, but united with Giovinazzo. The city was a fortress of the Hohenstaufens and of the Aragonese.

The Diocese of Molfetta contains 4 parishes; 80 secular and 6 regular priests; 42,000 Catholics. Terlizzi contains 3 parishes; 40 secular and 6 regular priests; 24,100 Catholics. Giovinazzo contains 2 parishes; 37 secular and 3 regular priests; 12,150 Catholics. In the united dioceses there are 6 convents for women, 4 for men, 2 schools for boys, and 4 for girls.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XXI.

U. BENIGNI.

Molière (properly, JEAN-BAPTISTE POQUELIN, the name by which he became known to fame having been assumed when he went on the stage, to avoid embarrassing his family), French comic poet; b. at Paris, 15 Jan., 1622; d. there 17 Feb., 1673. He was the son of a Paris furniture dealer who was also a valet-de-chambre to the king, and succeeded his father in the latter of these two capacities. After making his studies with the Jesuits at the Collège de Clermont, he seems to have studied law in some provincial town—perhaps Orléans. It is not known, however, if he ever took his licentiate. The stage very soon attracted him and absorbed him. At twenty-one he entered the theatrical company, organized under the name of "L'Illustre Théâtre", in which were Madeleine Béjart and her brothers. The troupe engaged a band of four musicians at the cost of one *livre* per day, and a dancer, who was to receive thirty-five *sols* per day and five *sols* extra for every day when there was a performance. The business started with a deficit, and Molière, who appears to have then been chosen president by his associates, was arrested for debt. He was imprisoned in the Châtelet, but released on his own recognizances.

In the course of the subsequent wanderings through different parts of France, Molière composed some small comic pieces of no importance, of which two have been preserved—"La Jalousie de Barbouillé" and "Le Médecin Volant". Afterwards, about 1653 or 1655, he staged, at Lyons, "L'Etourdi". In this he began to use the language of fine comedy which Corneille had created ten or twelve years before. "Le Dépit Amoureux", produced at Béziers in 1656, should also be mentioned here. Before long the "Illustre Théâtre" regained confidence to face the Parisian public; we find it in Paris in 1658. Next year the troupe, now authorized to call itself "Troupe de Monsieur, Frère du Roi" performed "Les Précieuses Ridicules". In this comedy Molière declared war against the spirit of refined humbuggery (*l'esprit précieux*), and he never ceased to be its enemy, as witness "Les Femmes Savantes" (1672), one of his last pieces. The last twelve years of his life saw the production of his most famous works. "L'Ecole des Maris" (1661) shows the beauty of a confiding and gentle character in a man; "Les Fâcheux" (also 1661) was written in fifteen days; "L'Ecole des Femmes" (1662) gives another lesson to husbands—which was very creditable to the playwright, for he himself, at the age of forty, had just married a girl of twenty, Madeleine Béjart's sister, the volatile Armande who was to give him so much trouble. The "Critique de L'Ecole des Femmes" and the "Impromptu de Versailles" (1663) are two little prose pieces in which the writer defends his comedy of the preceding year and attacks his critics. "Tartufe" (1664), the famous comedy, at first in three acts, afterwards in five, deals trenchant blows at hypocrisy, unfortunately, however, often striking true virtue at the same time. After its first production the public performance of this piece was forbidden, and the ban was not removed for five years.

MOLIÈRE
Painting by Pierre Mignard

In the interval Molière wrote: "Don Juan" (or "Le Festin de Pierre") (1665), apparently intended as a revenge for the suppression of "Tartufe"; "Le Misanthrope" (1669) a great comedy of character; "Amphitryon" (1668), three acts in verse of various measures, where Jupiter assumes the form of the Theban general, Amphitryon, in order to betray his wife, Alemena; lastly, "L'Avare" (1668). Excepting "Les Femmes Savantes", already mentioned, the comedies of his last four years exhibit a great deal of gaiety, but not so much breadth—"Monsieur de Pourceaugnac" and "Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme", in 1669, "Les Fourberies de Scapin", in 1671 and "Le Malade Imaginaire" (1673). While on the stage playing in "Le Malade Imaginaire", the author was seized with a violent hæmorrhage; he was carried home, and died.

In him France lost the greatest of the comic writers whom her history has produced. Judging Molière exclusively from a literary point of view, it must be admitted that he does not owe his reputation to the quantity of dramatic entanglement in his plays; he owes it above all to the truth of his portraiture. His friend Boileau called him "the looker-on" (*le contemplateur*). He knew how to look at the world, to note its vices and its failings, and his genius had the power of combining what he saw, melting all his observations together, adding to them, and thus creating beings who are no longer particular individuals, but are recognizable as men of their whole period—often of all periods of humanity. Moreover, the characters are his chief concern: with him, as with Racine, the characters carry the whole piece, they are its soul. His art may at times fail in other points—as in his *dénouements*, which are often ill contrived—but in that one respect he is always admirable. His plays, then, present a portrait of the heart of man, but a profile portrait drawn by a satirist, whose business is to see only the defective side of it, and a dramatic writer, who is obliged by the laws of stage optics to emphasize certain lines. This

verisimilitude—or, as his friend La Fontaine expressed it, carefulness "not to go one step away from nature" —is found in all Molière's works. It is particularly visible in his style. Good critics, it is true, have found fault with Molière's style, particularly in his verse; Boileau, Fénelon, and La Bruyère did so in the seventeenth century; Vauvenargues, in the eighteenth; Théophile Gautier and others, in the nineteenth. On the other hand, a whole school has arisen in the last fifty years to extol this writer: for the Molièrists, as they have been called, Molière is above all criticism; they preach a sort of cultus of Molière. To be more judicious, we must be more moderate. Admitting that the language of comedy, which is that of familiar conversation, permits him certain liberties, which he cannot be fairly blamed for using, still, making all due allowance for the nature of his medium, there is no denying that his style suffers from real carelessness—useless repetitions, incoherent metaphors, heavy and entangled phrases. Molière was obliged to write quickly; he was an improviser, but a genius of improvisation. For his style, in spite of its faults, is still, as Boileau said to Louis XIV, a "rare" style. Frank and natural, he excels in making reason and good sense talk. It is the style of a poet, too—warm, highly coloured, brilliant. Lastly, one finds in him striking words and striking touches, which come spontaneously, and add to his charm.

As for morality, it owes Molière much less than literature does. Although he gave out, in his prefaces, that it was his wish and duty as a dramatic poet, to be of service to morality, he has been severely censured in this regard, from Bossuet to Jean-Jacques Rousseau. While he never put on the stage—as is so often done in these days—a woman guilty of violating her marriage vows, or about to violate them, yet he has been reproached with the presentation of other dangerous pictures. Furthermore, he is always on the side of the young people, who surely need no encouragement in their evil propensities. All his sermons, all his satires, are for parents; all the unpleasant failings depicted by his comedies reside in the fathers and the old people; the laugh is always at their expense, except when their egoism excites horror. It must be confessed that, while the passions of the young king, Louis XIV, had only too much reason to be pleased with the author of "Amphitryon", religion had no cause to approve the author of "Tartufe". Molière's Christianity was not as profound as that of Corneille, Racine, Boileau, and nearly all the illustrious writers of his time. And yet, when there was question of his being given Christian burial, and the *curé* hesitated, on the ground that the priest had arrived too late to give absolution to the comedian, who, it may almost be said, passed from the stage to the tribunal of God, his widow proved that he had received the sacraments in the last previous paschal season.

See the edition of Molière by Despois and Mesnard in the *Collection des grands écrivains* (Paris, 1873–1900), also an English translation of his works with French text by Waller, 8 vols. (London, 1902–7), and English version with memoir by Wall in *Bohn's Library* (3 vols., London, 1876–77); Lacroix, *Bibliog. moliéresque* (Paris, 1875); Veuillot, *Molière et Bourdaloue* (Paris, 1877); Longhaye, *Hist. de la litt. franç. au XVII^e siècle* (Paris); Claretie, *Molière and Shakespeare* in *Fortnightly Review*, LVII (London, 1900), 317; Matthews, *Molière* (New York, 1910).

Georges Bertrin.

Molina, Alonso de, Franciscan friar, b. probably 1511 or 1512, at Escalona, province of Toledo, Spain; d. 1584, in the city of Mexico. In 1523 his parents came to New Spain, where he learned the Nahuatl, or Mexican language. The first twelve Franciscan missionaries who arrived in 1524, seeing how thoroughly versed he was in the language of the natives, begged Cortés to use his influence with the child's mother that he might be allowed to help them in their preaching and catechizing. The mother readily consented, and young Alonso became so attached to the fathers that he never left them. When he reached the required age he joined the Franciscan order, and for fifty years was indefatigable in his work among the Indians, devoting also some time to the numerous works which he left. In order to allow him to follow uninterruptedly his chosen work, his superiors relieved him of all cares of office, although there is record of his having been superior of the convent of Texcoco, in 1555. Although no great actions mark the life of Molina, he is nevertheless remarkable for his untiring zeal, and for the wonderful constancy with which, for half a century, he continued his work, resisting its monotony, overcoming all hardships and the opposition he often encountered. He left numerous works, the following unpublished: "Traduccion mexicana de las Epístolas y Evangelios de todo el año"; "Horas de Ntra. Sra. en mexicano"; many prayers and devotions for the Indians; "De Contemptu Mundi"; also a treatise on the sacraments. The following have been published: "Doctrina breve mexicana" (1571); "Vocabulario castellano mexicano" (1555); "Confesonario menor" (1565); "Confesonario mayor" (1565); "Doctrina Cristiana" (1578); "Arte mexicano" (1571); and "Vocabulario castellano mexicano y mexicano castellano" (1571, reprinted, Leipzig, 1880), the most important of his works.

Dicc. enciclopédico hispano-americano, III (Barcelona, 1893); Vetancurt, *Menologio franciscano* (Mexico, 1871); Molina, *Vocabulario de la lengua castellana mexicana* (Mexico, 1571); Siméon, *Dictionnaire de la langue Nahuatl* (Paris, 1885); *Obras de D. J. García Icazbalceta* (Mexico, 1896), III.

Camillus Crivelli.

Molina, Antonio de, a Spanish Carthusian and celebrated ascetical writer, b. about 1560, at Villanueva de los Infantes; d. at Miraflores, 21 September, 1612 or 1619. In 1575 he entered the Order of Augustinian Hermits, was elected superior at one of their houses in Spain, and for some time taught theology. But wishing to join an order of stricter discipline, he became a Carthusian at Miraflores, where he died prior of the monastery. He wrote in Spanish a few ascetical works, especially adapted for priests, which became the most popular books of their kind in Spain, and were translated into various foreign languages. The most famous of these is a manual for priests and bears the title: "Instruccion de Sacerdotes, en que se dá doctrina muy importante para conocer la alteza del sagrado oficio Sacerdotal, y para exercitarle debidamente". Twenty editions of this work are known to have been published, among them a Latin translation by the Belgian Dominican Nicolas Janssen Boy, which received five editions (Antwerp, 1618, 1644; Cologne, 1626, 1711, and 1712), and an Italian translation (Turin, 1865). It was severely attacked by the Jansenist Antoine Arnauld (De la fréquente Communion, 1643) but ably defended against him by Petavius ("Dogmata theologica, De Pœnitentia", lib. III, cap. vi; new ed., Paris, 1865–7, VIII, 286–8). He is also the author of two ascetical works adapted for laymen. The one, "Exercicios espirituales para personas ocupadas de cosas de su salvacion", was published at Burgos in 1613; the other, "Exercicios espirituales de la excelencias, provecho y necesidad de la oracion mental", etc., was first published at Burgos in 1615, and was translated into Latin.

Antonio, *Bibliotheca hispana nova* (Madrid, 1783–8), I, 145; Hurter, *Nomenclator*, 3rd ed., III, 608–9.

Michael Ott.

Molina (Mol. or Molin), Juan Ignacio, naturalist and scientist; b. 20 July, 1740, at Guaraculen near Talca (Chile); d. 23 Oct. (12 Sept.?), 1829, at Imola or Bologna (Italy). Molina first studied in Santiago and became a Jesuit when only fifteen. The young scholastic excelled in languages (he composed a number of poems), and in the natural sciences. In 1767 he was sent to Italy which grew to be his second home; he was ordained at Imola soon after, and then lived as

a tutor in Bologna. In his leisure time he devoted himself especially to the study of the natural sciences, although his chief distinction lies in having become the most prominent historian and geographer of his native American home. Molina published his works in Italian; they all appeared at Bologna, the first one anonymously. He treats of Chile in: (1) "Compendio della storia geografica, naturale e civile del regno del Chile" (1776), 8vo, 245 pp., 1 map, 10 tables; (2) "Saggio sulla storia naturale del Chile" (1782), 8vo, 368 pp., 1 map, 2nd enlarged edition (1810), 4to; (3) "Saggio della storia civile del Chile" (1787), 8vo, 333 pp., 2nd enlarged edition (1810), 4to, 306 pp. These three works have been translated into German (Leipzig, 1786–91); French (Paris); Spanish (2 vols., Madrid, 1788–95), the most complete edition; English (Middletown, Conn., 1808; London, 1809, 1825). The original and several of the translations contain Molina's portrait. As an expression of her gratitude Chile named the town of *Molina* after him. If these works evidence his learning as a student of natural history, this is equally true of his "Memorie di storia naturale lette in Bologna" (Bologna, 1821, 8vo, 2 vols. with 16 essays), which Molina as a member laid before the *Instituto Pontificio*. Another work, "Analogia de los tres reinos de la naturalezza", is of considerable interest, as it was written by Molina in Spanish, and because it was not published, although Mezzofanti procured the *imprimatur* in 1820. Molina was highly esteemed by the botanists; Schrank in 1789 named after him a genus of the *Gramineæ*, well known throughout Europe, *Molinia;* and Jussieu in the same year classified the genus *Molinæa;* other generic names (as *Molina*) are no longer used.

Sommervogel, *Biblioth. de la Comp. de Jésus*, V (1894); Saccardo, *La Botanica in Italia* (Venice, 1895, 1901).

Joseph Rompel.

Molina, Luis de, one of the most learned and renowned theologians of the Society of Jesus, b. of noble parentage at Cuenca, New Castile, Spain, in 1535; d. at Madrid, 12 October, 1600. At the age of eighteen, he entered the Society of Jesus at Alcalá, and, on finishing his novitiate, was sent to take up his philosophical and theological studies at Coimbra in Portugal. So successful was he in his studies that, at the close of his course, he was installed as professor of philosophy at Coimbra, and promoted a few years later to the chair of theology at the flourishing University of Evora. For twenty years, marked by untiring labour and devotion, he expounded with great success the "Summa" of St. Thomas Aquinas to eager students. In 1590 he retired to his native city of Cuenca to devote himself exclusively to writing and preparing for print the results of his long continued studies. Two years later, however, the Society of Jesus opened a special school for the science of moral philosophy at Madrid, and the renowned professor was called from his solitude and appointed to the newly established chair. Here death overtook him before he had held his new post for half a year. By a strange coincidence on the same day (12 Oct., 1600) the "Congregatio de auxiliis", which had been instituted at Rome to investigate Molina's new system of grace, after a second examination of his "Concordia", reported adversely on its contents to Clement VIII. Molina was not only a tireless student, but also a profound and original thinker. To him we are indebted for important contributions in speculative, dogmatic and moral theology as well as in jurisprudence. The originality of his mind is shown quite as much by his novel treatment of the old scholastic subjects as by his labours along new lines of theological inquiry.

Molina's chief contribution to the science of theology is the "Concordia", on which he spent thirty years of the most assiduous labour. The publication of this work was facilitated by the valuable assistance of Cardinal Albert, Grand Inquisitor of Portugal and brother of Emperor Rudolf II. The full title of the now famous work reads: "Concordia liberi arbitrii cum gratiæ donis, divina præscientia, providentia, prædestinatione et reprobatione" (Lisbon, 1588). As the title indicates, the work is primarily concerned with the difficult problem of reconciling grace and free will. In view of its purpose and principal contents, the book may also be regarded as a scientific vindication of the Tridentine doctrine on the permanence of man's free will under the influence of efficacious grace (Sess. VI, cap. v-vi; can., iv-v). It is also the first attempt to offer a strictly logical explanation of the great problems of grace and free will, foreknowledge and providence, and predestination to glory or reprobation, upon an entirely new basis, while meeting fairly all possible objections. This new basis, on which the entire Molinistic system rests, is the Divine *scientia media*. To make clear its intrinsic connexion with the traditional teachings, the work takes the form of a commentary upon several portions of the "Summa" of St. Thomas (I, Q. xiv, a. 13; Q. xix, a. 16; QQ. xxii-iii). Thus Molina is the first Jesuit to write a commentary upon the "Summa". As to style, the work has little to recommend it. The Latinity is heavy, the sentences are long and involved, and the prolix exposition and frequent repetition of the same ideas are fatiguing; in short, the "Concordia" is neither easy nor agreeable reading. Even though much of the obscurity of the book may be attributed to the subject-matter itself, it may be safely said that the dispute concerning Molina's doctrine would never have attained such violence and bitterness, had the style been more simple and the expressions less ambiguous. And yet Molina was of opinion that the older heresies concerning grace would never have arisen or would have soon passed away, if the Catholic doctrine of grace had before been treated according to the principles which he followed for the first time in his "Concordia" and with the minuteness and accuracy which characterized that work. But he was greatly mistaken. For not only was his doctrine powerless to check the teachings of Baius, which began to spread soon after the publication of his work, and to prevent the rise of Jansenism, which sprang from early Protestant ideas, but it was itself the cause of that historic controversy which has raged for centuries between Thomists and Molinists, and which has not wholly subsided even to this day. Thus, the "Concordia" became a bone of contention in the schools, and brought on a deplorable discord among the theologians, especially those of the Dominican and Jesuit orders.

The "Concordia" had scarcely left the press, and had not yet appeared on the market, when there arose against it a violent opposition. Some theologians, having got a knowledge of its contents, endeavoured by every means in their power to prevent its publication. Molina himself withheld the edition for a year. In 1589 he placed it on the market together with a defence of it, which he had in the meantime prepared and which was to answer the chief objections made against his work even before it appeared. The defence was published separately under the title: "Appendix ad Concordiam, continens responsiones ad tres objectiones et satisfactiones ad 17 animadversiones" (Lisbon, 1589). This precaution, however, was of little avail, and the controversy grew apace. Not only his principal adversaries among the Dominicans, Bañez and de Lemos, but even his own brothers in religion, Henriquez and Mariana, opposed his doctrine most bitterly. Soon the whole of Spain rang with the clamour of this controversy, and Molina was even denounced to the Spanish Inquisition. When the dispute was growing too bitter, Rome intervened and took the matter into its own hands. In 1594 Clement VIII imposed silence upon the contend-

ing parties, and in 1596 demanded that the documents be sent to the Vatican. To settle the controversy he instituted in 1598 a special "Congregatio de auxiliis", which at the early stages of its investigation showed a decided opposition to Molina's doctrine. Doubtless Molina took to the grave the impression that Molinism was doomed to incur the censure of the Holy See, for he did not live to see his new system exonerated by Paul V in 1607. (For further details see the article CONGREGATIO DE AUXILIIS.)

Undisturbed by the heat and bitterness of the attack, Molina published a complete commentary upon the first part of the Summa of St. Thomas, which he had prepared at Evora during the years 1570–73 ("Commentaria in primam partem D. Thomæ", 2 vols., Cuenca, 1592). The chief characteristic of this work, which has been repeatedly re-edited, is the insertion where opportunity offered of most of the dissertations of the "Concordia", which thus became an integral part of the commentary. The increasing bitterness and confusion of ideas occasioned by the controversy induced Molina to publish a new edition of the "Concordia" with numerous additions, in which he endeavoured to correct the misconceptions and misrepresentations of his doctrine, and at the same time to dispel the important misgivings and accusations of his adversaries. This edition bears the title: "Liberi arbitrii cum gratiæ donis etc. concordia, altera sui parte auctior" (Antwerp, 1595, 1609, 1705; new edition, Paris, 1876). To-day this is the only standard edition. After the lapse of nearly a century the Dominican Fr. Hyacinth Serry, in his "Historia Congregationis de auxiliis" (Louvain, 1700; Antwerp, 1709) accused Molina of having omitted many assertions from his Antwerp edition of the "Concordia", which were parts of the Lisbon edition. But Father Livinus de Meyer, S.J., subjected the two editions to a critical comparison, and succeeded in showing that the omissions in question were only of secondary moment, and that Serry's accusation was thus groundless. Meyer's work bears the title, "Historia controversiarum de auxiliis" (Antwerp, 1708). De Molina was not less eminent as a moralist and jurist than as a speculative theologian. A proof of this is his work "De Justitia et jure" (Cuenca, 1593), which appeared complete only after his death. This work is a classic, referred to frequently even at the present time (7 vols., Venice, 1614; 5 vols., Cologne, 1733). On broad lines Molina not only develops therein the theory of law in general and the special juridical questions arising out of the political economics of his time (e. g., the law of exchange), but also enters very extensively into the questions concerning the juridical relations between Church and State, pope and prince, and the like. It is a sad fact, that, in order to justify the brutal persecution of the Jesuits in France, the Benedictine Clémencet ("Extracts des assertions pernicieuses" etc., Paris, 1672) ransacked even this solid work and fancied he found therein lost principles of morality. This is but one of the many misfortunes which at that time of unrest fell so heavily, and as a rule so undeservedly, on the Society of Jesus (cf. Döllinger, "Moralstreitigkeiten", I, Munich, 1889, p. 337). The work "De Hispanorum primigeniorum origine et natura" (Alcalá, 1573; Cologne, 1588) is often attributed to Molina; in reality it is the work of another jurist of the same name, who was born at Ursaon in Andalusia.

As a man, priest, and religious, Molina commanded the respect and esteem of his bitterest adversaries. During his whole life his virtues were a source of edification to all who knew him. To prompt obedience he joined true and sincere humility. On his death-bed, having been asked what he wished done with his writings, he answered in all simplicity: "The Society of Jesus may do with them what it wishes". His love for evangelical poverty was most remarkable; in spite of his bodily infirmity, brought on by overwork, he never sought any mitigation in the matter of either clothing or food. He was a man of great mortification to the very end of his life.

A biography and bibliography together with a portrait of Molina may be found in the Cologne edition of his *De justitia et jure*, I (1733). It bears the title *L. Molinæ, S.J. vitæ morumque brevis adumbratio atque operum Catalogus.* There is no modern critical biography. See MORGOTT in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.; SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. des écrivains de la C. de J.*, V, 1167–79; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, I (2nd ed.), 47 sqq.

J. POHLE.

Molinism, the name used to denote one of the systems which purpose to reconcile grace and free will. This system was first developed by Luis de Molina, and was adopted in its essential points by the Society of Jesus. It is opposed by the Thomistic doctrine of grace—the term Thomism has a somewhat wider meaning—whose chief exponent is the Dominican Bañez. Along lines totally different from those of Molina, this subtile theologian endeavours to harmonize grace and free will on principles derived from St. Thomas. Whereas Molinism tries to clear up the mysterious relation between grace and free will by starting from the rather clear concept of freedom, the Thomists, in their attempt to explain the attitude of the will towards grace, begin with the obscure idea of efficacious grace. The question which both schools set themselves to answer is this: Whence does efficacious grace (*gratia efficax*), which includes in its very concept the actual free consent of the will, derive its infallible effect; and how is it that, in spite of the infallible efficacy of grace, the freedom of the will is not impaired? It is evident that, in every attempt to solve this difficult problem, Catholic theologians must safeguard two principles: first, the supremacy and causality of grace (against Pelagianism and Semipelagianism), and second, the unimpaired freedom of consent in the will (against early Protestantism and Jansenism). For both these principles are dogmas of the Church, clearly and emphatically defined by the Council of Trent. Now, whilst Thomism lays chief stress on the infallible efficacy of grace, without denying the existence and necessity of the free cooperation of the will, Molinism emphasizes the unrestrained freedom of the will, without detracting in any way from the efficacy, priority, and dignity of grace. As in the tunnelling of a mountain, galleries started by skilful engineers from opposite sides meet to form but one tunnel, thus it might have been expected that, in spite of different and opposite starting-points, the two schools would finally meet and reach one and the same scientific solution of the important problem. If we find, however, that this is not the case, and that they passed each other along parallel lines, we are inclined to attribute this failure to the intricate nature of the subject in question, rather than to the inefficiency of the scholars. The problem seems to lie so far beyond the horizon of the human mind, that man will never be able fully to penetrate its mystery. In the following we shall first consider Molinism as it came from its author's hands, and then briefly review the phases of its later historical development.

I. MOLINISM IN ITS ORIGINAL FORM.—Molinism combats the heresy of the Reformers, according to which both sinners and just have lost freedom of will. It maintains and strenuously defends the Tridentine dogma which teaches: (1) that freedom of will has not been destroyed by original sin, and (2) that this freedom remains unimpaired under the influence of Divine grace (cf. Sess. VI, can. iv–v, in Denzinger, "Enchiridion", ed. Bannwart, Freiburg, 1908, nn. 814–15). Freedom is the power of the will to act or not to act, to act this or that way; whereas it is the characteristic of necessary causes, as animals and inanimate beings, to produce their effects by an intrinsic necessity. Freedom of the will is a consequence of intelligence, and as such the most precious gift of man, an endow-

ment which he can never lose without annihilating his own nature. Man must of necessity be free in every state of life, actual or possible, whether that state be the purely natural (*status puræ naturæ*), or the state of original justice in paradise (*status justitiæ originalis*), or the state of fallen nature (*status naturæ lapsæ*), or the state of regeneration (*status naturæ reparatæ*). Were man to be deprived of freedom of will, he would necessarily degenerate in his nature and sink to the level of the animal. Since the purely natural state, devoid of supernatural grace and lacking a supernatural justice, never existed, and since the state of original justice has not been re-established by Christ's Redemption, man's present state alone is to be taken into consideration in solving the problem of the relation between grace and free will. In spite of original sin and concupiscence man is still free, not only with reference to ethical good and evil in his natural actions, but also in his supernatural salutary works in which Divine grace co-operates with his will. Molinism escaped every suspicion of Pelagianism by laying down at the outset that the soul with its faculties (the intellect and will) must be first constituted by prevenient grace a supernatural principle of operation *in actu primo*, before it can, in conjunction with the help of the supernatural concursus of God, elicit a salutary act *in actu secundo*. Thus, the salutary act is itself an act of grace rather than of the will; it is the common work of God and man, because and in so far as the supernatural element of the act is due to God and its vitality and freedom to man. It must not be imagined, however, that the will has such an influence on grace that its consent conditions or strengthens the power of grace; the fact is rather that the supernatural power of grace is first transformed into the vital energy of the will, and then, as a supernatural concursus, excites and accompanies the free and salutary act. In other words, as a helping or co-operating grace (*gratia adiuvans seu cooperans*), it produces the act conjointly with the will. According to this explanation, not only does Divine grace make a supernatural act possible, but the act itself, though free, is wholly dependent on grace, because it is grace which makes the salutary act possible and which stimulates and assists in producing it. Thus the act is produced entirely by God as First Cause (*Causa prima*), and also entirely by the will as second cause (*causa secunda*). The unprejudiced mind must acknowledge that this exposition is far from incurring the suspicion of Pelagianism or Semipelagianism.

When the Thomists propound the subtler question, through what agency does the will, under the influence and impulse of grace, cease to be a mere natural faculty (*actus primus*) and produce a salutary act (*actus secundus*), or (according to Aristotelean terminology) pass from potency into act, the Molinists answer without hesitation that it is no way due to the Thomistic predetermination (*prædeterminatio sive præmotio physica*) of the will of God. For such a causal predetermination, coming from a will other than our own, is a denial of self-determination on the part of our own will and destroys its freedom. It is rather the will itself which by its consent, under the restrictions mentioned above, renders the prevenient grace (*gratia præveniens*) co-operative and the completely sufficient grace (*gratia vere sufficiens*) efficacious; for, to produce the salutary act, the free will need only consent to the prevenient and sufficient grace, which it has received from God. This theory reveals forthwith two characteristic features of Molinism, which stand in direct opposition to the principles of Thomism. The first consists in this, that the *actus primus* (i. e. the power to elicit a supernatural act) is, according to Molinism, due to a determining influx of grace previous to the salutary act (*influxus prævius, gratia præveniens*), but that God enters into the salutary act itself (*actus secundus*) only by means of a concomitant supernatural concursus (*concursus simultaneus, gratia cooperans*). The act, in so far as it is free, must come from the will; but the *concursus prævius* of the Thomists, which is ultimately identical with God's predestination of the free act, makes illusory the free self-determination of the will, whether in giving or withholding its consent to the grace. The second characteristic difference between the two systems of grace lies in the radically different conception of the nature of merely sufficient grace (*gratia sufficiens*) and of efficacious grace (*gratia efficax*). Whereas Thomism derives the infallible success of efficacious grace from the very nature of this grace, and assumes consequently the grace to be efficacious intrinsically (*gratia efficax ab intrinseco*), Molinism ascribes the efficacy of grace to the free co-operation of the will and consequently admits a grace which is merely extrinsically efficacious (*gratia efficax ab extrinseco*). It is the free will that by the extrinsic circumstance of its consent makes efficacious the grace offered by God. If the will gives its consent, the grace which in itself is sufficient becomes efficacious; if it withholds its consent, the grace remains inefficacious (*gratia inefficax*), and it is due—not to God, but—solely to the will that the grace it reduced to one which is merely sufficient (*gratia mere sufficiens*).

This explanation gave the Molinists an advantage over the Thomists, not only in that they safeguarded thereby the freedom of the will under the influence of grace, but especially because they offered a clearer account of the important truth that the grace, which is merely sufficient and therefore remains inefficacious, is nevertheless always really sufficient (*gratia vere sufficiens*), so that it would undoubtedly produce the salutary act for which it was given, if only the will would give its consent. Thomism, on the other hand, is confronted by the following dilemma: Either the grace which is merely sufficient (*gratia mere sufficiens*) is able by its own nature and without the help of an entirely different and new grace to produce the salutary act for which it was given, or it is not: if it is not able, then this sufficient grace is in reality insufficient (*gratia insufficiens*), since it must be supplemented by another; if it is able to produce the act by itself, then sufficient and efficacious grace do not differ in nature, but by reason of something extrinsic, namely in that the will gives its consent in one case and withholds it in the other. If then, when possessed of absolutely the same grace, one sinner is converted and another can remain obdurate, the inefficacy of the grace in the case of the obdurate sinner is due, not to the nature of the grace given, but to the sinful resistance of his free will, which refuses to avail itself of God's assistance. But for Thomism, which assumes an intrinsic and essential difference between sufficient and efficacious grace, so that sufficient grace to become efficacious must be supplemented by a new grace, the explanation is by no means so easy and simple. It cannot free itself from the difficulty, as is possible for Molinism, by saying that, but for the refractory attitude of the will, God would have bestowed this supplementary grace. For, since the sinful resistance of the will, viewed as an act, is to be referred to a physical premotion on the part of God, as well as the free co-operation with grace, the will, which is predetermined *ad unum*, is placed in a hopeless predicament. On the one hand the physical premotion in the form of an efficacious grace, which is necessary to produce the salutary act, is lacking to the will, and, on the other, the entity of the sinful act of resistance is irrevocably predetermined by God as the Prime Mover (*Motor primus*). Whence then is the will to derive the impulse to accept or to reject the one premotion rather than the other? Therefore, the Molinists conclude that the Thomists cannot lay down the sinful resistance of the will as the cause of the inefficacy of the grace, which is merely sufficient.

At this stage of the controversy the Thomists urge with great emphasis the grave accusation that the Molinists, by their undue exaltation of man's freedom of will, seriously circumscribe and diminish the supremacy of the Creator over His creatures, so that they destroy the efficacy and predominance of grace and make impossible in the hands of God the infallible result of efficacious grace. For, they argue, if the decision ultimately depends on the free will, whether a given grace shall be efficacious or not, the result of the salutary act must be attributed to man and not to God. But this is contrary to the warning of St. Paul, that we must not glory in the work of our salvation as though it were our own (I Cor., iv, 7), and to his teaching that it is Divine grace which does not only give us the power to act, but "worketh" also in us "to will and to accomplish" (Phil., ii, 13); it is contrary also to the constant doctrine of St. Augustine, according to whom our free salutary acts are not our own work, but the work of grace.

The consideration of these serious difficulties leads us to the very heart of Molina's system, and reveals the real Gordian knot of the whole controversy. For Molinism attempts to meet the objections just mentioned by the doctrine of the Divine *scientia media*. Even Molinism must and does admit that the very idea of efficacious grace includes the free consent of the will, and also that the decree of God to bestow an efficacious grace upon a man involves with metaphysical certainty the free co-operation of the will. From this it follows that God must possess some infallible source of knowledge by means of which he knows from all eternity, with metaphysical certainty, whether in the future the will is going to co-operate with a given grace or to resist it. When the question has assumed this form, it is easy to see that the whole controversy resolves itself into a discussion on the foreknowledge which God has of the free future acts; and thus the two opposing systems on grace are ultimately founded upon the general doctrine on God and His attributes. Both systems are confronted with the wider and deeper question: What is the medium of knowledge (*medium in quo*) in which God foresees the (absolute or conditioned) free operations of His rational creatures? That there must be such a medium of Divine foreknowledge is evident. The Thomists answer: God foresees the (absolute and conditioned) free acts of man in the eternal decrees of His own will, which with absolute certainty produce *præmovendo* as definite *prædeterminationes ad unum*, all (absolute and conditional) free operations. With the same absolute certainty with which He knows His own will, He also foresees clearly and distinctly in the decrees of His will all future acts of man. However, the Molinists maintain that, since, as we remarked above, the predetermining decrees of the Divine Will must logically and necessarily destroy freedom and lead to Determinism, they cannot possibly be the medium in which God infallibly foresees future free acts. Rather these decrees must presuppose a special knowledge (*scientia media*), in the light of which God infallibly foresees from all eternity what attitude man's will would in any conceivable combination of circumstances assume if this or that particular grace were offered it. And it is only when guided by His infallible foreknowledge that God determines the kind of grace He shall give to man. If, for example, He foresees by means of the *scientia media* that St. Peter, after his denial of Christ, shall freely co-operate with a certain grace, He decrees to give him this particular grace and none other; the grace thus conferred becomes efficacious in bringing about his repentance. In the case of Judas, on the other hand, God, foreseeing the future resistance of this Apostle to a certain grace of conversion, decreed to allow it, and consequently bestowed upon him a grace which in itself was really sufficient, but remained inefficacious solely on account of the refractory disposition of the Apostle's will. Guided by this *scientia media* God is left entirely free in the disposition and distribution of grace. On His good pleasure alone it depends to whom He will give the supreme grace of final perseverance, to whom He will refuse it; whom He will receive into Heaven, whom He will exclude from His sight for ever. This doctrine is in perfect harmony with the dogmas of the gratuity of grace, the unequal distribution of efficacious grace, the wise and inscrutable operations of Divine Providence, the absolute impossibility to merit final perseverance, and lastly the immutable predestination to glory or rejection; nay more, it brings these very dogmas into harmony, not only with the infallible foreknowledge of God, but also with the freedom of the created will. The *scientia media* is thus in reality the cardinal point of Molinism; with it Molinism stands or falls. This doctrine of the *scientia media* is the battle-field of the two theological schools; the Jesuits were striving to maintain and fortify it, while the Dominicans are ever putting forth their best efforts to capture or turn the position. The theologians who have come after them, unhampered by the traditions of either order, have followed some the doctrine of the Jesuits, some the Dominican system.

The chief objection directed against Molinism at its rise was, that its shibboleth, the *scientia media*, was a sheer invention of Molina and therefore a suspicious innovation. The Molinists on the other hand did not hesitate to hurl back at the Thomists this same objection with regard to their *præmotio physica*. In reality both accusations were equally unfounded. As long as there is an historical development of dogma, it is natural that, in the course of time and under the supernatural guidance of the Holy Ghost, new ideas and new terms should gain currency. The deposit of faith, which is unchangeable in substance but admits of development, contains these ideas from the beginning, and they are brought to their full development by the tireless labours of the theological schools. The idea of the *scientia media* Molina had borrowed from his celebrated professor, Pedro da Fonseca, S.J. ("Commentar. in Metaphys. Aristotelis", Cologne, 1615, III), who called it *scientia mixta*. The justification for this name Molina found in the consideration that, in addition to the Divine knowledge of the purely possible (*scientia simplicis intelligentiæ*) and the knowledge of the actually existing (*scientia visionis*), there must be a third kind of "intermediate knowledge", which embraces all objects that are found neither in the region of pure possibility nor strictly in that of actuality, but partake equally of both extremes and in some sort belong to both kinds of knowledge. In this class are numbered especially those free actions, which, though never destined to be realized in historical fact, would come into existence if certain conditions were fulfilled. A hypothetical occurrence of this kind the theologians call a conditional future occurrence (*actus liber conditionate futurus seu futuribilis*). In virtue of this particular kind of Divine knowledge, Christ, for example, was able to declare with certainty to His obstinate hearers that the inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon would have done penance in sackcloth and ashes, if they had witnessed the signs and miracles which were wrought in Corozain and Bethsaida (cf. Matt., xi, 21 sq.). We know, however, that such signs and miracles were not wrought and that the inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon were not converted. Yet God had infallibly foreseen from all eternity that this conversion would have taken place if the condition (which never was realized) of Christ's mission to these cities had been fulfilled. Who will doubt that God in His omniscience foresees distinctly what any inhabitant of New York would do throughout the day, if he were now in London or Paris instead of America? It is true that a number of Thomists, for example Ledesma ("De div. gratia auxil."; Salamanca, 1611,

pp. 574 sqq.), denied, if not the existence, at least the infallibility of God's knowledge concerning the conditioned free future, and attributed to it only great probability. But, from the time that such eminent theologians as Alvarez, Gonet, Gotti, and Billuart succeeded in harmonizing the infallibility of this Divine knowledge with the fundamental tenets of Thomism by the subtle theory of hypothetical Divine decrees, there has been no Thomist who does not uphold the omniscience of God also with regard to conditioned events. But have they not then become supporters of the *scientia media?* By no means. For it is precisely the Molinists who most sternly repudiate these Divine predetermining decrees, be they absolute or conditioned, as the deathknell of man's freedom. For the very purpose of securing the freedom of the will and in no way to do violence to it by a physical premotion of any sort, the Molinists insisted all along that the knowledge of God precedes the decrees of His will. They thus kept this knowledge free and uninfluenced by any antecedent absolute or conditioned decree of God's will. Molinism is pledged to the following principle: The knowledge of God precedes as a guiding light the decree of His will, and His will is in no way the source of His knowledge. It was because by their *scientia media* they understood a knowledge independent of any decrees, that they were most sharply assailed by the Thomists.

II. Later Development of Molinism.—Thus far we have learned that the central idea of Molinism lies in the principle that the infallible success of efficacious grace is not to be ascribed to its own intrinsic nature, but to the Divine *scientia media*. The Society of Jesus has ever since clung tenaciously to this principle, but without considering itself bound to maintain all the assertions and arguments of Molina's "Concordia"; on many points of secondary importance its teachers are allowed perfect freedom of opinion.

First of all it was clear to the Jesuits from the beginning and the disputations before the Congregatio de Auxiliis (q. v.) did but strengthen the conviction, that a more perfect, more fully developed, and more accurate exposition of the Molinistic system on grace was both possible and desirable. As a modification of Molinism we are usually referred in the first place to that expansion and development, which afterwards took the name of Congruism (q. v.), and which owes its final form to the joint labours of Bellarmine, Suarez, Vasquez, and Lessius. As the article on Congruism shows in detail, the system received its name from the *gratia congrua*, i. e. a grace accommodated to circumstances. By such is understood a grace which, owing to its internal relationship and adaptation to the state of the recipient (his character, disposition, education, place, time, etc.), produces its effect in the light of the *scientia media* with infallible certainty, and thus is objectively identical with efficacious grace. The expression is borrowed from St. Augustine, as when he says: "Cujus autem miseretur, sic eum vocat, quomodo scit ei congruere, ut vocantem non respuat" (Ad Simplicianum, I, Q. ii, n. 13). Consistently then with this terminology, the grace which is merely sufficient must be called *gratia incongrua*, i. e. a grace which has not a congruity with the circumstances, and is therefore inefficacious. This term also is sanctioned by St. Augustine (l. c.), for he says: "Illi enim electi, qui congruenter vocati; illi autem, qui non congruebant neque contemperabantur vocationi, non electi, quia non secuti, quamvis vocati". This doctrine seems to have advanced beyond "extreme Molinism" to this extent, that inefficacious grace and merely sufficient grace are made to differ even in *actu primo*—not indeed in their internal nature and physical entity, but in their moral worth and ethical nature—inasmuch as the bestowal of an ever so weak *gratia congrua* is an incomparably greater benefit of God than that of an ever so powerful *gratia incongrua*, the actual inefficacy of which God foresaw from all eternity. Though Molina himself had taught this doctrine ("Concordia", Paris, 1876, pp. 450, 466, 522, etc.), it seems that among his followers some extreme Molinists unduly emphasized the power of the will over grace, thus drawing upon themselves the suspicion of Semipelagianism. At least Cardinal Bellarmine attacks some who propagated such one-sided Molinistic views, and who cannot have been mere imaginary adversaries; against them he skilfully strengthened the tenets of Congruism by numerous quotations from St. Augustine.

As was natural the later Molinism underwent considerable changes, and was improved by the unwearying labours of those who sought to establish the *scientia media*—the most important factor in the whole system—on a deeper philosophical and theological basis, and to demonstrate its worth from a dogmatic point of view. The task was a very difficult one. The theory of the Thomistic decrees of the Divine will having been eliminated as the infallible source of God's knowledge of free acts belonging to the conditional future, some other theory had to be substituted. Molina's doctrine, which Bellarmine and Becanus had made their own, was soon abandoned as savouring of Determinism. Molina (Concordia, pp. 290, 303) transferred the medium of God's infallible knowledge to the *supercomprehensio cordis* (*καρδιογνωσία*, the searching of hearts). In virtue of this supercomprehension, God knows the most secret inclinations and penetrates the most hidden recesses of man's heart, and is thus enabled to foresee with mathematical certainty the free resolves latent in man's will. This unsatisfactory explanation, however, met with the natural objection that the mathematically certain foreknowledge of an effect from its cause is nothing more or less than the knowledge of a necessary effect; consequently the will would no longer be free (cf. Kleutgen, "De Deo Uno", Rome, 1881, pp. 322 sqq.). Therefore, the opinion, gradually adopted since the time of Suarez (but repudiated in Molina's work), maintains that, by the *scientia media*, God sees the conditioned future acts in themselves, i. e. in their own (formal or objective) truth. For, since every free act must be absolutely determined in its being, even before it becomes actual or at least conditionally possible, it is from all eternity a definite truth (*determinata veritas*), and must consequently be knowable as such by the omniscient God with metaphysical certainty. Ruiz ("De scientia Dei", Paris, 1629), with a subtlety beyond his fellows, laid a deeper foundation for this theory, and succeeded in getting it permanently adopted by the Molinists. Further proofs for the *scientia media* may be found in Pohle's "Dogmatik", I (4th ed., 1908), pp. 206 sq. However, when further investigations were made, so great and well-nigh insurmountable were the difficulties which arose against the establishing of the absolute independence of the *scientia media* in regard to the Divine Will, that the greater number of the modern Molinists either give up the attempt to indicate a medium of Divine knowledge (*medium in quo*), or positively declare it to be superfluous; nevertheless, there are a few (e. g. Kleutgen, Cornoldi, Régnon) who make a sharp distinction between the question of the actual existence of the *scientia media* and that of its process. While vigorously maintaining the existence of the *scientia media*, they frankly acknowledge their ignorance with regard to its process of operation. Thus, the *scientia media*, which was meant to solve all the mysteries concerning grace, seems to have become itself the greatest mystery of all. The most favourable statement that may be made in its favour is that it is a necessary postulate in any doctrine of grace in which the freedom of the will is to be safeguarded; in itself it is but a *theologoumenon*. If we then consider that the Thomists also, with Billuart (De Deo dissert., VIII, art. iv, §2 ad 6) at their head, call the reconciliation of their *præmotio*

physica with the freedom of the will a "mystery", it would seem that man is not capable of solving the problem of the harmony between grace and free will.

Another phase in the development of this system is the fact that, in the course of time, some of the Molinists have made concessions to the Thomists in the question regarding predestination, without however abandoning the essentials of Molinism. The theory of the *præmotio physica* agrees admirably with the idea of an absolute predestination to glory irrespective of foreseen merits (*prædestinatio ante prævisa merita*). This is the reason why this theory appears, except in the case of a few theologians, as a characteristic feature of the Thomistic doctrine on grace. Now, absolute predestination to glory necessarily involves the rather harsh doctrine of reprobation, which, though only negative, is nevertheless equally absolute. For, if God determines to bestow efficacious graces only upon those whom He has from all eternity predestined to glory, then those not contained in his decree of predestination are a priori and necessarily damned.

Some leading Molinists like Bellarmine and Suarez may possibly have been tempted to show the practical possibility of reconciling Molinism with the eternal and unchangeable decree of predestination by siding with the Thomists in this question of secondary consideration, without, however, sacrificing their allegiance to the *scientia media*. But the majority of Molina's followers, under the lead of Lessius and Vasquez, most consistently held to the opposite view. For they admitted only a conditioned predestination to glory which becomes absolute only consequent upon the foreseen merits of man (*prædestinatio post—et propter—prævisa merita*), and roundly condemned negative reprobation on the ground that it not only limited but even ran counter to the salvific will of God. To-day there is scarcely a convinced Molinist who does not take alone this reasonable standpoint. A modification of Molinism of minor importance arose with regard to the so-called predefinition of good works (*prædefinitio bonorum operum*). By predefinition, in contradistinction to predestination to glory, theologians understand the absolute, positive, and efficacious decree of God from all eternity, that certain persons shall at some time in the future perform certain good works (cf. Franzelin, "De Deo Uno", Rome, 1883, pp. 444 sqq.). This predefinition to good works is either formal or virtual, according as God's decree governing these works and the bestowal of efficacious grace is either formal or merely virtual: Molina, Vasquez, and Gregory de Valentia defended virtual, while Suarez, Tanner, Silvester Maurus, and others upheld formal predefinition. (See CONGRUISM; GRACE, CONTROVERSIES ON.)

WERNER, *Thomas von Aquin*, III (Ratisbon, 1859), 380 sqq.; IDEM, *Franz Suarez u. die Scholastik der letzten Jahrh.*, I (Vienna, 1861), 244 sqq.; SCHNEEMAN, S.J., *Controversiarum de divinæ gratiæ liberique arbitrii concordia initia et progressus* (Freiburg, 1881); DE RÉGNON, S.J., *Bannes et Molina. Histoire, Doctrines, Critique métaphysique* (Paris, 1883); PESCH, S.J., *Ein Dominikanerbischof [Didacus Deza] als Molinist vor Molina in Zeitschr. für kath. Theol.* (Innsbruck, 1885), 171 sqq.; REUSCH, *Index der verbotenen Bücher*, II (Bonn, 1885), 298 sqq.; DÖLLINGER-REUSCH, *Bellarmin's Selbstbiographie* (Münich, 1887); SCHWANE, *Dogmengesch.*, IV (Freiburg, 1890); GAYRAUD, *Thomisme et Molinisme* (Paris, 1890); UDE, *Doctrina Capreoli de influxu Dei in actus voluntatis humanæ secundum principia Thomismi et Molinismi* (Graz, 1905); PAGUIER, *Le Jansénisme*, i (Paris, 1909); MORGOTT in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Molina*.—Concerning the *concursus divinus* see SUAREZ, *Opusc. de concursu, motione et auxilio Dei* (new ed., Paris, 1856); JEILER, O.S.F., *S. Bonaventuræ principia de concursu Dei generali ad actiones causarum secundarum collecta et S. Thomæ doctrina confirmata* (Quaracchi, 1897). Consult also textbooks on natural theology (HONTHEIM, GUTBERLET, LEHMEN, etc.) and on dogma.—Concerning the *scientia media* see HERICE, *De scientia Dei* (Pampil, 1623); BORULL, S.J., *Divina scientia futurorum contingentium, præcipue media* (Lyons, 1650); PLATEL, S.J., *Auctoritas contra prædeterminationem physicam pro scientia media* (Douai, 1669; 2nd ed., 1673); HENAO, S.J., *Scientia media historice propugnata* (Lyons, 1655; Salamanca, 1665); IDEM, *Scientia media theologice defensa* (2 vols., Lyons, 1674–6); HAMIREZ, S.J., *De scientia Dei* (Madrid, 1708); DE ARANDA, S.J., *De Deo sciente, prædestinante et auxiliante, seu Schola scientiæ mediæ* (Saragossa, 1693); STERZINGER, *Scientia media plene conciliata cum doctrina S. Thomæ* (Innsbruck, 1728). Of more recent works see HENSE, *Die Lehre vom göttlichen Vorherwissen der zukünftigen freien Handlungen in Katholik* (Mainz, 1872–3); CORNOLDI, S.J., *Della libertà umana* (Rome, 1884); PECCI, *Sentenza di S. Tommaso circa l'influsso di Dio sulle azioni delle creature ragionevoli e sulla scienza media* (Rome, 1885); SCHWANE, *Das göttliche Vorherwissen* (Münster, 1885); SCHNEIDER, *Das Wissen Gottes nach der Lehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin* (4 vols., Ratisbon, 1884–6); FELDNER, O.P., *Die Lehre des St. Thomas über die Willensfreiheit der vernünftigen Wesen* (Graz, 1890); IDEM, *Thomas oder Molina* in COMMER'S *Jahrbuch für Philos. u. spekulative Theol.* (1891—); FRINS, S.J., *De cooperatione Dei cum omni natura præsertim libera* (Paris, 1892), answered by DUMMERMUTH, O.P., *Defensio doctrinæ S. Thomæ de præmotione physica* (Paris, 1896); HONTHEIM, S.J., *Institutiones Theodicææ* (Freiburg, 1893); DE SAN, S.J., *De Deo Uno*, I: *De mente S. Thomæ circa prædeterminationes physicas* (Louvain, 1894); KOLB, *Menschliche Freiheit u. göttl. Vorherwissen nach Augustin* (Freiburg, 1908). Of text-books we may mention JANSSENS, *De Deo Uno*, II (Freiburg, 1900); PESCH, S.J., *Prælectiones dogmaticæ*, V (3rd ed., 1908), 140 sqq.; POHLE, *Dogmatik*, I (4th ed., 1908), 191–210; II (4th ed., 1909), 474–82.

J. POHLE.

Molinos, MIGUEL DE, founder of Quietism, b. at Muniesa, Spain, 21 Dec., 1640; d. at Rome, 28 Dec., 1696. In his youth he went to Valencia, where, having been ordained priest and received the degree of doctor, he held a benefice in the church of Santo Tomás and was confessor to a community of nuns. He pretended to be a disciple of the Jesuits and quoted them as his authority in his differences with the university. In 1662 he went to Rome as procurator in the cause of the beatification of Venerable Jerónimo Simón. Here, after residing in various other places, he finally took up his abode at the church of Sant' Alfonso which belonged to the Spanish Discalced Augustinians. The Jesuits and Dominicans having accused him of pernicious teachings, the Inquisition ordered his books to be examined. He defended himself well and was acquitted; but again Cardinal d'Estrées, French ambassador at Rome, acting on instructions from Paris, denounced him to the authorities. In May, 1685, the Holy Office formulated charges against him and ordered his arrest. The report of the process was read on 3 September, 1687, in the Dominican church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, in the presence of an immense concourse of people gathered for the occasion by means of grants of indulgences; he was declared a dogmatic heretic, sentenced to life imprisonment, to be perpetually clothed in the penitential garb, to recite the Credo and one-third of the Rosary, and to make confession four times every year. He received the sacraments on his deathbed. He taught interior annihilation, asserting that this is the means of attaining purity of soul, perfect contemplation, and the rich treasure of interior peace: hence follows the licitness of impure carnal acts, inasmuch as only the lower, sensual man, instigated by the demon, is concerned in them. In the cases of seventeen penitents he excused their lascivious acts, and claimed that those committed by himself were not blameworthy, as free will had had no part in them.

Innocent XI, in the Bull "Cœlestis Pastor" (2 November, 1687), condemned as heretical, suspect, erroneous, scandalous, etc., sixty-eight propositions which Molinos admitted to be his, being convicted of having asserted them in speech and in writing, communicated them to others, and believed them—propositions which are not those of the "Guía Espiritual" alone. Moreover, the pope prohibited and condemned all his works, printed or in manuscript. Molinos had followers in abundance; when he was arrested, it is said that twelve thousand letters from persons who consulted him were found in his possession. More than two hundred persons at Rome found themselves implicated in the affair; several communities of nuns practised the "prayer of quiet", while the inquisitorial proceedings in Italy lasted until the eighteenth century. In Spain, the Bishop of Oviedo, taken to Rome and imprisoned in the Castle of Sant' Angelo, the priest Juan de Causadas, and the Carmelite lay brother Juan de Longas, who corrupted a convent of religious women, were all punished as disciples of

Molinism. In France, the semiquietism of Fénelon and Jeanne Guyon (q. v.) took from Molinos only the teaching of "pure love". Among the writings of Molinos may be mentioned the following: (1) "La devoción de la buena muerte" (published at Valencia, 1662, under the name of Juan Bautista Catalá); (2) "La Guía espiritual" (published first in Italian, at Rome, 1675, then, in Spanish, at Madrid, 1676), approved by various theologians and by ecclesiastical authority, so much so that twenty editions appeared in twelve years, in Latin (1687), French, English (1685), German (1699), etc.; (3) "Tratado de la Comunión cuotidiana" (1687).

Menéndez Pelayo, *Heterodoxos españoles*, II (Madrid, 1880), 559; Burnet, *Recueil des diverses pièces concernant le quiétisme* (Amsterdam, 1688); Scharling, *Zeitschrift für gesch. theologische*, XXIV, XXV (Hamburg and Gotha, 1855); Rafael Urbano, *Guía Espiritual* (Barcelona, s. d.); Regio, *Clavis aurea qua aperiuntur errores Michaelis Molinos* (Messina, 1687); Gómez, *Biblioteca antigua y nueva de escritores aragoneses de Latassa . . . en forma de Diccionario bibliográfico-biográfico*, II (Saragossa, 1885), 328.

Antonio Pérez Goyena.

Molitor, Wilhelm (pseudonyms, Ulric Riesler and Benno Bronner), poet, novelist, canonist and publicist, b. at Zweibruecken in the Rhine Palatinate, 24 August, 1819; d. at Speyer, 11 January, 1880. After studying philosophy and jurisprudence in Munich and Heidelberg (1836–40), he held various juridical positions in the service of the State from 1843–9. But feeling himself called to the priesthood, the pious young jurist studied theology at Bonn (1849–51) and was ordained priest on 15 March, 1851. In the same year he became secretary to Bishop Weis of Speyer; on 11 November, 1857, he was elected canon of the cathedral chapter and, soon after, appointed *custos* of the cathedral, and professor of archæology and homiletics at the episcopal seminary. He took part in the consultations of the German bishops at Bamberg (1867), Würzburg (1868), and Fulda (1869). In 1868 Pius IX summoned him to Rome as a consultor in the labours preparatory to the Vatican Council. From 1875–7 he was a member of the Bavarian Landtag. He was the chief promoter of the Catholic movement in the Palatinate, and advanced the Catholic cause especially by founding the "Pfälzicher Pressverein", the daily paper "Rheinpfalz" and the "Katholische Vereinsdruckerei". His pronounced ultramontane principles made him unacceptable to the Bavarian Government, which in consequence repeatedly prevented his election to the See of Speyer. He is the author of numerous poems, dramas, novels, sketches on the questions of the day, and a few juridical treatises. A collection of his poems was published in 1884; his "Domlieder" in 1846. His dramas are: "Kynast" (1844); "Maria Magdalena" (1863, 1874); "Das alte deutsche Handwerk" (1864); "Die Freigelassene Neros" (1865); "Claudia Procula" (1867); "Julian der Apostat" (1867); "Des Kaisers Guenstling", a tragedy of the times of the martyrs (1874); "Die Blume von Sicilien" (1880, 1897); "Dramatische Spiele", containing the dramatic legend "Sankt Ursulas Rheinfahrt", the comedy "Die Villa bei Amalfi", and the dramatic tale "Schön Gundel" (1878); and his three festive plays,—"Weihnachtsbaum" (1867), "Das Haus zu Nazareth" (1872), and "Die Weisen des Morgenlands" (1877). His novels are: "Die schöne Zweibrückerin", 2 vols. (1844); "Der Jesuit" (1873); "Herr von Syllabus" (1873); "Memoiren eines Todtenkopfs", 2 vols. (1875); "Der Caplan von Friedlingen" (1877); "Der Gast im Kyffhäuser" (1880). His juridical works are: "Ueber kanonisches Gerichtsverfahren gegen Cleriker" (1856); "Die Immunität des Domes zu Speyer" (1859); "Die Decretale *Per Venerabilem*" (1876). He also wrote three volumes of sermons (1880–2); "Das Theater in seiner Bedeutung und in seiner gegenwärtigen Stellung" (1866); "Ueber Goethes Faust" (1869); "Brennende Fragen" (1874); "Die Grossmacht der Presse" and "Die Organisation der Katholischen Presse" (1866); and a few other works of minor importance. In collaboration with Huelskamp he wrote "Papst Pius IX in seinem Leben und Wirken", 4th ed. (1875) and in collaboration with Wittmer "Rom, Wegweiser durch die ewige Stadt" (1866, 1870).

Brummer in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, LII (Leipzig, 1906), 438–40; Kehrein, *Biographisch-litterarisches Lexikon der katholischen Dichter*, 2nd ed., I (Würzburg, 1872), 266–68; *Alte und Neue Welt*, XV (New York, 1880), 408–11.

Michael Ott.

Molloy (O'Molloy), Francis, theologian, grammarian, b. in King's County, Ireland, at the beginning of the seventeenth century; d. at St. Isidore's, Rome, about 1684. At an early age he entered the Franciscan Order, and in the year 1642 he was appointed lecturer in philosophy at the college of Klosterneuberg, near Vienna, and in 1645 passed to the chair of theology at Gratz. Here he published a Scotist work on the Incarnation.

About 1650 he was called to Rome and appointed primary professor of theology in the College of St. Isidore. During his residence in Rome he wrote several works on theological subjects and a long Latin poem on Prince Prosper Philip of Spain. In 1676 he published an Irish catechism under the title of "Lucerna Fidelium seu Fasciculus decerptus de Doctrina Christiana". This work, in the Irish language and characters, was printed at the office of the Congregation of the Propaganda, and was dedicated to Cardinal Altieri, Protector of Ireland. Father Molloy is best known as the author of the first Latin-Irish printed grammar (Grammatica Latino-Hibernica). This book also came from the press of the Propaganda (1677), and is dedicated to Cardinal Massimi, a great friend of the Irish. It is highly esteemed by writers on the Celtic languages, and is largely drawn upon by modern writers on Irish grammar.

Wadding-Sbaralea, *Scriptores Ord. Min.* (Rome, 1806); O'Reilly, *Irish Writers* (Dublin, 1820); Brennan, *Eccl. History of Ireland;* Ryan, *Worthies of Ireland* (London, 1821); Anderson, *Historical Sketches of the Native Irish* (London, 1846); Douglas Hyde, *Literary History of Ireland* (London, 1903); O'Molloy, *Irish Prosody*, tr. O'Flannghaile (Dublin, 1908).

Gregory Cleary.

Molloy, Gerald, theologian and scientist, b. at Mount Tallant House, near Dublin, 10 Sept., 1834; d. at Aberdeen, 1 Oct., 1906. Monsignor Molloy was a distinguished Irish priest and for many years a very popular and much admired figure in the intellectual life of Ireland. He was educated at Castleknock College, where he was very successful in his studies, and subsequently went to Maynooth College. Here he applied himself with enthusiasm to the study of theology and the physical sciences. In both departments his record was a brilliant one. He was barely twenty-three years of age when in 1857 he became professor of theology at Maynooth, and continued to hold that chair until 1874, when he accepted the professorship of natural philosophy at the Catholic University of Ireland. In 1883 he succeeded Dean Neville of Cork as Rector of the Catholic University, which office he occupied up to the day of his death. The varied nature of Monsignor Molloy's work in connexion with Irish education is very striking. He acted on the commission on manual training in primary schools, and filled the post of assistant commissioner under the Educational Endowments Act. As early as 1880 he became a member of the Senate of the Royal University of Ireland, and remained so till 1882, when he was appointed to a fellowship in the same university. In 1890 he became a member of the governing board of that institution and at the time of his death was its vice-chancellor. He was also a member of the Board of Intermediate Education. As a lecturer and skilled experimentalist, Molloy was very successful in dealing with difficult scientific subjects and rendering them

easily intelligible and interesting to his hearers. Under the auspices of the Royal Dublin Society, of whose council he was a member, he delivered a series of lectures on natural science, and in particular on electricity, in which he was an acknowledged expert. On one occasion he joined issue on the subject of lightning conductors with no less an adversary than Sir Oliver Lodge. Among his works are: "Geology and Revelation" (1870), a fuller and maturer treatment of a series of papers on geology in its relation with revealed religion, which appeared from time to time in the "Irish Ecclesiastical Record", and dealt with the supposed conflict between geology and revelation, solving the problem of reconcilement; "Outlines of a course of Natural Philosophy" (1880); "Gleanings in Science" (1888), an interesting series of popular lectures on scientific subjects; "The Irish Difficulty, Shall and Will" (1897). He also translated a number of passages from Dante's "Purgatorio", wrote of the Passion Play at Oberammergau, and was a frequent contributor to several magazines. At the time of his sudden death, due to heart failure, Father Molloy was representing the Catholic University at the celebration of the fourth centenary of the Aberdeen University, and was one of those on whom the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws was conferred by the latter university a few days before. His career is another striking contradiction of the theory that a Catholic clergyman must necessarily be an opponent of scientific progress.

Freeman's Journal (Dublin, 2 Oct., 1906); MOLLOY, *Geology and Revelation;* IDEM, *Gleanings in Science; Dublin Review* (1872) and *Irish Eccles. Record* (1866–9).

PETER F. CUSICK.

Molo, GASPARO (he wrote his name also MOLA and MOLI), skilful Italian goldsmith and planisher, chiefly known as a medalist, b. (according to Forrer) in Breglio near Como or (according to older records) in Lugano; date of death unknown. He was first active at Milan, then at Mantua, from 1608 at Florence, from which latter period we possess his first signed medal. Here he was *maestro delle stampe della monete.* In 1609 he became well known by his medals commemorating the marriage and the accession of Cosmo II. In 1609 and 1610 he cut the dies for the talers and the "medals of merit" conferred by the grand duke. According to Kenner, it is not necessary to suppose that he gave up his connexion with the Florentine court at this time, because, in the following years, he struck medals for the court in Mantua, as well as coins for Guastalla and Castiglione, especially as he was again working in Florence in 1614 (certainly in 1615). The medals also, which he made after 1620 for Prince Vincenzo II of Mantua, may very well have been struck at Florence. His further sojourn in Tuscany seems to have been rendered distasteful to him by intrigues. About 1623 he moved to Rome, where he became die-cutter at the papal mint in place of J. A. Moro, who died in 1625. Here he made a great many coins and medals for Urban VIII (1623–44), Innocent X (1644–55), and Alexander VII (1655–57). His last works date from 1664. As it seems strange that Molo should, at the age of eighty-four, still continue working with unabated strength, it is thought that another artist of his name—perhaps his son—continued Gasparo's work. Indeed, we find in 1639 a G. D. Molo, who might have been a son of Gasparo and who apparently died young; but it is more likely that Gasparo founded a school in Rome, and that his engravers worked according to his instructions and in his style, but passed off their works under his name and with his signature. One of his numerous pupils is his successor at the Zecca, the famous Hamerani (Hameran, a German), the founder of that long-lived family of artists, Hamerani. Molo is a good and faithful delineator of character (cf. the medal of Pope Innocent VII); he is also excellent in figure compositions. The dragon-killer St. George, as Kenner remarks, by its natural and beautiful filling in of space, reminds us of classical coins. As long as cast medals were generally used, public interest in the portrait predominated, and the reverse was usually neglected; this changed with the introduction of the stamping technique. We know only a few cast medals of Molo; he preferred the stamped medal, and his works of this kind are among the best of that time. It may be stated that he was directly responsible for the new ideas in stamping technique. Molo's biography is still very obscure.

KENNER in *Jahrb. der kunsthistor. Sammlungen des Ah. Kaiserhouses,* XII (Vienna, 1891), 137–49; FORRER, *Biogr. Dict. of Medalists, etc.* (4 vols., London, 1902–09).

K. DOMANIG.

Moloch (Heb. *Mōléch,* king).—A divinity worshipped by the idolatrous Israelites. The Hebrew pointing *Mōléch* does not represent the original pronunciation of the name, any more than the Greek vocalization Μολόχ found in the LXX and in the Acts (vii, 43). The primitive title of this god was very probably *Méléch,* "king", the consonants of which came to be combined through derision with the vowels of the word *Bōshéth,* "shame". As the word Moloch (A. V. Molech) means king, it is difficult in several places of the Old Testament to determine whether it should be considered as the proper name of a deity or as a simple appellative. The passages of the original text in which the name stands probably for that of a god are Lev., xviii, 21; xx, 2–5; III (A. V. I) Kings, xi, 7; IV (II) Kings, xxiii, 10; Is., xxx, 33; lvii, 9; Jer., xxxii, 35. The chief feature of Moloch's worship among the Jews seems to have been the sacrifice of children, and the usual expression for describing that sacrifice was "to pass through the fire", a rite carried out after the victims had been put to death. The special centre of such atrocities was just outside of Jerusalem, at a place called Tophet (probably "place of abomination"), in the valley of Geennom. According to III (I) Kings, xi, 7, Solomon erected "a temple" for Moloch "on the hill over against Jerusalem", and on this account he is at times considered as the monarch who introduced the impious cult into Israel. After the disruption, traces of Moloch worship appear in both Juda and Israel. The custom of causing one's children to pass through the fire seems to have been general in the Northern Kingdom [IV (II) Kings, xvii, 17; Ezech. xxiii, 37], and it gradually grew in the Southern, encouraged by the royal example of Achaz (IV Kings, xvi, 3) and Manasses [IV (II) Kings, xvi, 6] till it became prevalent in the time of the prophet Jeremias (Jerem. xxxii, 35), when King Josias suppressed the worship of Moloch and defiled Tophet [IV (II) Kings, xxiii, 13 (10)]. It is not improbable that this worship was revived under Joakim and continued until the Babylonian Captivity.

On the basis of the Hebrew reading of III (I) Kings, xi, 7, Moloch has often been identified with Milcom, the national god of the Ammonites, but this identification cannot be considered as probable: as shown by the Greek Versions, the original reading of III (I) Kings, xi, 7, was not Molech but Milchom [cf. also III (I) Kings, xi, 5, 33]; and according to Deut., xii, 29–31; xviii, 9–14, the passing of children through fire was of Chanaanite origin [cf. IV (II) Kings, xvi, 3]. Of late, numerous attempts have been made to prove that in sacrificing their children to Moloch the Israelites simply thought that they were offering them in holocaust to Yahweh. In other words, the *Melech* to whom child-sacrifices were offered was Yahweh under another name. To uphold this view appeal is made in particular to Jer., vii, 31; xix, 5, and to Ezech., xx, 25–31. But this position is to say the least improbable. The texts appealed to may well be understood otherwise, and the prophets expressly treat the cult of

Moloch as foreign and as an apostasy from the worship of the true God. The offerings by fire, the probable identity of Moloch with Baal, and the fact that in Assyria and Babylonia Malik, and at Palmyra Malach-bel, were sun-gods, have suggested to many that Moloch was a fire- or sun-god.

BAUDISSIN, *Jahve et Moloch* (Leipzig, 1874); SMITH, *Religion of the Semites* (London, 1894); SCHULTZ, *Old Testament Theology*, I (tr., Edinburgh, 1898); LAGRANGE, *Etudes sur les Religions Sémitiques* (Paris, 1903).

FRANCIS E. GIGOT.

Molokai, an interesting island, one of the North Pacific group formerly known as the Sandwich Islands, or as the Kingdom of Hawaii, then as the Republic of Hawaii, and since annexation by the United States of America as the Territory of Hawaii. This annexation was determined by joint resolution of Congress, signed by the President 7 July, 1898, the completed organization taking effect 14 June, 1900. Of the eight principal islands, Molokai is fifth in size, 261 sq. miles; also fifth in population (2504, Census of 1900). Its location is between the islands of Oahu and Maui, separated from the latter by a channel only eight miles in width, and having no great depth. Molokai is about thirty-eight miles in length from east to west, and its average width is about seven miles. The island, however, was larger in its original volcanic formation. The mountain backbone was split or displaced, the northern part being submerged in the ocean; and there now remains a line of majestic cliffs and noble headlands that for unique grandeur can hardly be surpassed, the great ocean beating at their base except where the few valleys or gulches form open places and where the cliffs recede. This somewhat irregular line of bold mountain face varies in height from 2200 feet in the central part of the island to 3500 feet towards the east. Some higher peaks lie farther back in the eastern part, the highest being almost 5000 feet. All of these highlands are strangely seamed by erosion; verdure has crept in, covering the protected parts, and in some places good-sized trees are growing. Except in the very dry times, many rivulets appear, disappear, come again to the surface or in the open places in kaleidoscopic variety. After heavy rains these little streams become torrents and from overhanging places leap into the open, and are caught and carried away by the winds. In the mountains back of the open-faced northern coast, many wild deer are found. A coral reef, about half a mile in width, fringes the southern coast. The slopes to the south and lower-lying parts are used for grazing. Owing to the uncertainty of the supply of water, the island is not well adapted to agriculture. Honey is an important export. Some attempt has been made at sugar planting, without much success. This picturesque group of islands is favoured in being out of the cyclone belt, and in having no snakes.

BALDWIN HOME, KALAWAO, MOLOKAI
The row of houses toward the sea was destroyed and the site is now occupied by the United States Leprosarium

LEPER SETTLEMENT.—The entire northern coast of Molokai has but one projection of land. The gulches are merely open places, like the mouth of a pocket, but just about in the central part of the coast, where the cliff is 2200 feet, there is at its base the Leper Settlement Peninsula (52 miles from Honolulu), somewhat of a horseshoe shape, about two miles wide near the cliff (*pali*), and projecting about two miles into the ocean. Around the extreme point this new coast line is from 100 to 150 feet high; nearer the *pali* it is not so much; at Kalawao, the eastern side, about fifty feet only; and at Kalaupapa, the western side, it is even less. An old and very difficult trail over the *pali* has been improved so that carrying the mails twice a week to and from the steamer landing of Kaunakakai, on the southern side of the island, is practicable, and occasionally a passenger (usually an official) comes or goes that way. The steamer comes around to the landing at Kalaupapa once a week. This peninsula has been formed by the action of a local volcano long since the main island was formed. The dead crater, Kauhako, occupies a central part of the peninsula, and has a well of brackish water, the surface keeping on a level with the ocean, its greatest depth being 750 feet. The entire formation is very porous, with many caverns and crevices. Just off Kalawao, and fronting the mouth of Waikalo Valley, are two masses of rock projecting from the sea, one known as Mokapu, one as Okala.

Leprosy first appeared in the Hawaiian Islands in 1853. In 1864 its spread had become so alarming that 3 Jan., 1865, in the reign of Kamehameha V, the Legislature passed "An act to prevent the spread of leprosy", the execution of the law being in the hands of the Board of Health. In 1865–6, there were 274 persons on the islands reported to be lepers. Under the act of 3 Jan., 1865, segregation was begun, and plans were made for a separate hospital. Land was purchased for this in Palolo Valley, Island of Oahu, but when it became known in the neighbourhood, objections were so strong that the effort was abandoned. A site was then secured at Kalihi, near Honolulu, well separated from the other habitations, and in November, 1865, the hospital was established there. This was for retention, examination, and to some extent medical treatment of the lepers or suspects. This was indeed good; but the need was felt of a larger and more permanent settlement, isolated for those declared to be lepers, to be operated in connexion with the Kalihi Hospital, where efforts would continue for the cure of cases in the early stages. In locating a leper settlement the search was soon directed to the Molokai Peninsula, so well protected by the sea in front and by the towering cliff behind. Favoured as it is by the wholesome trade-winds from the northeast, a place better adapted could hardly have been found. The Board of Health established its authority here on 6 Jan., 1866. Waikalo Valley, connected with the peninsula on the eastern side, and not accessible from other directions, was first selected, as the rich land there could be cultivated, and the little colony might become self-supporting. This attempt did not succeed, the deep valley being rather moist for habita-

tion. Therefore, a good part of the holdings upon the eastern and middle portions of the peninsula were secured, and improvements were begun. Waikalo Valley has not been useless, however, but has been used for cultivation of taro. The non-leper residents still remained at Kalaupapa, the steamer landing. In the time of these beginnings (1865–68) Dr. F. W. Hutchinson was President of the Board of Health, and was Minister of the Interior from 26 April, 1865, until 11 Dec., 1872. Mr. R. W. Meyer, a resident of the mountain-top above the settlement, was Board of Health Agent and attended to the business. He continued as agent, the practical and very efficient business manager of the Leper Settlement until his death, 12 June, 1897.

The physician at Kalihi Hospital reported 2 March, 1866, having received 158 lepers, 57 of whom were sent to Molokai Asylum, 101 remaining at Kalihi Hospital for treatment. In sending to Molokai, some difficulty attended the separating of relatives. Therefore, a few non-leper relatives were allowed to go along as helpers or *Kokuas*. Some cattle and sheep were also sent to Molokai. For Kalihi Hospital, and Molokai Asylum (or Settlement, as it generally became known later), the total amount of expenses in 1866 was $10,-012.48.

Matters went on pretty well at first, but after some time an ugly spirit developed at Molokai. Drunken and lewd conduct prevailed. The easy-going, good-natured people seemed wholly changed. Thus the President of the Board of Health reported at some length in 1868; but he was able to state that a change for the better had come. Improvements had been made at Molokai, including the building of an hospital. Mr. and Mrs. Walsh had been employed to take charge in February, 1867, relieving Mr. Leparat, who had resigned, Mr. Walsh to act as schoolmaster and magistrate, Mrs. Walsh as nurse. This 1868 report gives the number of lepers received at Molokai as 179, the number remaining at the Kalihi Hospital as 43, the total amount of expenses for Kalihi Hospital and Molokai Settlement since 1866 amounting to $24,803.-60. From this time on, efforts were continually made to render the segregation and treatment of lepers more effective. Many difficulties were met and overcome. To keep good order in these early years was always difficult. The lepers were increasing in number. Nearly all who came to the settlement were located at Kalawao, on the eastern side of the peninsula, the leper settlement practically continuing there for many years. In 1890 a better supply of water was brought from Waikalo Valley; the pipe was soon extended to Kalaupapa, the steamer landing. A reservoir was constructed midway on the ridge between Kalawao and Kalaupapa. Previous to that time a pipe was laid from a small reservoir in Waialeia Valley, between Waikalo and Kalawao, and extended only partly through Kalawao. At Kalaupapa, two miles distant, the people brought their water from Waihanau Valley in containers upon horses and donkeys. The people at Kalaupapa were chiefly non-lepers who lived there before settlement times. Their holdings (*kuleanas*) had not yet been secured for the lepers as those at Kalawao had been. This was done, however, in 1894, since, after the waterpipe was laid to Kalaupapa, the people had begun to drift that way, and the public buildings also, the shops, etc., had gradually been moved to that place. Therefore it was wisely determined that, in the interest of good order, as well as for convenience, the Government should own and control the entire peninsula and all of its approaches, the non-lepers being sent away. This was quite thoroughly accomplished in 1894.

Father Damien and the Franciscan Sisters.—It is the name of Father Damien, however, that has made Molokai known throughout the whole world. He came to the Molokai Settlement to remain, 11 May, 1873. Good order in the settlement was somewhat precarious. Damien's determined character proved to be of great value. Besides his priestly offices, there was opportunity for his efforts at every turn. With a hungry zeal for work, he accomplished many things for the good of the place; he helped the authorities, and brought about a good spirit among the people. Ten years later (1883) the Franciscan Sisters came to Honolulu from Syracuse, N. Y., having been engaged by the Hawaiian Government. They expected coming to the settlement at once, but the authorities concluded that conditions there were unsuitable, that better order must be secured, and some improvements made in buildings, etc. So the sisters remained at Kakaako Branch Hospital, near Honolulu, for about six years, a certain number of newly gathered lepers being retained there. This hospital was given up

Exterior, St. Francis' Church, Kalaupapa, Molokai
Built in 1906

when the sisters came to Molokai. At the settlement in 1883 conditions would indeed have been intolerable for the sisters, and the same was true in 1886 when the writer joined Father Damien; but matters were being gradually improved. At last three sisters came to Kalaupapa 15 Nov., 1888. Bishop Home for girls and women had been built. Two more sisters came 6 May, 1889, Robert Louis Stevenson coming by the same boat for a visit. Father Damien died 15 April, 1889. His death, after such a life, arrested the world's attention. A spontaneous outburst of applause from everywhere at once followed. The sixteen years of labour on Molokai made a record that seemed unique to the world at large. The world knew very little about lepers, and Father Damien's life came as a startling revelation of heroic self-sacrifice. He is acknowledged the Apostle of the lepers, and whatever others may do in the same field will help to perpetuate his fame and honour. A monument was offered by the people of England, and accepted by the Hawaiian Board of Health. It was given a place at Kalaupapa, not far from the steamer landing, near the public road now called "Damien Road", adjoining the sisters' place at Bishop Home. The monument in itself is interesting, being an antique cross, fashioned and adapted from stone cutting of about the sixth century, such as was found in the ruins of the Seven Churches of Clonmacnoise on the river Shannon, Ireland. It was transferred by the Board of Health to the Catholic Mission on 11 Sept., 1893, the Bishop coming to receive and bless it. Two miles away, at the other end of the Damien Road, in Kalawao, the body of Father Damien lies, close by the church, where the Pandanus tree stood that sheltered him on his arrival in 1873. Over this grave stands a simple cross with the inscription on one side, "Father Damien", on the other,

"Damien Deveuster". The strong wooden coffin was placed in an excavation, and imbedded in a solid block of concrete. Since Father Damien's time, two priests have usually been on duty at the settlement, one at Kalawao, the other at Kalaupapa. Father Pamphile Deveuster, Damien's brother, was here in 1895–7; he returned to Belgium, and died there 29 July, 1909.

GOVERNMENT AND THE LEPERS.—Public sentiment over the islands has always supported the Government in carrying out the law concerning lepers; official activity, although somewhat varying, has on the whole made fair progress; at times political interests have not been entirely favourable. The first home at Kalawao, for orphan boys and helpless men, was begun in 1886 under Father Damien, with a few old cabins at first, two large buildings being added in 1887–8, all irregular and provisional. The Government, however, recognized it as a home 1 January, 1889. Three Franciscan Sisters came to this Kalawao Home, 15 May, 1890, and the mother-superior visited it occasionally. In 1892–4 the present Baldwin Home was constructed, and put into use in May and June, 1894. The sisters were replaced 1 December, 1895, by four Brothers of the Picpus Order. Up to the present time (1910) the home has had, including those still living, 976 inmates. The Board of Health has always employed an experienced physician and other officials for the settlement. For many years the Hawaiians had strange ideas about regular physicians. Very few would call for one, and this continued at the settlement up to about 1902. They would, however, always take medicine from the brothers or sisters, and have had a friendly feeling for the Japanese treatment. It has been put in use, dropped, and revived many times. The elder Dr. Goto introduced it at Kakaako in 1886. Good order and favourable conditions in general were specially noteworthy from 1893. A glance over the records of the next ten years shows continued improvements in the water supply, enlarging of medical service, etc. Total expenses for segregation, support, and treatment of lepers for six years, ending 31 December, 1903, were $876,888.86. In 1906 the buildings owned by the Government numbered 298; those owned by private parties numbered 150. In 1908 the lepers at Molokai numbered 791: of these, 693 were Hawaiians, 42 Chinese, 26 Portuguese, 6 Americans, 5 Japanese, 6 Germans, 2 South Sea Islanders, 1 Dane, 1 French Canadian, 1 Swede, 2 Porto Ricans, 1 Filipino, 1 Tahitian, 1 Russian, 1 Corean, 1 British Negro, 1 Hollander. In 1866 the total number of lepers at the settlement on 31 December was 115; it kept increasing until in 1890 the number reached 1213. Since then there has been a decrease until, 31 December, 1908, the number was 771. In 1908 the plan adopted in the earliest days (1865–69), of attempting to cure new cases, or any that seemed promising, before being sent to Molokai, has been revived. The renewal should be more effective than in the early time because of the great advances science has made in the past forty years. This new work is now carried on at Kalihi as it was over forty years ago, but in better buildings and under far greater advantages. The general outfit at the Molokai Settlement is about complete: establishments for the medical department, hospital, dispensary, nursery, etc. There are bath houses and drug departments at the homes, and special houses for the sick. At Kalaupapa there are the *poi* factory, the shops, and warehouses, and the residences of the officials pleasantly located and well supplied with conveniences. A large building is under construction for white lepers, the funds being furnished by generous friends throughout the islands. There are two Catholic churches, and several of other denominations. At Kalawao the most prominent features are Baldwin Home and the U. S. Leprosarium. This leprosarium is probably the greatest institution of its kind in the world. The appropriation by Congress was generous. The buildings are extensive, and supplied with a very elaborate outfit of the best quality and latest invention, and everything in fact that present-day science can provide. Another new addition recently added by the U. S. Government is a fine lighthouse, a pyramidal concrete structure, the light of which is visible for about twenty-four miles.

QUINLAN, *Damien of Molokai* (New York, 1909); LINDGREN, *The Water Resources of Molokai* (Govt. Printing Office, Wash., D. C., 1903); MALO, *Hawaiian Antiquities* (Honolulu, 1903); DUTTON, *Earthquake Science Series* (New York and London, 1904); IDEM, *Hawaiian Volcanoes* (London, 1904); ALEXANDER, *A Brief History of the Hawaiian People* (New York, 1891–1899); THRUM, *Hawaiian Annual* (Honolulu, 1906–10); HITCHCOCK, *Hawaii and Its Volcanoes* (Honolulu, 1910); BLACKMAN, *The Making of Hawaii* (London, 1906); SENN, *Around the World via India* (Chicago, 1905); CARTER, *Report to Secretary of Interior* (Honolulu, 1904); FREAR, *Report to Sec. of Int.* (Honolulu, 1909); *Official Reports of the Hawaiian Board of Health* (Honolulu, 1866, 1868, 1894, 1902–1909); BOEYNAEMS, art. DAMIEN in THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA.

JOSEPH DUTTON.

Molyneux, SIR CARYLL, Baronet of Sefton, and third Viscount Molyneux of Maryborough in Ireland, b. 1624; d. 1699. He joined the Royalist army at the outbreak of the civil war, and served with his brother, the second viscount, in the Lancashire Regiment, which was mostly Catholic, through almost all the fighting from Manchester (1642) to Worcester (1651). After succeeding to the title he, as a well-known Catholic cavalier, experienced very harsh treatment from the victors; and the family estates suffered severely. It was not until the reign of James II that his fortunes improved. He was then made Lord Lieutenant of Lancashire, and was one of the few who fought with any success on James's side against the Prince of Orange, for he seized and held the town of Chester, until all further resistance was in vain. Some years later he was arrested on a fictitious charge of treason, called "The Lancashire plot", was imprisoned in the Tower with other Catholics, but upon trial was victoriously acquitted (1694).

Many other members of this notable and conspicuously Catholic family deserve mention. John Molyneux, of Melling, was a constant confessor for the Faith under Queen Elizabeth, and his son and grandson both died in arms fighting for King Charles at Newbury. Father Thomas Molyneux, S.J., probably of Alt Grange, Ince Blundell, was a confessor of the Faith at the time of Oates's Plot, meeting death from ill-treatment in Morpeth gaol, 12 January, 1681. The family is of itself exceedingly interesting. It came from Moulineaux in Seine Inferieure about the time of the Conquest, and can be shown to have held the manor of Sefton without interruption from about 1100 to the present day, while other branches of the family (of which those of Haughton in Nottinghamshire and Castle Dillon in Ireland are the most conspicuous) have spread all over the world. The main stem remained staunch through the worst times. William, seventh viscount, was a Jesuit, and there were in his time not less than seven Molyneux in the Society of Jesus alone. Arms: azure, a cross moline, or.

Victoria County Histories, Lancashire, III (London, 1907), 67–73; FOLEY, *Records S.J.*, VII (London, 1882), 513–516; *Catholic Record Society,* V (London, 1909), 109, 131, 218, etc.; PHILLIPPS, *The family of Sir Thomas Molyneux* (Middlehill, 1820); MOLINEUX, *Memoir of the Molineux Family* (London, 1882).

J. H. POLLEN.

Mombritius, BONINO, philologist, humanist, and editor of ancient writings, b. 1424; d. between 1482 and 1502. He was descended from a noble but not very wealthy family of Milan, and studied the Latin and Greek classics at Ferrara, with zeal and success. Later he became a teacher of Latin at Milan, and was highly esteemed, not only for his extensive knowledge and his literary works, but also for his earnest religious life, as may be gleaned from the letters of his contemporaries. He suffered many misfortunes, which, how-

ever, did not affect his industry. His literary importance lies especially in his editions of ancient writings. The following may be mentioned: "Chronica Eusebii, Hieronymi, Prosperi et Matthæi Palmerii" (Milan, 1475); "Scriptores rei Augustæ" (1475); "Papiæ Glossarium" (1476); "Mirabilia mundi" of Solinus (s. l. a.). A very notable contribution to hagiography is his collection of records of the martyrdom and lives of saints, which appeared under the title: "Sanctuarium" (2 folio vols., s. l. a.), probably printed in 1480, and recently edited (Paris, 1910) by the Benedictines of Solesmes (Boninus Mombritius, Sanctuarium seu vitæ Sanctorum. Novam editionem cur. monachi Solesmenses. 2 tomi). He also composed poems, some of which were published in his editions of the ancient writings, and some printed separately. Of the latter may be particularly mentioned "De passione Domini" (reprinted, Leipzig, 1499).

De vita et operibus Bonini Mombritii testimonia selecta in the above-mentioned new edition of the *Sanctuarium*, I (Paris, 1910), xiii–xxix; FABRICIUS, *Bibl. lat.*, V (Hamburg, 1736), 257; *Bibl.-script. Mediolan.*, I (Milan, 1754), cxlvi–cliii; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, II (3rd ed., Innsbruck, 1906), 1055.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Monaco, PRINCIPALITY AND DIOCESE OF, situated on the Mediterranean Sea, on the skirts of the Turbie and the Tête de Chien mountains, is surrounded on all sides by the French department of the Maritime Alps, and has an area of 5337 acres. On account of its beautiful climate, it is one of the most popular winter resorts in Europe. Its principal resources are the fishery of the gulf, the cultivation of fruit trees (olive, orange, lemon), and the Casino of Monte Carlo, established in 1856, whose revenues are sufficient to free the inhabitants of the principality from the burden of taxation. The capital consists of three large boroughs: the old Monaco, which is built on a promontory that extends 875 yards into the sea and encloses the harbour; the other two are Condamine and Monte Carlo. From ancient times until the nineteenth century the port of Monaco was among the most important of the French Mediterranean coast, but now it has lost all commercial significance. Among the notable constructions of the principality are the ancient fortifications, the old ducal palace which contains beautiful frescoes by Annibale Carracci, Orazio Ferrari, and Carlone, the cathedral, built (1884–87) in the Byzantine style, by Prince Albert III, the Casino of Monte Carlo, and the monumental fountain of the public square. Monaco dates from the time of the Phœnicians, who, on the promontory upon which the old town is built, erected a temple to the god Melkarth, called Monoicos, solitary, that is, not connected with the cult of Ashtoreth; whence the town derived its name, which is Moneque, in Provençal. In the early Middle Ages the neighbouring lords often contended with each other for the possession of this important port, which later was occupied by the Saracens; it was taken from them in the tenth century by Count Grimaldi, in whose family the principality remains to this day. Formerly, it comprised Mentone and Roquebrune. The Grimaldis often had to defend themselves against Spanish or Genoese fleets; the most famous blockade of the town was that of 1506, which failed. In 1619 Prince Honoratus II, with the assistance of the French, drove the Spaniards from Monaco, and since that time the principality has been under the protection of France. During the Revolution, Monaco was annexed to France, but the principality was re-established in 1814. A revolution broke out in 1848 against the misgovernment of Prince Honoratus V, who lost Mentone and Roquebrune, these cities declaring themselves free republics, and (1860) voting for their annexation to France.

Monaco belonged to the Diocese of Nice, but, in 1868, it became an abbey *nullius*, and at the instance of Prince Charles III, Leo XIII raised it to a diocese, immediately dependent upon the Holy See, making the abbot, Mgr Bonaventure Theuret, its first bishop.

DE ROYER DE SAINTE-SUZANNE, *La Principauté de Monaco* (Paris, 1884).

U. BENIGNI.

Monad (from the Greek *μονάς*, *μονάδος*), in the sense of ultimate, indivisible unit, appears very early in the history of Greek philosophy. In the ancient accounts of the doctrines of Pythagoras, it occurs as the name of the unity from which, as from a principle (*ἀρχή*), all number and multiplicity are derived. In the Platonic "Dialogues" it is used in the plural (*μονάδες*) as a synonym for the Ideas. In Aristotle's "Metaphysics" it occurs as the principle (*ἀρχή*) of number, itself being devoid of quantity, indivisible and unchangeable. The word *monad* is used by the neo-Platonists to signify the One; for instance, in the letters of the Christian Platonist Synesius, God is described as the Monad of Monads. It occurs both in ancient and medieval philosophy as a synonym for atom, and is a favourite term with such writers as Giordano Bruno, who speak in a rather indefinite manner of the minima, or minutely small substances which constitute all reality. In general, it may be affirmed that while the term atom, not only in its physical, but also in its metaphysical meaning, implies merely corporeal, or material attributes, the monad, as a rule, implies something incorporeal, spiritual, or, at least, vital. The term monad is, however, generally understood in reference to the philosophy of Leibniz, in which the doctrine of monadism occupies a position of paramount importance. In order to understand his doctrine (see LEIBNIZ) on this point, it is necessary to recall that he was actuated by a twofold motive in his attempt to define substance. He wished, in accordance with his general irenic plan, to reconcile the doctrine of the atomists with the scholastic theory of matter and form, and besides he wished to avoid on the one hand the extreme mechanism of Descartes, who taught that all matter is inert, and on the other the monism of Spinoza, who taught that there is but one substance, God. All this he hoped to accomplish by means of his doctrine of monads. Descartes had defined substance in terms of independent existence, and Spinoza was merely inferring what was implicitly contained in Descartes's definition when he concluded that therefore there is only one substance, the supremely independent Being, who is God. Leibniz prefers to define substance in terms of independent action, and thus escapes Descartes's doctrine that matter is by nature inert. At the same time, since the sources of independent action may be manifold, he escapes Spinoza's pantheistic monism. The atomists had maintained the existence of a multiplicity of minute substances, but had invariably drifted into a materialistic denial of the existence of spirits and spiritual forces. The scholastics had rejected this materialistic consequence of atomism and, by so doing, had seemed to put themselves in opposition to the current of modern scientific thought. Leibniz thinks he sees a way to reconcile the atomists with the scholastics. He teaches that all substances are composed of minute particles which, in every case, in the lowest minerals as well as in the highest spiritual beings, are partly material and partly immaterial. Thus, he imagines, the sharp contrast between atomistic materialism and scholastic spiritualism disappears in presence of the doctrine that all differences are merely differences of degree.

The monads are, therefore, simple, unextended substances, if by substance we understand a centre of force. They cannot begin or end except by creation or annihilation. They are capable of internal activity, but cannot be influenced in a physical manner by anything outside themselves. In this sense they are independent. Moreover, each monad is unique; that

is, there are no two monads alike. At the same time the monads must have qualities; "otherwise", says Leibniz (Monadol., n. 8), "they would not even be entities". There must, therefore, be in each monad the power of representation, by which it reflects all other monads in such a manner that an all-seeing eye could, by looking into one monad, observe the whole universe mirrored therein. This power of representation is different in different monads. In the lowest kind of substances it is unconscious—Leibniz finds fault with the Cartesians because they overlooked the existence of unconscious perception. In the highest kind it is fully conscious. We may, in fact, distinguish in every monad a zone of obscure representation and a zone of clear representation. In the monad of the grain of dust, for example, the zone of clear representation is very restricted, the monad manifesting no higher activity than that of attraction and repulsion. In the monad of the human soul the region of clear representation is at its maximum, this kind of monad, the "queen monad", being characterized by the power of intellectual thought. Between these two extremes range all the monads, mineral, vegetable, and animal, each being differentiated from the monad below it by possessing a larger area of clear representation, and each being separated from the monad above it by having a larger area of obscure representation. There is then in every created monad a material element, the region of obscure representation, and an immaterial element, the area of clear representation. Everything in the created world is partly material and partly immaterial, and there are no abrupt differences among things, but only differences in the extent of the immaterial as compared with the material. Minerals shade off insensibly (in the case of crystals) into living things, plant life into animal life, and animal sensation into human thought. "All created monads may be called souls. But, as feeling is sometimes more than simple perception, I am willing that the general name monads, or entelechies, shall suffice for those simple substances which have perception only, and that the term souls shall be confined to those in which perceptions are distinct, and accompanied by memory" (Monadol., n. 19). "We ascribe action to the monad in so far as it has distinct perceptions, and passivity, in so far as its perceptions are confused" (ibid., n. 49). If this is the only kind of activity that the monad possesses, how are we to account for the order and harmony everywhere in the universe? Leibniz answers by introducing the principle of Pre-established Harmony. There is no real action or reaction. No monad can influence another physically. At the beginning, however, God so pre-arranged the evolution of the activity of the myriads of monads that according as the body evolves its own activity, the soul evolves its activity in such a way as to correspond to the evolution of the activity of the body. "Bodies act as if there were no souls, and souls act as if there were no bodies; and yet both act as if one influenced the other" (Ibid., n. 81). This pre-established harmony makes the world to be a cosmos, not a chaos. The principle extends, however, beyond the physical universe, and applies in a special manner to rational souls, or spirits. In the realm of spirits there is a subordination of souls to the beneficent rule of Divine Providence, and from this subordination results the "system of souls", which constitutes the City of God. There is, therefore, a moral world within the natural world. In the former God is ruler and legislator, in the latter He is merely architect. "God as architect satisfies God as legislator" (ibid., n. 89), because even in the natural world no good deed goes without its recompense, and no evil deed escapes its punishment. Order among monads is thus ultimately moral.

Since Leibniz' time the term monad has been used by various philosophers to designate indivisible centres of force, but as a general rule these units are not understood to possess the power of representation or perception, which is the distinguishing characteristic of the Leibnizian monad. Exception should, however, be made in the case of Renouvier, who, in his "Nouvelle monadologie", teaches that the monad has not only internal activity but also the power of perception.

LEIBNIZ, *Monadology*, tr., in *Journal of Spec. Phil.* (1867), I, 129 sq.; IDEM, tr. by DUNCAN in *Leibniz' Philosophical Works* (New Haven, 1890); IDEM, tr. LATTA (Oxford, 1898); original in *Opera Philos.*, ed. ERDMANN (Berlin, 1840); IDEM, with notes, ed. PIAT (Paris, 1900); JASPER, *Leibniz u. die Scholastik* (Leipzig, 1899); MERZ, *Leibniz* in *Blackwood's Phil. Classics* (Edinburgh and London, 1884); RENOUVIER AND PRAT, *La nouvelle monadologie* (Paris, 1899).

WILLIAM TURNER.

Monaghan, JOHN JAMES. See WILMINGTON, DIOCESE OF.

Monarchians, heretics of the second and third centuries. The word, *Monarchiani*, was first used by Tertullian as a nickname for the Patripassian group (adv. Prax., x), and was seldom used by the ancients. In modern times it has been extended to an earlier group of heretics, who are distinguished as Dynamistic, or Adoptionist, Monarchians from the Modalist Monarchians, or Patripassians.

I. DYNAMISTS, OR ADOPTIONISTS.—All Christians hold the unity (*μοναρχία*) of God as a fundamental doctrine. By the Patripassians this first principle was used to deny the Trinity, and they are with some reason called Monarchians. But the Adoptionists, or Dynamists, have no claim to the title, for they did not start from the monarchy of God, and their error is strictly Christological. An account of them must, however, be given here simply because the name Monarchian has adhered to them in spite of the repeated protests of historians of dogma. But their ancient and accurate name was Theodotians. The founder of the sect was a leather-seller of Byzantium named Theodotus. He came to Rome under Pope Victor (c. 190–200) or earlier. He taught (Philosophumena, VII, xxxv) that Jesus was a man born of a virgin according to the counsel of the Father, that He lived like other men, and was most pious; that at His baptism in the Jordan the Christ came down upon Him in the likeness of a dove, and therefore wonders (*δυνάμεις*) were not wrought in Him until the Spirit (which Theodotus called Christ) came down and was manifested in Him. They did not admit that this made Him God; but some of them said He was God after His resurrection. It was reported that Theodotus had been seized, with others, at Byzantium as a Christian, and that he had denied Christ, whereas his companions had been martyred; he had fled to Rome, and had invented his heresy in order to excuse his fall, saying that it was but a man and not God that he had denied. Pope Victor excommunicated him, and he gathered together a sect in which we are told much secular study was carried on. Hippolytus says that they argued on Holy Scripture in syllogistic form. Euclid, Aristotle, and Theophrastus were their admiration, and Galen they even adored. We should probably assume, with Harnack, that Hippolytus would have had less objection to the study of Plato or the Stoics, and that he disliked their purely literal exegesis, which neglected the allegorical sense. They also emended the text of Scripture, but their versions differed, that of Asclepiodotus was different from that of Theodotus, and again from that of Hermophilus; and the copies of Apolloniades did not even tally with one another. Some of them "denied the law and the Prophets", that is to say, they followed Marcion in rejecting the Old Testament.

The only disciple of the leather-seller of whom we know anything definite is his namesake Theodotus the banker (*ὁ τραπεζίτης*). He added to his master's doc-

trine the view that Melchisedech was a celestial power, who was the advocate for the angels in heaven, as Jesus Christ was for men upon earth (a view found among later sects.—See MELCHISEDECHIANS). This teaching was of course grounded on Hebrews, vii, 3, and it is refuted at length by St. Epiphanius as Heresy 55, "Melchisedechians", after he has attacked the leather-seller under Heresy 54, "Theodotians". As he meets a series of arguments of both heretics, it is probable that some writings of the sect had been before Hippolytus, whose lost "Syntagma against all heresies" supplied St. Epiphanius with all his information. After the death of Pope Victor, Theodotus, the banker, and Asclepiodotus designed to raise their sect from the position of a mere school like those of the Gnostics to the rank of a Church like that of Marcion. They got hold of a certain confessor named Natalius, and persuaded him to be called their bishop at a salary of 150 *denarii* (24 dollars) a month. Natalius thus became the first antipope. But after he had joined them, he was frequently warned in visions by the Lord, Who did not wish His martyr to be lost outside the Church. He neglected the visions, for the sake of the honour and gain, but finally was scourged all night by the holy angels, so that in the morning with haste and tears he betook himself in sackcloth and ashes to Pope Zephyrinus and cast himself at the feet of the clergy, and even of the laity, showing the weals of the blows, and was after some difficulty restored to communion. This story is quoted by Eusebius II (VI, xxviii) from the "Little Labyrinth" of the contemporary Hippolytus, a work composed against Artemon, a late leader of the sect (perhaps c. 225–30), whom he did not mention in the "Syntagma" or the "Philosophumena". Our knowledge of Artemon, or Artemas, is limited to the reference to him made at the end of the Council of Antioch against Paul of Samosata (about 266–268), where that heretic was said to have followed Artemon, and in fact the teaching of Paul is but a more learned and theological development of Theodotianism (see PAUL OF SAMOSATA).

The sect probably died out about the middle of the third century, and can never have been numerous. All our knowledge of it goes back to Hippolytus. His "Syntagma" (c. 205) is epitomized in Pseudo-Tertullian (Præscript., lii) and Philastrius, and is developed by Epiphanius (Hær., liv. lv); his "Little Labyrinth" (written 139–5, cited by Eusebius, V, 28) and his "Philosophumena" are still extant. See also his "Contra Noetum" 3, and a fragment "On the Melchisedechians and Theodotians and Athingani", published by Caspari (Tidskr. für der Evangel. Luth. Kirke, Ny Raekke, VIII, 3, p. 307). But the Athingani are a later sect, for which see MELCHISEDECHIANS. The Monarchianism of Photinus (q. v.) seems to have been akin to that of the Theodotians. All speculations as to the origin of the theories of Theodotus are fanciful. At any rate he is not connected with the Ebionites. The Alogi have sometimes been classed with the Monarchians. Lipsius in his "Quellenkritik des Epiphanius" supposed them to be even Philanthropists, on account of their denial of the Logos, and Epiphanius in fact calls Theodotus an *ἀπόσπασμα* of the Alogi; but this is only a guess, and is not derived by him from Hippolytus. As a fact, Epiphanius assures us (Hær., 51) that the Alogi (that is, Gaius and his party) were orthodox in their Christology (see MONTANISTS).

II. MODALISTS.—The Monarchians properly so-called (Modalists) exaggerated the oneness of the Father and the Son so as to make them but one Person; thus the distinctions in the Holy Trinity are energies or modes, not Persons: God the Father appears on earth as Son; hence it seemed to their opponents that Monarchians made the Father suffer and die. In the West they were called Patripassians, whereas in the East they are usually called Sabellians. The first to visit Rome was probably Praxeas, who went on to Carthage some time before 206–08; but he was apparently not in reality a heresiarch, and the arguments refuted by Tertullian somewhat later in his book "Adversus Praxean" are doubtless those of the Roman Monarchians (see PRAXEAS).

A. *History.*—Noetus (from whom the Noetians) was a Smyrnæan (Epiphanius, by a slip, says an Ephesian). He called himself Moses, and his brother Aaron. When accused before the presbyterate of teaching that the Father suffered, he denied it; but after having made a few disciples he was again interrogated, and expelled from the Church. He died soon after, and did not receive Christain burial. Hippolytus mockingly declares him to have been a follower of Heraclitus, on account of the union of opposites which he taught when he called God both visible and invisible, passible and impassible. His pupil Epigonus came to Rome. As he was not mentioned in the "Syntagma" of Hippolytus, which was written in one of the first five years of the third century, he was not then well known in Rome, or had not yet arrived. According to Hippolytus (Philos., IX, 7), Cleomenes, a follower of Epigonus, was allowed by Pope Zephyrinus to establish a school, which flourished under his approbation and that of Callistus. Hagemann urges that we should conclude that Cleomenes was not a Noetian at all, and that he was an orthodox opponent of the incorrect theology of Hippolytus. The same writer gives most ingenious and interesting (though hardly convincing) reasons for identifying Praxeas with Callistus; he proves that the Monarchians attacked in Tertullian's "Contra Praxean" and in the "Philosophumena" had identical tenets which were not necessarily heretical; he denies that Tertullian means us to understand that Praxeas came to Carthage, and he explains the nameless refuter of Praxeas to be, not Tertullian himself, but Hippolytus. It is true that it is easy to suppose Tertullian and Hippolytus to have misrepresented the opinions of their opponents, but it cannot be proved that Cleomenes was not a follower of the heretical Noetus, and that Sabellius did not issue from his school; further, it is not obvious that Tertullian would attack Callistus under a nickname.

Sabellius soon became the leader of the Monarchians in Rome, perhaps even before the death of Zephyrinus (c. 218). He is said by Epiphanius to have founded his views on the Gospel according to the Egyptians, and the fragments of that apocryphon support this statement. Hippolytus hoped to convert Sabellius to his own views, and attributed his failure in this to the influence of Callistus. That pope, however, excommunicated Sabellius c. 220 ("fearing me", says Hippolytus). Hippolytus accuses Callistus of now inventing a new heresy by combining the views of Theodotus with those of Sabellius, although he excommunicated them both (see CALLISTUS I, POPE). Sabellius was apparently still in Rome when Hippolytus wrote the Philosophumena (between 230 and 235). Of his earlier and later history nothing is known. St. Basil and others call him a Libyan from Pentapolis, but this seems to rest on the fact that Pentapolis was found to be full of Sabellianism by Dionysius of Alexandria, c. 260. A number of Montanists led by Æschines became Modalists (unless Harnack is right in making Modalism the original belief of the Montanists and in regarding Æschines as a conservative). Sabellius (or at least his followers) may have considerably amplified the original Noetianism. There was still Sabellianism to be found in the fourth century. Marcellus of Ancyra developed a Monarchianism of his own, which was carried much further by his disciple, Photinus. Priscillian was an extreme Monarchian and so was Commodian ("Carmen Apol.", 89, 277, 771). The "Monarchian Prologues" to the Gospels found in most old MSS. of the Vulgate, were attrib-

uted by von Dobschütz and P. Corssen to a Roman author of the time of Callistus, but they are almost certainly the work of Priscillian. Beryllus, Bishop of Bostra, is vaguely said by Eusebius (H. E., VI, 33) to have taught that the Saviour had no distinct pre-existence before the Incarnation, and had no Divinity of His own, but that the Divinity of the Father dwelt in Him. Origen disputed with him in a council and convinced him of his error. The minutes of the disputation were known to Eusebius. It is not clear whether Beryllus was a Modalist or a Dynamist.

B. *Theology.*—There was much that was unsatisfactory in the theology of the Trinity and in the Christology of orthodox writers of the Ante-Nicene period. The simple teaching of tradition was explained by philosophical ideas, which tended to obscure as well as to elucidate it. The distinction of the Son from the Father was so spoken of that the Son appeared to have functions of His own, apart from the Father, with regard to the creation and preservation of the world, and thus to be a derivative and secondary God. The unity of the Divinity was commonly guarded by a reference to the unity of origin. It was said that God from eternity was alone, with His Word, one with Him (as Reason, *in vulca cordis*, λόγος ἐνδιάθετος), before the Word was spoken (*ex ore Patris*, λόγος προφορικός), or was generated and became Son for the purpose of creation. The Alexandrians alone insisted rightly on the generation of the Son from all eternity; but thus the Unity of God was even less manifest. The writers who thus theologize may often expressly teach the traditional Unity in Trinity, but it hardly squares with the Platonism of their philosophy. The theologians were thus defending the doctrine of the Logos at the expense of the two fundamental doctrines of Christianity, the Unity of God and the Divinity of Christ. They seemed to make the Unity of the Godhead split into two or even three, and to make Jesus Christ something less than the supreme God the Father. This is eminently true of the chief opponents of the Monarchians, Tertullian, Hippolytus, and Novatian. (See Newman, "The Causes of Arianism", in "Tracts theol. and eccles.") Monarchianism was the protest against this learned philosophizing, which to the simplicity of the faithful looked too much like a mythology or a Gnostic emanationism. The Monarchians emphatically declared that God is one, wholly and perfectly one, and that Jesus Christ is God, wholly and perfectly God. This was right, and even most necessary, and whilst it is easy to see why the theologians like Tertullian and Hippolytus opposed them (for their protest was precisely against the Platonism which these theologians had inherited from Justin and the Apologists), it is equally comprehensible that guardians of the Faith should have welcomed at first the return of the Monarchians to the simplicity of the Faith, "ne videantur deos dicere, neque rursum negare salvatoris deitatem" ("Lest they seem to be asserting two Gods or, on the other hand, denying the Saviour's Godhead".—Origen, "On Titus", frag. II). Tertullian in opposing them acknowledges that the uninstructed were against him; they could not understand the magic word οἰκονομία with which he conceived he had saved the situation; they declared that he taught two or three Gods, and cried "Monarchiam tenemus." So Callistus reproached Hippolytus, and not without reason, with teaching two Gods.

Already St. Justin knew of Christians who taught the identity of the Father and the Son ("Apol.", I, 63; "Dial.", cxxviii). In Hermas, as in Theodotus, the Son and the Holy Ghost are confused. But it was reserved for Noetus and his school to deny categorically that the unity of the Godhead is compatible with a distinction of Persons. They seem to have regarded the Λόγος as a mere name, or faculty, or attribute, and to have made the Son and the Holy Ghost merely aspects or modes of existence of the Father, thus emphatically identifying Christ with the one God. "What harm am I doing", was the reply made by Noetus to the presbyters who interrogated him, "in glorifying Christ?" They replied: "We too know in truth one God; we know Christ; we know that the Son suffered even as He suffered, and died even as He died, and rose again on the third day, and is at the right hand of the Father, and cometh to judge the living and the dead; and what we have learned we declare" (Hippol., "Contra Noetum", 1). Thus they refuted Noetus with tradition—the Apostles' Creed is enough; for the Creed and the New Testament indeed made the distinction of Persons clear, and the traditional formulas and prayers were equally unmistakable. Once the Monarchian system was put into philosophical language, it was seen to be no longer the old Christianity. Ridicule was used; the heretics were told that if the Father and the Son were really identified, then no denial on their part could prevent the conclusion that the Father suffered and died, and sat at His own right hand. Hippolytus tells us that Pope Zephyrinus, whom he represents as a stupid old man, declared at the instance of Callistus: "I know one God Christ Jesus, and besides Him no other Who was born and Who suffered"; but he added: "Not the Father died, but the Son". The reporter is an unsympathetic adversary; but we can see why the aged pope was viewing the simple assertions of Sabellius in a favourable light. Hippolytus declares that Callistus said that the Father suffered *with* the Son, and Tertullian says the same of the Monarchians whom he attacks. Hagemann thinks Callistus-Praxeas especially attacked the doctrine of the Apologists and of Hippolytus and Tertullian, which assigned all such attributes as impassibility and invisibility to the Father and made the Son alone capable of becoming passible and visible, ascribing to Him the work of creation, and all operations *ad extra*. It is true that the Monarchians opposed this Platonizing in general, but it is not evident that they had grasped the principle that all the works of God *ad extra* are common to the Three Persons as proceding from the Divine Nature; and they seem to have said simply that God as Father is invisible and impassible, but becomes visible and passible as Son. This explanation brings them curiously into line with their adversaries. Both parties represented God as one and alone in His eternity. Both made the generation of the Son a subsequent development; only Tertullian and Hippolytus date it before the creation, and the Monarchians perhaps not until the Incarnation. Further, their identification of the Father and the Son was not favourable to a true view of the Incarnation. The very insistence on the unity of God emphasized also the distance of God from man, and was likely to end in making the union of God with man a mere indwelling or external union, after the fashion of that which was attributed to Nestorius. They spoke of the Father as "Spirit" and the Son as "flesh", and it is scarcely surprising that the similar Monarchianism of Marcellus should have issued in the Theodotianism of Photinus.

It is impossible to arrive at the philosophical views of Sabellius. Hagemann thought that he started from the Stoic system as surely as his adversaries did from the Platonic. Dorner has drawn too much upon his imagination for the doctrine of Sabellius; Harnack is too fanciful with regard to its origin. In fact we know little of him but that he said the Son was the Father (so Novatian, "De Trin." 12, and Pope Dionysius relate). St. Athanasius tells us that he said the Father is the Son and the Son is the Father, one in hypostasis, but two in name (so Epiphanius): "As there are divisions of gifts, but the same Spirit, so the Father is the same, but is developed [πλατύνεται] into Son and Spirit" (Orat., IV, c. Ar., xxv). Theodoret says he spoke of one hypostasis and a threefold πρόσωπον, whereas St. Basil says he willingly admitted three

πρόσωπα in one hypostasis. This is, so far as words go, exactly the famous formula of Tertullian, "tres personæ, una substantia" (three persons, one substance), but Sabellius seems to have meant "three modes or characters of one person". The Father is the Monad of whom the Son is a kind of manifestation; for the Father is in Himself silent, inactive (σιωπῶν, ἀνενέργητος), and speaks, creates, works, as Son (Athan., l. c., 11). Here again we have a parallel to the teaching of the Apologists about the Word as Reason and the Word spoken, the latter alone being called Son. It would seem that the difference between Sabellius and his opponents lay mainly in his insisting on the unity of hypostasis after the emission of the Word as Son. It does not seem clear that he regarded the Son as beginning at the Incarnation; according to the passage of St. Athanasius just referred to, he may have agreed with the Apologists to date Sonship from the creative action of God. But we have few texts to go upon, and it is quite uncertain whether Sabellius left any writings. Monarchianism is frequently combated by Origen. Dionysius of Alexandria fought Sabellianism with some imprudence. In the fourth century the Arians and Semiarians professed to be much aftaid of it, and indeed the alliance of Pope Julius and Arhanasius with Marcellus gave some colour to accusations against the Nicene formulas as opening the way to Sabellianism. The Fathers of the fourth century (as, for instance, St. Gregory of Nyssa, "Contra Sabellium", ed. Mai) seem to contemplate a more developed form than that known to Hippolytus ("Contra Noetum " and "Philosophumena") and through him, to Epiphanius: the consummation of creation is to consist in the return of the Λόγος from the humanity of Christ to the Father, so that the original unity of the Divine Nature is after all held to have been temporally compromised, and only in the end will it be restored, that God may be all in all.

Our chief original authorities for early Monarchianism of the Modalist type are Tertullian, "Adversus Praxean", and Hippolytus, "Contra Noetum" (fragment) and "Philosophumena". The "Contra Noetum" and the lost "Syntagma" were used by Epiphanius, Hær. 57 (Noetians), but the sources of Epiphanius's Hær. 62 (Sabellians) are less certain. The references by Origen, Novatian, and later Fathers are somewhat indefinite.

The best Catholic exposition of Monarchianism is by HAGEMANN, *Die römische Kirche* (Freiburg im Br., 1864); the best Protestant account, HARNACK in *Realencyclopädie* s. v. *Monarchianismus* (1903); DORNER, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi* (2nd ed., Berlin, 1853); tr., *Doctrine of the Person of Christ* (5 vols., Edinburgh, 1861–63); BORNEMANN, *Die Taufe Christi in der dogmatischen Beurtheilung der vier ersten Jahrh.* Leipzig, 1896); DÖLLINGER, *Hippolytus und Kallistus* (Ratisbon, 1853); tr., *Hippolytus and Callistus* (Edinburgh, 1876); SALMON in *Dict. of Christ. Biogr.*, s. v. *Sabellianism* and *Sabellius;* FECHTRUP in *Kirchenlex.*, s. vv. SABELLIUS; DUCHESNE, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, I (Paris, 1906); tr., *Early History of the Christian Church* (London, 1909); TIXÉRONT, *Histoire des dogmes*, I (Paris, 1905); and the *Histories of Dogma* by SCHWANE, HARNACK, etc.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Monarchia Sicula, a right exercised from the beginning of the sixteenth century by the secular rulers of Sicily, according to which they had final jurisdiction in purely religious matters, independent of the Holy See. This right they claimed on the ground of a papal privilege. The oldest document advanced in support of their claim is a Bull of 5 July, 1098, addressed by Urban II to Count Roger I of Sicily (Jaffé, "Regista Rom. Pont.", I, 2nd ed., n. 5706; latest edition of the text in "Quellen und Forschungen aus italien. Archiven und Bibliotheken", VII, 1904, pp. 214–9). The pope agreed not to appoint a papal legate for Sicily against the count's will, and declared his intention of getting executed by the count the ecclesiastical acts, usually performed by a legate (quinimmo quæ per legatum acturi sumus, per vestram industriam legati vice exhiberi volumus). Paschal II in a Bull of 1 October, 1117, addressed to Count Roger II of Sicily (Jaffé, loc. cit., 6562), confirmed this privilege and defined it more clearly. He bestowed upon Roger II the same power, "in the sense that if a papal legate be sent thither, that is a representative of the pope, you in your zeal shall secure the execution of what the legate is to perform" (ea videlicet ratione, ut si quando illuc ex latere nostro legatus dirigitur, quem profecto vicarium intelligimus, quæ ab eo gerenda sunt, per tuam industriam effectui mancipentur). Urban II had thus granted Apostolic legatine power to the secular rulers; according to the Bull of Paschal II this meant that, when a papal legate was sent to Sicily to exercise jurisdiction in certain ecclesiastical matters as the pope's representative, he must communicate the nature of his commission to the secular ruler, who would then execute in person the pope's order in place of the legate (*legati vice*). In both instances it was a question not of a jurisdiction of the princes of Sicily independent of the Holy See, but only of the privilege of the secular rulers to execute the precepts of the supreme Church authorities; in other words, the sovereign of Sicily was privileged, but also bound, to carry out papal regulations in his land.

As a result of the feudal relationship between the princes of Sicily and the pope, ecclesiastical matters here took on a more pronouncedly political character than elsewhere, and the Church in Sicily was reduced to the greatest dependence upon the secular power. However, up to the beginning of the sixteenth century, the privilege bestowed by Urban II was never invoked or even mentioned. When Ferdinand II of Aragon became King of Sicily, his secretary, Luca Barberi of Noto in Sicily, undertook to collect the official documents by which the rights of the kings of Sicily, both in ecclesiastical and in secular matters, were clearly determined. To this collection (*Capibrevio*) was joined a collection of documents under the title "Liber Monarchiæ", meant to prove that the secular rulers of Sicily had always exercised the spiritual power. In this "Liber Monarchiæ" the privilege conferred by Urban II in regard to the legatine power was first published. The kings urged it to give a legal basis to the authority they had long exercised over the local Church. They also used it to extend their pretensions that, by virtue of an old papal privilege, they possessed ecclesiastical authority in spiritual matters to be exercised independently of the pope. Despite doubts expressed concerning the genuineness of the Urban document, Ferdinand declared on 22 January, 1515: "As for the Kingdom of Sicily, where we exercise the supervision of spiritual as well as of secular affairs, we have made sure that we do so legitimately". In consequence of such exorbitant demands, disputes arose between the popes and the rulers of the island. Clement VII negotiated with Charles V concerning the Monarchia Sicula, but without success. In 1578 Philip II tried vainly to obtain a formal confirmation of the right from Pius V. In 1597 the king appointed a special permanent judge (*Judex Monarchiæ Siculæ*), who was to give final decisions in the highest ecclesiastical causes, an appeal from his judgment to the pope's being forbidden. The *Judex Monarchiæ Siculæ* claimed the general right to visit the convents, supreme jurisdiction over the bishops and the clergy, and the exercise of a number of ecclesiastical rights belonging to the bishops, so that papal jurisdiction was almost wholly excluded.

When Baronius, in an excursus on the year 1097 in the eleventh volume of his "Annales ecclesiastici" (Rome, 1605), produced solid reasons against the genuineness of Urban II's Bull and especially against the legality of the Monarchia Sicula, a violent feud arose, and the Court of Madrid prohibited the eleventh volume from all countries of the Spanish Empire. Baronius omitted the excursus in the second edition of the "Annales" (Antwerp, 1608), but pub-

lished instead a special "Tractatus de Monarchia Sicula". During the War of the Spanish Succession another serious conflict arose between the Papal Curia and the Spanish court in regard to this alleged legatine power. The occasion of the dispute was a question of ecclesiastical immunity, and the differences continued after Count Victor Amadeus had been made King of Sicily by the Peace of Utrecht and had been crowned at Palermo (1713). On 20 February, 1715, Clement XI declared the Monarchia Sicula null and void, and revoked the privileges attached to it. This edict was not recognized by the monarchs of Sicily, and, when a few years later the island came under the rule of Charles VI, Benedict XIII entered into negotiations with him with the result that the Decree of Clement XI was withdrawn, and the Monarchia Sicula restored, but in an altered form. The king, through the concession of the pope could now appoint the *Judex Monarchiæ Siculæ*, who was at the same time to be the delegate of the Holy See and empowered to decide in the last instance upon religious matters. On the basis of this concession the kings of Sicily demanded more and more far reaching rights in ecclesiastical affairs, so that fresh struggles with the Holy See constantly arose. The situation grew ever more unbearable. Pius IX tried in vain by amicable adjustments to enforce the essential rights of the Holy See in Sicily. Garibaldi, as "Dictator" of Sicily, claimed the rights of the papal legate, and, during the service in the cathedral at Palermo, caused legatine honours to be shown him. In the Bull "Suprema" of 28 January, 1864, which was not published with the prescriptions for its execution until 10 October, 1867, Pius IX revoked the Monarchia Sicula finally and forever. The government of Victor Emanuel protested, and the *Judex Monarchiæ Siculæ*, Rinaldi, refused to submit, for which he was excommunicated in 1868. Article 15 of the Italian law of guarantees (13 May, 1871) explicitly revoked the Monarchia Sicula, and the question was thus finally disposed of.

SENTIS, *Die Monarchia Sicula. Eine historisch-canonistische Untersuchung* (Freiburg, 1869), which contains the older literature (pp. 4–6); FORNO, *Storia della apostolica legazione annessa alla corona di Sicilia* (2nd ed., Palermo, 1869); SCADUTO, *Stato e chiesa in Sicilia* (Palermo, 1887); GIANNONNE, *Il tribunale della Monarchia Sicula* (Rome, 1892); CASPAR, *Die Legatengewalt der normannischsizilischen Herrscher im 12. Jahr.* in *Quellen u. Forschungen aus italien. Archiven u. Bibliotheken*, VII (1904), 189–219.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Monasteries, DOUBLE, religious houses comprising communities of both men and women, dwelling in contiguous establishments, united under the rule of one superior, and using one church in common for their liturgical offices. The reason for such an arrangement was that the spiritual needs of the nuns might be attended to by the priests of the male community, who were associated with them more closely than would have been possible in the case of entirely separate and independent monasteries. The system came into existence almost contemporaneously with monasticism itself, and like it had its origin in the East. Communities of women gathered around religious founders in Egypt and elsewhere, and from the life of St. Pachomius we learn many details as to the nuns under his rule and their relation to the male communities founded by him. Double monasteries, of which those of St. Basil and his sister, Macrina, may be cited as examples, were apparently numerous throughout the East during the early centuries of monasticism. It cannot be stated with any certainty when the system found its way into the West, but it seems probable that its introduction into Gaul may be roughly ascribed to the influence of Cassian, who did so much towards reconciling Eastern monasticism with Western ideas. St. Cæsarius of Arles, St. Aurelian, his successor, and St. Radegundis, of Poitiers, founded double monasteries in the sixth century, and later on the system was propagated widely by St. Columbanus and his followers. Remiremont, Jouarre, Brie, Chelles, Andelys, and Soissons were other well-known examples of the seventh and eighth centuries. From Gaul the idea spread to Belgium and Germany and also to Spain, where it is said to have been introduced by St. Fructuosus in the middle of the seventh century. According to Yepes there were in Spain altogether over two hundred double monasteries.

Ireland presents only one known example—Kildare—but probably there were others besides, of which all traces have since been lost. In England most of the early foundations were double; this has been wrongly attributed by some writers to the fact that many of the Anglo-Saxon nuns were educated in Gaul, where the system was then in vogue, but it seems more correct to ascribe it to the religious influence of the missionaries from Iona, since the first double monastery in England was that of St. Hilda at Whitby, established under the guidance of St. Aidan, and there is no evidence to show that either St. Aidan or St. Hilda was acquainted with the double organization in use elsewhere. Whitby was founded in the seventh century, and in a short time England became covered with similar dual establishments, of which Coldingham, Ely, Sheppey, Minster, Wimborne, and Barking are prominent examples. In Italy, the only other country besides those already mentioned where double monasteries are known to have existed, they were not numerous, but St. Gregory speaks of them as being found in Sardinia (Ep. xi), and St. Bede mentions one at Rome (Hist. Eccl., IV, i). The Danish invasions of the ninth and tenth centuries destroyed the double monasteries of England, and, when they were restored, it was for one sex only, instead of for a dual community. The system seems to have died out also in other countries at about the same time, and it was not revived until the end of the eleventh century when Robert of Arbrissel inaugurated his reform at Fontevrault and gave the idea a fresh lease of life. It is not surprising to find that such a system was sometimes abused, and hence it was always an object of solicitude and strict legislation at the hands of ecclesiastical authority. Many synodal and conciliar decrees recognized its dangers, and ordered the strictest surveillance of all communications passing between monks and nuns. Too close proximity of buildings was frequently forbidden, and every precaution was taken to prevent any occasion of scandal. Very probably it was this scant favour shown by the Church towards it that caused the gradual decline of the system about the tenth century.

In many double monasteries the supreme rule was in the hands of the abbess, and monks as well as nuns were subject to her authority. This was especially the case in England, e. g. in St. Hilda's at Whitby and St. Etheldreda's at Ely, though elsewhere, but more rarely, it was the abbot who ruled both men and women, and sometimes, more rarely still, each community had its own superior independent of the other. The justification for the anomalous position of a woman acting as the superior of a community of men is usually held to originate from Christ's words from the Cross, "Woman, behold thy son; Son, behold thy mother"; and it is still further urged that maternity is a form of authority derived from nature, whilst that which is paternal is merely legal. But, whatever may be its origin, the supreme rule of an abbess over both men and women was deliberately revived, and sanctioned by the Church, in two out of the three medieval orders that consisted of double monasteries. At Fontevrault (founded 1099) and with the Bridgettines (1346), the abbess was the superior of monks as well as of nuns, though with the Gilbertines (1146) it was the prior who ruled over both. In the earlier double monasteries both monks and nuns observed the same rule *mutatis mutandis;* this example was fol-

lowed by Fontevrault and the Bridgettines, the rule of the former being Benedictine, while the latter observed the Rule of St. Bridget. But with the Gilbertines, whilst the rule of the nuns was substantially Benedictine, the monks adopted that of the Augustinian Canons. (See BRIGITTINES; FONTEVRAULT; GILBERTINES.) Little is known as to the buildings of the earlier double monasteries except that the church usually stood between the two conventual establishments, so as to be accessible from both. From excavations made on the site of Watton Priory, a Gilbertine house in Yorkshire, it appears that the separation of nuns from canons was effected by means of a substantial wall, several feet high, which traversed the church lengthways, and it is probable that some similar arrangement was adopted in other double monasteries. No such communities exist at the present day in the Western Church.

BATESON, *Origin and Early History of Double Monasteries* in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, XIII (London, 1899); ECKENSTEIN, *Woman under Monasticism* (Cambridge, 1896); TUKER AND MALLESON, *Handbook to Christian and Ecclesiastical Rome*, III (London, 1900); BUTLER, *Lausic History of Palladius* in *Texts and Studies*, VI (Cambridge, 1904); YEPES, *Chronicon Generale Ord. S. P. N. Benedicti* (Cologne, 1603); MABILLON, *Annales O. S. B.* (Paris, 1703–39); *Vita S. Pachomii* in *P. L.*, LXXIII; FEHR in *Dict. Théol. Cath.* (Paris, 1859).

G. CYPRIAN ALSTON.

Monasteries, SUPPRESSION OF.—Under this title will be treated only the suppressions of religious houses (whether monastic in the strict sense or houses of the mendicant orders) since the Reformation. The somewhat more general subject of state encroachments on Church property will be found treated under such titles as LAICIZATION; COMMENDATORY ABBOT; INVESTITURES, CONFLICT OF. The economic motives of state opposition to the tenure of lands by religious corporations (dating from the thirteenth century) are explained under MORTMAIN. The countries dealt with in the present article are: I. Germany, the Iberian Peninsula, and Italy; II. England. (For French suppressions, see FRANCE, especially sub-title, *The Third Republic and the Church in France.*)

I. GERMANY, SPAIN AND PORTUGAL, ITALY.—A. *Germany (including all Austrian Dominions).*—The confiscation of religious property following upon the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) had been for the benefit of Protestant princes only. More than a hundred monasteries and innumerable pious foundations disappeared at this time. Towards the middle of the eighteenth century a new movement tending to the destruction of monastic institutions swept over those portions of the German Empire which had remained attached to the Catholic Faith. "Josephinism", as this political and religious movement was afterwards called, taking its name from its foster-father, the Emperor Joseph II, made the Church subservient to the State. The supernatural character of the religious life was ignored; abbeys and convents could be permitted to exist only on giving proof of their material utility. A plan was formed at this period for the general secularization of monastic and other ecclesiastical property for the profit of the Catholic Governments in Germany. This was part of a general plan for a redistribution of territory. Frederick II (the Great) of Prussia had taken the initiative and had won over England and France to his idea. The opposition of Maria Theresa, of the Prince Bishop of Mainz, and of Pope Benedict XIV caused the project to fail. The Holy See kept the diplomacy of Prussia in check for some years. To counteract the action of Rome on public sentiment, the partisans of secularization encouraged in Germany the spread of those philosophical errors—Materialism and Rationalism—which were then gaining ground in France (see ENCYCLOPEDISTS). With this view they succeeded in withdrawing the universities from Roman influence.

Meanwhile the princes approached the task directly. The Elector Maximilian (Joseph) III (1745–77) began in Bavaria a work of destruction which was carried on by his successors down to the Elector Maximilian Joseph IV, Napoleon's ally, who became King Maximilian I of Bavaria in 1805 (d. 1825). Measures were taken first against the mendicant orders; the secular power began to meddle in the government of the monasteries, a commission being appointed by the civil authorities for that purpose. In the meantime (1773) the suppression of the Jesuits was decreed. About the year 1782 the Elector Charles Theodore (1778–99) obtained the assent of Pius VI to a project for the extinction of several religious foundations. The Elector Maximilian Joseph IV (King Maximilian I) of Bavaria completed the work of destruction, influenced by the policy of his ally, Napoleon I, and assisted by the Count de Montgelas, his chief minister. A rescript of 9 September, 1800, deprived the religious orders in Bavaria of all property rights and prohibited them to receive novices. The convents of the mendicant orders (Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinians, Carmelites) and the religious houses of women were the first to fall. Then came the turn of the Canons Regular and the Benedictines. The cathedral monasteries were not spared. Among the abbeys that disappeared in 1803 may be mentioned: St. Blasien of the Black Forest (the community, however, being admitted, in 1809, to the monastery of St. Paul), St. Emmeran of Ratisbon, Andechs, St. Ulrich of Augsburg, Michelsberg, Benedictbeurn, Ertal, Kempten, Metten, Oberaltaich, Ottobeurn, Scheyern, Tegernsee, Wessobrünn.

The monasteries in other parts of North Germany met with the common fate of all church property. On the left bank of the Rhine they were suppressed when that territory was annexed to France by the Peace of Lunéville, 9 February, 1801. Their property was disposed of by the Diet of Ratisbon (3 March, 1801—February, 1803), the deplorable business having been negotiated in Paris with Bonaparte and Talleyrand. Besides her twenty-five ecclesiastical principalities and her eighteen universities, Catholic Germany lost all her abbeys and her religious houses for men: their property was given to Bavaria, Prussia, and Austria. As to the religious houses for women, the princes were to consult with the bishops before proceeding to expel their inmates. The future reception of novices was forbidden. In the Netherlands, the Principality of Liège, and the portions of Switzerland annexed by France, the religious houses disappeared completely.

In the territories immediately subject to the House of Hapsburg, the secularization of monastic houses had begun more than thirty years before this. In pursuance of the policy with which his name has been especially associated, the Emperor Joseph II (d. 1790) forbade the teaching of theology in monasteries, even to the young religious, and also the reception of novices. Intercourse with the Holy See was placed under imperial control. It was forbidden to receive foreign religious. The civil authorities interfered in the regular discipline of communities. Commendatory abbots were appointed. Monasteries were deprived of the parishes belonging to them. Superiors had to account to the emperor's representatives for the disposition of their incomes. Theological works printed outside the Empire could not be used.—Such were the principal lines of action of this administration, of which Kaunitz was the minister. All this, however, was but the prelude to a decree of suppression which was issued on 17 March, 1783.

This decree applied to all monasteries, whether of women or of men, judged useless by the standards of Josephinism; their revenues were taken to increase the salaries of the secular priests or for pious establishments useful to religion and humanity. The dioceses of the Low Countries (then subject to the House of

Hapsburg) lost one hundred and sixty-eight convents, abbeys, or priories. In all, 738 religious houses were suppressed in the Empire during the reign of Joseph II.

In anticipation of this disaster, Pius VI had conferred on the bishops extensive privileges. They had power to dispense expelled religious, both men and women, from wearing their habit, and, in case of necessity, to dispense them from the simple vows. They were to secure for them a pension—but, as this was generally insufficient, many were reduced to poverty. The Government transformed the monasteries into hospitals, colleges, or barracks. The victims of the persecution remained faithful to their religious obligations. Their ordinaries took great care of them, Cardinal de Frankenberg, Archbishop of Mechlin, affording a particularly bright example in this respect. The Abbey of Melk (q. v.) was spared; some of the suppressed houses were even affiliated to it; but on the death of Abbot Urban I (1783), the emperor placed over the monks a religious of the Pious Schools as commendatory abbot. The monasteries of Styria were soon closed, though some houses—e. g., Kremsmünster, Lambach, Admont—escaped the devastation. All those in Carinthia and the Tyrol were sacrificed. The religious in Bohemia had not yet recovered from the ravages caused by the wars of Frederick II and Maria Theresa, when they had to encounter this fresh tempest. Breunau, Emmaus of Prague, and Raigern, with a few monasteries of Cistercians and Premonstratensians, escaped complete ruin. The emperor showed no consideration towards the venerable Abbey of St. Martin of Pannonia and its dependencies. In Hungary the Benedictines were entirely wiped out.

The death of Joseph II put an end to this violence, without, however, stopping the spread of those opinions which had incited it. His brother, Leopold II (d. 1792) allowed things to remain as he found them, but Francis II (Francis I of Austria, son of Leopold II) undertook to repair some of the ruin, permitting religious to pronounce solemn vows at the age of twenty-one. The Hungarian Abbey of St. Martin of Pannonia was the first to profit by this benevolence, but its monks had to open the gymnasia in it and its dependencies. The monasteries of the Tyrol and Salzburg had escaped the ruin. These countries were attached to Austria by the Congress of Vienna (Sept., 1814—June, 1815). The monks were allowed to reenter. The celebrated Abbey of Reichenau alone did not arise from its ruins. The princely Abbey of St. Gall, too, had been dissolved during the Wars of the Revolution and the Empire, and there was a proposal, at the Congress of Vienna, to re-establish it, but without giving it back its lands: the abbot would not accept the conditions thus imposed, and the matter went no further. The Swiss monasteries were exposed to pillage and ruin during the wars of the Revolution. The government of the Helvetian Republic was hostile to them, they recovered a little liberty after the Act of Mediation, in 1803. But the situation changed after 1832. The Federal Constitution, revised at that time, suppressed the guarantees granted to convents and religious foundations. During the long period of persecution and confiscation in Switzerland, from 1838 to 1848 (for which see LUCERNE), the monks of Mariastein sought refuge in Germany, and then in France and Austria; those of Mury were sheltered at Griess (Tyrol), others, like Disentis, fell into utter ruin. The Swiss Benedictines then went to the United States, where they founded the Swiss-American congregation.

B. *The Iberian Peninsula.*—The constitution of 1812 given to the Kingdom of Spain by the Government which Napoleon imposed on it suppressed all religious congregations and confiscated their property, in accordance with the conqueror's general policy. They were re-established in 1814 by King Ferdinand, whom the War of Independence had restored to the Throne. Their existence was again threatened by the Revolution of 1820, when the Cortes decreed the suppression of the religious orders, leaving only a few houses to shelter the aged and infirm. It must be said that, in this case, the effect of the generally anti-religious principles actuating the revolutionists was reinforced by the impoverishment of the nation by the Napoleonic wars, by the revolt of its American colonies, and by changed economic conditions. Ferdinand III, who was restored to the throne by the French Army, hastened to annul the decrees of the Cortes (1823). The monasteries and their property were given back to the religious, who were enabled once more to live in community. But in October, 1835, a decree of the Government, inspired by Juan de Mendizabal, minister of finance, again suppressed all the monasteries in Spain and its possessions. The Cortes, which had not been consulted, approved of this measure next year, and promulgated a law abolishing vows of religion. All the movable and immovable property was confiscated and the income assigned to the sinking fund. Objects of art and books were, in general, reserved for the museums and public libraries, though many of them were left untouched, and many others dispersed. Large quantities of furniture and other objects were sold, the lands and rights of each house alienated, while speculators realized large fortunes. Certain monasteries were transformed into barracks or devoted to public purposes. Others were sold or abandoned to pillage.

In 1859 the Government gave to the bishops those religious houses which had not already been disposed of. Numerous conventual churches were turned over for parish use. The religious were promised a pension not to exceed one franc a day, but it was never paid. No mercy was shown even to the aged and the infirm, who were not allowed to wait for death in their cells. Almost all hoped for an approaching political change that would restore them their religious liberty, as had happened twice before, but the event proved otherwise. The destruction was irrevocable, some religious sought a refuge in Italy and in France. The greater number either petitioned the bishops to incorporate them in their dioceses or went to live with their families. The people of the Northern provinces, who are very devoted to Catholicism, did not associate themselves directly with the measures taken against the religious; so much cannot be said for those of the South and of the large towns, where the expulsion of religious sometimes took the appearance of a popular insurrection: convents were pillaged and burned, religious were massacred. Monasteries of women were treated less inhumanly: here the authorities contented themselves with confiscating property and suppressing privileges; but the nuns continued to live in community. With time the passion and hatred of the persecutors diminished somewhat. The monks of the Abbey of Montserrat in Catalonia were able to come together again. The religious orders which supplied the clergy for the Spanish colonies, such as the Dominicans, Augustinians, and Franciscans, were authorized to retain some houses.

The monasteries in Portugal met the same fate as those in Spain, and at about the same time (1833). Only the Franciscans charged with religious duties in the Portuguese colonies were spared.

C. *Italy.*—During the eighteenth century, while Josephinism was rampant in Catholic Germany, Leopold, afterwards the Emperor Leopold II, tried to emulate in some degree the emperor's anti-monastic policy. But the general persecution of religious orders in Italy did not begin until the wars of the Revolution and the Empire had effected a complete transformation in that country. France inspired with her anti-religious tendencies the new governments established by Napoleon, Church property was confiscated; monasteries and convents were suppressed,

though congregations devoted to the care of the sick and to the instruction of poor children were tolerated here and there as, for instance, in the Kingdom of Italy, founded in 1805. The repressive measures could not be enforced in all localities with equal severity. Napoleon extended them to the city of Rome in 1810. The authorities then closed the religious houses of both sexes. At Naples the authorities proceeded to suppress all the orders and confiscate their property (1806–13). When the Congress of Vienna restored these states to their exiled rulers, the latter hastened to make the Church free once more. In Tuscany the duke made a grant to the monasteries, in exchange for the lands that they had lost. In the Pontifical States things reverted to the ancient order: 1824 houses for men and 612 for women were re-established. In Naples the religious had diminished by at least one-half.

The period of peace, however, was not destined to endure: the establishment of Italian unity was fatal to the religious orders. The persecution was resumed in the constitutional Kingdom of Sardinia, which was about to become the agent and the type of united Italy. Cavour imposed this anti-religious policy on King Victor Emmanuel. He proposed first to secularize the monastic property: the money thus obtained was to serve as a church fund to equalize the payment of the diocesan clergy. The king finally gave his sanction to a law which suppressed, in his own states alone, 334 convents and monasteries, containing 4280 religious men and 1200 nuns. This ruin and depredation proceeded uniformly with the cause of Italian unity, since the Piedmontese constitution and legislation were imposed on the whole peninsula. The religious orders and benefices not charged with cures of souls were declared useless, and suppressed; the buildings and lands were confiscated and sold (1866). The Government paid allowances to the surviving religious. In some abbeys—as at Monte Cassino—the members of the community were allowed to remain as care-takers. The Papal States were subjected to the same policy after 1870. The Italian authorities contented themselves with depriving the religious of their legal existence and all they possessed, without raising any obstacles to a possible reconstruction of regular communities. A certain number of monasteries have thus been able to exist and carry on their work, owing solely to the guarantee of individual liberty; their existence is precarious, and an arbitrary measure of the Government might at any time suppress them. After the general dissolution, some Italian religious—for instance, the Olivetans and the Canons Regular of St. John Lateran—crossed the Alps and established houses of their respective orders in France. J. M. Besse.

Suppression of Monasteries in England under Henry VIII.—From any point of view the destruction of the English monasteries by Henry VIII must be regarded as one of the great events of the sixteenth century. They were looked upon, in England, at the time of Henry's breach with Rome, as one of the great bulwarks of the papal system. The monks had been called "the great standing army of Rome". One of the first practical results of the assumption of the highest spiritual powers by the king was the supervision by royal decree of the ordinary episcopal visitations, and the appointment of a layman—Thomas Cromwell—as the king's vicar-general in spirituals, with special authority to visit the monastic houses, and to bring them into line with the new order of things. This was in 1534; and, some time prior to the December of that year, arrangements were already being made for a systematic visitation. A document, dated 21 January, 1535, allows Cromwell to conduct the visit through "commissaries"—rather than personally—as the minister is said to be at that time too busy with "the affairs of the whole kingdom". It is now practically admitted that, even prior to the issue of these commissions of visitation, the project of suppressing some, if indeed not all, of the monastic establishments in the country, had been not only broached, but had become part of Henry's practical politics. It is well to remember this, as it throws an interesting and somewhat unexpected light upon the first dissolutions: the monasteries were doomed prior to these visitations, and not in consequence of them, as we have been asked to believe according to the traditional story. Parliament was to meet early in the following year, 1536, and, with the twofold object of replenishing an exhausted exchequer and of anticipating opposition on the part of the religious to the proposed ecclesiastical changes, according to the royal design, the Commons were to be asked to grant Henry the possessions of at least the smaller monasteries. It must have been felt, however, by the astute Cromwell, who is credited with the first conception of the design, that to succeed, a project such as this must be sustained by strong yet simple reasons calculated to appeal to the popular mind. Some decent pretext had to be found for presenting the proposed measure of suppression and confiscation to the nation, and it can hardly now be doubted that the device of blackening the characters of the monks and nuns was deliberately resorted to.

The visitation opened apparently in the summer of 1535, although the visitatorial powers of the bishops were not suspended until the eighteenth of the following September. Preachers were moreover commissioned to go over the country in the early autumn, in order, by their invectives, to educate public opinion against the monks. These pulpit orators were of three sorts, (1) "railers", who declaimed against the religious as "hypocrites, sorcerers, and idle drones, etc."; (2) "preachers", who said the monks "made the land unprofitable"; and (3) those who told the people that, "if the abbeys went down, the king would never want any taxes again". This last was a favourite argument of Cranmer, in his sermons at St. Paul's Cross. The men employed by Cromwell—the agents entrusted with the task of getting up the required evidence—were chiefly four, Layton, Leigh, Aprice, and London. They were well fitted for their work; and the charges brought against the good name of some at least of the monasteries, by these chosen emissaries of Cromwell are, it must be confessed, sufficiently dreadful, although even their reports certainly do not bear out the modern notion of wholesale corruption.

The visitation seems to have been conducted systematically, and to have passed through three clearly defined stages. During the summer the houses in the west of England were subjected to examination; and this portion of the work came to an end in September, when Layton and Leigh arrived at Oxford and Cambridge respectively. In October and November the visitors changed the field of their labours to the eastern and southeastern districts; and in December we find Layton advancing through the midland counties to Lichfield, where he met Leigh, who had finished his work in the religious houses of Huntingdon and Lincolnshire. Thence they proceeded together to the north, and the city of York was reached on 11 January, 1536. But with all their haste, to which they were urged by Cromwell, they had not proceeded very far in the work of their northern inspection before the meeting of Parliament.

From time to time, whilst on their work of inspection, the visitors, and principally London and Leigh, sent brief written reports to their employers. Practically all the accusations made against the good name of the monks and nuns are contained in the letters sent in this way by the visitors, and in the document, or documents, known as the "Comperta Monastica", which were drawn up at the time by the same visitors and forwarded to their chief, Cromwell. No other evidence as to the state of the monasteries at this time is forthcoming, and the inquirer into the truth of

these accusations is driven back ultimately upon the worth of these visitors' words. It is easy, of course, to dismiss inconvenient witnesses as being unworthy of credit, but in this case a mere study of these letters and documents is quite sufficient to cast considerable doubt upon their testimony, whilst an examination into the subsequent careers of these royal inquisitors will more than justify the rejection of their testimony as wholly unworthy of belief. (Gasquet, "Henry VIII and the English Monasteries", I, xi.)

It is of course impossible to enter into the details of the visitation. We must, therefore, pass to the second step in the dissolution. Parliament met on 4 February, 1536, and the chief business it was called upon to transact was the consideration and passing of the act suppressing the smaller religious houses. It may be well to state exactly what is known about this matter. We know for certain that the king's proposal to suppress the smaller religious houses gave rise to a long debate in the Lower House, and that Parliament passed the measure with great reluctance. It is more than remarkable, moreover, that in the preamble of the Act itself Parliament is careful to throw the entire responsibility for the measure upon the king, and to declare, if words mean anything at all, that they took the truth of the charges against the good name of the religious, solely upon the king's "declaration" that he knew the charges to be true. It must be remembered, too, that one simple fact proves that the actual accusations, or "Comperta"—whether in the form of the visitors' notes, or of the mythical "Black-book"—could never have been placed before Parliament for its consideration in detail, still less for its critical examination and judgment. We have the "Comperta" documents—the findings of the visitors, whatever they may be worth, whilst on their rounds, among the State papers—and it may be easily seen that no distinction whatever is made in them between the greater and lesser houses. All are, to use a common expression, "tarred with the same brush"; all, that is, are equally smirched by the filthy suggestions of Layton and Leigh, of London and Aprice. "The idea that the smaller monasteries rather than the larger were particular abodes of vice", writes Dr. Gairdner, the editor of the State papers of this period, "is not borne out by the 'Comperta'". Yet the preamble of the very Act, which suppressed the smaller monasteries because of their vicious living, declares positively that "in the great and solemn Monasteries of the realm" religion was well observed and God well served. Can it be imagined for a moment that this assertion could have found its way into the Act of Parliament, had the reports, or "Comperta", of the visitors been laid upon the table of the House of Commons for the inspection of the members? We are consequently compelled by this fact to accept as history the account of the matter given in the preamble of the first Act of dissolution: namely that the measure was passed on the strength of the king's "declaration" that the charges against the smaller houses were true, and on that alone.

In its final shape the first measure of suppression merely enacted that all religious houses not possessed of an income of more than £200 a year should be given to the Crown. The heads of such houses were to receive pensions, and the religious, despite the alleged depravity of some, were to be admitted to the larger and more observant monasteries, or to be licensed to act as secular priests. The measure of turpitude fixed by the Act was thus a pecuniary one. All monastic establishments which fell below the £200 a year standard of "good living" were to be given to the king to be dealt with at his "pleasure, to the honour of God and the wealth of the realm".

This money limit at once rendered it necessary, as a first step in the direction of dissolution, to ascertain which houses came within the operation of the Act. As early as April, 1536 (less than a month from the passing of the measure), we find mixed commissions of officials and country gentlemen appointed in consequence to make surveys of the religious houses, and instructions issued for their guidance. The returns made by these commissioners are of the highest importance in determining the moral state of the religious houses at the time of their dissolution. It is now beyond dispute that the accusations of Cromwell's visitors were made prior to the passing of the Act of Suppression of 1536, and therefore prior to, not after (as most writers have erroneously supposed), the constitution of these mixed commissions of gentry and officials. The main purpose for which the commissioners were nominated was of course to find out what houses possessed an income of less than £200 a year; and to take over such in the king's name, as now by the late Act legally belonging to His Majesty. The gentry and officials were however instructed to find out and report upon "the conversation of the lives" of the religious; or in other words they were specially directed to examine into the moral state of the houses visited. Unfortunately, comparatively few of the returns of these mixed commissions are now known to exist; although some have been discovered, which were unknown to Dr. Gairdner when he made his "Calendar" of the documents of 1536. Fortunately, however, the extant reports deal expressly with some of the very houses against which Layton and Leigh had made their pestilential suggestions. Now that the suppression was resolved upon and made legal, it did not matter to Henry or Cromwell that the inmates should be described as "evil livers"; and so the new commissioners returned the religious of these same houses as being really "of good and virtuous conversation", and this, not in the case of one house or district only, but, as Gairdner says, "the characters given of the inmates are almost uniformly good".

To prepare for the reception of the expected spoils, what was known as the Augmentation Office was established, and Sir Thomas Pope was made its first treasurer, 24 April, 1536. On this same day instructions were issued for the guidance of the mixed commissions in the work of dissolving the monasteries. According to these directions, the commissioners, having interviewed the superior and shown him the "Act of Dissolution", were to make all the officials of the house swear to answer truthfully any questions put to them. They were then to examine into the moral and financial state of the establishment, and to report upon it, as well as upon the number of the religious and "the conversation of their lives". After that, an inventory of all the goods, chattels, and plate was to be taken, and an "indenture" or counterpart of the same was to be left with the superior, dating from 1 March, 1536, because from that date all had passed into the possession of the king. Thenceforward the superior was to be held responsible for the safe custody of the king's property. At the same time the commissioners were to issue their commands to the heads of the houses not to receive any more rents in the name of the convent, nor to spend any money, except for necessary expenses, until the king's pleasure should be known. They were, however, to be strictly enjoined to continue their care over the lands, and "to sow and cultivate" as before, until such time as some king's farmer should be appointed and relieve them of this duty. As for the monks, the officer was told "to send those that will remain in religion to other houses with letters to the governors, and those that wish to go to the world to my lord of Canterbury and the lord chancellor for" their letters to receive some benefices or livings when such could be found for them.

One curious fact about the dissolution of the smaller monasteries deserves special notice. No sooner had the king obtained possession of these houses under the money value of £200 a year, than he commenced to

refound some "in perpetuity" under a new charter. In this way no fewer than fifty-two religious houses in various parts of England gained a temporary respite from extinction. The cost, however, was considerable, not alone to the religious, but to their friends. The property was again confiscated and the religious were finally swept away, before they had been able to repay the sums borrowed in order to purchase this very slender favour at the hands of the royal legal possessor. In hard cash the treasurer of the Court of Augmentation acknowledges to have received, as merely "part payment of the various sums of money, due to the king for fines or compositions for the toleration and continuance" of only thirty-three of these refounded monasteries, some £5948 6s. 8d. or hardly less, probably, than £60,000 of present-day money. Sir Thomas Pope, the treasurer of the Court of Augmentation, ingenuously adds that he has not counted the arrears due to the office under this head, "since all and each of the said monasteries, before the close of the account, have come into the King's hands by surrender, or by the authority of Parliament have been added to the augmentation of the royal revenues". "For this reason, therefore," he adds, "the King has remitted all sums of money still due to him, as the residue of their fines for his royal toleration." The sums paid for the fresh foundations "in perpetuity", which in reality as the event showed meant only the respite of a couple of years or so, varied considerably. As a rule they represented about three times the annual revenue of the house; but sometimes, as in the case of St. Mary's, Winchester, which was fined £333 6s. 8d. for leave to continue, it was re-established with the loss of some of its richest possessions.

It is somewhat difficult to estimate correctly the number of religious houses which passed into the king's possession in virtue of the Act of Parliament of 1536. Stowe's estimate is generally deemed sufficiently near the mark, and he says: "the number of the houses then suppressed was 376". In respect to the value of the property, Stowe's estimate would also appear to be substantially correct when he gives £30,000, or some £300,000 of present-day money, as the yearly income derived from the confiscated lands. There can be no doubt, however, that subsequently the promises of large annual receipts from the old religious estates proved illusory, and that, in spite of the rack-renting of the Crown farmers, the monastic acres furnished far less money for the royal purse than they had previously done under the thrifty management and personal supervision of their former owners.

As to the value of the spoils which came from the wrecked and dismantled houses, where the waste was everywhere so great, it is naturally difficult to appraise the value of the money, plate, and jewels which were sent in kind into the king's treasury, and the proceeds from the sales of the lead, bells, stock, furniture, and even the conventual buildings. It is, however, reasonably certain that Lord Herbert, following Stowe, has placed the amount actually received at too high a figure. Not, of course, that these goods were not worth vastly more than the round £100,000, at which he estimates them; but nothing like that sum was actually received or acknowledged by Sir Thomas Pope, as treasurer of the Court of Augmentation. Corruption, without a doubt, existed everywhere, from the lowest attendant of the visiting commissioner to the highest court official. But allowing for the numberless ways in which the monastic possessions could be plundered in the process of transference to their new possessor, it may be not much beyond the mark to put these "Robin Hood's pennyworths", as Stowe calls them, at about £1,000,000 of present-day money.

Something must necessarily be said of the actual process which was followed by the Crown agents in dissolving these lesser monasteries. It was much the same in every case, and it was a somewhat long process, since the work was not all done in a day. The rolls of accounts, sent into the Augmentation Office by the commissioners, show that it was frequently a matter of six to ten weeks before any house was finally dismantled and its inmates had all been turned out of doors. The chief commissioners paid two official visits to the scene of operations during the progress of the work. On the first they assembled the superior and his subjects in the Chapter House, announced to the community and its dependents their impending doom; called for and defaced the convent seal, the symbol of corporate existence, without which no business could be transacted; desecrated the church; took possession of the best plate and vestments "unto the King's use"; measured the lead upon the roof and calculated its value when melted; counted the bells; and appraised the goods and chattels of the community. Then they passed on to the scene of their next operations, leaving behind them certain subordinate officers and workmen to carry out the designed destruction by stripping the roofs and pulling down the gutters and rain pipes; melting the lead into pigs and fodders, throwing down the bells, breaking them with sledge-hammers and packing the metal into barrels ready for the visit of the speculator and his bid for the spoils. This was followed by the work of collecting the furniture and selling it, together with the window frames, shutters, and doors by public auction or private tender. When all this had been done, the commissioners returned to audit the accounts and to satisfy themselves generally that the work of devastation had been accomplished to the king's contentment—that the nest had been destroyed and the birds scattered—that what had been a monument of architectural beauty in the past was now a "bare roofless choir, where late the sweet birds sang".

No sooner had the process of destruction begun simultaneously all over the country than the people began at last to realize that the benefits likely to accrue to them out of the plunder were most illusory. When this was understood, it was first proposed to present a petition to the king from the Lords and Commons, pointing out the evident damage which must be done to the country at large if the measure were carried out fully; and asking that the process of suppression should be at once stopped, and that the lesser houses, which had not yet been dissolved under the authority of the Act of 1536, should be allowed to stand. Nothing, of course, came of this attempt. Henry's appetite was but whetted by what had come to him, and he only hungered for more of the spoils of the Church and the poor. The action of the Parliament in 1536 in permitting the first measure to become law made it in reality much more difficult for Henry to draw back; and in more senses than one it paved the way for the general dissolution. Here and there in the country active resistance to the work of destruction was organized, and in the case of Lincolnshire, Yorkshire, and the North generally, the popular rising of the "Pilgrimage of Grace" was caused in the main, or at least in great measure, by the desire of the people at large to save the religious houses from ruthless destruction. The failure of the insurrection of the "Pilgrimage of Grace" was celebrated by the execution of twelve abbots and, to use Henry's own words, by a wholesale "tying-up" of monks. By a new and ingenious process, appropriately called "Dissolution by Attainder", an abbey was considered by the royal advisers to fall into the king's hands by the supposed or constructive treason of its superior. In this way several of the larger abbeys, with all their revenues and possessions, came into Henry's hands as a consequence of the "Pilgrimage of Grace".

The Parliament of 1536, it will be remembered, had granted Henry the possession only of the houses the annual value of which was less than £200. What happened in the three years that followed the passing

of the Act was briefly this: the king was ill satisfied with the actual results of what he had thought would prove a veritable gold mine. Personally, perhaps, he had not gained as much as he had hoped for from the dissolutions which had taken place. The property of the monks somehow seemed cursed by its origin; it passed from his control by a thousand-and-one channels, and he was soon thirsting for a greater prize, which, as the event showed, he was equally unable to guard for his own uses. By his instructions, visitors were once more set in motion against the larger abbeys, in which, according to the Act of 1536, religion was "right well kept and observed". Not having received any mandate from Parliament to authorize the extension of their proceedings, the royal agents, eager to win a place in his favour, were busy up and down the country, cajoling, coercing, commanding, and threatening the members of the religious houses in order to force them to give up their monasteries unto the King's Majesty. As Dr. Gairdner puts it: "by various arts and means the heads of these establishments were induced to surrender, and occasionally when an abbot was found, as in the case of Woburn, to have committed treason in the sense of the recent statutes, the house (by a stretch of the tyrannical laws) was forfeited to the king by his attainder. But attainders were certainly the exception, surrenders being the general rule".

The autumn of 1537 saw the beginning of the fall of the friaries in England. For some reason, possibly because of their poverty, they had not been brought under the Act of 1536. For a year after the "Pilgrimage of Grace" few dissolutions of houses, other than those which came to the king by the attainder of their superiors, are recorded. With the feast of St. Michael, 1537, however, besides the convents of friars the work of securing, by some means or other, the surrender of the greater houses went on rapidly. The instructions given to the royal agents are clear. They were, by all methods known to them, to get the religious "willingly to consent and agree" to their own extinction. It was only when they found "any of the said heads and convents, *so appointed to be dissolved*, so wilful and obstinate that they would in no wise" agree to sign and seal their own death-warrant, that the commissioners were authorized by Henry's instructions to "take possession of the house" and property by force. And, whilst thus engaged, the royal agents were ordered to declare that the king had no design whatsoever upon the monastic property or system as such, or any desire to secure the total suppression of the religious houses. They were instructed at all costs to put a stop to such rumours, which were naturally rife all over the country at this time. This they did; and the unscrupulous Dr. Layton declared that he had told the people everywhere that "in this they utterly slandered the King their natural lord". He bade them not to believe such reports; and he "commanded the abbots and priors to set in the stocks" such as related such untrue things. It was, however, as may be imagined, hard enough to suppress the rumour whilst the actual thing was going on. In 1538 and 1539 some 150 monasteries of men appear to have signed away their corporate existence and their property, and by a formal deed handed over all rights to the king.

When the work had progressed sufficiently the new Parliament, which met in April, 1539, after observing that divers abbots and others had yielded up their houses to the king, "without constraint, coercion, or compulsion", confirmed these surrenders and vested all monastic property thus obtained in the Crown. Finally, in the autumn of that year, Henry's triumph over the monastic orders was completed by the horrible deaths for constructive treason of the three great Abbots of Glastonbury, Colchester, and Reading. And so, as one writer has said, "before the winter of 1540 had set in, the last of the abbeys had been added to the ruins with which the land was strewn from one end to the other".

It is difficult, of course, to estimate the exact number of religious and religious houses suppressed at this time in England. Putting all sources of information together, it seems that the monks and regular canons expelled from the greater monasteries were about 3200 in number; the friars, 1800; and the nuns, 1560. If to these should be added the number of those affected by the first Act of Parliament, it is probably not far from the truth to say that the number of religious men and women expelled from their homes by the suppression were, in round numbers, about 8000. Besides these, of course, there were probably more than ten times that number of people turned adrift who were their dependents, or otherwise obtained a living in their service.

If it is difficult to determine, with any certainty, the number of the religious in monastic England at the time of the dissolution of the monasteries, it is still more so to give any accurate estimate of the property involved. Speed calculated the annual value of the entire property, which passed into Henry's hands at some £171,312 4s. 3¾d. Other valuations have placed it at a higher figure, so that a modern calculation of the annual value at £200,000, or some £2,000,000 of present-day money, is probably not excessive. Hence, as a rough calculation, it may be taken that at the fall of the monasteries an income of about two million pounds sterling a year, of the present money value, was taken from the Church and the poor and transferred to the royal purse.

It may, however, be at once stated that Henry evidently never derived anything like such a sum from the transaction. The capital value was so diminished by gratuitous grants, sales of lands at nominal values, and in numerous other ways, that in fact, for the eleven years from 1536 to 1547, the Augmentation Office accounts show that the king only drew an average yearly income of £37,000, or £370,000 of present-day money, from property which, in the hands of the monks, had probably produced five times the amount. As far as can be gathered from the accounts still extant, the total receipts of the king from the monastic confiscations from April, 1536, to Michaelmas, 1547, was about thirteen million and a half of present-day money, to which must be added about a million sterling, the melting value of the monastic plate. Of this sum, leaving out of calculation the plate and jewels, not quite three millions were spent by the king personally; £600,000 was spent upon the royal palaces, and nearly half a million on the household of the Prince of Wales. More than five millions sterling are accounted for under the head of war expenses, and nearly £700,000 were spent on coast defence. Pensions to religious persons account for £330,000; and one curious item of £6000 is entered as spent "to secure the surrender of the Abbey of Abingdon."

GASQUET, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries* (London, 1899); IDEM, *Overlooked Testimonies to the Character of the English Monasteries* in *Dublin Review* (April, 1894); DIXON, *History of the Church of England*, I, II; GAIRDNER, *The Church in the Sixteenth Century* (London, 1902); IDEM, *Calendar of State Papers of Henry VIII*, vols. for *1527–40* and *Introductions;* IDEM, *Lollardy and the Reformation in England* (London, 1908); *Letters relating to the Suppression of the Monasteries*, ed WRIGHT (Camden Society, London, 1843); ARCHBOLD, *The Somerset Religious Houses* in *Cambridge Historical Essays*, no. 6 (1892); MANNING, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries* in *Dublin Review* (April, 1888); IDEM, *Henry VIII and the Suppression of the Greater Monasteries* in *Dublin Review* (April, 1889); SPENCE, *The Passing of the Monk* in *Quarterly Review* (July, 1895); COBBETT, *History of the Reformation*, ed. GASQUET (London, 1896); JESSOPP, *Before the Great Pillage* (London, 1901); WAKEMAN, *Introduction to the Church History of England* (London, 1896, 1898); SPELMAN, *The History and Fate of Sacrilege* (London, 1698, 1848, 1853).

FRANCIS AIDAN GASQUET.

Monastery, CANONICAL ERECTION OF A.—A religious house (monastery or convent) is a fixed resi-

dence of religious persons. It supposes, therefore, continuous habitation of a community strictly so called, governed by a superior and following the rule prescribed by the respective order. Such a religious house is to be distinguished from a grange or farm, from a villa or place of recreation, and from a hospice or place for the reception of travelling religious. The conditions for the legitimate erection of a monastery are: (1) the permission of the Holy See. This is certain for countries subject to the Decree "Romanos Pontifices" (i. e. the United States, England, etc.); it is also required for Italy. Outside of Italy and missionary countries generally, the question is much disputed by canonists; (2) the assent of the ordinary. This condition was approved by the Council of Chalcedon in 451, and was in force as late as the twelfth century. In the thirteenth, the privileges of the mendicant orders caused frequent derogations from the law, but the ancient discipline was restored by the Council of Trent (Sess. XXV, de Reg., cap. iii). This permission cannot be given by the vicar-general nor by the vicar-capitular. Before the bishop gives his assent, he should make himself acquainted with the opinions of those to whom such a monastery might prove a detriment, as the superiors of other religious orders already established there, or the people of the place. The parish priest cannot object, unless it is intended to confer parochial rights on the new religious house; (3) there must be a proper provision for the sustenance of twelve religious, otherwise they must live under the jurisdiction of the ordinary. This last condition does not, however, apply to countries where the "Romanos Pontifices" is in force. For the transfer of a monastery from one site to another in the same locality, no permission of the Holy See is required, as this is translation, not erection. There was an ancient law that a new monastery could not be erected within a certain distance from an older one, but it has gone into desuetude. As regards convents of religious women, the assent of the ordinary is required, but not that of the Holy See. The same holds for the erection of houses of pious congregations and institutes.

BACHOFEN, *Compendium Juris Regularium* (New York, 1903); TAUNTON, *The Law of the Church* (St. Louis, 1906), s. v. *Monastery;* VERMEERSCH, *De Religiosis Institutis*, I (Bruges, 1902).

WILLIAM H. W. FANNING.

Monasticism.—Monasticism or monachism, literally the act of "dwelling alone" (Greek, *μόνος*, *μονάζειν*, *μοναχός*), has come to denote the mode of life pertaining to persons living in seclusion from the world, under religious vows and subject to a fixed rule, as monks, friars, nuns, or in general as religious. The basic idea of monasticism in all its varieties is seclusion or withdrawal from the world or society. The object of this is to achieve a life whose ideal is different from and largely at variance with that pursued by the majority of mankind; and the method adopted, no matter what its precise details may be, is always self-abnegation or organized asceticism. Taken in this broad sense monachism may be found in every religious system which has attained to a high degree of ethical development, such as the Brahmin, Buddhist, Jewish, Christian, and Moslem religions, and even in the system of those modern communistic societies, often anti-theological in theory, which are a special feature of recent social development especially in America. Hence it is claimed that a form of life which flourishes in environments so diverse must be the expression of a principle inherent in human nature and rooted therein no less deeply than the principle of domesticity, though obviously limited to a far smaller portion of mankind. This article and its two ensuing sections, EASTERN MONASTICISM and WESTERN MONASTICISM, deal with the monastic order strictly so called as distinct from the "religious orders" such as the friars, canons regular, clerks regular, and the more recent congregations. For information as to these see RELIGIOUS ORDERS, and the article on the particular order or congregation required.

I. ITS GROWTH AND METHOD.—*Origin.*—Any discussion of pre-Christian asceticism is outside the scope of this article, but readers who wish to study this portion of the subject may be referred to Part I, of Dr. Zockler's "Askese und Mönchtum" (Frankfort, 1897), which deals with the prevalence of the ascetic idea among races of the most diverse character. So too, any question of Jewish asceticism as exemplified in the Essenes or Therapeutæ of Philo's "De Vita Contemplativa" is excluded, but for this reference may be given to Mr. F. C. Conybeare's volume "Philo about the Contemplative Life" (Oxford, 1895), by which the authenticity of the work has been reinstated after the attacks of Dr. Lucius and other scholars. It has already been pointed out that the monastic ideal is an ascetic one, but it would be wrong to say that the earliest Christian asceticism was monastic. Any such thing was rendered impossible by the circumstances in which the early Christians were placed, for in the first century or so of the Church's existence the idea of living apart from the congregation of the faithful, or of forming within it associations to practise special renunciations in common was out of question. While admitting this however it is equally certain that monasticism, when it came, was little more than a precipitation of ideas previously in solution among Christians. For asceticism is the struggle against worldly principles, even with such as are merely worldly without being sinful. The world desires and honours wealth, so the ascetic loves and honours poverty. If he must have something in the nature of property then he and his fellows shall hold it in common, just because the world respects and safeguards private ownership. In like manner he practises fasting and virginity that thereby he may repudiate the licence of the world.

Hereafter the various items of this renunciation will be dealt with in detail, they are mentioned at this stage merely to show how the monastic ideal was foreshadowed in the asceticism of the Gospel and its first followers. Such passages as I John, ii, 15–17: "Love not the world, nor the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the charity of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world is the concupiscence of the flesh, and the concupiscence of the eyes, and the pride of life, which is not of the Father but is of the world. And the world passeth away and the concupiscence thereof. But he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever"—passages which might be multiplied, and can bear but one meaning if taken literally. And this is precisely what the early ascetics did. We read of some who, driven by the spirit of God, dedicated their energies to the spread of the Gospel and, giving up all their possessions passed from city to city in voluntary poverty as apostles and evangelists. Of others we hear that they renounced property and marriage so as to devote their lives to the poor and needy of their particular church. If these were not strictly speaking monks and nuns, at least the monks and nuns were such as these; and, when the monastic life took definite shape in the fourth century, these forerunners were naturally looked up to as the first exponents of monachism. For the truth is that the Christian ideal is frankly an ascetic one and monachism is simply the endeavour to effect a material realization of that ideal, or organization in accordance with it, when taken literally as regards its "Counsels" as well as its "Precepts" (see ASCETICISM; COUNSELS, EVANGELICAL).

Besides a desire of observing the evangelical counsels, and a horror of the vice and disorder that prevailed in a pagan age, two contributory causes in particular are often indicated as leading to a renunciation of the world among the early Christians. The first of these was the expectation of an immediate Second

Advent of Christ (cf. I Cor., vii, 29-31; I Pet., IV, 7, etc.). That this belief was widespread is admitted on all hands, and obviously it would afford a strong motive for renunciation since a man who expects this present order of things to end at any moment, will lose keen interest in many matters commonly held to be important. This belief however had ceased to be of any great influence by the fourth century, so that it cannot be regarded as a determining factor in the origin of monasticism which then took visible shape. A second cause more operative in leading men to renounce the world was the vividness of their belief in evil spirits. The first Christians saw the kingdom of Satan actually realized in the political and social life of heathendom around them. In their eyes the gods whose temples shone in every city were simply devils, and to participate in their rites was to join in devil worship. When Christianity first came in touch with the Gentiles the Council of Jerusalem by its decree about meat offered to idols (Acts, xv, 20) made clear the line to be followed. Consequently certain professions were practically closed to believers since a soldier, schoolmaster, or state official of any kind might be called upon at a moment's notice to participate in some act of the state religion. But the difficulty existed for private individuals also. There were gods who presided over every moment of a man's life, gods of house and garden, of food and drink, of health and sickness. To honour these was idolatry, to ignore them would attract inquiry and possibly persecution. And so when, to men placed in this dilemma, St. John wrote, "Keep yourselves from idols" (I John, v, 21) he said in effect "Keep yourselves from public life, from society, from politics, from intercourse of any kind with the heathen", in short "renounce the world".

By certain writers the communistic element seen in the Church of Jerusalem during the first years of its existence (Acts, iv, 32) has sometimes been pointed to as indicating a monastic element in its constitution, but no such conclusion is justified. Probably the community of goods was simply a natural continuation of the practice, begun by Jesus and the Apostles, where one of the band kept the common purse and acted as steward. There is no indication that such a custom was ever instituted elsewhere and even at Jerusalem it seems to have collapsed at an early period. It must be recognized also that influences such as the above were merely contributory and of comparatively small importance The main cause which begot monachism was simply the desire to fulfil Christ's law literally, to imitate Him in all simplicity, following in His footsteps whose "kingdom is not of this world". So we find monachism at first instinctive, informal, unorganized, sporadic; the expression of the same force working differently in different places, persons, and circumstances; developing with the natural growth of a plant according to the environment in which it finds itself and the character of the individual listener who heard in his soul the call of "Follow Me".

(2) *Means to the End.*—It must be clearly understood that, in the case of the monk, asceticism is not an end in itself. For him, as for all men, the end of life is to love God. Monastic ascetism then means the removal of obstacles to loving God, and what these obstacles are is clear from the nature of love itself. Love is the union of wills. If the creature is to love God, he can do it in one way only; by sinking his own will in God's, by doing the will of God in all things: "if ye love Me keep my commandments". No one understands better than the monk those words of the beloved disciple, "Greater love hath no man than this that a man lay down his life", for in his case life has come to mean renunciation. Broadly speaking this renunciation has three great branches corresponding to the three evangelical counsels of poverty, chastity, and obedience.

(a) Poverty.—There are few subjects, if any, upon which more sayings of Jesus have been preserved than upon the superiority of poverty over wealth in His kingdom (cf. Matt., v, 3; xiii, 22; xix, 21 sq.; Mark, x, 23 sq.; Luke, vi, 20; xviii, 24 sq., etc.), and the fact of their preservation would indicate that such words were frequently quoted and presumably frequently acted upon. The argument based upon such passages as Matt., xix, 21 sq., may be put briefly thus. If a man wish to attain eternal life it is better for him to renounce his possessions than to retain them. Jesus said, "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God", the reason being no doubt that it is difficult to prevent the affections from becoming attached to riches, and that such attachment makes admission into Christ's kingdom impossible. As St. Augustine points out, the disciples evidently understood Jesus to include all who covet riches in the number of "the rich", otherwise, considering the small number of the wealthy compared with the vast multitude of the poor, they would not have asked, "Who then shall be saved"? "You cannot serve God and Mammon" is an obvious truth to a man who knows by experience the difficulty of a whole-hearted service of God; for the spiritual and material good are in immediate antithesis, and where one is the other cannot be. Man cannot sate his nature with the temporal and yet retain an appetite for the eternal; and so, if he would live the life of the spirit, he must flee the lust of the earth and keep his heart detached from what is of its very nature unspiritual. The extent to which this voluntary poverty is practised has varied greatly in the monachism of different ages and lands. In Egypt the first teachers of monks taught that the renunciation should be made as absolute as possible. Abbot Agathon used to say, "Own nothing which it would grieve you to give to another". St. Macarius once, on returning to his cell, found a robber carrying off his scanty furniture. He thereupon pretended to be a stranger, harnessed the robber's horse for him and helped him to get his spoil away. Another monk had so stripped himself of all things that he possessed nothing save a copy of the Gospels. After a while he sold this also and gave the price away saying, "I have sold the very book that bade me sell all I had".

As the monastic institute became more organized legislation appeared in the various codes to regulate this point among others. That the principle remained the same however is clear from the strong way in which St. Benedict speaks of the matter while making special allowance for the needs of the infirm, etc. (Reg. Ben., xxxiii). "Above everything the vice of private ownership is to be cut off by the roots from the monastery. Let no one presume either to give or to receive anything without leave of the abbot, nor to keep anything as his own, neither book, nor writing tablets, nor pen, nor anything whatsoever, since it is unlawful for them to have their bodies or wills in their own power". The principle here laid down, viz., that the monk's renunciation of private property is absolute, remains as much in force to-day as in the dawn of monasticism. No matter to what extent any individual monk may be allowed the use of clothing, books, or even money, the ultimate proprietorship in such things can never be permitted to him. (See Poverty; Mendicant Friars; Vow.)

(b) Chastity.—If the things to be given up be tested by the criterion of difficulty, the renunciation of material possessions is clearly the first and easiest step for man to take, as these things are external to his nature. Next in difficulty will come the things that are united to man's nature by a kind of necessary affinity. Hence in the ascending order chastity is the second of the evangelical counsels, and as such it is based upon the words of Jesus, "If any man come to me and hate not his father and mother and wife and children and brethren and sisters yea and his own soul also, he

cannot be my disciple" (Luke, xiv, 26). It is obvious that of all the ties which bind the human heart to this world the possession of wife and children is the strongest. Moreover the renunciation of the monk includes not only these but in accordance with the strictest teaching of Jesus all sexual relations or emotion arising therefrom. The monastic idea of chastity is a life like that of the angels. Hence the phrases, "angelicus ordo", "angelica conversatio", which have been adopted from Origen to describe the life of the monk, no doubt in reference to Mark, xii, 25. It is primarily as a means to this end that fasting takes so important a place in the monastic life. Among the early Egyptian and Syrian monks in particular fasting was carried to such lengths that some modern writers have been led to regard it almost as an end in itself, instead of being merely a means and a subordinate one at that. This error of course is confined to writers about monasticism, it has never been countenanced by any monastic teacher. (See CELIBACY OF THE CLERGY; CHASTITY; CONTINENCE; FAST; VOW.)

(c) Obedience.—"The first step in humility is obedience without delay. This befits those who count nothing dearer to them than Christ on account of the holy service which they have undertaken . . . without doubt such as these follow that thought of the Lord when He said, I came not to do my own will but the will of Him that sent me" (Reg. Ben., v). Of all the steps in the process of renunciation, the denial of a man's own will is clearly the most difficult. At the same time it is the most essential of all as Jesus said (Matt., xvi, 24), "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me". The most difficult because self-interest, self-protection, self-regard of all kinds are absolutely a part of man's nature, so that to master such instincts requires a supernatural strength. The most essential also because by this means the monk achieves that perfect liberty which is only to be found where is the Spirit of the Lord. It was Seneca who wrote, "parere deo libertas est", and the pagan philosopher's dictum is confirmed and testified to on every page of the Gospel. In Egypt at the dawn of monasticism the custom was for a young monk to put himself under the guidance of a senior whom he obeyed in all things. Although the bond between them was wholly voluntary the system seems to have worked perfectly and the commands of the senior were obeyed without hesitation. "Obedience is the mother of all the virtues": "obedience is that which openeth heaven and raiseth man from the earth": "obedience is the food of all the saints, by her they are nourished, through her they come to perfection": such sayings illustrate sufficiently the view held on this point by the fathers of the desert. As the monastic life came to be organized by rule, the insistence on obedience remained the same, but its practice was legislated for. Thus St. Benedict at the very outset, in the Prologue to his Rule, reminds the monk of the prime purpose of his life, viz., "that thou mayest return by the labour of obedience to Him from whom thou hadst departed by the sloth of disobedience". Later he devotes the whole of his fifth chapter to this subject and again, in detailing the vows his monks must take, while poverty and chastity are presumed as implicitly included, obedience is one of the three things explicitly promised.

Indeed the saint even legislates for the circumstance of a monk being ordered to do something impossible. "Let him seasonably and with patience lay before his superior the reasons of his incapacity to obey, without showing pride, resistance or contradiction. If, however, after this the superior still persist in his command, let the younger know that it is expedient for him, and let him obey for the love of God trusting in His assistance" (Reg. Ben., lxviii). Moreover "what is commanded is to be done not fearfully, tardily, nor coldly, nor with murmuring, nor with an answer showing unwillingness, for the obedience which is given to superiors is given to God, since He Himself hath said, He that heareth you, heareth Me" (Reg. Ben., v). It is not hard to see why so much emphasis is laid on this point. The object of monasticism is to love God in the highest degree possible in this life. In true obedience the will of the servant is one with that of his master, and the union of wills is love. Wherefore, that the obedience of the monk's will to that of God may be as simple and direct as possible, St. Benedict writes (ch. ii) "the abbot is considered to hold in the monastery the place of Christ Himself, since he is called by His name" (see OBEDIENCE; VOW). St. Thomas, in chapter xi of his Opusculum" On the Perfection of the Spiritual Life", points out that the three means of perfection, poverty, chastity, and obedience, belong peculiarly to the religious state. For religion means the worship of God alone, which consists in offering sacrifice, and of sacrifices the holocaust is the most perfect. Consequently, when a man dedicates to God all that he has, all that he takes pleasure in, and all that he is, he offers a holocaust; and this he does pre-eminently by the three religious vows.

(3) *The Different Kinds of Monks.*—It must be clearly understood that the monastic order properly so-called differs from the friars, clerks regular, and other later developments of the religious life in one fundamental point. The latter have essentially some special work or aim, such as preaching, teaching, liberating captives, etc., which occupies a large place in their activities and to which many of the observances of the monastic life have to give way. This is not so in the case of the monk. He lives a special kind of life for the sake of the life and its consequences to himself. In a later section we shall see that monks have actually undertaken external labours of the most varied character, but in every case this work is extrinsic to the essence of the monastic state. Christian monasticism has varied greatly in its external forms, but, broadly speaking, it has two main species (a) the eremitical or solitary, (b) the cenobitical or family types. St. Anthony (q. v.) may be called the founder of the first and St. Pachomius (q. v.) of the second.

(a) The Eremitical Type of Monasticism.—This way of life took its rise among the monks who settled around St. Anthony's mountain at Pispir and whom he organized and guided. In consequence it prevailed chiefly in northern Egypt from Lycopolis (Asyut) to the Mediterranean, but most of our information about it deals with Nitria and Scete. Cassian (q. v.) and Palladius (q. v.) give us full details of its working and from them we learn that the strictest hermits lived out of earshot of each other and only met together for Divine worship on Saturdays and Sundays, while others would meet daily and recite their psalms and hymns together in little companies of three or four. There was no Rule of Life among them but, as Palladius says, "they have different practices, each as he is able and as he wishes". The elders exercised an authority, but chiefly of a personal kind, their position and influence being in proportion to their reputation for greater wisdom. The monks would visit each other often and discourse, several together, on Holy Scripture and on the spiritual life. General conferences in which a large number took part were not uncommon. Gradually the purely eremitical life tended to die out (Cassian, "Conf.", xix) but a semi-eremitical form continued to be common for a long period, and has never ceased entirely either in East or West where the Carthusians and Camaldulese still practise it. It is needless here to trace its developments in detail as all its varieties are dealt with in special articles (see ANCHORITES; ANTHONY, ST.; ANTHONY, ORDERS OF ST.; CAMALDOLESE; CARTHUSIANS; HERMITS; LAURA; MONASTICISM, EASTERN; STYLITES OR PILLAR SAINTS; PAUL THE HERMIT, ST.).

(b) The Cenobitical Type of Monasticism.—This type began in Egypt at a somewhat later date than the eremitical form. It was about the year 318 that St. Pachomius, still a young man, founded his first monastery at Tabennisi near Denderah. The institute spread with surprising rapidity, and by the date of St. Pachomius's death (c. 345) it counted eight monasteries and several hundred monks. Most remarkable of all is the fact that it immediately took shape as a fully organized congregation or order, with a superior general, a system of visitations and general chapters, and all the machinery of a centralized government such as does not again appear in the monastic world until the rise of the Cistercians and Mendicant Orders some eight or nine centuries later. As regards internal organization the Pachomian monasteries had nothing of the family ideal. The numbers were too great for this and everything was done on a military or barrack system. In each monastery there were numerous separate houses, each with its own *præpositus*, cellarer, and other officials, the monks being grouped in these according to the particular trade they followed. Thus the fullers were gathered in one house, the carpenters in another, and so on; an arrangement the more desirable because in the Pachomian monasteries regular organized work was an integral part of the system, a feature in which it differed from the Antonian way of life. In point of austerity however the Antonian monks far surpassed the Pachomian, and so we find Bgoul and Schenutè endeavouring, in their great monastery at Athribis, to combine the cenobitical life of Tabennisi with the austerities of Nitria.

In the Pachomian monasteries it was left very much to the individual taste of each monk to fix the order of life for himself. Thus the hours for meals and the extent of his fasting were settled by him alone, he might eat with the others in common or have bread and salt provided in his own cell every day or every second day. The conception of the cenobitical life was modified considerably by St. Basil. In his monasteries a true community life was followed. It was no longer possible for each one to choose his own dinner hour. On the contrary, meals were in common, work was in common, prayer was in common seven times a day. In the matter of asceticism too all the monks were under the control of the superior whose sanction was required for all the austerities they might undertake. It was from these sources that western monachism took its rise; further information on them will be found in the articles BASIL THE GREAT, SAINT; BASIL, RULE OF SAINT; BENEDICT OF NURSIA, SAINT; PACHOMIUS, SAINT; PALLADIUS, SAINT.

(4) *Monastic Occupations.*—It has already been pointed out that the monk can adopt any kind of work so long as it is compatible with a life of prayer and renunciation. In the way of occupations therefore prayer must always take the first place.

(a) Monastic Prayer.—From the very outset it has been regarded as the monk's first duty to keep up the official prayer of the Church. To what extent the Divine office was stereotyped in St. Anthony's day need not be discussed here, but Palladius and Cassian both make it clear that the monks were in no way behind the rest of the world as regards their liturgical customs. The practice of celebrating the office apart, or in twos and threes, has been referred to above as common in the Antonian system, while the Pachomian monks performed many of the services in their separate houses, the whole community only assembling in the church for the more solemn offices, while the Antonian monks only met together on Saturdays and Sundays. Among the monks of Syria the night office was much longer than in Egypt (Cassian, "Instit.", II, ii; III, i, iv, viii) and new offices at different hours of the day were instituted. In prayer as in other matters St. Basil's legislation became the norm among Eastern monks, while in the west no changes of importance have taken place since St. Benedict's rule gradually eliminated all local customs. For the development of the Divine office into its present form see the articles, BREVIARY; HOURS, CANONICAL; and also the various "hours", e. g. MATINS; LAUDS, etc.; LITURGY, etc. In the east this solemn liturgical prayer remains to-day almost the sole active work of the monks, and, though in the west many other forms of activity have flourished, the *Opus Dei* or Divine Office has always been and still is regarded as the pre-eminent duty and occupation of the monk to which all other works, no matter how excellent in themselves, must give way, according to St. Benedict's principle (Reg. Ben., xliii) "Nihil operi Dei præponatur" (Let nothing take precedence of the work of God). Alongside the official liturgy, private prayer, especially mental prayer, has always held an important place; see PRAYER; CONTEMPLATIVE LIFE.

(b) Monastic Labours.—The first monks did comparatively little in the way of external labour. We hear of them weaving mats, making baskets and doing other work of a simple character which, while serving for their support, would not distract them from the continual contemplation of God. Under St. Pachomius manual labour was organized as an essential part of the monastic life; and, since it is a principle of the monks as distinguished from the mendicants, that the body shall be self-supporting, external work of one sort or another has been an inevitable part of the life ever since.

(i) Agriculture, of course, naturally ranked first among the various forms of external labour. The sites chosen by the monks for their retreat were usually in wild and inaccessible places, which were left to them precisely because they were uncultivated, and no one else cared to undertake the task of clearing them. The rugged valley of Subiaco, or the fens and marshes of Glastonbury may be cited as examples, but nearly all the most ancient monasteries are to be found in places then considered uninhabitable by all except the monks. Gradually forests were cleared and marshes drained, rivers were bridged and roads made; until, almost imperceptibly, the desert place became a farm or a garden. In the later Middle Ages, when the Black Monks were giving less time to agriculture, the Cistercians re-established the old order of things; and even to-day such monasteries as La Trappe de Staoueli in N. Africa, or New Nursia in W. Australia do identically the same work as was done by the monks a thousand years ago. "We owe the agricultural restoration of a great part of Europe to the monks" (Hallam, "Middle Ages", III, 436); "The Benedictine monks were the agriculturists of Europe" (Guizot, "Histoire de la Civilisation", II, 75); such testimony, which could be multiplied from writers of every creed, is enough for the purpose here (see CISTERCIANS).

(ii) Copying of MSS.—Even more important than their services to agriculture has been the work of the monastic orders in the preservation of ancient literature. In this respect too the results achieved went far beyond what was actually aimed at. The monks copied the Scriptures for their own use in the Church services and, when their cloisters developed into schools, as the march of events made it inevitable they should, they copied also such monuments of classical literature as were preserved. At first no doubt such work was solely utilitarian, even in St. Benedict's rule the instructions as to reading and study make it clear that these filled a very subordinate place in the disposition of the monastic life. Cassiodorus was the first to make the transcription of MSS. and the multiplication of books an organized and important branch of monastic labour, but his insistence in this direction influenced western monachism enormously and is in fact his chief claim to recognition as a legislator for

monks. It is not too much to say that we to-day are indebted to the labours of the monastic copyists for the preservation, not only of the Sacred Writings, but of practically all that survives to us of the secular literature of antiquity (see MANUSCRIPT; CLOISTER; SCRIPTORIUM).

(iii) Education.—At first no one became a monk before he was an adult, but very soon the custom began of receiving the young. Even infants in arms were dedicated to the monastic state by their parents (see Reg. Ben., lix) and in providing for the education of these child-monks the cloister inevitably developed into a schoolroom (see OBLATI). Nor was it long before the schools thus established began to include children not intended for the monastic state. Some writers have maintained that this step was not taken until the time of Charlemagne, but there is sufficient indication that such pupils existed at an earlier date, though the proportion of external scholars certainly increased largely at this time. The system of education followed was that known as the "Trivium" and "Quadrivium" (see ARTS, THE SEVEN LIBERAL), which was merely a development of that used during classical times.

The greater number of the larger monasteries in western Europe had a claustral school and not a few, of which St. Gall in Switzerland may be cited as an example, acquired a reputation which it is no exaggeration to call European. With the rise of the universities and the spread of the mendicant orders the monastic control of education came to an end, but the schools attached to the monasteries continued, and still continue to-day, to do no insignificant amount of educational work (see ARTS, THE SEVEN LIBERAL; CLOISTER; EDUCATION; SCHOOLS).

(iv) Architecture, painting, sculpture and metal work.—Of the first hermits many lived in caves, tombs, and deserted ruins, but from the outset the monk has been forced to be a builder. We have seen that the Pachomian system required buildings of elaborate plan and large accommodation, and the organized development of monastic life did not tend to simplify the buildings which enshrined it. Consequently skill in architecture was called for and so monastic architects were produced to meet the need in the same almost unconscious manner as were the monastic schoolmasters. During the medieval period the arts of painting, illuminating, sculpture, and goldsmiths' work were practised in the monasteries all over Europe and the output must have been simply enormous.

We have in the museums, churches, and elsewhere such countless examples of monastic skill in these arts that it is really difficult to realize that all this wealth of beautiful things forms only a small fraction of the total of artistic creation turned out century after century by these skilful and untiring craftsmen. Yet it is certainly true that what has perished by destruction, loss and decay would outweigh many times over the entire mass of medieval art work now in existence, and of this the larger portion was produced in the workshop of the cloister (see ARCHITECTURE; ECCLESIASTICAL ART; PAINTING; ILLUMINATION; RELIQUARY; SHRINE; SCULPTURE).

(v) Historical and patristic work.—As years passed by the great monastic corporations accumulated archives of the highest value for the history of the countries wherein they were situated. It was the custom too in many of the larger abbeys for an official chronicler to record the events of contemporary history. In more recent times the seed thus planted bore fruit in the many great works of erudition which have won for the monks such high praise from scholars of all classes. The Maurist Congregation of Benedictines (q. v.) which flourished in France during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was the supreme example of this type of monastic industry, but similar works on a less extensive scale have been undertaken in every country of western Europe by monks of all orders and congregations, and at the present time (1910) this output of solid scholarly work shows no signs whatever of diminution either in quality or quantity.

(vi) Missionary work.—Perhaps the mission field would seem a sphere little suited for monastic energies, but no idea could be more false. Mankind is proverbially imitative and so, to establish a Christianity where paganism once ruled, it is necessary to present not simply a code of morals, not the mere laws and regulations, nor even the theology of the Church, but an actual pattern of Christian society. Such a "working model" is found pre-eminently in the monastery, and so it is the monastic order which has proved itself the apostle of the nations in western Europe.

To mention a few instances of this—Saints Columba in Scotland, Augustine in England, Boniface in Germany, Ansgar in Scandinavia, Swithbert and Willibrord in the Netherlands, Rupert and Emmeran in what is now Austria, Adalbert in Bohemia, Gall and Columban in Switzerland, were monks who, by the example of a Christian society which they and their companions displayed, led the nations among whom they lived from paganism to Christianity and civilization. Nor did the monastic apostles stop at this point but, by remaining as a community and training their converts in the arts of peace, they established a society based on Gospel principles and firm with the stability of the Christian faith, in a way that no individual missionary, even the most devoted and saintly, has ever succeeded in doing.

It must be clearly understood however, that monasticism has never become stereotyped in practice, and that it would be quite false to hold up any single example as a supreme and perfect model. Monasticism is a living thing and consequently it must be informed with a principle of self motion and adaptability to its environment. Only one thing must always remain the same and that is the motive power which brought it into existence and has maintained it throughout the centuries, viz., the love of God and the desire to serve Him as perfectly as this life permits, leaving all things to follow after Christ.

Dictionnaire d'Ascéticisme; MIGNE, *Encyclopédie Théologique*, XLV, XLVI; A KEMPIS, *De Imitatione Christi;* ALLIES, *The Monastic Life*, vol. VIII of "The Formation of Christendom" (London, 1896); AMBROSE, ST., *De Virginibus: De Viduis: Epistolæ*, in *P. L.*, XIV–XVII; AMÉLINEAU, *Vie de Schnoudi* (Paris, 1888); IDEM, *Voyage d'un moine égyptien dans le désert* (Vienna, 1883); IDEM, *Essai sur l'évolution hist. et philos. des idées morales dans l'Egypte ancienne* (Paris, 1895); *Apophthegmata Patrum*, in *Verba Seniorum*, *P. L.*, LXV; AQUINAS, ST. THOMAS, tr. PROCTER, *The Religious State* (London, 1902); IDEM, tr. IDEM, *Apology for the Religious Orders* (London, 1902); ATHENAGORAS, *Legatio pro Christianis* in *P. G.*, VI; ATHANASIUS, ST., *Vita Antonii: Epistolæ*, *P. G.*, XXV–XXVIII; AUGUSTINE, ST., *De moribus Eccles. Cathol., Epistolæ: Enchiridion* in *P. L.*, XXXIV–XXXVII; BAKER, *Sancta Sophia* (London, 1876); BASIL, ST., *Epistolæ: Regula fusius tractata, Regula brevius tractata, De renuntiatione sæculi, Hexæmeron (prœmium), De Judicio; Constitutiones asceticæ* (N.B. The last named probably by Eustathius of Sebaste), *P. G.*, XXIX–XXXII; BEDE, VEN., *Vitæ SS. Abbatum* in *P. L.*, LXLV; BENEDICT, ST., *Regula*, *P. L.*, LXVI; BERNARD, ST., *De diligendo Deo: Epistolæ*, *P. L.*, CLXXXII–V; BINGHAM, *Antiquities* (London, 1865); BLOSIUS, *Opera Omnia* (Antwerp, 1632); BORNEMANN, *In investiganda monachatus origine quibus de causis ratio habenda sit Originis* (Göttingen, 1885); BRIGHT, *Some Aspects of primitive church life* (London, 1893); BUDGE, *Book of the Governors* (London, 1893); IDEM, *Paradise of the Holy Fathers* (2 vols., London, 1907); BUTLER, *Lausiac History of Palladius* (Cambridge, 1898); CÆSARIUS OF ARLES, ST., *Regula ad Virgines* in HOLSTEIN; CALMET, *Comment.* in *Reg. S. Benedicti* (Paris, 1734); CASSIAN (tr. GIBSON), *Institutes: Conferences* (Oxford, 1894); critical text ed., PETSCHENIG (Vienna, 1886, 1888); CASSIODORUS, *Opera* in *P. L.*, LXX; CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, ST., *Paidagogus: Stromata: quis dives salvetur* in *P. G.*, VIII, IX; COLUMBANUS, ST., *Regula : Pœnitentiale* in HOLSTEIN; CONYBEARE, *Philo about the contemplative life* (Oxford, 1895); IDEM, *Apology and Acts of Apollonius*, etc. (London, 1894); CYPRIAN, ST., *de habitu Virginum* in *P. L.*, IV; *Diognetus, Epistle to*, in *P. G.*, II; DOYLE, *Principles of the Monastic Life* (London, 1883); FEASEY, *Monasticism* (London, 1898); GASQUET, *English monastic life* (London, 1904); GREGORY, ST., *Dialogues: Epistles*, in *P. L.*, LXVI; GREGORY NAZIANZEN, ST., *Oration on Athanasius* in *P. G.*, XXXV–XXXVIII;

HAHN-HAHN, tr. BOWDEN, *The Fathers of the desert* (2 vols., London, 1867); HANNAY, *Spirit and Origin of Christian Monasticism* (London, 1903); IDEM, *The Wisdom of the Desert* (London, 1904); HARNACK, *Das Mönchtum, seine Ideale und seine Geschichte*, (Giessen, 1895); HUMFREY, *Elements of the Religious Life* (London, 1895); HOLSTEIN, *Codex Regularum* (2 vols., Rome, 1661); JEROME, ST., *Vita Pauli: Vita Hilarionis: Vita Malchi: Adv. Joh. Jerus.: Adv. Jovinian: De Viris illustrib.: Epsitolæ* in *P. L.*, XXII–XXX; KRANICH, *Die Ascetik in ihrer dogmatischen Grundlage bei Basilius dem Grossen* (Paderborn, 1896); KRÜGER, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1898); LECKY, *History of European Morals* (2 vols., London, 1869); L'HUILLIER, *Explication de la Règle de S. Benoît* (2 vols., Paris, 1901); LUCIUS, *Die Therapeuten* (Strasburg, 1880); MABILLON, *Acta SS. Ordinis S. Benedicti* (Paris, 1701); IDEM, *Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti* (Paris, 1703); METHODIUS, *Symposium decem virginum* in *P. G.*, XVIII; MONTALEMBERT, *Les Moines d'Occident* (7 vols. Paris, 1860), tr. with introd. by GASQUET (London, 1896); NEWMAN, *Historical Sketches* (3 vols., London, 1873); OZANAM, *History of Civilization in the Fifth century* (London, 1868); PREUSCHEN, *Palladius und Rufinus* (Giessen, 1897); PALLADIUS, *Historia Lausiaca*, ed. BUTLER (Cambridge, 1904); RAMSAY, *The Church in the Roman Empire* (London, 1895); RILEY, *Athos the mountain of the Monks* (London, 1887); ROSWEYD, *Vitæ Patrum* (Antwerp, 1628), mostly reprinted in *P. L.*, LXXIII–LXXIV; RUFINUS, *Historia Monachorum* in *P. L.*, XXI; IDEM, *Verba Seniorum* in ROSWEYD; IDEM, *Regula S. Basilii Ep.* in HOLSTEIN; SPREITZENHOFER, *Die Entwicklung des alten Mönchtums in Italien* (Vienna, 1894); IDEM, *Die Historischen Voraussetzung der Regel des Hl. Benedict* (Vienna, 1895); SUAREZ, tr. HUMFREY, *The Religious State* (3 vols., London, 1884); SMITH, *Rise of Christian Monasticism* (London, 1892); IDEM, *Characteristics of Christian Morality* (London, 1875); SULPICIUS SEVERUS, *Dialogues: Life of St. Martin* in *P. L.*, XX; WEINGARTEN, *Der Ursprung des Mönchtums* (Gotha, 1877); WEIZSACKER, tr. MILLER, *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church;* WOLTER, *Elementa Monastica* (Bruges, 1880); WOODHOUSE, *Monasticism, ancient and modern* (London, 1896); ZOCKLER, *Askese und Mönchtum* (Frankfort, 1897).

G. ROGER HUDDLESTON.

II. EASTERN MONASTICISM BEFORE CHALCEDON (A. D. 451).—Egypt was the Motherland of Christian monasticism. It sprang into existence there at the beginning of the fourth century and in a very few years spread over the whole Christian world. The rapidity of the movement was only equalled by the durability of its results. Within the lifetime of St. Anthony the religious state had become what it has been ever since, one of the characteristic features of the Catholic Church, with its ideals, and what may be termed the groundwork of its organization, determined. But this was not all. The simple teaching of the first Egyptian monks and hermits fixed once and forever the broad outlines of the science of the spiritual life, or, in other words, of ascetic theology. The study, therefore, of early monasticism possesses a great deal more than a merely antiquarian interest. It is concerned with a movement the force of which is in no way spent and which has had a very large share in creating the conditions which obtain at the present day.

The first chapter in the history of monasticism is the life of St. Anthony which has already been described (see ANTHONY, SAINT). The inauguration of the monastic movement may be dated either about 285, when St. Anthony, no longer content with the life of the ordinary ascetic, went into the wilderness, or about 305, when he organized a kind of monastic life for his disciples. *Ascetic* is the term usually employed by writers on monasticism for those who in pre-monastic days forsook the world so far as they were able. Of the three Evangelical counsels, chastity alone can be practised independently of external circumstances. Naturally, therefore (beginning with the sub-Apostolic age), we hear first of men and women leading the virgin life (cf. I Clem., xxxviii; Ignat., "ad Polycarp.", c. v; Hermas, "Sim.", IX, 30).

The Apologists pointed triumphantly to such (Justin, "Apol.", I, xv; Athenagoras, "Legat.", xxxiii; Minucius Felix, "Octav.", xxxi). Voluntary poverty, in the complete renunciation of all worldly possessions, would be difficult till there were monasteries, for persons with wealth to renounce would not, generally speaking, have been brought up so as to be capable of earning their own livelihood. Still we have the examples of Origen, St. Cyprian, and Pamphilus to show that the thing was done. A full practice of the last Evangelical counsel (obedience) could only be realized after the monastic ideal had taken root and passed beyond the purely eremitical stage. The ante-Nicene ascetic would be a man who led a single life, practised long and frequent fasts, abstained from flesh and wine, and supported himself, if he were able, by some small handicraft, keeping of what he earned only so much as was absolutely necessary for his own sustenance, and giving the rest to the poor. If he were an educated man, he might be employed by the Church in some such capacity as that of catechist. Very often he would don the kind of dress which marked its wearer off as a philosopher of an austere school.

In Egypt, at the time when St. Anthony first embraced the ascetic life, there were numbers of ascetics living in huts in the neighbourhood of the towns and villages. When St. Anthony died (356 or 357), two types of monasticism flourished in Egypt. There were villages or colonies of hermits—the eremitical type; and monasteries in which a community life was led—the cenobitic type. A brief survey of the opening chapters of Palladius's "Lausiac History" will serve as a description of the former type.

Palladius was a monk from Palestine who, in 388, went to Egypt to drink in the spirit of monasticism at the fountainhead. On landing at Alexandria he put himself in the hands of a priest named Isidore, who in early life had been a hermit at Nitria and now apparently presided over a hospice at Alexandria without in any way abating the austerity of his life. By the advice of Isidore, Palladius placed himself under the direction of a hermit named Dorotheus who lived six miles outside Alexandria, with whom he was to pass three years learning to subdue his passions and then to return to Isidore to receive higher spiritual knowledge. This Dorotheus spent the whole day collecting stones to build cells for other hermits, and the whole night weaving ropes out of palm leaves. He never lay down to sleep, though slumber sometimes overtook him while working or eating. Palladius, who seems to have lived in his cell, ascertained from other solitaries that this had been his custom from his youth upwards. Palladius's health broke down before he completed his time with Dorotheus, but he spent three years in Alexandria and its neighbourhood visiting the hermitages and becoming acquainted with about 2000 monks. From Alexandria he went to Nitria, where there was a monastic village containing about 5000 solitaries. There was no kind of monastic rule. Some of the solitaries lived alone, sometimes two or more lived together. They assembled at the church on Saturdays and Sundays. The church was served by eight priests of whom the oldest always celebrated, preached, and judged, the others only assisting. All worked at weaving flax. There were bakeries where bread was made, not only for the village itself, but for the solitaries who lived in the desert beyond. There were doctors. Wine also was sold.

Strangers were entertained in a guest-house. If able to read, they were lent a book. They might stay as long as they liked, but after a week they were set to some kind of work. If at the ninth hour a man stood and listened to the sound of psalmody issuing from the different cells, he would imagine, says Palladius, that he was caught up into paradise. But, though there was no monastic rule at Nitria, there was municipal law, the outward symbol of which was three whips suspended from three palm trees, one for monks who might be guilty of some fault, one for thieves who might be caught prowling about, and the third for strangers who misbehaved. Further into the desert was a place called Cells, or Cellia, whither the more perfect withdrew. This is described by the

author of the "Historia monachorum in Ægypto". Here the solitaries lived in cells so far apart that they were out out of sight and out of hearing of one another. Like those of Nitria, they met only on Saturdays and Sundays at church, whither some of them had to travel a distance of three or four miles. Often their death was only discovered by their absence from church.

In strong contrast with the individualism of the eremitical life was the rigid discipline which prevailed in the cenobitical monasteries founded by St. Pachomius. When, in 313, Constantine was at war with Maxentius, Pachomius, still a heathen, was forcibly enlisted together with a number of other young men, and placed on board a ship to be carried down the Nile to Alexandria. At some town at which the ship touched, the recruits were overwhelmed with the kindness of the Christians. Pachomius at once resolved to be a Christian and carried out his resolution as soon as he was dismissed from military service. He began as an ascetic in a small village, taking up his abode in a deserted temple of Serapis and cultivating a garden on the produce of which he lived and gave alms. The fact that Pachomius made an old temple of Serapis his abode was enough for an ingenious theory that he was originally a pagan monk. This view is now quite exploded.

Pachomius next embraced the eremitical life and prevailed upon an old hermit named Palemon to take him as his disciple and share his cell with him. It may be noted that this kind of discipleship, which, as we have already seen, was attempted by Palladius, was a recognized thing among the Egyptian hermits. Afterwards he left Palemon and founded his first monastery at Tabennisi near Denderah. Before he died, in 346, he had under him eight or nine large monasteries of men, and two of women. From a secular point of view, a Pachomian monastery was an industrial community in which almost every kind of trade was practised. This, of course, involved much buying and selling, so the monks had ships of their own on the Nile, which conveyed their agricultural produce and manufactured goods to the market and brought back what the monasteries required. From the spiritual point of view, the Pachomian monk was a religious living under a rule more severe, even when allowance has been made for differences of climate and race, than that of the Trappists.

A Pachomian monastery was a collection of buildings surrounded by a wall. The monks were distributed in houses, each house containing about forty monks. Three or four houses constituted a tribe. There would be from thirty to forty houses in a monastery. There was an abbot over each monastery, and provosts with subordinate officials over each house. The monks were divided into houses according to the work they were employed in: thus there would be a house for carpenters, a house for agriculturists, and so forth. But other principles of division seem to have been employed, e. g., we hear of a house for the Greeks. On Saturdays and Sundays all the monks assembled in the church for Mass; on other days the Office and other spiritual exercises were celebrated in the houses.

"The fundamental idea of St. Pachomius's Rule", writes Abbot Butler, "was to establish a moderate level of observance (moderate in comparison with the life led by the hermits) which might be obligatory on all; and then to leave it open to each—and to indeed encourage each—to go beyond the fixed minimum, according as he was prompted by his strength, his courage, and his zeal" ("Lausiac History", I, p. 236). This is strikingly illustrated in the rules concerning food. According to St. Jerome, in the preface to his translation of the "Rule of Pachomius", the tables were laid twice a day except on Wednesdays and Fridays, which, outside the seasons of Easter and Pentecost, were fast days. Some only took very little at the second meal; some at one or other of the meals confined themselves to a single food; others took just a morsel of bread. Some abstained altogether from the community meal; for these bread, water, and salt were placed in their cell.

Pachomius appointed his successor a monk named Petronius, who died within a few months, having likewise named his successor, Horsiesi. In Horsiesi's time the order was threatened with a schism. The abbot of one of the houses, instead of forwarding the produce of the work of his monks to the head house of the order, where it would be sold and the price distributed to the different houses according to their need, wished to have the disposal of it for the sole benefit of his own monastery. Horsiesi, finding himself unable to cope with the situation, appointed Theodore, a favourite disciple of Pachomius, his coadjutor.

When Theodore died, in the year 368, Horsiesi was able to resume the government of the order. This threatened schism brings prominently before us a feature connected with Pachomius's foundation which is never again met with in the East, and in the West only many centuries later. "Like Cîteaux in a later age", writes Abbot Butler, "it almost at once assumed the shape of a fully-organized congregation or order, with a superior general and a system of visitation and general chapters—in short, all the machinery of a centralized government, such as does not appear again in the monastic world until the Cistercian and the Mendicant Orders arose in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries" (op. cit., I, 235).

A word must be said about Schenoudi, or Schnoudi, or Senuti. Shortly after the middle of the fourth century, two monks, Pgol and Pschais, changed their eremitical monasteries into cenobitical ones. Of the latter we know scarcely anything. Schenoudi, when a boy of about nine years old, came under the care of his uncle Pgol. Both Pgol and Schenoudi were reformers—the Pachomian Rule was not strict enough for them.

Schenoudi succeeded his uncle Pgol as head of the White Monastery of Athribis and, till his death (about 453), was not only the greatest monastic leader, but one of the most important men, in Egypt. He waged war against heretics; he took a prominent part in the rooting out of paganism; he championed the cause of the poor against the rich. He once went in person to Constantinople to complain of the tyranny of government officials. On one occasion 20,000 men, women, and children took refuge in the White Monastery during an invasion of the savage Blemmyes of Ethiopia, and Schenoudi maintained all the fugitives for three months, providing them with food and medical aid. On another occasion he ransomed a hundred captives and sent them home with food, clothing, and money for their journey (Leipoldt, "Schenute von Atripe", 172, 173). Schenoudi's importance for the history of monasticism is small, for his influence, great as it was in his own country, did not make itself felt elsewhere. There were two barriers: Upper Egypt was a difficult and dangerous country for travellers, and such as did penetrate there would not be likely to visit a monastery where hardly anything but Coptic was spoken. According to Abbot Butler, "Schenoudi is never named by any Greek or Latin writer" (op. cit., II, 204). He has been rediscovered in our own time in Coptic MSS. A description of the ruins of the White Monastery will be found in Curzon's "Monasteries of the Levant", ch. xi. There are photographs of the outer wall and the ruins of the church in Milne's "Hist. of Egypt under Roman Rule".

In part II of Butler's "Lausiac History" is a map of Monastic Egypt. A glance at this map and

the notes accompanying it brings forcibly before the mind an important fact in monastic history. With the exception of a single Pachomian monastery at Canopus, near Alexandria, the cenobitic monasteries are in the South, and confined to a relatively small area. The eremitical monasteries, on the contrary, are everywhere, and especially in the North. These latter were thus far more accessible to pilgrims visiting Egypt and so became the patterns or models for the rest of the Christian world. It was the eremitical, not the cenobitical, type of monasticism which went forth from Egypt.

Monasticism at a very early date spread along the route of the Exodus and the desert of the Forty Years' Wandering. The solitaries had a special predilection for Scriptural sites. At every place hallowed by tradition, which Sylvia visited (A. D. 385), she found monks. The attraction of Mt. Sinai for the solitaries was irresistible, in spite of the danger of captivity or death at the hands of the Saracens. In 373 a number of solitaries inhabited this mountain, living on dates and other fruit, such bread as they had being reserved for the Sacred Mysteries. All the week they lived apart in their cells; they gathered together in the church on Saturday evening and, after spending the night in prayer, received communion on Sunday morning. Forty of them were massacred in 373, and on the same day another group of solitaries at Raithe (supposed to be Elim) were killed by a second band of barbarians. These events were described by eye-witnesses (Tillemont, "H. E.", VII, 573–80). The same kind of life was being led at Mt. Sinai, and a similar experience was undergone some twenty years later when St. Nilus was there.

St. Hilarion, who for a time had been a disciple of St. Anthony, propagated monasticism of the eremitical type first in the neighbourhood of his native city Gaza and then in Cyprus. His friend St. Epiphanius, after practising the monastic life in Egypt, founded a monastery near Eleutheropolis in Palestine somewhere about 330 or perhaps a little later.

In Jerusalem and its neighbourhood there were numerous monasteries at a very early date. To name only a few, there was the monastery on the Mount of Olives, from which Palladius went forth on his tour of the Egyptian monasteries; there were two monasteries for women in Jerusalem, built by the older and younger Melania respectively. At Bethlehem St. Paula founded three monasteries for women and one for men about A. D. 387. There was, besides, in Bethlehem the monastery where Cassian some years before began his religious life. The lauras, which were very numerous, formed a conspicuous feature in Palestinian monasticism. The first seems to have been founded before 334 by St. Chariton at Pharan, a few miles from Jerusalem; later on, two more were founded by the same saint at Jericho and at Suca.

St. Euthymius (473) founded another celebrated one in the Valley of Cedron. Near Jericho was the laura ruled over by St. Gerasimus (475). Some details concerning the rule of this laura have fortunately been preserved in a very ancient Life of St. Euthymius. It consisted of a cenobium where the cenobitic life was practised by novices and others less proficient. There were also seventy cells for solitaries. Five days in the week these latter lived and worked alone in their cells. On Saturday they brought their work to the cenobium, where, after receiving Holy Communion on Sundays, they partook of some cooked food and a little wine. The rest of the week their fare was bread, dates, and water. When some of them asked to be allowed to heat some water, that they might cook some food, and to have a lamp to read by, they were told that if they wished to live thus they had better take up their abode in the cenobium (Acta SS., March, I, 386–87).

Antioch, when St. John Chrysostom was a young man, was full of ascetics and the neighbouring mountains were peopled with hermits. So great was the impulse driving men to the solitary life that at one time there was an outcry, amounting almost to a persecution, among Christians as well as pagans against those who embraced it. This was the occasion of St. Chrysostom's treatise against the opponents of monasticism: in the first book he dwelt upon the guilt incurred by them; the second and third were addressed respectively to a pagan and a Christian father who were opposing the wish of their sons to embrace the monastic state. The pathetic scene between the saint and his mother, which he describes in the beginning of the "De sacerdotio", must be typical of what took place in many Christian homes. He himself so far yielded to his mother's entreaties that he contented himself with the ascetic life at home till her death. Palestine and Antioch must suffice as examples of the rapid spread of monasticism outside of Egypt. There is abundant evidence of the same phenomenon in all the countries between the Mediterranean and Mesopotamia; and Mesopotamia, according to St. Jerome, whose testimony is amply borne out by other writers, rivalled Egypt itself in the number and holiness of its monks (Comm. in Isaiam, V, xix).

We now come to a name second only in importance to St. Anthony's for the history of eastern monasticism. St. Basil the Great before embracing the monastic state made a careful study of monasticism in Egypt, Palestine, Cœlesyria, and Mesopotamia. The result was a decided preference for the cenobitical life. He founded several monasteries in Pontus, over one of which he himself for a time presided, and very soon monasteries, modelled after his, spread over the East. His monks assembled together for "psalmody" and "genuflexions" seven times a day, in accordance with the Psalmist's "Septies in die laudem dixi tibi" (Ps. cxviii, 164): at midnight ("Media nocte surgebam"—Ibid., 62), at evening, morning, and midday (Ps. lv, 18), at the third hour, the hour of Pentecost, and at the ninth, the sacred hour of the Passion. To complete the tale of seven, the midday prayer was divided into two parts separated by the community meal (Sermo "Asceticus", Benedictine edition, II, 321). St. Basil's monastic ideal is set forth in a collection of his writings known as the "Asceticon", or "Ascetica", the most important of which are the "Regulæ fusius tractatæ", a series of answers to questions, fifty-five in number, and the "Regulæ brevius tractatæ", in which three hundred and thirteen questions are briefly replied to. It must not be supposed that the "Regulæ" form a rule, though it would be possible to go a good way towards constituting one out of them They are answers to questions which would naturally arise among persons already in possession of a framework of customs or traditions. Sometimes they treat of practical questions, but as often as not they deal with matters concerning the spiritual life. What is on the whole a good description of them will be found in Smith and Cheetham, "Dict. of Christ. Antiquities", II, 1233 sqq.

It would not be easy to exaggerate St. Basil's influence upon eastern monasticism: he furnished the type which ultimately prevailed. But two points of the utmost importance, as marking the difference between Eastern and Western monasteries, must be kept in mind. (1) He did not draw up a rule, but gave, what is far more an elastic thing, a model or pattern. (2) He was not the founder of a religious order. No Eastern, except St. Pachomius, ever was. An order, as we understand the term, is a purely Western product. "It is not enough", says a writer who cer-

tainly does not underrate St. Basil's influence, "to affirm that the Basilian Order is a myth. One must go further and give up calling the Byzantine monks Basilians. Those most concerned have never taken to themselves this title, and no Eastern writer that I know of has ever bestowed it upon them" (Pargoire in "Dict. d'Archéologie chrétienne", s. v. "Basile"). In a word, every monastery is an order of its own. With St. Basil Eastern monasticism reached its final stage—communities of monks leading the contemplative life and devoting themselves wholly to prayer and work. The cenobitical life steadily became the normal form of the religious calling, and the eremitical one the exceptional form, requiring a long previous training.

We must now speak of the grounds upon which St. Basil based his decision—a decision so momentous for the future history of monasticism—in favour of the cenobitical life. Life with others is more expedient because, in the first place, even for the supply of their bodily needs, men depend upon one another. Further, there is the law of charity. The solitary has only himself to regard; yet "charity seeks not itself".

Again, the solitary will not equally discover his faults, there being no one to correct him with meekness and mercy. There are precepts of charity which can only be fulfilled in the cenobitical life. The gifts of the Holy Spirit are not all given to all men, but one is given to one man and another to another. We cannot be partakers in the gifts not bestowed on ourselves if we live by ourselves. The great danger to the solitary is self-complacency; he is not put to the test, so that he is unable to learn his faults or his progress. How can he learn humility when there is no one to prefer before himself? Or patience when there is no one to yield to? Whose feet shall he wash? To whom shall he be as a servant? (Reg. fus. tract., Q. vii.) This condemnation of the eremitical life is interesting because of what might almost be called its tameness. One would expect at least a lurid picture of the dangers which the solitary ran, delusions, melancholy culminating in despair, terrible moral and spiritual falls, the abandonment of the religious calling for the life of vice, and so forth. But instead of such things we have little more than what amounts to disadvantages and the risk of somewhat flat and commonplace kinds of failure, against which the common life afforded the best protection. Clearly St. Basil found very little that was tragic during the two years he was investigating monasticism in Egypt, Mesopotamia, and elsewhere.

It might be supposed that so uncompromising a verdict against the eremitical life would stir up a fierce conflict. As a matter of fact, it did nothing of the kind. Palestine, towards the end of the fourth century, began to supersede Egypt as the centre of monasticism, and in Palestine the laura and the cenobium were in perfect harmony. That of St. Gerasimus, with its cenobium already referred to, may be taken as a typical example. St. Basil's authority was equal to St. Anthony's among the leaders of Palestinian monasticism; yet they took it as a matter of course that life in the laura was the most perfect, though under ordinary circumstances it should not be entered upon before an apprenticeship had been served in a cenobium. The paradox is not so great as it may at first sight appear. The dweller in the laura was under an archimandrite or abbot and so was not exposed to the dangers of the purely eremitical state. (A number of passages from the Lives of St. Euthymius, St. Theodosius, and others bearing upon the above subject have been brought together by Holl, "Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim Griechischen Möncthum", Leipzig, pp. 172 sqq.)

At the Council of Chalcedon, monasticism had so become a recognized part of the life of the Church that it was especially legislated for. Monasteries were not to be erected without the leave of the bishop; monks were to receive due honour, but were not to mix themselves up with the affairs of Church or State. They were to be subject to the bishop, etc. (can. iv). Clerics and monks were not to serve in war or embrace a secular life (can. vii). Monasteries were not to be secularized (can. xxiv).

Solitary spots, according to St. Basil, should be chosen as sites for monasteries. Nevertheless, they soon found their way into cities. According to Marin ("Les Moines de Constantinople", Paris, 1897, 330–898), at least fifteen monasteries were founded at Constantinople in the time of Constantine the Great; but Besse (Les Moines d'Orient, 18) affirms that the three most ancient ones only dated back to the time of Theodosius (375–95). In 518 there were at least fifty-four monasteries in Constantinople. Their names and those of their rulers are given in a petition addressed by the monks of Constantinople to Pope Hormisdas in 518 (Martin, ibid., 18).

For Egyptian monasticism, not only are the original sources far superior to those for early Monasticism elsewhere, but the subject has been more thoroughly investigated. The most important work that has appeared in recent times is BUTLER, *The Lausiac History of Palladius* in *Cambridge Texts and Studies*, VI, (first part, 1898; second part, 1904). Other important works are LADEUZE, *Etude sur le cénobitisme Pakhomien pendant le IV^e siècle et la première moitié du V^e* (Louvain and Paris, 1898); SCHIEWIETZ, *Das morgenlandische Mönchthum*, I (Mainz, 1904); LEIPOLDT, *Schenute von Atripe* (Leipzig, 1903) in *Texte und Untersuch.* (new series), XI (Leipzig, 1903). Ladeuze gives an exhaustive study of the documents upon which our knowledge of Pachomius and Schenoudi are based. Schiewietz treats of (1) Christian asceticism in the first three centuries and (2) Egyptian monasticism in the fourth; he omits Schenoudi altogether. A very important point of difference between Ladeuze and Schiewietz on the one hand, and Butler on the other, is the unfavourable estimate formed by the first two and the favourable one by the last of Palladius's account of the Pachomian monasticism. Classifications and appreciations of the original sources will be found in BUTLER, *op. cit.*, pt. I, 196 sqq.; pt. II, p. xii. The most valuable, now that th text has been restored by Butler, is the *Lausiac History of Palladius* (see above). What used to pass for Palladius was a text very much interpolated with the *Historia monachorum in Ægypto*, an account of information gathered by seven monks of Palestine who visited Egypt in 394–95, written by one of them. The Greek text was printed for the first time by PREUSCHEN, *Palladius und Rufinus* (Giessen, 1897). Till 1897 it was only known in the Latin version of Rufinus, which was supposed to be the original. As the experiences narrated do not square with the facts of Rufinus's Life, this supposition reduced it to the level of an historical romance. Butler has proved, or nearly proved, that the Greek is the original and thus restored the work to its proper place as a genuine record. He has done the same for the *Lausiac Hist.* by recovering the uninterpolated text. *The Institutes and Conferences* of Cassian are also records based upon personal knowledge (see art. CASSIAN, JOHN). For Pachomian monasticism the chief authorities are the Greek Life of Pachomius; PACHOMIUS, *Asceticum*, known also as the *Paralipomena;* the *Epistola Ammonis* on Theodore (all to be found in ACTA SS., May, I); and St. Jerome's translation of the Rule. A number of Coptic and Arabic MSS. concerning Egyptian monasticism have been published of late years chiefly by AMÉLINEAU, for which we must refer the reader to the bibliography at the end of LADEUZE, *op. cit.*, and to LEIPOLDT, *op. cit.* An English translation of Syriac versions of the Lausiac History, the *Asceticum*, and the *Hist. Monach.* (there attributed to St. Jerome) will be found in vol. I of BUDGE, *Paradise of the Fathers* (London, 1907). For Palladius, references to the corresponding Greek text of Butler will be found on pp. xxxiii, xxxiv.

For non-Egyptian Eastern monasticism, the chief sources are the Lives, when authentic, of individual monks and hermits; ST. THEODORET, *De vitis patrum;* certain writings of ST. BASIL, ST. JEROME, ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, ST. EPIPHANIUS, ST. EPHREM SYRUS, ST. HILUS, etc.; the historians SOCRATES and SOZOMEN. Among older books dealing with the subject TILLEMONT's *Mémoires* is perhaps the most indispensable. MARIN, *Vies des Pères des déserts d'Orient* (9 vols., Paris, 1824), gives copious quotations from the original sources. The only important modern work upon Eastern Monasticism as a whole seems to be BESSE, *Les moines d'Orient antérieurs au concile Chalcédoine* (451) (Louvain, 4001)

FRANCIS JOSEPH BACCHUS.

III. EASTERN MONASTICISM.—(1) *Origin.*—The first home of Christian monasticism is the Egyptian desert. Hither during persecution men fled the world and the danger of apostasy, to serve God in solitude. St. Anthony (270–356) is counted the father of all monks. His fame attracted many others, so that under Diocletian and Constantine there were large colonies of monks in

Egypt, the first λαῦραι. St. Athanasius's (d. 373) friendly relations to the Egyptian monks and the refuge he found among them during his second (356–362) and third (362–363) exiles are well known incidents of his life. The monks lived each in his own hut, providing for their simple needs with their own hands, united by a bond of willing submission to the direction of some older and more experienced hermit, coming together on Saturday and Sunday for common prayer, otherwise spending their time in private contemplation and works of penance. Celibacy was from the beginning an essential note of monasticism. A wife and family were part of the "world" they had left.

Poverty and obedience were to some extent relative, though the ideal of both was developing. The monk of the desert was not necessarily a priest; he formed a different class from the clergy who stayed in the world and assisted the bishops. For a long time this difference between monks and clergy remained; the monk fled all intercourse with other people to save his soul away from temptation. Later some monks were ordained priests in order to administer sacraments to their brethren. But even now in the East the priest-monk (ἱερομόναχος) is a special person distinct from the usual monk (μόναχος), who is a layman.

St. Anthony's scarcely less famous disciple Pachomius (d. 345) is believed to have begun the organization of the hermits in groups, "folds" (μάνδραι) with stricter subjection to a leader (ἀρχιμανδρίτης); but the organization was vague. Monasticism was still a manner of life rather than affiliation to an organized body; any one who left wife and family and the "world" to seek peace away from men was a monk. Two codified "Rules" are attributed to Pachomius; of these the longer is translated into Latin by St. Jerome, a second and shorter one is in Palladius, "Hist. Lausiaca" XXXVIII. Sozomenos gives a compendium of the "Rule of Pachomius" (H. E., III, xiv). Neither of these rules is authentic, but they may well contain maxims and principles that go back to his time, mixed with later ones. They are already considerably advanced towards a regulated monastic life. They order uniformity in dress, obedience to a superior, prayers and meals at fixed times in common; they regulate both ascetic practices and handwork.

About the same time as St. Anthony in Egypt, Hilarion flourished at Gaza in Palestine (see St. Jerome, "Life of St. Hilarion" in P. L., XXIII, 29–54). He stands at the head of West Syrian monasticism. In the middle of the fourth century Aphraates speaks of monks in East Syria (Wright, "The Homilies of Aphraates", London, 1869, I, Hom. 6 and 18). At the same time we hear of them in Armenia, Pontus, and Cappadocia. Epiphanius, for instance, who in 367 became Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus, had been for thirty years a monk in Palestine. At the time of St. Basil (330–379), therefore, there were already monks all over the East. As soon as he was baptized (357) he determined to be a monk himself; he spent two years travelling "to Alexandria, through Egypt, in Palestine, Syria, and Mesopotamia" (Ep. 223), studying the life of the monks. Then in 358 he formed the community at Annesos in Pontus that was to be in some sort a new point of departure for Eastern monasticism. He describes the life at Annesos in a letter to St. Gregory Nazianzen (Ep. 2). Its principles are codified in various ascetic works by him, of which the chief are the two "Rules", the longer (Ὅροι κατὰ πλάτος, P. G., XXXI, 905–1052) and the shorter (Ὅροι κατ' ἐπιτομήν, ib., 1051–1306). (See BASIL, RULE OF SAINT.)

(2) *To the great Schism.*—Gradually nearly all Eastern monasteries accepted the Rules of St. Basil. Their inner organization evolved a hierarchy of officials among whom the various offices were distributed; the prayers, meals, work, punishments were portioned out according to the ascetic works of St. Basil, and so the whole monastery arrived at a working order.

That order obtains still. In its inner life Eastern monasticism has been extraordinarily stationary. There is practically no development to describe. Its history from the fourth century down to our own time is only a chronicle of the founding and endowment of new monasteries, of the part taken by monks in the great religious controversies and in one or two controversies of their own, of the emperors, empresses, patriarchs, and other great persons who, freely or under compulsion, ended their career in the world by retiring to a monastery. Two ideas that constantly recur in Eastern theology are that the monastic state is that of Christian perfection and also a state of penance. Eusebius (d. c. 340) in his "Demonstratio evangelica" distinguishes the two kinds of life of a Christian, the less perfect life in the world and the perfect life of monks.

The idea recurs continually. Monks lead the "angelic life", their dress is the "angelic habit"; like the angels they neither marry nor give in marriage, and like them the chief object of their existence is to sing the praises of God (in the Divine office). Not incompatible with this is the other idea, found in St. Basil and many others, that their state is one of penance (μετάνοια). Symeon of Thessalonica (d. 1429) counts the monks simply as "penitents" (μετανοοῦντες). The most perfect life on earth, namely, is that of a man who obeys the command to "do penance, for the Kingdom of Heaven is nigh".

The organization and life of a Byzantine monastery before the schism is known to us by the decrees affecting it made by various councils, laws in the "Corpus iuris" (in the "Codex" and the "Novellæ"), the lives of eminent monks, of which the "Synaxarion" has preserved not a few, and especially by the ascetic writings of monks, letters, sermons, and so on, in which they give advice to their colleagues. Of such monastic writers St. John Damascene (d. c. 754), George Hamartolos (ninth century), and especially St. Theodore of Studion (d. 826) are perhaps the most valuable for this purpose. At the head of each independent monastery (λαῦρα is the common name in Greek) was the superior. At first (e. g., by Justinian: "Nov.", V, vii; CXXIII, v and xxxiv) he is called indifferently ἀββᾶς, ἀρχιμανδρίτης, ἡγούμενος. Later the common name is ἡγούμενος only. The archimandrite has become a person of superior rank and takes precedence of a hegumenos. Goar thinks that archimandrite meant the superior of a patriarchal monastery, that is, one immediately subject to the patriarch and independent of the jurisdiction of the ordinary. The title then would correspond to that of the Western "Abbas nullius".

Marin (Les Moines de Constantinople, pp. 87–90), admitting this, demonstrates from examples that there was an intermediate period (from about the sixth to the ninth centuries) during which the title archimandrite was given as a purely personal honour to certain hegumenoi without involving any exemption for the monastery. A further precedence belonged to a "great archimandrite". The election and rights of the hegumenos are described by St. Basil in his two Rules, by Justinian (Novel., CXXIII, xxxiv), and Theodore of Studion (Testamentum, in P. G., XCIX, 1817–1818). He was elected by the monks by a majority of votes; in cases of dispute the patriarch or ordinary decided; sometimes lots were cast. He was to be chosen for his merit, not according to the time he had already spent in the monastery, and should be sufficiently learned to know the canons. The patriarch or bishop must confirm the election and institute the hegumenos. But the emperor received him in audience and gave him a pastoral staff (the

ῥάβδος). The ceremony of induction is given in the "Euchologion" (Goar's edition, Venice, 1730, 395–396). He then remained abbot for life, except in the event of his being deposed, after trial, for some canonical offence.

The hegumenos had absolute authority over all his monks, could receive novices and inflict punishments; but he was bound always by the rule of St. Basil and the canons, and he had to consult a committee of the more experienced monks in all cases of difficulty. This committee was the *σύναξις* that in many ways limited the autocracy of the superior (St. Basil's Rule, P. G., XXXI, 1037). The hegumenos in the Byzantine time, after Justinian, was generally, but not quite always, a priest. He received the confessions of his monks [there are instances of those who were not priests usurping this office (Marin, op. cit., 96)] and could ordain them to minor Orders, including the subdiaconate. Under the abbot there was a hierarchy of other officials, more or less numerous according to the size of the laura. The *δευτερεύων* took his place in case of his absence or sickness, the *οἰκονόμος* had charge of all the property, the *κελλάριος* looked after the food, the *ἐπιστημόναρχος* saw to the regular performance of services in the church, the *κανονάρχης* guided the singers during the Divine office. These officials, who usually formed the synaxis, acted as a restraint on the authority of the hegumenos. Numerous lesser offices, as those of infirmarian, guest-master, porter, cook, and so on, were divided among the community. The monks were divided into three orders, novices, those who bear the lesser habit and those who have the great habit. Children (the Council in Trullo of 692 admits profession as valid after the age of ten years), married men (if their wives are willing), even slaves who are badly treated by their masters or in danger of losing their faith, could be received as novices. Justinian ordered novices to wear lay clothes (Novel., V, ii), but soon the custom was introduced that after a probation of about six months (while they were postulants) they should have their hair cut (tonsure) and receive a tunic (*χιτών*) and the tall cap called *καλιμαύχιον*. The service for this first clothing is in the "Euchologion" (Goar, pp. 378–380).

Blessed Trinity (Hagia Triada) Monastery, Meteora, Thessaly

After three years' noviceship the monk received the lesser habit or *mandyas* (*τὸ μικρὸν σχῆμα, μανδύας*). He is again tonsured in the form of a cross, receives a new tunic, belt, cap, sandals, and the monastic cloak (*μανδύας*). For the rite, see Goar, pp. 382–389. The mandyas is the "angelic habit" that makes him a true monk; it is at this service that he makes his vows. An older form of the "sacrament of monastic perfection" (*μυστήριον μοναχικῆς τελειώσεως*), that is, of the profession and reception of a monk, is given by Dionysius Areopagita (c. 500), "de Eccles. Hierarch.", VI, ii (P. G., III, 533). The monk is "ordained" by a priest (*ἱερεύς*; he always calls bishops *ἱεράρχαι*), presumably the abbot. Standing he recites the "monastic invocation" (*τὴν μοναστικὴν ἐπίκλησιν*), evidently a prayer for the grace he needs. The priest then asks him if he renounces everything, explains to him the duties of his state, signs him with the cross, tonsures him and clothes him in the habit, finally celebrates the holy Liturgy, and gives him Communion. From the time of his profession the monk remains inseparably attached to the monastery. Besides the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience he makes a vow of perseverance in the religious exercises of the particular *laura* he has chosen. Normally he can no more change to another than go back to the world. He should moreover never go out at all. In theory all monks are "enclosed" (St. Basil, P. G., XXXI, 635-636); but this rule has never been taken very literally. Monks travelled about, with the consent of their superiors and with the excuse that they were engaged in business of the laura or of the Church in general.

But there still remained a further step. After having proved their perseverance for some years monks were accustomed to ask, as a reward for their advancement in the ascetic life, for the "great habit" (*τὸ μέγα καὶ ἀγγελικὸν σχῆμα*). This was simply a larger and more dignified cloak, suitable for the veterans of the monastery. Gradually its reception became a regular ceremony and the wearers of the great habit began to form a superior class, the aristocracy of the laura. St. Theodore of Studion objected strongly to this distinction: "As there is only one baptism", he says, "so is there only one habit" (P.G., XCIX, 1819). It is true that there is no real place for such a higher rank in the monastic system. At the reception of the first habit the monk makes his solemn vows for life and becomes a full monk in every sense. However, in spite of opposition, the custom grew. The imposition of the great habit repeats very much the ceremony of the lesser one and forms a kind of renewal of vows (Goar, 403–414); it is from the older monks who have gone through this rite and are honourably distinguished by their long cloaks that the dignitaries of the laura are chosen. Another gradual development was the formation of a class of priest-monks. At first no monks received any ordination; then one or two were made priests to administer sacraments to the others, then later it became common to ordain a monk priest. But it has never become the rule that all choir-monks should be ordained, as it became in the West. On entering monasteries people changed their name. The monk was to abstain from flesh-meat always; his food was fruit and vegetables and on feast-days fish, eggs, milk, and cheese. Wine was allowed. The chief meal, the only full meal in the day, was served at the sixth hour (midday); on the frequent fast-days, including every Wednesday and Friday and the four fasting-times, it was put off till the ninth hour. Later in the evening, after the *ἀπόδειπνον* (compline), the remains of the meal were again spread in the refectory and any who wished, chiefly the younger members, might partake of a light supper (cf. Marin, op. cit., p. 121).

The monk's main occupation was the daily chanting of the long Byzantine office in church. This took up a great part of the day and the night. There were moreover the *ὁλονυκτικά* offices, which on the eves of great feasts lasted all night. The rest of the time was spent in manual work, digging, carpentry, weaving,

and so on, portioned out to each by the abbot, of which the profit belonged to the monastery (St. Basil, P. G., XXXI, 1016, 1017, 1132, etc.; Marin, op. cit., 132–135). Men who already know an innocent and profitable craft may continue to exercise it as monks. Some practised medicine for the good of the community. Nor were the study of theology and the arts of calligraphy and painting neglected. Monasteries had libraries, and monks wrote theological works and hymns. In St. Theodore's time the Studion monastery was famous for its library and the beautiful handwriting of its monks (Theodore, "Orat.", XI, 16; in P. G., XCIX). There was a scale of punishments ranging from special fasts and prayers or the *ἀπευλογία* —that is, privation of the abbot's blessing—to the *ἀφορισμός* or solitary confinement and excommunication from all common prayers and the sacraments. The punishment for fornication was excommunication for fifteen years (cf. the "Epitimia" ascribed to St. Basil in M. P., XXXI, 1305–1314). A monk who had proved his constancy for many years in the community could receive permission from the hegumenos to practise the severer life of a hermit. He then went to occupy a solitary cell near the laura (St. Basil's Rule, P. G., XXXI, 1133). But he was still counted a member of the monastery and could return to it if he found solitude too hard. At the court of the Patriarch of Constantinople was an official, the Exarch of the monks, whose duty it was to supervise the monasteries. Most other bishops had a similar assistant among their clergy.

Celibacy became an ideal for the clergy in the East gradually, as it did in the West. In the fourth century we still find St. Gregory Nazianzen's father, who was Bishop of Nazianzos, living with his wife, without scandal. But very soon after that the present Eastern rule obtained. It is less strict than in the West. No one may marry after he has been ordained priest (Paphnutius at the first Council of Nicæa maintains this; see the discussion in Hefele-Leclercq, "Histoire des Conciles", Paris, 1907, I, pp. 620–624; the first Canon of the Synod of Neocæsarea in 314 or 325, ib., p. 327, and Can. Apost., xxvi. The Synod of Elvira about 300 had decreed absolute celibacy for all clerks in the West, Can. xxxiii, ib., pp. 238–239); priests already married may keep their wives (the same law applied to deacons and subdeacons: Can. vi of the Synod in Trullo, 692; see "Echos d'Orient", 1900–1901, pp. 65–71), but bishops must be celibate. As nearly all secular priests were married this meant that, as a general rule, bishops were chosen from the monasteries, and so these became, as they still are, the road through which advancement may be attained. Besides the communities in monasteries there were many extraordinary developments of monasticism. There were always hermits who practised various extreme forms of asceticism, such as binding tight ropes round their bodies, very severe fasting, and so on. A singular form of asceticism was that of the Stylites (*στυλῖται*), who lived on columns. St. Symeon Stylites (q. v.) began this practice in 420.

From the time of Constantine the building and endowment of monasteries became a form of good work adopted by very many rich people. Constantine and Helen set the example and almost every emperor afterwards (except Julian) followed it (Marin, "Les moines de Constantinople", chap. i). So monasteries grew up all over the empire. Constantinople especially was covered with them (see the list, ib., 23–25). One of the chief of these was Studion (*Στούδιον*) in the south-western angle of the city, founded by a Roman, Studius, in 462 or 463. It was occupied by so-called "sleepless" (*ἀκοίμητοι*) monks who, divided into companies, kept an unceasing round of prayer and psalm-singing day and night in their church. But they were not a separate order; there was no distinction between various religious orders. St. Theodore, the great defender of images in the second Iconoclast persecution, became Hegumenos of Studion in 799 (till his death in 826). His letters, sermons and constitutions for the Studite monks gave renewed ideals and influenced all Byzantine monasticism. During this period a great number of decrees of synods, ordinances of patriarchs, emperors, and abbots, further defined and expanded the rule of St. Basil. Many Eastern synods draw up among their canons laws for monks, often merely enforcing the old rule (e. g. the Synod of Gangres in the middle of the fourth century, Can., xix, etc.). St. John Chrysostom (cf. Montalembert, "Histoire des Moines d'Occident", Paris, 1880, I, 124), the Patriarch John the Faster (d. 595: Pitra, "Spicilegium Solesmense", Paris, 1852, IV, 416–444), the Patriarch Nicephoros (d. 829: ib., 381, 415), and so on, down to Photius (Hergenröther, "Photius", Ratisbon, 1867, II, 222–223), added to these rules, which, collected and commented in the various constitutions and *typika* of the monasteries, remain the guide of a Byzantine monk. Most of all, St. Theodore's "Constitutions of Studion" (P. G., XCIX, 1703–1720) and his list of punishments for monks (ib., 1734–1758) represent a classical and much copied example of such a collection of rules and principles from approved sources. St. Basil's mother and sister had formed a community of women at Annesos near the settlement of the men. From that time convents of nuns spread throughout the Byzantine Church, organized according to the same rule and following the same life as that of the monks with whatever modifications were necessary for their sex. The convents were subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop or patriarch. Their spiritual needs were provided for by a priest, generally a priest-monk, who was their "ghostly father" (*πνευματικὸς πατήρ*). The abbess was called *ἡγουμένισσα*.

Lastly, during this period the monks play a very important part in theological controversies. The Patriarch of Alexandria, for instance, in his disputes with Constantinople and Antioch could always count on the fanatical loyalty of the great crowd of monks who swarmed up from the desert in his defence. Often we hear of monks fighting, leading tumults, boldly attacking the soldiers. In all the Monophysite troubles the monks of Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and the capital were able to throw the great weight of their united influence on the one side or the other. During the Acacian schism (482–519), while the whole Byzantine Church broke communion with Rome, only the "sleepless" monks of Studion remained Catholic. On the whole, the monks were generally on the Catholic side. During the Iconoclast persecution they were so determined against the overthrow of the holy pictures that the Iconoclast emperors made the abolition of monasticism part of their programme and persecuted people for being monks just as much as for worshipping images (see Iconoclasm). Especially the great Studion monastery at Constantinople had a tradition of unswerving orthodoxy and loyalty to Rome. They alone kept communion with the Holy See in the Acacian schism, they were the leaders of the Image-worshippers in Iconoclast times, and their great abbot St. Theodore (d. 826) was one of the last defenders of union and the pope's rights before the great schism.

(3) *From the schism to modern times.*—The schism made little difference to the inner life of the Byzantine monasteries. Like the lower clergy and the people they quietly followed their bishops, who followed the patriarchs, who followed the Œcumenical patriarch into schism. After that their life went on as before, except that, having lost the advantage of intercourse with the West, they gradually drifted into the same stagnation as the rest of the Orthodox Church. They lost their tradition of scholarship, they had never done any work in parishes, and so they gradually arrived at the ideal that the "angelic life" meant, besides their immensely long prayers, contemplation

and fasting, doing nothing at all. In the eighteenth century, when an attempt was made to found monastic schools, they fiercely resented such a desecration of their ideal. During the early Middle Ages the Orthodox remained immeasurably behind the Catholic monks, who were converting western Europe and making their monasteries the homes of scholarship. The chief event of this period is the foundation of the Athos monasteries, destined to become the centre of Orthodox monasticism. When St. Athanasius of Athos founded the great Laura there, there were already cells of hermits on the holy mountain. Nevertheless he is rightly looked upon as the founder of the communities that made Athos so great a centre of Orthodoxy (see ATHOS, MOUNT; also Kyriakos, Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία, Athens, 1898, III, 74–78; "Echos d'Orient", II, 321–31).

In the tenth and eleventh centuries the famous monasteries called the Meteora (Μετέωρα) in Thessaly were built on their inaccessible peaks to escape the ravages of the Slavs. The Turkish conquest made little difference to the monks. Moslems respect religious. Their Prophet had spoken well of monks (Koran, Sura V, 85) and had given a charter of protection to the monks of Sinai; but they shared fully the degradation of the Orthodox Church under Moslem rule. The Turkish conquest sealed their isolation from the rest of Christendom; the monasteries became the refuge of peasants too lazy to work, and the monk earned the scorn with which he is regarded by educated people in the East. Eugenios Bulgaris (d. 1800), one of the chief restorers of classical scholarship among the Greeks, made a futile attempt to found a school at Athos. The monks drove him out with contumely as an atheist and a blasphemer, and pulled his school down. Its ruins still stand as a warning that study forms no part of the "angelic" life.

(4) *Monasticism in the present Orthodox Church.*— The sixteen independent Churches that make up the Orthodox communion are full of monasteries. There are fewer convents. One great monastery, that of Mount Sinai, follows what professes to be the old rule of St. Anthony. All the others have St. Basil's rule with the additions, expansions, and modifications made by later emperors, patriarchs, and synods. There is no distinction of religious orders as in the West, though many lauras have customs of their own. All monks are "Basilians" if one must give them a special name. A monk is μόναχος, a priest-monk ἱερομόναχος. A monastery is μόνη or λαῦρα. The novice (ἀρχάριος) wears a tunic called ῥᾶσος with a belt and the *kalimauchion* of all the clergy, he is often called ῥασοφόρος. After two years (the period is sometimes shortened) he makes his (solemn) vows and receives the small habit (μανδύας). Technically he is now a μικρόσχημος, though the word is not often used. After an undefined time of perseverance he receives the great habit (κουκούλιον) and becomes μεγαλόσχημος. The popular Greek name for monk is "good old man" (καλόγερος). The election, the rights and duties of the hegumenos and other dignitaries remain as they were before the schism. The title "archimandrite" appears to be given now to abbots of the more important monasteries and also sometimes as a personal title of distinction to others. It involves only precedence of rank.

Most monasteries depend on the local metropolitan. In the Orthodox states (Russia, Greece, etc.) the Holy Synod has a good deal to say in their management, confirms the election of the abbot, controls, and not unfrequently confiscates their property. But certain great monasteries are exempt from local jurisdiction and immediately subject to the patriarch or Holy Synod. These are called σταυροπήγια. One Orthodox monastery (Mount Sinai) of which the abbot is also "Archbishop of Sinai", is an autocephalous Church, obeying only Christ and the Seven Councils. The Γενικοὶ κανονισμοί of the Œcumenical patriarchate contain a chapter about monasteries (pp. 67 sq.). They are divided into three classes, those with more than twenty, more than ten or more than five monks. Only those of the first class (more than twenty monks) are bound to sing all the Divine office and celebrate the holy Liturgy every day. Monasteries with less than five monks are to be suppressed or incorporated in larger ones. Monastic property accumulated in the East as in the West. Many quarrels between the Church and State have arisen from usurped control or even wholesale confiscation of this property by the various Orthodox governments. The first Greek Parliament in 1833 (at Nauplion) suppressed all monasteries in the new kingdom that had less than six monks. In 1864 Cusa confiscated all monastic property in Rumania, of which much belonged to the monasteries of Mount Sinai, Jerusalem, and Athos. In 1875 Russia confiscated three-fifths of the property in Bessarabia belonging to the monastery of the Holy Sepulchre. Of the rest it paid itself one-fifth for its trouble and applied two-fifths to what it described euphemistically as pious purposes in Russia. Many monasteries have farms called μετόχια in distant lands. Generally a few monks are sent to administer the *metochion* of which all the revenue belongs to the mother-house. The most famous monasteries in the southern part of the Orthodox Church are Mount Sinai, the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, the Meteora in Thessaly, Sveti Naum on the Lake of Ochrida and, most of all, Athos. The national quarrels in the Orthodox Church have full development at Athos. Till lately the Greeks succeeded in crushing all foreign elements. They drove the Georgians from Iviron, the Bulgars from Philotheos, Xenophon, and St. Paul's. Now they are rapidly losing ground and influence; the Slavs are building large *Sketai*, and Russia here as everywhere is the great danger to the Greek element. The Russians have only one laura (Panteleimon or Russiko) but with its huge Sketai it contains more monks than all the Greek lauras together. All the Athos monasteries are *stauropegia;* only the Patriarch of Constantinople has any jurisdiction. For ordinations the hegumenoi invite the neighbouring Metropolitan of Heraclea. The monasteries have also the dignity of "Imperial" lauras, as having been under the protection of former emperors.

(5) *Monasticism in Russia.*—The writer is indebted to Mr. C. Faminsky of the Russian Embassy Church at London for the following account and the Russian bibliography. There have been monks in Russia since Christianity was first preached there in the tenth century. Their great period was the fourteenth century; their decline began in the sixteenth. Peter the Great (1661–1725) at one time meant to suppress the monasteries altogether. In 1723 he forbade new novices to be received. Under Catherine II (1761–1796) a more prosperous era began; since Alexander I (1801–1825) monasteries flourish again all over the empire. The latest census (1896) counts 495 monasteries and 249 convents of nuns. These are divided into 4 lauras (in Russia the name means a certain precedence and special privileges); 7 stauropegia (subject directly to the Holy Synod and exempt from the ordinary's jurisdiction), 64 monasteries attached to bishops' palaces. The rest are divided into three classes. There are 73 of the first class (which have at least 33 monks or, if convents, 52 nuns), 100 of the second (17 monks or nuns) and 191 of the third (12 monks or 17 nuns). There are further 350 monasteries not classified. Catherine II introduced the practice of drawing up official lists of the monasteries. She found 1072 monasteries in her empire of which she abolished 496 and classified the rest. In Russia, as at Athos, monasteries are either cœnobic (*obshejitel'nyie*) or idiorhythmic (*neobshejitel'nyie*); but these latter are not in favour with the Holy Synod

which restores the cœnobic rule wherever possible. Some monasteries are supported by government (*shtatnyie*), others have to support themselves. The three classes mentioned above concern the amounts received by the supported monasteries. The stauropegia are: Solovetsky, at Archangel, Simonoff, Donskoyi, Novospassky, and Saikonospassky at Moscow, Voskresensky or New Jerusalem, Spaso-Yakovlesky. The census of 1896 counts 42,940 monks and 7464 nuns in the empire. The most famous Russian monasteries are Kieff (Kievsky Laura) founded in 1062 by a St. Anthony, the largest of all; the Troitzky Laura near Moscow, founded by St. Sergius in 1335 and now the home of the first "Ecclesiastical Academy" (Seminary) in the empire; the Metropolitan of Moscow is its hegumenos. The Pochaievsky Laura, founded in the thirteenth century and famous for its miraculous *eikon* of the Blessed Virgin; Solovetsky, founded in 1429; Surieff (in the government of Novgorod) founded in 1030; Tikhvinsy (in Novgorod); Volokolamsky (in the Moscow government) founded by St. Joseph of Volokolamsk in 1479, which has an important library and has often been used as a state prison, and Kyrilla-Bilesersky (in Novgorod) founded by St. Cyril in 1397.

(6) *Monasticism in the lesser Eastern Churches.*—Little need be said of these Churches. All had fully developed monasticism according to St. Basil's idea before they went into schism, and all have monks and nuns under much the same conditions as the Orthodox, though, naturally, in each case there has been some special development of their own. The *Nestorians* once had many monasteries. Joseph Simon Assemani in the eighteenth century counts 31 ("Bibl. Orientalis", III, Rome, 1725, xiv, §2). Since the fourteenth century the discipline has become so relaxed that monks can easily get dispensed from their vows and marry (Badger, "The Nestorians and their Rituals", London, 1852, II, p. 179). They now have neither monasteries nor convents; but there are monks and nuns who live in their own houses or wander about. The *Copts* have many monasteries arranged almost exactly like those of the Orthodox (Silbernagl, "Verfassung u. gegenwärtiger Bestand sämtl. Kirchen des Orients", Ratisbon, 1904, 291–293). The *Abyssinian* monasteries are very flourishing (ib. 299–302). There are in Abyssinia also people called *debterats*, regular canons who say the office in common and obey a superior called *nebrait*, but may marry. The Nebrait of Aksum is one of the most powerful members of the Abyssinian Church and the leader of the national party against the foreign (Coptic) metropolitan. The *Syrian Jacobites* once had a great number of monasteries. Down to the sixth century there were still Stylites among them. They now have only nine monasteries in the present reduced state of their Church, most of them also residences of bishops. The Jacobite monk fasts very strictly. To eat meat is a crime punished as equal to adultery (Silbernagl, op. cit., 313–315). The *Armenian* Church, as being considerably the largest and most flourishing of these lesser Eastern Churches, has the largest number of monks and the most flourishing monastic state. Armenian monks follow St. Basil's rule, but are much stricter in the matter of fasting. The novitiate lasts eight years. It is a curious contrast to this strictness that the abbot is often not a monk at all, but a married secular priest who hands on his office to his son by hereditary right. Most Armenian bishops live in monasteries. Etchmiadzin, the residence of the Katholikos, is theoretically the centre of the Armenian Church. The Armenians have the huge monastery of St. James, the centre of their quarter of Jerusalem, where their Patriarch of Jerusalem lives, and the convent of Deir asseituni on Mount Sion with a hundred nuns. Armenian monks do not as a rule become bishops; the bishops are taken from the unmarried Vartabeds, that is, the higher class of secular priests (doctors). In all the other Eastern Churches bishops are monks. All use their monasteries as places of punishment for refractory clergy.

(7) *Uniate Monks.*—The only difference union with Rome makes to Eastern monks is that there is in the Uniate Churches a certain tendency to emulate the Latin religious orders. As this generally means a disposition to do something more than recite the Divine office, it may be counted an unmixed advantage. Uniate monks, like all the uniate clergy, are admittedly better educated than the schismatics; some of them at least attend Western schools or seminaries of Latin religious in the East. It is a Latinizing tendency that makes them often use special names for their order and even evolve into something like separate religious orders. Thus most Uniate Byzantine monks call themselves "Basilians", as the Latins use "Benedictine" or "Franciscan". Among the Melchites the two great congregations of Salvatorians and Shuwerites (see MELCHITES) are practically different orders. The Uniate *Armenians* have the famous Mechitarist Congregation, really a special religious order founded by Mechitar (1676–1749). The Mechitarists have the monastery of San Lazaro at Venice, and a branch separated from the others in 1774 have a house at Vienna. By their schools, missions, and literary activity they have always done great things in educating and converting their countrymen. The Catholic *Chaldees* have three monasteries, Rabban Hormuzd, Alkosh, and Mar Yurgis in Mesopotamia. The *Maronite* Church from the beginning has been specially a monastic Church. It was first formed by the schism of the monks of St. John Maro, in the Lebanon, from the Patriarch of Antioch. Since their union with Rome they have formed separate orders. Till 1757 there were two such orders, those of St. Isaias and of St. Antony. The St. Antony monks then split again into two congregations, the Aleppians (monks of Aleppo) and Baladites (*baladiye*, country monks). Clement XIV sanctioned this separation in 1770. All follow the rule of St. Antony. For the rest the Uniate monks of each Church have the same rule and customs as the corresponding schismatics. Certain details have been revised and abuses eliminated by the Roman authorities. There are Uniate monasteries wherever there are Uniate Christians. Uniate bishops are by no means always monks as there are many of unmarried secular priests. One may note especially the Uniate Byzantine monks in southern Italy and in the great monastery of Grottaferrata outside Rome.

HARNACK, *Das Mönchthum, seine Ideale u. seine Geschichte* in *Reden u. Aufsätze*, I (Giessen, 1904), 83–139; AMÉLINEAU, *Histoire de Saint Pakhome et de ses communautés* in *Annales du Musée Guimet*, XVII (Paris, 1889); MARIN, *Les Moines de Constantinople* (Paris, 1897); IDEM, *De Studio cœnobio constantinopolitano* (Paris, 1897); ZINGERLE, *Leben u. Wirken des hl. Symeon Stylites* (Innsbruck, 1855); DELEHAYE, *Les Stylites: Compte rendu du troisième congrès scientifique des Catholiques à Bruxelles* (Brussels, 1895); GARDNER, *Theodore of Studium* (London, 1905); LANGLOIS, *Le Mont Athos* (Paris, 1867); MEYER, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der neueren Geschichte u. des gegenwärtigen Zustandes der Athosklöster* in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* (1890); RILEY, *Athos, or the Mountain of the Monks* (London, 1887); SCHMIDTKE, *Das Klosterland des Athos* (Leipzig, 1903); GELZER, *Vom hlgen. Berge u. aus Makedonien* (Leipzig, 1904); VANNUTELLI, *Monte Athos e le Meteore* (Rome, 1888) in *Sguardo all' Oriente*, II and XIII; KATTENBUSCH, *Lehrbuch der vergleichenden Confessionskunde*, I (Freiburg, 1892), 522–537; BETH, *Die orientalische Christenheit* (Berlin, 1902), 322–333; SILBERNAGL, *Verfassung u. gegenwärtiger Bestand sämtlicher Kirchen des Orients* (Ratisbon, 1904); PAVLOV, *Istorichesky ocherk secularisakiyi zerkovnikh zemel v. Rossiyi* (Odessa, 1871); GORCHAKOFF, *Monastirskiyi Prikas* (St. Petersburg, 1868); KAZANSKY, *Istoria Prav. Russ. Monashestva* (Moscow, 1855); ZVIERINSKY, *Material dla istorico-topograficheskago izsliedovaniya o pr. monastirach* (3 vols., St. Petersburg, 1890); PAVLOVSKY, *Useobshiyi Putievoditel* (Nijnei-Novgorod, 1907): a guide to all Russian monasteries.

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

IV. WESTERN MONASTICISM.—(1) *Pre-Benedictine Period.*—The introduction of monasticism into the West may be dated from about A. D. 340 when St.

Athanasius visited Rome accompanied by the two Egyptian monks Ammon and Isidore, disciples of St. Anthony. The publication of the "Vita Antonii" some years later and its translation into Latin spread the knowledge of Egyptian monachism widely and many were found in Italy to imitate the example thus set forth. The first Italian monks aimed at reproducing exactly what was done in Egypt and not a few—such as St. Jerome, Rufinus, Paula, Eustochium and the two Melanias—actually went to live in Egypt or Palestine as being better suited to monastic life than Italy. As however the records of early Italian monasticism are very scanty, it will be more convenient to give first a short account of early monastic life in Gaul, our knowledge of which is much more complete.

(a) Gaul.—The first exponent of monasticism in Gaul seems to have been St. Martin, who founded a monastery at Ligugé near Poitiers, c. 360 (see LIGUGÉ; MARTIN OF TOURS, ST.). Soon after he was consecrated Bishop of Tours; he then formed a monastery outside that city, which he made his customary residence. Although only some two miles from the city the spot was so retired that Martin found there the solitude of a hermit. His cell was a hut of wood, and round it his disciples, who soon numbered eighty, dwelt in caves and huts. The type of life was simply the Antonian monachism of Egypt (see above, EASTERN MONASTICISM) and so rapidly did it spread that, at St. Martin's funeral two thousand monks were present. Even more famous was the monastery of Lérins (q. v.) which gave to the Church of Gaul some of its most famous bishops and saints. In it too the famous Abbot John Cassian (q. v.) settled after living for seven years among the monks of Egypt, and from it he founded the great Abbey of St. Victor at Marseilles. Cassian was undoubtedly the most celebrated teacher that the monks of Gaul ever had, and his influence was all on the side of the primitive Egyptian ideals. Consequently we find that the eremitical life was regarded as being the summit or goal of monastic ambition and the means of perfection recommended were, as in Egypt, extreme personal austerities with prolonged fasts and vigils, and the whole atmosphere of ascetical endeavour so dear to the heart of the Antonian monk (see CASSIAN, JOHN; FRANCE; CÆSARIUS OF ARLES, ST.; LÉRINS, etc).

(b) Celtic Monasticism (Ireland, Wales, Scotland).—Authorities are still divided as to the origin of Celtic monasticism, but the view most commonly accepted is that of Mr. Willis Bund which holds it to have been a purely indigenous growth and rejects the idea of any direct connexion with Gallic or Egyptian monasticism. It seems clear that the first Celtic monasteries were merely settlements where the Christians lived together—priests and laity, men, women, and children alike—as a kind of religious clan. At a later period actual monasteries both of monks and nuns were formed, and later still the eremitical life came into vogue. It seems highly probable that the ideas and literature of Egyptian or Gallic monachism may have influenced these later developments, even if the Celtic monasticism were purely independent in origin, for the external manifestations are identical in all three forms. Indeed the desire for austerities of an extreme character has always remained a special feature of Irish asceticism down to our own time. Want of space forbids any detailed account of Celtic monasticism in this place but the following articles may be referred to: (for Ireland) ARMAGH, BANGOR, CLONARD, CLONFERT, CLONMACNOISE, LISMORE, BOBBIO, LUXEUIL, SAINTS PATRICK, CARTHAGE, COLUMBANUS, COMGALL; (for Wales) LLANCARVAN, BANGOR, SAINTS ASAPH, DAVID, DUBRIC, GILDAS, KENTIGERN; (for Scotland) IONA, SCHOOL OF, LINDISFARNE, ABBEY OF, SAINTS NINIAN, COLUMBA, AIDAN. Undoubtedly, however, the chief glory of Celtic monasticism is its missionary work, the results of which are to be found over all northwestern Europe. The observance, at first so distinctive, gradually lost its special character and fell into line with that of other countries; but, by that time, Celtic monasticism had passed its zenith and its influence had declined.

(c) Italy.—Like the other countries of western Europe, Italy long retained a purely Eastern character in its monastic observance. The climate and other causes however combined to render its practice far harder than in the lands of its origin. In consequence the standard of observance declined, and it is clear from the Prologue to St. Benedict's Rule that by his day the lives of many monks left much to be desired. Moreover there was as yet no fixed code of laws to regulate the life either of the monastery or of the individual monk. Each house had its own customs and practices, its own collection of rules dependent largely on the choice of the abbot of the moment. There were certainly in the West translations of various Eastern codes, e. g. the Rules of Pachomius and Basil and another attributed to Macarius. There were also St. Augustine's famous letter (Ep., ccxi) on the management of convents of nuns, and also the writings of Cassian, but the only actual Rules of Western origin were the two by St. Cæsarius for monks and nuns respectively, and that by St. Columbanus, none of which could be called a working code for the management of a monastery. In a word monachism was still waiting for the man who should adapt it to Western needs and circumstances and give to it a special form distinct from that of the East. This man was found in the person of St. Benedict (480–543).

(2) *The Spread of St. Benedict's Rule.*—Full details of St. Benedict's legislation, which had such immense effect on the monasticism of Western Europe, will be found in the articles BENEDICT OF NURSIA, ST., and BENEDICT, RULE OF ST. It is sufficient here to point out that St. Benedict legislated for the details of the monastic life in a way that had never been done before either in East or West. It is clear that he had acquainted himself thoroughly with the lives of the Egyptian fathers of the desert, with the writings of St. Basil, Cassian, and Rufinus; and in the main lines he has no intention of departing from the precedents set by these great authorities. Still the standard of asceticism aimed at by him, as was inevitable in the West, is less severe than that of Egypt or Syria. Thus he gives his monks good and ample food. He permits them to drink wine. He secures a sufficient period of unbroken sleep. His idea was evidently to set up a standard that could and should be attained by all the monks of a monastery, leaving it to individual inspiration to essay greater austerities if the need of these were felt by any one. On the other hand, probably as a safeguard against the relaxations mentioned above, he requires a greater degree of seclusion than St. Basil had done. So far as possible all connexion with the world outside the monastery is to be avoided. If any monk be compelled by duty to go beyond the monastery enclosure he is forbidden on his return to speak of what he has seen or heard. So too no monk may receive gifts or letters from his friends or relatives without permission of the abbot. It is true that guests from without are to be received and entertained, but only certain monks specially chosen for the purpose may hold intercourse with them.

Perhaps, however, the chief point in which St. Benedict modified the pre-existing practice is his insistence upon the *stabilitas loci*. By this special Vow of Stability he unites the monk for life to the particular monastery in which his vows are made. This was really a new development and one of the highest importance. In the first place by this the last vestige of personal freedom was taken away from the monk. Secondly it secured in each monastery that continuity of theory and practice which is so essential for the

family which St. Benedict desired above everything. The abbot was to be a father and the monk a child. Nor was he to be more capable of choosing a new father or a new home than any other child was. After all St. Benedict was a Roman, and the scion of a Roman patrician family, and he was simply bringing into the monastic life that absolute dependence of all the members of a family upon the father which is so typical of Roman law and usage. Only at the selection of a new abbot can the monks choose for themselves. Once elected the abbot's power becomes absolute; there is nothing to control him except the Rule and his own conscience which is responsible for the salvation of every soul entrusted to his care.

The Rule of St. Benedict was written at Monte Cassino in the ten or fifteen years preceding the saint's death in 543, but very little is known of the way in which it began to spread to other monasteries. St. Gregory (Dial., II, xxii) speaks of a foundation made from Monte Cassino at Terracina, but nothing is known of this house. Again the traditions of Benedictine foundations in Gaul and Sicily by St. Maurus and St. Placid are now generally discredited. Still the Rule must have become known very soon, for by the death of Simplicius, the third Abbot of Monte Cassino, in line from St. Benedict, it is referred to as being generally observed throughout Italy (Mabillon, "Annal. Bened.", VII, ii). In the year 580 Monte Cassino was destroyed by the Lombards and the monks fled to Rome, taking with them the autograph copy of the Rule. They were installed by Pelagius II in a monastery near the Lateran Basilica. It is almost certain that St. Gregory the Great who succeeded Pelagius II introduced the Benedictine Rule and observance into the monastery of St. Andrew which he founded on the Cœlian Hill at Rome, and also into the six monasteries he founded in Sicily. Thanks to St. Gregory the Rule was carried to England by St. Augustine and his fellow monks; and also to the Frankish and Lombard monasteries which the pope's influence did much to revive. Indirectly too, by devoting the second book of his "Dialogues" to the story of St. Benedict's life and work, Gregory gave a strong impetus to the spread of the Rule. Thus the first stage in the advance of St. Benedict's code across Western Europe is closely bound up with the name of the first monk-pope.

In the seventh century the process continued steadily. Sometimes the Benedictine code existed side by side with an older observance. This was the case at Bobbio where the monks lived either under the rule of St. Benedict or of St. Columbanus, who had founded the monastery in 609. In Gaul at the same period a union of two or more rules was often to be found, as at Luxeuil, Solignac, and elsewhere. In this there was nothing surprising, indeed the last chapter of St. Benedict's rule seems almost to contemplate such an arrangement. In England, thanks to St. Wilfrid of York, St. Benedict Biscop and others, the Benedictine mode of life began to be regarded as the only true type of monachism. Its influence however was still slight in Ireland where the Celtic monasticism gave way more slowly. In the eighth century the advance of Benedictinism went on with even greater rapidity owing principally to the efforts of St. Boniface. That saint is known as the Apostle of Germany although the Irish missionaries had preceded him there. His energies however were divided between the two tasks of converting the remaining heathen tribes and bringing the Christianity of the Irish converts into line with the Roman use and obedience. In both these undertakings he achieved great success and his triumph meant the destruction of the earlier Columban form of monasticism. Fulda, the great monastery of St. Boniface's institution, was modelled directly on Monte Cassino in which Sturm the abbot had resided for some time so that he might become perfectly acquainted with the workings of the Rule at the fountain head, and in its turn Fulda became the model for all German monasteries. Thus by the reign of Charlemagne the Benedictine form of monasticism had become the normal type throughout the West with the sole exception of some few Spanish and Irish cloisters. So completely was this the case that even the memory of earlier things had passed away and it could be gravely doubted whether monks of any kind at all had existed before St. Benedict and whether there could be any other monks but Benedictines.

At the time of Charlemagne's death in 814 the most famous monk in western Europe was St. Benedict of Aniane, the friend and counsellor of Louis the new emperor. For him Louis built a monastery near his imperial palace at Aix, and there Benedict gathered thirty monks, chosen from among his own personal friends and in full sympathy with his ideas. This monastery was intended to be a model for all the religious houses of the empire, and the famous Assembly of 817 passed a series of resolutions which touched upon the whole range of the monastic life. The object of these resolutions was to secure, even in the minutest details, an absolute uniformity in all the monasteries of the empire, so that it might seem as if "all had been taught by one single master in one single spot". As might have been expected the scheme failed to do this, or even anything approaching thereto, but the resolutions of the Assembly are of high interest as the first example of what are nowadays called "Constitutions", i. e. a code, supplementary to the Holy Rule, which shall regulate the lesser details of everyday life and practice. The growth of the Benedictine monasticism and its development during the period known as the "Benedictine centuries" will be found treated of in the article BENEDICTINES, but it may be stated broadly that, while it had of course its periods of vigour and decline, no serious modification of St. Benedict's system was attempted until the rise of Cluny in the early part of the tenth century.

(3) *The Rise of Cluny.*—The essential novelty in the Cluniac system was its centralization. Hitherto every monastery had been a separate family, independent of all the rest. The ideal of Cluny, however, was to set up one great central monastery with dependent houses, numbered even by the hundred, scattered over many lands and forming a vast hierarchy or monastic feudal system under the Abbot of Cluny. The superior of every house was nominated by the Abbot of Cluny, every monk was professed in his name and with his sanction. It was in fact more like an army subject to a general than St. Benedict's scheme of a family with a father to guide it, and for two centuries it dominated the Church in Western Europe with a power second only to that of the papacy itself. (See CLUNY; BERNO, ST.; ODO, ST.; HUGH THE GREAT.) Anything indeed more unlike the primitive monasticism with its caves and individualism than this elaborate system with the pomp and circumstance which soon attended it could hardly be imagined, and the instinct which prompted men to become monks soon began to tell against a type of monasticism so dangerously liable to relapse into mere formalism. It must be understood however that the observance of Cluny was still strict and the reaction against it was not based on any need for a reform in morals or discipline. The abbots of Cluny during the first two centuries of its existence, with the sole exception of Pontius (1109) who was soon deposed, were men of great sanctity and commanding ability. In practice however the system had resulted in crushing all initiative out of the superiors of the subordinate monasteries and so, when a renewal of vigour was needed there was no one capable of the effort required and the life was crushed out of the body by its own weight. That this defect was the real cause why the system failed is cer-

tain. Nothing is more remarkable in the history of Benedictine monasticism than its power of revival by the springing up of renewed life from within. Again and again, when reform has been needed, the impetus has been found to come from within the body instead of from outside it. But in the case of Cluny such a thing had been rendered practically impossible, and on its decline no recovery took place.

(4) *Reaction against Cluny.*—The reaction against Cluny and the system of centralization took various forms. Early in the eleventh century (1012) came the foundation of the Camaldolese by St. Romuald. This was a hark back to the ancient Egyptian ideal of a number of hermits living in a "laura" or collection of detached cells which were situated some considerable distance apart (see CAMALDOLESE). A few years later (1039) St. John Gualbert founded the Order of Vallombrosa which is chiefly important for the institution of "lay brothers", as distinct from the choir monks, a novelty which assumes high importance in later monastic history (see LAY-BROTHER; VALLOMBROSA). In 1074 came the Order of Grammont which however did not move to the place from which its name is derived until 1124 (see GRAMMONT; STEPHEN OF MURET, ST.). Far more important than these was the establishment in 1084 of the Carthusians by St. Bruno, at the Grand Chartreuse near Grenoble, which boasts that it alone of the great orders has never required to be reformed (see CARTHUSIANS; CHARTREUSE, LE GRAND; BRUNO, ST.). In all these four institutes the tendency was towards a more eremitical and secluded form of life than that followed by the Benedictines, but this was not the case in the greatest of all the foundations of the period, viz. the Cistercians.

The Cistercians derived their name from Cîteaux near Dijon where the Order was founded about 1098 by St. Robert of Molesme. The new development differed from that of Cluny in this that, while Cluny established one scattered family of vast size, Cîteaux preserved the idea that each monastery was an individual family but united all these families into one "Order" in the modern sense of an organized congregation. The Abbot and House of Cîteaux was to be pre-eminent for ever over all the monasteries of the order. The abbots of all other monasteries were to assemble at Cîteaux in general chapter every year. The purpose of this was to secure in every monastery a complete uniformity in the details of observance, and this uniformity was to be made even more certain by a yearly visitation of each house. The Abbot of Cîteaux possessed the further right of visiting any and every monastery at will, and though he was not to interfere with the temporalities of any house against the wishes of the abbot and brethren, in all matters of discipline his power was absolute. This elaborate system was set forth in the famous document known as the "Carta Caritatis" and in it for the first time the expression "Our Order" is used in the modern sense. Previously the word, as used in the phrase "the monastic order" had denoted the mode of life common to every monastery. In the "Carta Caritatis" it is used to exclude all monastic observance not exactly on the lines of the "new monastery", i. e., Cîteaux, and subject to it. The monasteries of the Cistercians spread over Europe with surprising rapidity and from the colour of their habit the monks were called the "White Monks", the older Benedictines and Cluniacs being known as the "Black Monks "(see CISTERCIANS; CÎTEAUX; ROBERT OF MOLESME, ST.; BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX, ST.).

The impetus given by these new foundations helped to revitalize the Benedictine monasteries of the older type, but at the same time a new influence was at work upon western monasticism. Hitherto the monastic ideal had been essentially contemplative. Certainly the monks had undertaken active work of many kinds but always as a kind of accident, or to meet some immediate necessity, not as a primary object of their institute nor as an end in itself. Now however religious foundations of an active type began to be instituted, which were dedicated to some particular active work or works as a primary end of their foundation. Of this class were the Military Orders, e. g., the Templars, Hospitallers, and Teutonic Knights; numerous Institutes of canons, e. g., Augustinians, Premonstratensians, and Gilbertines; the many Orders of friars, e. g. Carmelites, Trinitarians, Servites, Dominicans, and Franciscans or Friars Minor. Of these and the multitudinous modern foundations of an active character, as distinct from a contemplative or monastic one, this article does not profess to treat; they will be found fully dealt with in the general article RELIGIOUS ORDERS and also individually in separate articles under the names of the various orders and congregations. It must be recognized however that these active institutions attracted a vast number of vocations and to that extent tended to check the increase and development of the monastic order strictly so called, even while their fervour and success spurred the older institutes to a renewal of zeal in their special observances.

The Fourth Council of Lateran in 1215 passed certain special canons to regulate monastic observance and prevent any falling away from the standard set up. These directions tended to adapt the best features of the Cistercian system, e. g. the general chapters, to the use of the Black monks, and they were a great step in the path which later proved so successful. At the time however they were practically ignored by the monasteries on the Continent, and only in England was any serious effort made to put them into practice. The consequence was that the English monasteries of Black monks soon formed themselves into one national congregation, the observance throughout the country became largely uniform, and a far higher standard of life obtained than was common in continental monasteries at the same period. The system of periodical general chapters ordered by the Lateran Council was maintained. So too was the subjection of all monasteries to the diocesan bishops as a normal state of affairs; indeed only five abbeys in all England were exempt from episcopal jurisdiction. There were of course individual failures here and there, but it is clear that, from the date of the Council of Lateran up to the time of their destruction, the English Benedictine houses maintained on the whole a good standard of discipline and preserved the affectionate respect of the great majority of the laity in every rank of life.

(5) *Period of Monastic Decline.*—On the Continent the period succeeding the Fourth Lateran Council was one of steady decline. The history of the time tells of civil disturbance, intellectual upheaval, and a continual increase of luxury among ecclesiastics as well as laymen. The wealth of the monasteries was tempting and the great ones both in Church and State seized upon them. Kings, nobles, cardinals, and prelates obtained nominations to abbeys "in commendam" and more often than not absorbed the revenues of houses which they left to go to ruin. Vocations grew scarce and not unfrequently the communities were reduced to a mere handful of monks living on a trifling allowance doled out to them none too willingly by the layman or ecclesiastic who claimed to be their commendatory abbot. Efforts to check these evils were not wanting especially in Italy. The Sylvestrines, founded by St. Sylvester de Gozzolini about the middle of the thirteenth century, were organized on a system of perpetual superiors under one head, the Prior of Monte Fano, who ruled the whole congregation as general assisted by a chapter consisting of representatives from each house (see SYLVESTRINES).

The Celestines, founded about forty years later by St. Peter Morone (Celestine V), were organized on much the same plan but the superiors were not perpetual and the head of the whole body was an Abbot elected by the General Chapter for three years and ineligible for re-election for nine years after his previous term of office (see CELESTINES; CELESTINE V, ST.). The Olivetans, founded about 1313 by Bernardo Tolomei of Siena, mark the last stage of development. In their case the monks were not professed for any particular monastery, but, like friars, for the congregation in general. The officials of the various houses were chosen by a small committee appointed for this purpose by the general chapter. The abbot-general was visitor of all monasteries and "superior of superiors", but his power was held for a very short period only. This system had the very great advantage that it rendered the existence of commendatory superiors practically impossible, but it secured this at the cost of sacrificing all family life in the individual monastery which is the central idea of St. Benedict's legislation. Further, by taking the right of election away from the monastic communities, it concentrated all real power in the hands of a small committee, a course obviously open to many possible dangers (see OLIVETANS).

(6) *Monastic Revival.*—In the great wave of reform and revival which characterized the later fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the older institutions of Benedictines once more gave proof of their vitality and a spontaneous renewal of vigour was shown throughout Europe. This revival followed two main lines. In the Latin countries the movement pursued the path marked out by the Olivetans. Thus in Italy all the monasteries of Black monks were gradually united together under the name of the Congregation of St. Justina of Padua, afterwards called the Cassinese Congregation (see under BENEDICTINES). Similar methods were adopted in the formation of the Congregations of St. Maur and St. Vannes in France, in the two Congregations of Spanish Benedictines, and in the revival of the English Congregation. In Germany the revival took a different path; and, while keeping closer to the traditions of the past, united the existing monasteries very much in the manner ordered by the Fourth Council of Lateran in 1215. The Union of Bursfeld is perhaps the best example of this method. An example of reform in the seventeenth century was the work of Abbé de Rancé in instituting the Cistercian reform at La Trappe. In this his object was to get as close as possible to the primitive form of Benedictine life. No one can question his sincerity or the singleness of his intentions, but de Rancé was not an antiquary and had not been trained as a monk but as a courtier. The result was that he interpreted St. Benedict's rule with the most absolute literalness, and thus succeeded in producing a cast-iron mode of life far more rigid and exacting than there is any reason to believe St. Benedict himself either desired to or did beget. The upheaval of the French Revolution and the wars which followed it seemed likely to give a death blow to Western monachism and in fact did destroy monasteries by the hundred. But nothing perhaps is more noteworthy, in all the wonderful revival of Catholicism which the last hundred years have seen, than the resuscitation of monastic life in all its forms, not only in Europe, but also in America, Africa, Australia, and other distant lands whose very existence was unknown to the founders of Western monachism. Details of this revival will be found in the articles on the various orders and congregations referred to above.

No mention has been made in this article of the question of women under Monasticism. Broadly speaking the history of contemplative nuns, as distinct from nuns of the more recent active orders, has been identical with that of the monks. In almost every instance the modifications, reforms, etc., made by the various monastic legislators have been adopted by convents of women as well as by the monks. In cases where any special treatment has been thought necessary, e. g. the Carthusian Nuns, a separate section of the article on the order or congregation in question has been dedicated to the subject. These sections should be referred to in all cases for detailed information. (For practical details of the monastic life and the actual working of a monastery see the articles MONASTICISM; MONASTERY; ABBEY; ABBOT; ABBESS; OBEDIENTIARIES; BENEDICT, RULE OF ST.; BENEDICT OF NURSIA, ST.; NUN.)

G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

Moncada, FRANCISCO DE, Count of Osona, Spanish historian, son of the Governor of Sardinia and Catalonia, b. at Valencia, 29 December, 1586; d. near Goch, Germany, 1635. He entered the army at a very early age, and in 1624, was appointed by King Philip IV ambassador to the imperial court at Vienna, where he soon succeeded in acquiring the esteem of Ferdinand II and his ministers. In 1629 he was recalled from Vienna and sent to Brussels in place of Cardinal de la Cueva, ambassador to the Infanta Isabella. His chief duty there consisted in keeping the king posted in regard to the conditions in the Netherlands, in supervising the royal officials, and in watching over the disbursements of Spanish funds. He soon discovered the chief fault of the preceding administration and endeavoured to concede to the Belgians a much larger share in the administration of their country's affairs, for he realized that only by such a show of confidence could they be kept loyal to the empire. He also proposed, though without success, to transfer the general management of Belgian affairs from Madrid to Brussels. In 1630 he was appointed commander-in-chief of the navy, in 1632 of the entire army, and in 1634, after the death of the Infanta, governor of Belgium, until relieved by the arrival of Prince Cardinal Ferdinand. His crowning and final achievement as military commander was the liberation of Breda, the citizens of which ordered memorial coins struck in his honour. The following year he accompanied the cardinal on an expedition into the Duchy of Cleves, where he died after a short illness at the siege of Goch. He had an amiable character, knew how to guide men according to his own desires, and combined great shrewdness and firmness with wise moderation. He wrote a valuable history of the expedition of the Catalonians and Aragonians against the Turks and Greeks (Barcelona, 1623; Madrid, 1777, 1805, 1883; Paris, 1841, in "Tesoro de los historiadores espanoles"). We furthermore possess from his pen the "Vida de Anicio Manlio Torquato Severino Boecio", which was printed (Frankfort, 1642) seven years after his death.

Biog. Nat., I (Brussels, 1866), 578–590.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Mondino (a diminutive for RAIMONDO; MUNDINUS) DEI LUCCI, anatomist, b. probably at Bologna, about 1275; d. there, about 1327. Mondino performed a series of public dissections at the University of Bologna in the early part of the fourteenth century. He is sometimes said to have performed only two or three dissections, but his own writings refute this. He is often proclaimed the first to have performed dissections in modern times, but Haeser says that many anatomists dissected before his time, and that we have even a manual of dissection written before this, by one Ricardus. Mondino systematized dissection, and wrote a manual called "Anathomia", which was used in nearly all medical schools for three centuries after his time. Its popularity can be judged from the editions issued after the invention of printing. There is one at Pavia (1478), Bologna (1482), and Padua(1484); there are Venice editions of 1494, 1498, 1500, and 1507; Leipzig (1505), Strasburg (1509), and Marburg and

Lyons shortly afterwards. His book was considered such an authority that an old teacher declared that medical students for centuries worshipped him as a god. If something found in a dissection were not described in Mondino's "Anathomia", constantly open before them while dissecting, it was considered an anomaly. The work of course has been superseded by progress in the science of anatomy, but it is easy to understand from it how much practical anatomy for surgical purposes the medieval physicians were taught.

HAESER in *Biographisches Lexicon der hervorragenden Aerzte; Bibliographie médicale* (Paris, 1826); for the question of dissection before and by Mondino, see PILCHER, *The Mondino Myth* in *Medical Library and Historical Journal* (Brooklyn, Dec., 1906); WALSH, *The Popes and Science* (New York, 1908).

JAMES J. WALSH.

Mondoñedo (Lat. MONDUMETUM, or MINDON), DIOCESE OF (MINDONIENSIS, also BRITONIENSIS, DUMIENSIS, and VILLABRIENSIS), comprises the civil Provinces of Lugo and Corunna, and is bounded on the north by the Bay of Biscay, on the east by the Austurias, on the south by the Diocese of Lugo, and on the west by the Archdiocese of Compostela (or Santiago de Galicia), of which it has been a suffragan since 1114. Some authorities have sought to fix the date of the foundation of this diocese (under its primitive name of Britonia) earlier than the second half of the sixth century, but the later date seems the more probable when we consider that, at the Second Council of Braga (572), Mailoc, Bishop of Britonia, was ranked lowest because of the more recent origin of his see. It seems to have been founded by the Suevian king, Theodomir, converted to Catholicism by St. Martin of Dumio (see MARTIN OF BRAGA, SAINT) and to have included in its jurisdiction the Churches of the Britones (a territory coinciding with that of Mondoñedo) and some of those of the Asturias. In the beginning it was a suffragan of Lugo, until the Goths placed Lugo under the jurisdiction of Braga. After Mailoc no mention is found of the bishops of Britonia for a long time, doubtless because the great distance from Toledo made it impossible for them to assist at the councils. In 633 Metopius, Bishop of Britonia, assisted at the Fourth Council of Toledo, presided over by St. Isidore. Sonna, his successor, was one of the bishops who signed at the Seventh Council of Toledo (646) and sent a representative to the Eighth Council of Toledo (16 December, 653). When Britonia was invaded and destroyed by the Saracens, the bishop and priests took refuge in Asturias. In 899, during the reign of Alfonso III, Theodesimus, Bishop of Britonia assisted with other prelates at the consecration of the church of Santiago. It may also be noted that, in the repartition of the parishes, the church of San Pedro de Nova was assigned as the residence of the bishops of Britonia and Orense, when they should come to assist at the councils of Oviedo. By that time, however, the See of Britonia had been translated to the town of Mondumetum and the church of St. Martin of Dumio, or Mondoñedo. The diocese has since been most generally known by this name, although the episcopal residence has again changed. After the time of St. Martin it was transferred to Villamayor de Brea, from which it derived the name of Villabriensis, and afterwards to Ribadeo, but it was nevertheless known as Mindoniense, as a document of the year 1199 bears witness. At first, its patron was St. Martin of Tours, but St. Martin of Dumio was afterwards chosen patron.

The church of St. Martin of Mondoñedo, one of the best of the ancient churches of this region, had been the cathedral church since 866. The present parochial house is a part of the old episcopal palace, connected with the church by a gallery from what seems to have been one of the episcopal chambers. In 1112 the queen, Doña Urraca, transferred the episcopal residence to Brea, a valley about seven and a half miles from St. Martin of Mondoñedo, in the midst of which is Villamayor de Brea, where the cathedral church of Santa María Vallibriense was built. The Blessed Virgin, under her title of the Assumption, was the patroness of this church. Alfonso VII gave a charter to the town, and the bishop resided there until Ferdinand II of León transferred the episcopal residence to Ribadeo. In 1233 Don Martín, successor to Don Pelayo, transferred it to its present location, Mondoñedo, now a town of 10,590 inhabitants. To appease the discontent occasioned in Ribadeo by this change, Bishop Nuño II and his chapter established a collegiate church in Ribadeo with a canon and four prebendaries (*racioneros*).

Many of the bishops of Mondoñedo were noted for their sanctity and learning. First among these is St. Rosendus, who, in consideration of his eminent virtue, was created a bishop when he was very young, and governed the diocese from 928 to 942. He founded the monastery of Celanova, to which he afterwards retired to live the life of a monk. Of another abbot of Celanova, Gonzalvo, a legend has been preserved which attributes to his prayers the repulse of the Northmen who were devastating the coasts of Galicia. His sepulchre is in the church of St. Martin of Mondoñedo, and on the spot on the shore where he prayed a chapel has been erected to which people come in great numbers, especially at Pentecost. Don Martín, bishop from 1219 to 1248, built the present cathedral of Mondoñedo, except for the present façade and four chapels, which form an additional nave behind the principal one. Towards the end of his life he resigned his see and withdrew to St. Martin of Mondoñedo to prepare for death. Don Pedro Enríquez de Castro (1426–45) is credited with having built the ancient cloister, where the coat of arms of his family was emblazoned. Don Fadrique de Guzmán (1462–92) made notable repairs in the cathedral; Don Alfonso Suárez de la Fuente del Salce (1493–96) was named inquisitor general by Pope Alexander VI; Don Pedro Pacheco, son of the Conde de Montalban (1533-37) was created a cardinal; Fray Antonio de Guevara, a classical writer, preacher and chronicler for Charles V shed lustre on the See of Mondoñedo. Don Diego de Soto (1546–49) completely renovated the cathedral.

In the church at Villamayor de Brea, which was formerly the cathedral of the diocese, there are some notable frescoes, entirely covering the walls of the interior. Those on the Gospel side represent, in three large panels, the slaughter of the Innocents; those on the Epistle side, four scenes from the life of St. Peter. Other paintings, the work of the Asturian painter, Terán, decorate the domes of the transept and the main chapel. The present cathedral of Mondoñedo, built in the thirteenth century (see above), is one of the best examples of ogival art in Galicia. The Romanesque portal is, as in many of the churches of that period, the most ancient portion. In the seventeenth century a façade in the Baroque style was added. The church is in the form of a Latin cross, with three naves; it has fine altars, choir stalls in the Flemish style, mural paintings of the fifteenth century, interesting for the history of art, and two organs in the over-decorated style of the eighteenth century, while the sacristy is richly decorated with pictures of the Flemish school. The Capilla de los Remedios, built in 1738, by Bishop Sarmiento de Sotomayor also deserves mention. The monastery of San Salvador de Lorenzana, formerly belonging to the Benedictines, and so called from its proximity to the river Lorenzana, is one of the most notable in Galicia. It was founded on 17 June, 969, during the episcopate of Theodomir, by the saintly Conde Osorio Gutiérrez, and was richly endowed. The remains of the founder, who became a member of the community, are interred in the monastery. A very beautiful monument constructed of rare marbles, such as are not to be found

in any other part of Spain, has been erected over his grave. His memory is venerated, and the faithful visit his tomb. The convent of the Alcantarines (Franciscans of the reform of St. Peter of Alcántara), founded in 1731, is now used as barracks. The court-house (1584) and the seminary are among the principal buildings of Mondoñedo.

The present seminary building, in the Huertas del Torrillón, was built by Bishop José Francisco de Losada in 1770–75. Mondoñedo, which until 1836, was the capital of the province, numbers among her distinguished sons the teacher Pacheco Febrero, author of "Galería de Escribanos", José Cayetano Suaces, Bishop of Palencia; Lucas Miranda, author of the "Teatro de Prelados de la Iglesia de Mondoñedo", and the sculptor Castro, designer of the inspiring figure of Saint Francis in the cathedral. Bishop Manuel Navarrete wrote a long history of Mondoñedo and its bishops. The present (1910) Bishop of Mondoñedo, Don Juan José Solés y Fernández, b. at Oviedo, 1848, was consecrated on 26 May, 1907.

Flórez, *España Sagrada*, XVIII (2nd ed., Madrid, 1789); Villamil, *Crónica de la Provincia de Lugo* (Madrid, 1867); Murguía, *España, sus monumentos y artes: Galicia* (Barcelona, 1888); de la Fuente, *Historia eclesiástica de España* (Barcelona, 1855).

Ramón Ruiz Amado.

Mondovì, Diocese of (Montisregalis), in Piedmont, province of Cuneo, northern Italy. The city is built upon three hills, at a height of about 1600 feet above sea-level, and dates from the year 1000; but the suburb of Breo, the name of which recalls the Bredolensis colony mentioned in a Roman inscription found in that neighbourhood, had a castle in the time of Charlemagne. The town, called Monsvici, also Monteregale, was under the bishops of Asti until 1198, when it established itself as a commune, but was compelled to struggle against the bishops of Asti, the marquesses of Saluzzo and of Monferrato, and the counts of Savoy, in turn recognizing and shaking off the suzerainty of one or another of those lords. The commune maintained a war against the marquesses of Civa (1240–50), and finally, Bressano di Vico, a powerful lord in Mondovì, attempted to make himself master of the city, which submitted to Charles of Anjou (1260), and from that time, with some interruptions, remained under the protection of the kings of Naples, until 1366. In 1396, having again changed lords several times, it came under the dominion of the Savoyard lords of Achaia, and in 1418, under that of the dukes of Savoy, in whose possession it remained. In 1476 and in 1533, the inhabitants of Mondovì attempted to give their allegiance either to the Marquess of Monferrato or to the Duke of Mantua, and the French contested for its possession with the imperialists (1536–43), and with the house of Savoy (1543–59). The city was at war with the Duke of Savoy for the salt monopoly (1678–99). Napoleon defeated the Piedmontese near Mondovì (1796), thereby assuring his way through the valley of the Po, and in 1799 it was pillaged by the French.

It was the birthplace of the pious Cardinal Bona, of the celebrated physicist Beccaria, and of Marquess Ormea, a statesman of the eighteenth century. Its cathedral contains paintings by Giulio Romano, Cambiaso, and others. The residence of the bishop is one of the noblest episcopal palaces in Italy. In the church of la Missione there are frescoes by the Jesuit Pozzi. Outside the city is the sanctuary of the Madonna del Pilone, dating from the fourteenth century, but finished later (1730–49). The palace of the counts of San Quintino contained the first printing-office in Piedmont, and was the seat of a university (1560–1719) founded by Duke Emmanuel Philibert, the first institution of its kind in Piedmont. The city, at first part of the Diocese of Asti, became the seat of a bishop, suffragan of the Archbishop of Milan, but, since 1515, Turin has been its metropolitan. In 1817, the territory of Cuneo was detached from the See of Mondovì, and made a diocese. The first bishop of Mondovì was Damiano Zavaglia, a zealous and peace-loving prelate; among his successors were Percivallo di Palma (1429), Amadeo Romagnano (1497), who reconstructed the cathedral (1550); Michele Ghislieri, O.P. (1550), later Pope Pius V; Cardinal Vincenzo Lauro (1566), founder of the seminary, during whose incumbency the cathedral and other churches were torn down to make room for the citadel; Giovanni Battista Isnardi (1697), who restored the episcopal palace and the church of St. Dalmazio; Carlo Felice Sanmartino (1741), founder of the new seminary, and Giovanni Tommaso Ghilardi, O.P. (1842), a very pious and charitable man. The city contains 145 parishes, with 170,000 faithful, 6 religious houses of women, 10 educational establishments for boys and 15 for girls; it has three Catholic newspapers.

Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1887), XIV; Grassi, *Memorie historiche della chiesa vescovile di Monteregale* (Turin, 1785); Della Rocca, *Le Storie dell' antica città di Monteregale ossia Mondovì* (2 vols., Turin, 1894–99).

U. Benigni.

Mone, Franz, historian and archæologist, b. at Mingolsheim near Bruchsal, Baden, 12 May, 1796; d. at Karlsruhe, 12 March, 1871. He attended the gymnasium at Bruchsal and in 1814 entered Heidelberg, where in 1817 he was appointed tutor (*Privatdozent*) in history, in 1818 secretary of the university library, in 1819 extraordinary, and in 1822 ordinary, professor, and in 1825 head of the university library. From 1827 to 1831 he was professor at Louvain. On his return to Baden he edited for a period the "Karlsruher Zeitung"; he became in 1835 archivist and director of the General National Archives at Karlsruhe, and retired in 1868. By his great diligence and tireless energy he acquired extensive knowledge. His works on early history ("Urgeschichte des badischen Landes", 2 vols., 1845; "Untersuchungen über die gallische Sprache", 1851; "Celtische Forschungen", 1857) suffer from his tendency to trace everything possible to a Celtic origin. More important are his works on literary history, which include: "Einleitung in das Nibelungenlied" (1818); "Geschichte des Heidentums im nördlichen Europa" (2 vols., 1822–3); "Otnit" (1821); "Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur und Sprache" (1830); "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der deutschen Heldensage" (1836); "Uebersicht der niederländischen Volksliteratur älterer Zeit" (1838). In the "Anzeiger für Kunde des deutschen Mittelalters" (1835–9), he calls attention to a great mass of unknown materials. Of great value for the history of the drama are his editions of "Altdeutsche Schauspiele" (1841) and "Schauspiele des Mittelalters" (2 vols., 1846). His works, "Lateinische und griechische Messen" (1850) and "Lateinische Hymnen" (3 vols., 1853–5), advanced the knowledge of liturgy and ecclesiastical poetry, and offer important liturgical documents not published elsewhere. For the history of his native country the following are useful: "Badisches Archiv" (2 vols., 1826–7); "Quellensammlung der badischen Landesgeschichte" (4 vols., 1848–67); the second volume of the "Episcopatus Constantiensis" of Neugart (1862), and, most particularly, the extraordinarily rich and varied "Zeitschrift für die Geschichte des Oberrheins" (21 vols., 1850–68), which was founded by Mone, and in which most of the articles during these early years were from his pen. It has been continued since then by the General Archives and by the Historical Commission of Baden. His industry and zeal in collecting were very praiseworthy, although he was sometimes deficient in accuracy and critical judgment; in his works the economico-historical interest is always in the foreground. He was an earnest and pious Catholic, and took part in the Baden ecclesiastical-political strife during the forties, publishing the two aggressive anonymous pam-

phlets, "Die katholischen Zustände in Baden" (1841–3).

VON WEECH, *Badische Biographien*, II (Heidelberg, 1875), 88–9; IDEM in *Allg. deutsche Biogr.*, XXII (Leipzig, 1885), 165–6. Portions of Mone's correspondence were edited by VON WEECH in *Zeitschr. für die Gesch. des Oberrheins*, LV (1901), 422 sqq., 650 sqq.; LVII (1903), 458 sqq.

KLEMENS LÖFFLER.

Moneta (MONETUS), theologian, b. at Cremona, Italy, date unknown; d. at Bologna, 1240. He was one of the first disciples of St. Dominic. Previous to his entrance into the order in 1220, he was professor of philosophy in the university of Bologna, where his rare erudition and depth of thought as well as his clearness of exposition won for him a wide reputation. The eloquence of Bl. Reginald, the superior of the local community, attracted to the order so many renowned doctors and students that Moneta began to fear for his own prestige, to insure which, he carefully avoided the preacher and exhorted his pupils, by word and example, to do likewise. But yielding to his pupils' wishes one day he accompanied them to a sermon and was so deeply moved by it that he resolved to become a religious. He was later noted for his sanctity no less than for his eloquent and learned controversies with the heretics. His intense devotion to study caused him to lose his sight in the latter days of his life. He is the author of "Summa contra Catharos et Waldenses", a widely read work during his time. It was first edited in 1743 by a religious of his order, Thomas Aug. Ricchini, who supplied the work with copious notes. In a biographical sketch of the author with which he prefaced the work, we are informed that Moneta wrote also a commentary on Aristotle's logic and a "Summa casuum conscientiæ".

QUÉTIF-ECHARD, *SS. Ord. Præd.*, I, 122; *Mon. Ord. Præd. Hist.*, I, 169; DENIFLE, *Archiv. für Lit. u. Kirchgesch.*, II, 232; ST. GILES, *Life of Bl. Reginald*, Eng. tr. (New York, 1877), 56–9.

JOSEPH SCHRODER.

Mongolia.—The name used to designate an immense uneven plateau, part of the Chinese Empire, extending, roughly speaking, from the Tarbagataï to the great K'ingan chains.

GEOGRAPHY.—Mongolia is bounded on the north by the Siberian provinces of Tomsk, Irkutsk, Yeniseisk, and Transbaikalia, as defined by the Russo-Chinese treaties of 1689 and 1727; on the east, by Manchuria, the frontier crossing the Nonni River; on the south, the frontier, after following the Shara Muran, which separates it from the Chinese provinces of Chi-li, Shan-si, Shen-si, and, crossing the bend of the Hwang-ho (Ordos Country), Kan-su, includes Ala-shan, following part of the Great Wall; on the southwest and west it is bounded by the New Dominion (Sin Kiang) and the Siberian province of Semipalatinsk to Mount Kaldar (Altai). The population of Mongolia is estimated variously at 2,600,000 (Statesman's Year Book, 1910), 2,580,000, or nearly 2 to the square mile, and 5,000,000. Its area of 1,367,953 square miles may be divided into three regions: the central region, known as the Mongolian Sha-mo, in contradistinction to the Great Sha-mo, or Desert of Gobi; the north-western region, a plateau connected with the Great Altaï, including Kobdo and Urga, and bounded on the S. E. by the Ektagh Altaï (or Mongolian, or Southern, Altaï); the southwestern region of the great K' ingan, a long chain of mountains, stretching from the Shara Muren to the Argún River, separating the plateau of Gobi from the Manchurian plains.

The climate is extremely dry, and the temperature varies abruptly with the season of the year and even the hour of the day. An idea of the severity of a Mongolian winter may be gathered from the following description of conditions in the month of October: "The cold by this time was almost Arctic. All our provisions were frozen through and through; potatoes were like lumps of iron; meat had to be broken rather than cut; and some eggs which we had brought with us were frozen so hard that, in spite of a preliminary thawing, the yolks were still solid lumps of ice when the whites were perfectly fried. Tea left in the bottom of a cup in the tent was frozen solid in a very few minutes. The ink froze on one's pen as one wrote, and one had to blow on it after writing every two or three words, while each page had to be thawed over the lamp before it could be blotted. In the morning we woke with our moustaches fringed with lumps of ice and a coating of ice along the edge of the bed-clothes where the breath had fallen" (Kidston, "China", no. 3, 1904, 21).

The Kerulon, or Khérelon, River, though "an inconsiderable river, is the longest of the vast arid East Mongol upland, and the permanence of the pastures along its banks has always attracted a large share of the nomad population; many of the Tsetsen princes keep their headquarters on or close to the Kerulon" (Campbell, 24). This river rises on the southern slopes of the Kentai Mountains, near Mount Burkhan Kalduna and enters the Dalai Nor, five or six miles south-west of the Altan Emûl (Golden Saddle), a pair of brown hills, famous in Mongol legend, between which the river flows. The Dalaï, or Kulun Nor, is a lake in the Manchurian region, 16 miles from north-east to south-west, and about 10 miles from east to west, near the Transbaikalian frontier of Russia; it was visited in 1689 by Father Gerbillon. This lake receives on the north the waters of the Dalaï Gol, which, united to the Khailar River, form the Argún River, and this in turn joins the Shilka. The Argún and Shilka being united take the name of Amúr, or He-lung-kiang, the great river which runs into the Okhotsk Sea. The Ursun Gol carries the overflow of the Buyr, or Bur, Nor to the Kulun Nor; the Khalka Gol, which rises in Lake Galba, on the western slope of the great K'ingan range, flows into the Buyr Nor; near it, on its south bank, stands the Ikhe Boshan Sume (Monastery of the Large Buddha). The Selenga River which runs into Lake Baikal, rises in the Ulan Taïga and Khan Taïga Mountains; its main tributaries are on the left, the Eke Gol flowing from the Kosso Gol in the middle of which is the Buddhist sacred island of Dalai Kui; on the right the Orkhon, which springs from the Khangai chain, receiving on the left the waters of the Tamir and on the right those of the Tola.

THE PEOPLE.—*Organization.*—With regard to the word *Mongol*, Mr. E. H. Parker (Asiatic Quart. Rev., July, 1910) writes: "It is usually believed that Jenghiz Khan gave the name Mung-Ku (the present Chinese name for 'Mongol') to his people, and the word is said to mean 'silver', just as the Liao (Kitan) dynasty is said to mean 'iron', and the Kin (Niuchen) dynasty to mean 'gold' . . . In the same way, I suspect the various forms, Mungu or Mungut, which have an unbroken descent from A. D. 600 to A. D. 1200 (before Jenghiz rose to power), must refer to some ancient stream or typographical peculiarity in the Onon region, near where Jenghiz arose." In the History of the Ming Dynasty (Ming Shi) the Mongols are styled Ta-ta (Tatars) and also Meng-gu. The Mongol tribes are divided into Nui Mung-ku (Inner Mongols) and Wai Mung-ku (Outer Mongols). The Nui Mung-ku, including forty-nine banners (*ho shun*), arose out of the organization formed by the descendants of Jenghiz Khan, which has continued to the present time. Under the Yuan dynasty they were organized in six divisions (*Djirgughan Tuman*, or "Six Ten Thousands"), forming two wings, the right occupying the western portion of the Mongolian territory, the left the eastern portion. The Inner Mongols are now divided into six *meng* (Chinese), or *chogolgán* (Mongol), including twenty-four *pu* (Chinese), or *aimak* (Mongol), as follows: I. Cherim Meng, or League, comprising the following *pu*, or tribes: (1) Khorch'in, 6 banners; (2) Djalaid, 1 banner; (3) Turbet, 1 banner; (4) Ghorlos, 2 banners. II. Cho-

sot'u League: (5) Kharach'in, 3 banners; (6) T'umed, 2 banners. III. Chao Uda League: (7) Ao-Khan, 1 banner; (8) Naiman, 1 banner; (9) Barin, 2 banners; (10) Djarud, 2 banners; (11) Aru Khorch'in, 2 banners; (12) Ongniod, 1 banner; (13) Keshikhteng, 1 banner; (14) Khalka of the Left, 1 banner. IV. Silinghol League: (15) Uchumuch'in, 2 banners; (16) Khaochid, 2 banners; (17) Sunid, 2 banners; (18) Abaga, 2 banners; (19) Abaganur, 2 banners. V. Ulan Ch'ap League: (20) Sze Tze Pu Lo, or Durban Keuked, 1 banner; (21) Mou Mingan, 1 banner; (22) Urad, 3 banners; (23) Khalka of the Right, 1 banner; VI. Ikh Chao League: (24) Ordos, 7 banners. W. F. Mayers who gives these particulars (Chinese Government) adds that with the tribes of the Ordos there are amalgamated certain fragments of the T'umed tribe, occupying the region adjacent to Kwei Hwa Ch'êng, to the north-east of the Great Bend of the Yellow River.

Inner Mongolia is broadly speaking "what is to the south of the Great Desert"; it extends over the plateau beyond the K'ingan Mountains into the upper valleys of the Manchurian rivers, the Liao and the Sungari; it includes part of Outer Chi-li. With the exception of the Ch'ahar and the T'umed, placed under the government of Manchu generals, each Mongolian banner is ruled by an hereditary chieftain or noble (Dzassak or Jassak). These nobles are classed in six ranks, from *ts'in wang*, "prince of the first order", to *taichi*, or *daidji*, "noble". They are controlled by the *Li fan Yuan*. Campbell writes (op. cit. supra): "The descent and honours of every noble are registered in the Li Fan Yuan, at Peking, and the bearers of hereditary titles indicate their successors, who must be confirmed in the succession by decrees of the Chinese Emperor. On succeeding to a title, a Jassak is summoned to Peking for audience. All the nobility of the Inner Mongol tribes pay visits to the Chinese Court at New Year by roster, a cycle of three years completing the roster; and those who do not go to Court are required to attend at the local Jassak's residence on New Year's Day in full Court dress, and perform the proper obeisances in the direction of Peking. A *jassak* presents a sheep and a bottle of milk spirit to the emperor on these occasions, and a *taichi* gives a 'scalded sheep.' Such as visit Peking are banqueted and receive presents of silk, and they attend in the suite of the Chinese Emperor when he goes forth to offer the seasonable sacrifices."

The Wai Mung-ku, or Outer Mongols, comprise the Khalkhas and the Kalmuks, or Western Mongols. The country stretches "along the Siberian frontier from near Lake Kulun to the Altai, and includes the four Aimak, or Khantaes, of the Khalkas, and the west Mongol territories under the jurisdiction of the Chinese Military Government at Uliasut'ai, Kobdo, Tarbagatai, and Uriankhai. In the term Outer Mongolia may also be included the Mongols of Kokonor and Tsaidam, who are under the control of an Imperial agent stationed at Si-ning Fu" (Campbell, op. cit.). The Khalkhas constitute four great *pu*: (1) the T'ushét'u Khanate, 20 banners; (2) Tsetsen Khanate, 23 banners; (3) Dzassakt'u Khanate, 18 banners; (4) Sain-noin Tribe, 22 banners. Urga (Ta-kuren) is the administrative centre of the East Khalkha Khanates, within the territory of the T'ushét'u Khan. Its name represents the Russian pronunciation of the Mongol word *örgo* (residence). According to C. W. Campbell, the full native name is Bodgo Lamain Khure (The God-lama's Encampment); shorter names are Da Khure, or Ikhe Khure (Great Encampment), Bogdo Khure, and simply Khure; the Chinese call the place K'u-lun, or K'u-lien, or Ta K'u-lien. Urga includes three towns lying to the north of the Tola River: Urga proper, the Mongol quarters; the Russian consulate and settlement, a mile and a half to the east; and farther east Mai-mai chên, the Chinese Urga, the commercial town. There is a population of 25,000, half of whom are lamas. There is a Chinese commissioner, styled *K'u-lun pan shi ta ch'en* (incumbent in 1910, Yen Chi), and an assistant commissioner, styled *pang pan ta ch'en* (incumbent in 1910, Pêng-ch'u-k'o-ch'ê-lin). Urga is also the residence of the *cheptsundampa hut'ukht'u*, or patriarch of the Khalkha tribes, ranking, in the Lamaist Church, next to the Dalaï and the Panshen erdeni lamas; this title was conferred in the middle of the seventeenth century by the Dalaï lama on a son of the T'ushet'u khan, known in Mongol history as Undur Gegen. When the British troops entered Lhasa, the Dalaï lama fled to Urga, where he arrived on the 27 Nov., 1904. Uliasut'ai, in the territory of the Sain Noin Khalkas, is the seat of a *tsiang kiun*, or military governor (in 1910 K'un siu), and of two *ts'an tsan ta ch'ên*, or military assistant governors (in 1910 Ch'ê-têng-so-no-mu and K'uei Huan. Kobdo, on the Bayantu, has, subject to Uliasut'ai, a military assistant governor (in 1910, P'u Jun), and a commissioner, or *pan shi ta ch'ên* (in 1910 Si Hêng). At Si-ning there is a *pan shi ta ch'en* (in 1910, Ch'ing Shu).

The Kalmuks, or Western Mongols, next in importance to the Khalkhas, include six tribes: (1) Oelöt (Eleuths), Kalmuks; (2) Turbet; (3) Turgut; (4) Khoshoit; (5) Khoit; (6) Ch'oros. To these should be added the Ts'ing Hai Mung-ku, Mongols of Kokonor, including 29 banners, all Kalmuk, 21 banners being Khoshoit; the Alashan Mung-ku, Mongols of Alashan, of Kalmuk descent, with Ning hia as their chief centre; the Yeo Muh, nomadic tribes, including the Ch'ahar, near the Great Wall, the Bargu tribe, controlled by Je-hol and Kalgan, the Urianghai, Mingad, and Djakch'in under the Governor of Uliasut'ai. The Buriat are subject to Russia, and the Dam Mongols live in Tsaidam between Kokonor and Tibet.

As a result of the recent Russo-Japanese agreement, the Chinese Imperial Grand Council studied the means of preserving the integrity of Mongolian territory; it was resolved that two divisions of modern troops should be sent to this country, that education should be established according to Chinese methods, and that a railway should be built across Mongolia with its terminus at Peking.

Religion.—The religion of the Mongols is Buddhism under the Lamaist form, introduced from Tibet at the end of the Ming Dynasty. The lamas like the *cheptsundampa hut'ukht'u* at Urga, have their head clean shaven. Large monasteries exist at Je-hol and Dolon-nor (Lama-miao), and at Wu T'ai shan, in the Shan-si Province. The Lamaist organization in and near Peking is named Chu King Lama; the metropolitan, Chang-chia Hut'ukht'u lives at Dolon-nor—or rather at Yung Ho Kung—and controls the Mongols of Ch'ahar. Lamaism has certainly altered the character of the warlike followers of Jenghiz, who are now a peaceful population of herdsmen. "The Lamas", writes Kidston (op. cit., p. 19), "exercise enormous influence; every tent has its altar, every high ridge on the plain has its sacred cairn, the repetition of prayers and the telling of beads is universal and incessant, and almost every collection of 'yurts' has its prayer flags, fluttering conveniently easy petitions with every breeze that blows. Belief in the transmigration of the soul and in the utter unimportance of the mere body is so strong that the bodies of laymen are not buried at all, but simply thrown out on the plain, where the dogs make short work of them. The taking of life is regarded with horror, though sheer necessity makes an exception and provides quibbling excuses for the slaughter of sheep. On the whole journey we only saw one fire-arm, and that was evidently intended for show rather than for use. It was carried by one of the escort provided for us by Prince Ha-la-han, and, from inquiries, I believe that it represented the entire armament of the Principality."

Customs, Language, etc.—The typical Mongol is short and stumpy; the head is shaven, with the exception of a tuft of hair, a souvenir of the Manchu conquest. Family ties are very loose; marriage being a civil contract the binding force of which is the mere will of the parties. Stock-breeding is the occupation of practically all Mongols. They are remarkable herdsmen, and their ponies which are excellent, are branded. They have herds of camels, and yaks are to be seen in the mountainous parts of northern Mongolia. Mr. George J. Kidston (China, No. 3, 1904) observes: "Both in features and in character they are less foreign to the European than the Chinese. They have often almost ruddy complexions; they laugh more heartily, have none of the endless formalities and (to us) crooked ways of thought that distinguish the Chinese, and they have even certain customs that strike one as being distinctly Western. The women, for instance, when they meet, embrace one another and kiss on both cheeks, while the men shake both hands. . . . Perhaps the first thing that strikes a stranger about the Mongols, after their exceeding filthiness, is their love of talking. . . . Hospitality is a universal virtue, and one may enter any 'yurt' on the plain and be sure of a welcome. . . . They are excitable, but courage is not their strong point, and disputes die out in lengthy warfare of words." They are also lazy and voracious. They live on mutton, milk, and brick tea; they have neither flour, vegetables, nor eggs. "They have one very excellent preparation which the Chinese call 'milk-skin'; it is made by boiling milk until the cream settles in a thick skin on the top, and it much resembles Devonshire cream. The only native strong drink is made from fermented mare's milk. We were told that it is intoxicating if partaken of in large quantities. The Mongols, however, have a decided weakness for Chinese wine and spirits, and the Chinese always speak of them as a drunken race" (op. cit., 19). The Mongol tent (*gher*, or *yurt*) is made of a trellis of wooden staves fastened neatly together with strings of hide, the whole being covered with felt, the best of which comes from Russian Turkestan.

The Mongol language belongs to the Ural-Altaic family, the Kalmuk dialect, though containing a number of Turkish words, being the purer. The Uighúr is the basis of the modern Mongol and Manchu characters; it is of Syriac origin, introduced into Eastern Turkestan by the early Nestorian missionaries. There is a dialect poem in Uighúr, the "Kudatku bibk", dating from A. D. 1069, which was published in 1870 by Arminius Vambery, and in 1891 by W. Radloff.

History.—When Jenghiz Khan died on 18 August, 1227, his dominions were divided among his four sons. Juji, the eldest son, died before his father, and was replaced by his own son Batu, who had for his share the plains of Kipchak, the lower course of the Syr-Daria, the Aral and Caspian Seas, the valleys of the Don and the Volga, and northward beyond the Ural River; Chagatai had the Kingdom of Mávará-un-Nahr, or Transoxiana, and also what is now Chinese Turkestan, Ferghána, Badakhshan, etc., and his capital was Almalik; Okkodai, the third son, had the Mongol country with the capital, Karákorum; lastly, Tu-li had the territory between the Karákorum mountains and the sources of the Onon River. Karákorum (*kara*, black; *kuren*, a camp), was called by the Chinese Ho-lin and was chosen for his capital by Jenghiz Khan in 1206. Its full name, Ha-la Ho-lin, was taken from a river to the west. In the spring of 1235, Okkodai had a wall built round Ho-lin. After the death of Kúblái, Ho-lin was altered to Ho-Ning, and in 1320 the name of the province was changed into Lingpe ("mountainous North", i. e., the Ying-shan chain, separating China Proper from Mongolia). Recent researches have fully confirmed the belief that the Erdeni Tso, or Erdeni Chao, monastery, founded in 1586, occupies the site of Karákorum, near the bank of the Orkhon, between this river and the Kokchin (old) Orkhon. In 1256, Mangku Khan decided to transfer the seat of government to Kaiping fu, or Shang-tu, near the present Dolon nor, north of Peking. In 1260, Kúblái transferred his capital to Ta-tu (Peking), and it was called Khan-baligh. The second Supreme Khan was Okkodai (1229–41), replaced by his son Kuyuk (third Great Khan) (1246–48), Turakina being regent (1241–46); Ogulgaïmish was regent (1248–51). The title was then transferred to the Tu-li branch of Jenghiz family, and the fourth great Khan was Mangku, who was killed at the siege of Ho-chou in Sze-ch'uan (1251–57).

Kúblái, brother of Mangku, who succeeded him in 1260, was the fifth great Khan and the first real Emperor of China of the Yuan Dynasty (1280). His ancestors have the following dynastic titles or *miao hao:* T'ai Tsu (Jenghiz), T'ai Tsung (Okkodai), Ting Tsung (Kuyuk), Hien Tsung (Mangku). Kúblái himself has the *miao hao* of She Tsu and the two reign-titles (*nien hao*) of Chung T'ung (1260) and Che Yuan (1264). The list of his successors according to their *miao hao*, with *nien hao* in parentheses, is as follows: Ch'êng Tsung, 1295 (Yuan Chêng, 1295; Ta Teh, 1297); Wu Tsung, 1308 (Che Ta, 1308); Jên Tsung, 1312 (Hwang K'ing, 1312; Yen Yew, 1314); Ying Tsung, 1321 (Che Che, 1321); Tai Ting Ti, 1324; (Tai Ting, 1324; Che Ho, 1328); Ming Tsung, 1329 (T'ien Li, 1329); Wen Ti, 1330 (T'ien Li, 1330, Che Shun, 1330); Shun Ti, 1333 (Yuan Tung, 1333; Che Yuan, 1335; Che Chêng, 1341). The misconduct and weakness of the emperors led a Chinese priest, Chu Yuan-chang, to raise the standard of rebellion and expel the Mongols, in 1368. This priest ascended the throne under the title of Hung Wu, and established his dynasty, the Ming, at Nan-king. Of the Court of Kúblái Khan the Venetian traveller Marco Polo has left us a glorious account. China was then divided into twelve *sheng*, or provinces: Cheng Tung, Liao Yang, Chung Shu, Shen-si, Ling Pe (Karákorum), Kan Su, Sze-ch'wan, Ho-nan Kiang-Pe, Kiang-che, Kiang-si, Hu-Kwang and Yun-Nan.

The younger brother of Kúblái, Hulaku, captured Bagdad, on 5 Feb., 1258; and the Khalif Mostásim Billah, the last of the Abbasid sovereigns, surrendered to the Mongol chief on 10 February. Hulaku was thus the founder of the dynasty of Ilkhans of Iran, which included the following princes: Hulaku, until 1265; Abaka (1265–81); Nikudar Ahmed (1281–84); Arghún (1284–91); Gaikhatu (1291–95); Baïdu (1295); Ghazan Mahmud (1295–1304); Ghiyas ed-din Oljaitu Khudabendeh Mohammed (1304–16); Abusaïd Bahadur (1316–35); Moïzz ed-dunia we'd-din Arpa (1335–36); Musa (1336); Mohammed (1336–38); Togha Timur (1338–39); Izz ed-din Djehan-Timur (1339); Satibeg (1339); Suleiman (1339–44); Adil Anushirwan (1344–53). After the death of Abusaïd all these princes were but nominal sovereigns, overruled by five small dynasties: (1) Ilkhanian-Jelaïrid, at Bagdad (1336–1432); (2) Beni Kurt, in Khorasan and Herat (1248–1383); (3) Modhafferian, in Irak, Fars, and Kerman (1335–92); (4) Serbedarian, in Khorasan (1335–81); (5) Jubanian, in Azerbaidjan (1337–55). They were all destroyed by Timur or his successors. Among the first Ilkhans, Arghún and Oljaitu had relations with the kings of France: two letters are preserved in the French Archives, one from Arghún Khan (1289), brought by Buscarel, and the other from his son Oljaitu (May, 1305) to Philip the Fair. These letters are both in the Mongol language, and, according to Abel Rémusat and other authorities, in the Uighúr character, the parent of the present Mongol writing; facsimiles of them are given in Prince Roland Bonaparte's "Recueil des documents de l'époque mongole". Under this dynasty, in 1318, Pope John XXII had created an archbishopric at Sulthanyeh, of which Franco of Perugia, William

Adam (1 June, 1323), John of Cora (1329), and others were the incumbents, down to Thomas de Abaraner (19 Dec., 1425).

Chagatai died in 1241, and was replaced by his grandson Kara Hulaku. About 1321, under Kabak, the realm of Chagatai was divided into two parts; Mávará-un-Nahr, or Transoxiana, and Moghulistan, or Jatah. About fifteen khans ruled Transoxiana, while confusion and discord were prevalent, until the great Timur conquered the land and restored order in 1370 (A. H. 771). The first ruler of Moghulistan (1321) was Isán Bugha Khán; after the death of Sultan Ahmed Khan (1504) a state of anarchy prevailed in the country until Sultan Mansur, the eldest son of Ahmed, established his authority at Aksu, Turfan, etc., and created the Khanate of Uighuristán, while the Kirghiz in the steppes, having elected khans, formed the Confederation of Kazák-Uzbegs, and Sultan Said Khan, third son of Ahmed, established a khanate in Kashgar and the western provinces (see TURKESTAN).

From Juji, the eldest son of Jenghiz Khan, descended the following dynasties of khans: (1) Kipchak, 1224–1502; (2) Astrakhan, 1466–1554; (3) Great Bulgaria, 1224–1438; (4) Kazan, 1438–1552; (5) Kasimof, 1450–1681; (6) Crimea, 1420–1783; (7) Nogaïs, 1224–1301; (8) Kazák-Uzbegs, 1427–1830; (9) Turan and Tiumen, 1225–1659; (10) Tiumen and Sibir, 1301–1588; (11) Kharezen, 1515–1805; (12) Mávará-un-Nahr, 1500–1796.

CATHOLIC MISSIONS.—In 1838, the Vicariate Apostolic of Liao-tung was detached from the Diocese of Peking. It included both Manchuria and Mongolia. Emmanuel-Jean-François-Verrolles, of the Paris Missions Etrangères, was the first vicar Apostolic. Five years later (28 August, 1840) the new vicariate was divided into three vicariates Apostolic: (1) Liao-tung and Manchuria; (2) Mongolia; (3) Kan su. Mongolia had been a dependence of the Diocese of Peking from 1690 to 1838, and after 1783 had been administered by the Lazarists; the Paris Missions Etrangères kept it only two years, and when it was made a separate vicariate Apostolic (28 August, 1840) at the head of it was placed Joseph Martial Mouly, titular Bishop of Fussola, who, on his transfer to Peking (1857), was replaced by Florent Daguin, titular Bishop of Troas, who died 9 May, 1859. François Tagliabue was then appointed pro-vicar and superior of the mission. On 7 Sept., 1864, the Lazarists surrendered Mongolia to the Belgian missionaries, and Theophilus Verbiest (b. at Antwerp in 1823) was the first superior and Pro-vicar Apostolic; he died 23 Feb., 1868, and was succeeded as pro-vicar by Edward Smorembourg. Jacques Bax (b. 1824) was appointed vicar Apostolic 22 Oct., 1874, was consecrated titular Bishop of Adran, 6 Jan., 1875, and died 4 Jan., 1895, at Si-wan-tze. On 21 Dec., 1883, Leo XIII divided Mongolia into three vicariates Apostolic, Eastern, Central, and Western and Southern Mongolia, all in the hands of the Belgian Missionaries (Congr. Imm. Cordis B. M. V. de Scheutveld). The first Vicar Apostolic of Eastern Mongolia was Conrad Abels, b. at Weest, Limburg, Holland, 31 Jan., 1856, consecrated titular Bishop of Lagania, 31 Oct., 1897; residence at Sung shu tsuei tze (Notre Dame des Pins). He was succeeded by Theodore Hermann Rutjes, titular Bishop of Eleuteropolis, who died 4 August, 1896. There are in Eastern Mongolia 39 European and 12 native priests; 19,864 Christians; 18 churches. (2) Central Mongolia, after the partition, in 1883, remained under Mgr Bax, who was succeeded as vicar Apostolic by Jerome Van Aertselaer (b. 1 Nov., 1845), consecrated titular Bishop of Zarai, 24 July, 1898, with residence at Siwan tze. There are 46 European and 23 native priests; 25,775 Christians; 37 churches. (3) Western-Southern Mongolia.—To the vicariate created in 1883 were added by decree of 12 Oct., 1886, the Prefecture of Ning hia from the Kan-su vicariate and the Sub-prefecture K'u-luan. The residence is at Eul she sze k'ing ti. Vicar Apostolic Alphonsus Bermyn (b. 2 Aug., 1853) was consecrated 15 April, 1901, titular Bishop of Stratonicea. He replaced Alphonse de Vos, titular Bishop of Abdera, d. 21 July, 1888, and Ferdinand Hamer, who was transferred from Kan-su, 30 August, 1888, and martyred August, 1900. There are 45 European and 1 native priests; 13,896 Christians; 30 churches. This vicariate is the Ordos country.

BERNH. JÜLG has translated Mongolian legends and tales into German, especially, *Die Märchen des Siddhi Kür* (1866–68) and I. J. SCHMIDT has translated the great work of SANANG SETZEN under the title, *Geschichte der Ost Mongolen und ihres Fürstenhauses* (St. Petersburg, 1829). The latter author has also published *Grammatik der Mongolischen Sprache* (St. Petersburg, 1831) and *Mongolisch-deutsch-russisches Wörterbuch* (St. Petersburg, 1835). J. E. KOVALEVSKI, *Dictionnaire mongol-russe-français* (3 vols, quarto, Kasan, 1844–49). Other Mongolian scholars worthy of mention are: VON DER GABELENTZ, BOBROVNIKOV, GOLDSTUNSKY, POZDNIEV. See also CAMPBELL, *Journey in Mongolia* in *China* (1904), no. 1; KIDSTON, *Journey in Mongolia* in *China* (1904), no. 3—both parliamentary papers; CORDIER, *Bibliotheca Sinica*, chapter *Mongolia*.

HENRI CORDIER.

Monica, SAINT, widow; born of Christian parents at Tagaste, N. Africa, in 333; died at Ostia, near Rome, in 387. We are told but little of her childhood. She was married early in life to Patritius who held an official position in Tagaste. He was a pagan, though like so many at that period, his religion was no more than a name; his temper was violent and he appears to have been of dissolute habits. Consequently Monica's married life was far from being a happy one, more especially as Patritius's mother seems to have been of a like disposition with himself. There was of course a gulf between husband and wife; her almsdeeds and her habits of prayer annoyed him, but it is said that he always held her in a sort of reverence. Monica was not the only matron of Tagaste whose married life was unhappy, but, by her sweetness and patience, she was able to exercise a veritable apostolate amongst the wives and mothers of her native town; they knew that she suffered as they did, and her words and example had a proportionate effect.

Three children were born of this marriage, Augustine the eldest, Navigius the second, and a daughter, Perpetua. Monica had been unable to secure baptism for her children, and her grief was great when Augustine fell ill; in her distress she besought Patritius to allow him to be baptized; he agreed, but on the boy's recovery withdrew his consent. All Monica's anxiety now centred in Augustine; he was wayward and, as he himself tells us, lazy. He was sent to Madaura to school and Monica seems to have literally wrestled with God for the soul of her son. A great consolation was vouchsafed her—in compensation perhaps for all she was to experience through Augustine—Patritius became a Christian. Meanwhile, Augustine had been sent to Carthage, to prosecute his studies, and here he fell into grievous sin. Patritius died very shortly after his reception into the Church and Monica resolved not to marry again. At Carthage Augustine had become a Manichean and when on his return home he ventilated certain heretical propositions she drove him away from her table, but a strange vision which she had urged her to recall him. It was at this time that she went to see a certain holy bishop, whose name is not given, but who consoled her with the now famous words, "the child of those tears shall never perish". There is no more pathetic story in the annals of the Saints than that of Monica pursuing her wayward son to Rome, whither he had gone by stealth; when she arrived he had already gone to Milan, but she followed him. Here she found St. Ambrose and through him she ultimately had the joy of seeing Augustine yield, after seventeen years of resistance. Mother and son spent six months of true peace at Cassiacum, after which time Augustine was baptized in the church of St. John the Baptist at Milan. Africa claimed them however, and they set

out on their journey, stopping at Cività Vecchia and at Ostia. Here death overtook Monica and the finest pages in his "Confessions" were penned as the result of the emotion Augustine then experienced.

St. Monica was buried at Ostia, and at first seems to have been almost forgotten, though her body was removed during the sixth century to a hidden crypt in the church of St. Aureus. About the thirteenth century, however, the cult of St. Monica began to spread and a feast in her honour was kept on 4 May. In 1430 Martin V ordered the relics to be brought to Rome. Many miracles occurred on the way, and the cultus of St. Monica was definitely established. Later, the Archbishop of Rouen, Cardinal d'Estouteville, built a church at Rome in honour of St. Augustine and deposited the relics of St. Monica in a chapel to the left of the high altar. The Office of St. Monica however does not seem to have found a place in the Roman Breviary before the sixteenth century. In 1850 there was established at Notre Dame de Sion at Paris an Association of Christian mothers under the patronage of St. Monica; its object was mutual prayer for sons and husbands who had gone astray. This Association was in 1856 raised to the rank of an archconfraternity and spread rapidly over all the Catholic world, branches being established in Dublin, London, Liverpool, Sidney, and Buenos Ayres. Eugenius IV had established a similar Confraternity long before.

ST. AUGUSTINE, *Confessions*, IX, reprinted in SURIUS. GUALTERUS, Canon Regular of Ostia, who was especially charged with the work of removing the relics from Ostia by Martin V, wrote a life of the saint with an account of the translation. He appended to the life a letter which used to be attributed to St. Augustine but which is undoubtedly spurious; it purports to be written to his sister Perpetua and describes their mother's death. The BOLLANDISTS decide for the contemporary character of the letter whilst denying it to St. Augustine. BARONIUS, *Ann. Eccl.*, ad an. 389; BOUGAUD, *Histoire de S. Monique.*

HUGH T. POPE.

Monism (from the Greek μόνος, "one", "alone", "unique") is a philosophical term which, in its various meanings, is opposed to Dualism or Pluralism. Wherever pluralistic philosophy distinguishes a multiplicity of things, Monism denies that the manifoldness is real, and holds that the apparently many are phases, or phenomena, of a one. Wherever dualistic philosophy distinguishes between body and soul, matter and spirit, object and subject, matter and force, the system which denies such a distinction, reduces one term of the antithesis to the other, or merges both in a higher unity, is called Monism.

I. IN METAPHYSICS.—The ancient Hindu philosophers stated as a fundamental truth that the world of our sense-experience is all illusion (*maya*), that change, plurality, and causation are not real, that there is but one reality, God. This is metaphysical Monism of the idealistic-spiritual type, tending towards mysticism. Among the early Greek philosophers, the Eleatics, starting, like the Hindus, with the conviction that sense-knowledge is untrustworthy, and reason alone reliable, reached the conclusion that change, plurality, and origination do not really exist, that Being is one, immutable, and eternal. They did not explicitly identify the one reality with God, and were not, so far as we know, inclined to mysticism. Their Monism, therefore, may be said to be of the purely idealistic type. These two forms of metaphysical Monism recur frequently in the history of philosophy; for instance, the idealistic-spiritual type in neo-Platonism and in Spinoza's metaphysics, and the purely idealistic type in the rational absolutism of Hegel. Besides idealistic Monism there is Monism of the materialistic type, which proclaims that there is but one reality, namely, matter, whether matter be an agglomerate of atoms, a primitive, world-forming substance (see IONIAN SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY), or the so-called cosmic nebula out of which the world evolved. There is another form of metaphysical Monism, represented in these days by Haeckel and his followers, which, though materialistic in its scope and tendency, professes to transcend the point of view of materialistic Monism and unite both matter and mind in a higher something. The weak point of all metaphysical Monism is its inability to explain how, if there is but one reality, and everything else is only apparent, there can be any real changes in the world, or real relations among things. This difficulty is met in dualistic systems of philosophy by the doctrine of matter and form, or potency and actuality, which are the ultimate realities in the metaphysical order. Pluralism rejects the solution offered by scholastic dualism and strives, with but little success, to oppose to Monism its own theory of synechism or panpsychism (see PRAGMATISM). The chief objection to materialistic Monism is that it stops short of the point where the real problem of metaphysics begins.

II. IN THEOLOGY.—The term *Monism* is not much used in theology because of the confusion to which its use would lead. Polytheism, the doctrine that there are many Gods, has for its opposite Monotheism, the doctrine that there is but one God. If the term *Monism* is employed in place of *Monotheism*, it may, of course, mean Theism, which is a monotheistic doctrine, or it may mean Pantheism, which is opposed to theism. In this sense of the term, as a synonym for Pantheism, Monism maintains that there is no real distinction between God and the universe. Either God is indwelling in the universe as a part of it, not distinct from it (pantheistic Immanentism), or the universe does not exist at all as a reality (Acosmism), but only as a manifestation or phenomenon of God. These views are vigorously combated by Theism, not only on considerations of logic and philosophy, but also on considerations of human life and conduct. For the ethical implications of pantheism are as detrimental to it as its shortcomings from the point of view of consistency and reasonableness. Theism does not deny that God is indwelling in the universe; but it does deny that He is comprised in the universe. Theism does not deny that the universe is a manifestation of God; but it does deny that the universe has no reality of its own. Theism is, therefore, dualistic: it holds that God is a reality distinct from the universe and independent of it, and that the universe is a reality distinct from God, though not independent of Him. From another point of view, theism is monistic; it maintains that there is but One Supreme Reality and that all other reality is derived from Him. *Monism* is not then an adequate equivalent of the term *Theism*.

III. IN PSYCHOLOGY.—The central problem of rational psychology is the question of the relation between soul and body. Scholastic dualism, following Aristotle, maintains that man is one substance, composed of body and soul, which are respectively matter and form. The soul is the principle of life, energy, and perfection; the body is the principle of decay, potentiality, and imperfection. These two are not complete substances: their union is not accidental, as Plato thought, but substantial. They are, of course, really distinct, and even separable; yet they act on each other and react. The soul, even in its highest functions, needs the co-operation, at least extrinsic, of the body, and the body in all its vital functions is energized by the soul as the radical principle of those functions. They are not so much two in one as two forming one compound. In popular imagination this dualism may be exaggerated; in the mind of the extreme ascetic it sometimes is exaggerated to the point of placing a too sharp contrast between "the flesh" and "the spirit", "the beast" and "the angel", in us.

Psychological Monism tends to obliterate all distinction between body and soul. This it does in one of three ways. (A) Monism of the materialistic type reduces the soul to matter or material conditions, and thus, in

effect, denies that there is any distinction between soul and body. The Stoics described the soul as a part of the material world-substance; the Epicureans held that it is a compound of material atoms; modern Materialism knows no substantial soul except the nervous system; Cabanis, for instance, proclaims his materialism in the well-known crude formula: "The brain digests impressions, and organically secretes thought." Psychological materialism, as metaphysical materialism, closes its eyes to those phenomena of the soul which it cannot explain, or even denies that such phenomena exist. (B) Monism of the idealistic type takes an entirely opposite course. It reduces the body to mind or mental conditions. Some of the neo-Platonists held that all matter is non-existent, that our body is, therefore, an error on the part of our minds, and that the soul alone is the personality.

John Scotus Eriugena, influenced by the neo-Platonists, held the body to be a resultant from incorporeal qualities which the soul, by thinking them and synthesizing them, creates into a body for itself. In modern times, Berkeley included the human body in his general denial of the reality of matter, and maintained that there are no substances except the soul and God. The grounds for this belief are epistemological. Psychological Monism runs counter to common sense and experience. Historically, it is a reaction against materialism. To refute materialism it is not necessary to deny that the body is a reality. The unreflecting dualism of common sense and the scientific dualism which the Scholastics built on the facts of experience steer a safe and consistent course between the hasty generalization of the Materialist, who sees nothing but body, and the bold paradox of the Idealist, who recognizes no reality except mind.

(C) A third kind of psychological Monism goes by the name of psychophysical parallelism. It maintains two principles, the one negative and the other affirmative. First, it denies categorically that there is, or can be, any direct causal influence of the soul on the body or of the body on the soul: our thoughts cannot produce the movements of our muscles, neither can the action of light on the retina produce in us the "thought" of a colour. Secondly, it affirms in some shape or form that both the body and the soul are phases of something else, that this something evolves its activities along two parallel lines, the physical and the psychical, so that the thought, for instance, of moving my hand is synchronous with the motion of my hand, without one in any way influencing the other. This is the doctrine of Occasionalists who, like Malebranche, (q. v.), maintain that the union of the soul and body "consists in a mutual and natural correspondence of the thoughts of the soul with the processes of the brain, and of the emotions of the soul with the movements of the animal spirits" (Rech. de la Vérité, II, v). It is the doctrine of Spinoza, whose metaphysical Monism compelled him to hold that body and soul are merely aspects of the one substance, God, under the attributes extension and thought, but that they unfold their modes of activity in a manner preordained to correspondence (Eth., II, ii, schol.). Leibniz meets the difficulty in his own characteristic way by teaching that all monads are partly material and partly immaterial, and that among all monads and their activities there exists a pre-established harmony (see LEIBNIZ; MONAD). In the so-called *Identitätsphilosophie* of some German Transcendentalists, such as Schelling, reality is mind in so far as it is active, and matter in so far as it is passive; mind and matter are, therefore, two harmonious, but independent, series of phases of reality. Fechner's view is similar: he holds that the reality pervading the whole universe is at once physical and psychical, that the physical is the "exterior" and the psychical the "interior", or "inner", side of reality, and that the body and soul in man are but one instance of a parellelism which prevails everywhere in nature. Paulsen ("Introd. to Phil.", tr. Thilly, 87 sqq.) holds that "two propositions are contained in the theory of parallelism: (1) Physical processes are never effects of psychical processes; (2) Psychical processes are never effects of physical processes." He adopts Fechner's panpsychism, maintaining that "everything corporeal points to something else, an inner, intelligible element, a being for itself, which is akin to what we experience within ourselves". Both the corporeal and the "inner" are parts of the universal system, which is the body of God, and, though they do not interact, they act in such a way that harmony results.

Herbert Spencer uses the word *parallelism* in a slightly different sense: the separate impressions of the senses and the stream of inner conscious states must be adjusted by the activity of the mind, if the two series are to be of any use to the developing or evolving animal or man; that is, there must be a parallelism between a certain physical evolution and the correlative psychical evolution" (Principles of Psych., n. 179), while both mind and matter are mere "symbols of some form of Power absolutely and forever unknown to us" (op. cit., n. 63). This idea finds favour among the evolutionists generally, and has one distinct advantage: it obviates the necessity of explaining many phenomena of mind which could not be accounted for by the principles of materialistic evolution. Thus, under the name "double-aspect theory" it is adopted by Clifford, Bain, Lewes, and Huxley. Among empirical psychologists parallelism has been found satisfactory as a "working hypothesis". Experience, it is maintained, tells us nothing of a substantial soul that acts on the body and is acted upon. It does tell us, however, that psychical states are apparently conditioned by bodily states, and that states of body apparently influence states of mind. For the purposes of science, conclude the empiricists, it is enough to maintain as an empirical formula that the two streams of activity are, so to speak, parallel, though never confluent. There is no need to ground the formula on any universal metaphysical theory, such as the pan-psychism of Fechner and Paulsen. It is enough that, as Wundt points out, the facts of experience establish a correspondence between physical and psychical, while the dissimilarity of the physical and the psychical precludes the possibility of one being the cause of the other. To all these parallelistic explanations of the relations between soul and body the Scholastic dualists take exception. First, the scholastics call attention to the verdict of experience. Up to a certain point, the facts of experience are capable of a parallelistic, as well as of a dualistic, explanation. But when we come to consider the unity of consciousness, which is a fact of experience, we find that the theory of parallelism breaks down, and the only explanation that holds is that of dualists, who maintain the substantiality of the soul. Secondly, if the parallelistic theory be true, what, ask the Scholastic dualists, becomes of the freedom of the will and moral responsibility? If our mental and bodily states are not to be referred to an immediate personal subject, but are considered phases or aspects of a universal substance, a cosmic soul, mind-stuff, or unknown "form of Power", it is not easy to see in what sense the will can be free, and man be held responsible for his mental or bodily acts.

In a minor sense the word *monism* is sometimes used in psychology to designate the doctrine that there is no real distinction between the soul and its faculties. Psychological dualism holds that soul and body are distinct, though incomplete, substances. But how about the soul itself? Plato's doctrine that it has three parts has had very little following in philosophy. Aristotle distinguished between the substance of the soul and its powers (*δυνάμεις*), or faculties,

and bequeathed to the Schoolmen the problem whether these faculties are really, or only notionally, distinct from the soul itself. Those who favour the real distinction are sometimes called pluralists in psychology, and their opponents, who say that the distinction is nominal or, at most, notional, are sometimes called psychological Monists. The question is decided by inferences from the facts of consciousness. Those who hold real distinction of function argue that this is sufficient ground for a real distinction of faculties.

IV. In Epistemology, as in psychology, Monism is used in various senses to signify, in a general way, the antithesis of dualism. The Dualist in epistemology agrees with the ordinary observer, who distinguishes both in theory and in practice between "things" and "thoughts". Common sense, or unreflecting consciousness, takes things generally to be what they seem. It acts on the conviction that the internal world of our thoughts corresponds with the external world of reality. The philosophical dualist questions the extent and accuracy of that correspondence; he learns from psychology that many instances of so-called immediate perception have in them a large share of interpretation, and are, in so far, referable to the activity of the mind. Nevertheless, he sees no reason to quarrel with the general verdict of common sense that there is a world of reality outside us, as well as a world of representation within us, and that the latter corresponds in a measure to the former. He distinguishes, therefore, between subject and object, between self and not-self, and holds that the external world exists. The Monist in one way or another eliminates the objective from the field of reality, obliterates the distinction between self and not-self, and denies that the external world is real. Sometimes he takes the ground of idealism, maintaining that thoughts are things, that the only reality is perception, or rather, that a thing is real only in the sense that it is perceived, *esse est percipi*. He scornfully rejects the view of naïve realism, refers with contempt to the copy-theory (the view that our thoughts represent things) and is rather proud of the fact that he is in conflict with common sense. Sometimes he is a solipsist, holding that self alone exists, that the existence of not-self is an illusion, and that the belief in the existence of other minds than our own is a vulgar error. Sometimes, finally, he is an acosmist: he denies that the external world exists except in so far as it is thought to exist: or he affirms that we create our own external world out of our own thoughts.

However, the classical form of epistemological Monism at the present time is known as Absolutism. Its fundamental tenet is metaphysical monism of the purely idealistic type. It holds that both subject and object are merely phases of an abstract, unlimited, impersonal consciousness called the Absolute; that neither things nor thoughts have any reality apart from the Absolute. It teaches that the universe is a rational and systematic whole, consisting of an intellectual "ground" and multiform "appearances" of that ground, one appearance being what the Realist calls things, and another what the Realist calls thoughts. This is the doctrine of the Hegelians, from Hegel himself down to his latest representatives, Bradley and McTaggart. All these forms of epistemological Monism—namely, idealism, solipsism, acosmism, and absolutism—have, of course, metaphysical bearings, and sometimes rest on metaphysical foundations. Nevertheless, historically speaking, they are traceable to a psychological assumption which is, and always will be, the dividing line between Dualism and Monism in epistemology. The Dualists, in their analysis of the act of knowing, call attention to the fact that in every process of perception the object is immediately given. It seems like emphasizing the obvious to say so, yet it is precisely on this point that the whole question turns. What I perceive is not a sensation of whiteness but a white object. What I taste is not the sensation of sweetness but a sweet substance. No matter how much the activity of the mind may elaborate, synthesize, or reconstruct the data of sense-perception, the objective reference cannot be the result of any such subjective activity; for it is given originally in consciousness. On the contrary, the Monist starts with the idealistic assumption that what we perceive is the sensation. Whatever objective reference the sensation has in our consciousness is conferred on it by the activity of the mind. The objective is, therefore, reducible to the subjective; things are thoughts; we make our world. In the dualist's analysis there is immediate, presentative contact in consciousness between the subject and the object. In the Monist's account of the matter there is a chasm between subject and object which must be bridged over somehow. The problem of Dualism or Monism in epistemology depends, therefore, for solution on the question whether perception is presentative or representative; and the dualist, who holds the presentative theory, seems to have on his side the verdict of introspective psychology as well as the approval of common sense.

In recent Pragmatist contributions to epistemology there is presented a different view of epistemological Monism from that given in the preceeding paragraphs, and a solution is offered which differs entirely from that of traditional dualism. In William James's works, for instance, Monism is described as that species of Absolutism which "thinks that the all-form or collective-unit form is the only form that is rational", while opposed to it is Pluralism, that is, the doctrine that "the each-form is an eternal form of reality no less than it is the form of temporal appearance" (A Pluralistic Universe, 324 sqq.). The multitude of "each-forms" constitute, not a chaos, but a cosmos, because they are "inextricably interfused" into a system. The unity, however, which exists among the "each-forms" of reality is not an integral unity nor an articulate or organic, much less a logical, unity. It is a unity "of the strung-along type, the type of continuity, contiguity, or concatenation" (op. cit., 325). Into this unfinished universe, into this stream of successive experiences, the subject steps at a certain moment. By a process which belongs, not to logic, but to life, which exceeds logic, he connects up these experiences into a concatenated series. In other words, he strings the single beads on a string, not of thought, but of the practical needs and purposes of life. Thus the subject makes his own world, and, really, we are not any better off than if we accepted the verdict of the intellectualistic Idealist. We have merely put the practical reason in place of the theoretical: so far as the value of knowledge is concerned the antithesis between Monism and Pluralism is more apparent than real, and the latter is as far from the saneness of realistic Dualism as the former. It is true that the Pluralist admits, in a sense, the existence of the external world; but so also does the Absolutist. The trouble is that neither admits it in a sense which would save the distinction between subject and object. For the Pluralist as well as the Monist is entangled in the web of subjective Idealism as soon as he favours the doctrine that perception is representative, not presentative.

V. In Cosmology, the central question is the origin of the universe. The early Ionian philosophers assigned, as the cause or principle (ἀρχή is the Aristotelian word) of the universe, a substance which is at once the material out of which the universe is made and the force by which it was made. As Aristotle says, they failed to distinguish between the material cause and the efficient cause. They were, therefore, dynamists and hylozoists. That is, they held matter to be of its nature active, and en-

dowed with life. Without the aid of any extrinsic force, they said, the original substance, by a process of thickening and thinning, or by quenching and kindling, or in some other immanent way, gave rise to the universe as we now see it. This primitive cosmothetic Monism gradually gave way to a dualistic conception of the origin of the world. Tentatively at first, and then more decisively, the later Ionians introduced the notion of a primitive force, distinct from matter, which fashioned the universe out of the primordial substance. Anaxagoras it was, who, by clearly defining this force and describing it as mind (νοῦς), earned the encomium of being the "first of the ancient philosophers who spoke sense". Dualism, thus introduced, withstood the onslaughts of materialistic Atomism and Epicureanism, pantheistic Stoicism and emanationistic neo-Platonism. It was developed by Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, who brought to their description of the world-forming process a higher notion of cosmothetic mind than the pre-Socratic philosophers possessed. It was left for the Christian philosophers of Alexandria and their successors, the Scholastics of medieval times, to elaborate the doctrine of creation *ex nihilo*, and thus bring out more clearly the rôle played by the Divine Power and Will in the formation of the universe. The order, harmony, and purposiveness evident everywhere in nature are cited by the creationists as evidence to show that mind must have presided at the origination of things. Furthermore, the question of dynamism or mechanism hinges on the problem of the nature of matter. This phase of the question has been developed especially in post-Cartesian philosophy, some maintaining that matter is essentially inert and must, therefore, have acquired force and activity from without, while others as stoutly maintain that matter is by nature active and, consequently, may have developed its own force from within. Evolution of the thoroughgoing type takes the latter view. It holds that in the primitive cosmic matter was contained "the power and potency" of all life and movement, in such a way that no external agent was required in order to bring it to actual existence. Here, as in the question of Theism, Christian philosophy is frankly dualistic, although it acknowledges that, since actuality antecedes potency by nature and, as a matter of fact, the world originated in time, while God is eternal, there was, before creation, but One Reality.

VI. In Ethics, the word *Monism* is very little used. In some German works it is employed to designate the doctrine that the moral law is autonomous. Christian ethics is essentially heteronomic: it teaches that all law, even natural law, emanates from God. Kantian ethics and Evolutionistic ethics hold that the moral law is either self-imposed or emanates from the moral sense which is a product of the struggle for existence. In both the Kantian and the Evolutionistic systems there is only one source of the power of moral discrimination and approval. For this reason the word *Monism* is here used in its generic sense. In English philosophical literature, however, the word has no such signification. In accounting for the origin of evil, a problem which, though it belongs to metaphysics, has important bearings on ethical questions, some philosophers have adopted a Dualistic doctrine and explained that good and evil originate from two distinct principles, the one supremely good, the other completely and absolutely evil. This was the doctrine of the ancient Persians, from whom it was borrowed by Manes, the founder of the Manichean sect. Opposed to this is the Monistic view, that God is indeed the cause of all that is good in the universe, and that evil is not to be assigned to any supreme cause distinct from God. Whatever explanation be given of the existence of evil in the world, it is maintained that a supreme principle of evil is utterly impossible and even inconceivable.

VII. Contemporary Monistic Movements and Schools.—In current philosophical literature, whenever no special qualification is added, Monism generally means the modified materialistic monism of Haeckel. Modern materialistic Monism in Germany begins with Feuerbach, a disciple of Hegel. Feuerbach was followed by Vogt and Moleschott. To these succeeded Haeckel, who combines Darwinian evolution with a materialistic interpretation of Spinoza and Bruno. Haeckel's works, both in the original and in English translations, have had a wide circulation, their popularity being due rather to the superficial manner in which Haeckel disposes of the most serious questions of metaphysics than to any intrinsic excellence of content or method. Haeckel is honorary president of the Monistenbund (Society of Monists), founded at Jena in 1906, for the purpose of propagating the doctrines of Monism. The society is openly anti-Christian, and makes active warfare against the Catholic Church. Its publications, "Der Monist" (a continuation of the "Freie Glocken"—first number, 1906), "Blätter des deutschen Monistenbunds" (first number, July, 1906), and various pamphlets (Flugblätter des Monistenbunds), are intended to be a campaign against Christian education and the union of Church and State.

The group of writers in America who, under the editorship of Dr. Paul Carus, have been identified with the "Monist" (Chicago, monthly, first number, Jan., 1891) are not, apparently, actuated by the same animosity against Christianity. Nevertheless, they hold Haeckel's fundamental tenet that Monism as a system of philosophy transcends Christianity as a form of belief, and is the only rational synthesis of science and religion. "Religious progress no less than scientific progress", writes Carus, "is a process of growth as well as a cleansing from mythology. . . . Religion is the basis of ethics. . . . The ideal of religion is the same as that of science, it is a liberation of the mythological elements and its aim is to rest upon a concise but exhaustive statement of facts" (Monism, Its Scope and Import, 8, 9). This "concise but exhaustive statement of facts" is positive Monism, the doctrine, namely, that the whole of reality constitutes one inseparable and indivisible entirety. Monism is not the doctrine that one substance alone, whether it be mind or matter, exists: such a theory, says Dr. Carus, is best designated as Henism. True Monism "bears in mind that our words are abstracts representing parts or features of the One and All, and not separate existences" (op. cit., 7). This Monism is Positivistic, because its aim is "the systematisation of knowledge, that is, of a description of facts" (ibid.). "Radical free thought" is the motto of this school of Monism; at the same time, it disclaims all sympathy with destructive Atheism, Agnosticism, Materialism, and Negativism in general. Nevertheless, the untrained student of philosophy will be likely to be more profoundly influenced by the Monistic criticism of Christianity than by the constructive effort to put something in place of the errors referred to.

All Monism may be described as resulting from the tendency of the human mind to discover unitary concepts under which to subsume the manifold of experience. So long as we are content to take and preserve the world of our experience as we find it, with all its manifoldness, variety, and fragmentation, we are in the condition of primitive man, and little better than brute animals. As soon as we begin to reflect on the data of the senses, we are led by an instinct of our rational nature to reduce manifold effects to the unity of a causal concept. This we first do in the scientific plane. Afterwards, carrying the process to a higher plane, we try to unify these under philosophical categories, such as substance and accident, matter and force, body and mind, subject and object.

The history of philosophy, however, shows with unmistakable clearness that there is a limit to this unifying process in philosophy. If Hegel were right, and the formula, "The rational alone is real", were true, then we should expect to be able to compass all reality with the mental powers which we possess. But, Christian philosophy holds, the real extends beyond the domain of the (finite) rational. Reality eludes our attempt to compress it within the categories which we frame for it. Consequently, Dualism is often the final answer in philosophy; and Monism, which is not content with the partial synthesis of Dualism, but aims at an ideal completeness, often results in failure. Dualism leaves room for faith, and hands over to faith many of the problems which philosophy cannot solve. Monism leaves no room for faith. The only mysticism that is compatible with it is rationalistic, and very different from that "vision" in which, for the Christian mystic, all the limitations, imperfections, and other shortcomings of our feeble efforts are removed by the light of faith.

See works referred to under METAPHYSICS; also, VEITCH, *Dualism and Monism* (London, 1895); WARD, *Naturalism and Agnosticism* (2 vols., London, 1899); ROYCE, *The World and the Individual* (New York, 1901); BAKEWELL, *Pluralism and Monism* in *Philos. Rev.*, VII (1898), 355 sqq.; BOWEN, *Dualism, Materialism or Idealism* in *Princeton Rev.*, I (1878), 423 sqq.; GURNEY, *Monism* in *Mind*, VI (1881), 153 sqq.; *Articles* in *Monist* (1891—); ADICKES, *Kant contra Haeckel* (Berlin, 1901); GUTBERLET, *Der mechanische Monismus* (Paderborn, 1893); ENGERT, *Der naturalistiche Monismus Haeckels* (Berlin, 1907); DREWS, *Der Monismus* (Leipzig, 1908); *Articles* by KLINIKE in *Jahrbuch für Phil. u. Spek. Theol.* (1905, 1906); MALTESE, *Monismo e nichilismo* (2 vols., Vittoria, 1887); ABATE, *Il monismo nelle diverse forme* (Catania, 1893); HAECKEL, *Der Monismus als Band zwischen Religion und Wissenschaft*, tr. GILCHRIST (London, 1894); IDEM, *Die Welträthsel*, tr. MCCABE (London, 1900). On Carus's School of Monism, besides *The Monist* (1891—) and *The Open Court* (pub. fortnightly, first number, Feb. 17, 1887), cf. CARUS, *Primer of Philosophy* (Chicago, 1896); IDEM, *Fundamental Problems* (Chicago, 1894); IDEM, *Monism, Its Scope and Import* (Chicago, 1891).

WILLIAM TURNER.

Monita Secreta, a code of instructions alleged to be addressed by Acquaviva, the fifth general of the Society, to its various superiors, and laying down the methods to be adopted for the increase of its power and influence. According to them, every means is to be employed of acquiring wealth for the order, by enticing promising young men to enter it and endow it with their estates; rich widows are to be cajoled and dissuaded from remarriage; every means is to be used for the advancement of Jesuits to bishoprics or other ecclesiastical dignities, and to discredit the members of other orders, while the world is to be persuaded that the Society is animated by the purest and least interested motives: the reputation of those who quit it is to be assailed and traduced in every way.

That the "Monita" are in reality what they pretend, cannot possibly be maintained. They are known to be the work of one Jerome Zahorowski, a Pole, who, having been a member of the Society, had been discharged in 1611. They first appeared at Cracow in 1612 in MS., purporting to be a translation from the Spanish, and were printed in the same city in 1614. Various stories were told, however, as to the mode in which these secret instructions were originally discovered; the credit being most commonly assigned to Duke Christian of Brunswick who, having been born in 1599, was a mere boy when they first saw the light. The place where they were found was variously set down as Paderborn, Prague, Liège, Antwerp, Glatz, and on board a captured East Indiaman. Attempts were likewise made at various times, as late even as 1783, to excite interest in the work as the result of a new discovery; to say nothing of an undated edition, in the early nineteenth century, which professes to issue from the Propaganda Press, and to be authenticated by the testimonies of various Jesuit authorities. These, however, are manifestly nothing but impudent and malignant fabrications, the general, "Felix Aconiti", being utterly unknown in the Annals of the Society, and the censor who approves the publication bearing the ominous name "Pasquinelli", while the titles which, it is alleged, should ensure the esteem of men in general for the Society, include all the crimes and abominations of every kind—immoralities, conspiracies, murders, and regicides—which their bitterest enemies have ever attributed to the Society.

In looking for more authentic evidence as to the true character of the "Monita", it is unnecessary to cite any to whose testimony a suspicion of partiality might attach—from Bishop Lipski of Cracow (1616), through the long list of Jesuit writers who have from the first denounced the fabrication, and who are quoted by Father Bernard Duhr in his "Jesuiten Fabeln". Witnesses beyond any such exception are for example, the famous Fra Paolo Sarpi, the historian of the Council of Trent, the Jansenist Henri de Saint-Ignace, as well as Arnauld and the "Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques", to whom may be added Pascal himself, whose negative testimony is sufficient to show what he thought on the subject.

To these witnesses may be added such pronounced anti-Jesuits as von Lang, Döllinger, Friedrich (the author of Janus), Huber, and Reusch, as well as the Protestant historian Gieseler. In the British House of Commons, during the debates on Catholic Emancipation, the fraudulent character of the "Monita" was fully acknowledged by more than one speaker, while the authorities of the British Museum, and likewise the French bibliographer M. Barbier, agree in describing the work as "apocryphal".

The only defence seriously attempted on the other side is that offered by the late Dr. Littledale in his notorious article "Jesuits", in the "Encyclopædia Britannica". He acknowledges, indeed, that the work is in reality "both caricature and libel", but pleads nevertheless that it is substantially true, since its author, "a shrewd and keen observer", having noticed how Jesuits actually worked, deduced from his observations the rules by which they were guided. As to this remarkable example of "jesuitical" argumentation, it is sufficient to inquire upon what solid foundation Dr. Littledale's basal assumption rests. Where is the evidence that the principles of the "Monita" animate Jesuit practice? The official rules and constitutions of the order plainly contradict in every respect these supposed instructions, for they expressly prohibit the acceptance of ecclesiastical dignities by its subjects, unless compelled by papal authority, and from the days of the founder, St. Ignatius himself, it is known that every obstacle has been thrown by the Society in the way of such promotion. Moreover, in many cases, genuine private instructions from the general to subordinate superiors have fallen into hostile hands, but while in many cases they are found to give instructions directly contrary to those we have heard, it is not even alleged that in any instance they corroborate them.

DUHR, *Die Monita Secreta oder die geheimen Verordnungen der Gesellschaft Jesu;* SAINT-HÉLIER, *Les Monita Secreta des Jésuites, devant l'Histoire;* HUBER, *Der Jesuitenorden*, p. 106; REUSCH, *Der Index der Verbotener Bücher*, p. 281; PARKINSON in *The Month* (July–August, 1873; March, 1902); GERARD, *The Secret Instructions of the Jesuits* (Catholic Truth Society pamphlet).

JOHN GERARD.

Monk.—A monk may be conveniently defined as a member of a community of men, leading a more or less contemplative life apart from the world, under the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, according to a rule characteristic of the particular order to which he belongs. The word monk is not itself a term commonly used in the official language of the Church. It is a popular rather than a scientific designation, but it is at the same time very ancient, so much so that its origin cannot be precisely determined. So far as regards the English form of the word, that undoubtedly

comes from the Anglo-Saxon *munuc*, which has in turn arisen from the Latin *monachus*, a mere transliteration of the Greek *μόναχος*. This Greek form is commonly believed to be connected with *μόνος*, lonely or single, and is suggestive of a life of solitude; but we cannot lose sight of the fact that the word *μονή*, from a different root, seems to have been freely used, e. g. by Palladius, as well as *μοναστήριον*, in the sense of a religious house (see Butler, "Palladius's Lausiac History", *passim*). Be this as it may, the Fathers of the fourth century are by no means agreed as to the etymological significance of *monachus*. St. Jerome writes to Heliodorus (P. L., XXII, 350), "Interpret the name monk, it is thine own; what business hast thou in a crowd, thou who art solitary?" St. Augustine on the other hand fastens on the idea of unity (*μονάς*) and in his exposition of Ps. cxxxii, extols the appropriateness of the words "Ecce quam bonum et quam jucundum habitare fratres in unum" when chanted in a monastery, because those who are monks should have but one heart and one soul (P. L., XXXVII, 1733). Cassian (P. L., XLIX, 1097), and Pseudo-Dionysius (De Eccl. Hier., vi) seem to have thought monks were so called because they were celibate.

In any case the fact remains that the word *monachus* in the fourth century was freely used of those consecrated to God, whether they lived as hermits or in communities. So again St. Benedict a little later (c. 535) states at the beginning of his rule that there are four kinds of monks (*monachi*)—(1) cenobites who live together under a rule or an abbot, (2) anchorites or hermits, who after long training in the discipline of a community, go forth to lead a life of solitude (and of both of these classes he approves); but also (3) "sarabites" and (4) "girovagi" (wandering monks), whom he strongly condemns as men whose religious life is but a pretence, and who do their own will without the restraint of obedience. It is probably due to the fact that the Rule of St. Benedict so constantly describes the brethren as *monachi* and their residence as *monasterium*, that a tradition has arisen according to which these terms in Latin and English (though not so uniformly in the case of the corresponding German and French words) are commonly applied only to those religious bodies which in some measure reproduce the conditions of life contemplated in the old Benedictine Rule. The mendicant friars, e. g. the Dominicans, Franciscans, Carmelites, etc., though they live in community and chant the Divine Office in choir, are not correctly described as monks. Their work of preaching, mixing with their fellow men in the world, soliciting alms, and moving from place to place, is inconsistent with the monastic ideal. The same is to be said of the "clerks regular", like the Jesuits, in whose rule the work of the apostolate is regarded as so important that it is considered incompatible with the obligation of singing office in choir. Again members of the religious congregations of men, which take simple but not solemn vows, are not usually designated as monks. On the other hand it should be noted that in former days a monk, even though he sang office in choir, was not necessarily a priest, the custom in this respect having changed a good deal since medieval times. Besides the Benedictines with their various modifications and offshoots, i. e. the Cluniacs, Cistercians, Trappists etc., the best known orders of monks are the Carthusians, the Premonstratensians, and the Camaldolese. The honorary prefix Dom, an abbreviation of *Dominus* is given to Benedictines and Carthusians.

HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen* (Paderborn, 1907 sqq.); HÉLYOT, *Histoire des Ordres Religieux* (Paris, 1743); SCHIWIETZ, *Vorgesch. des Mönchthums* in the *Archiv f. kath. Kirchenrecht* (Mainz, 1898), 3 sqq. and 305 sqq.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Monogamy. See MARRIAGE.

Monogram of Christ.—By the Monogram of Christ is ordinarily understood the abbreviation of Christ's name formed by combining the first two letters of the Greek form ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ, thus ; this monogram was also known as the *Chrismon*. There are, however, besides this type of monogram, two other monograms of Christ—one of His name, Jesus, the other of both His names together. The most common form (that first alluded to), was adopted by Constantine the Great on his military standards. The monogram of the famous labarum (q. v.), as described by Eusebius (Vita Const., I, xxxi), is that given above. Lactantius (De mont. persec., xliv) describes it as "transversa X littera summo capite circumflexo", a somewhat obscure expression interpreted by Hauck ("Realencyk. für prot. Theol.", s. vv. Monogramm Christi) as a X with one of its strokes perpendicular and the upper arm of this stroke rounded to form a P . Many variants of these two forms exist in the monuments of the fourth and fifth centuries. The Greek letters X P combined in a monogram occur on pre-Christian coins (e. g. the Attic tetradrachma and some coins of the Ptolemies), and in some Greek manuscripts of the Christian period they are employed as an abbreviation of such words as ΧΡΟΝΟΣ, ΧΡΤΣΟΣ, ΧΡΤΣΟΣΤΟΜΟΣ. Lowrie remarks, however, that when employed as an abbreviation the X stands upright, whereas in the monogram of Christ it lies on its side , thus appearing more symmetical. The form is of Christian origin; it came into use in the course of the fourth century, and represents a stage in the development of the monogram into the cross.

The opinion of Hauck that the monogram, in the form in which it appears on the labarum, was well known in Christian society before Constantine would seem, from the circumstances of the case, to be well founded; for otherwise how would the emperor have recognized it as a Christian symbol? Yet, at the same time it must be said that it appears only rarely on pre-Constantinian monuments, and then generally as an abbreviation (*compendium scripturæ*) rather than as an emblem; as, for instance, in a third century inscription in the Catacomb of St. Priscilla: ΣΟΙ ΛΟΞΑ ΕΝ . The adoption of the monogram by Constantine for use on the imperial military standards and on the shields of the soldiers, as a symbol of Christianity, was the beginning of its popularity in the empire. During the fourth century it was represented on all manner of monuments: on public edifices, churches, sarcophagi, lamps, vestments, clothing, household utensils, etc. It appears frequently in association with inscriptions on tombs, sometimes in relation with the apocalyptic letters A and ω, or with the symbolic fish, doves, palm branches, and the like. It rarely appears on Roman monuments, however, after the fatal year 410, when the Eternal City fell into the hands of Alaric, but in the East it long continued to enjoy its popularity. In the course of the fifth century, in the West, the form became the more common, but in the East the earlier form continued in favour.

MONOGRAMS OF JESUS CHRIST.—A monogram formed of the initial letters of both Christ's names appears in a Roman monument of the year 268 or 279 as part of the inscription on a tomb: BENEMERENTI (in) Domi No. Two Gallic monuments with this mon ogram, bearing the dates 491 and 597, are noted by Le Blant, and once it occurs on an ancient lamp, in association with the apocalyptic letters A and ω. In a somewhat different form it occurs in several monuments of the cemetery of St. Callistus: in these the I crosses the X horizontally instead of perpendicularly . The IX monogram (for ΙΗΣΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ), also appears on some sarcophagi of Provence enclosed in a circle, thus forming a star: the star that guided the Wise Men to Bethlehem. The monogram IC XC occurs in manuscripts of the Scriptures (the Codex Alexandrinus and the Codex Claromontanus) as early as

the fifth and sixth centuries. Peculiar to the Latin Church is the monogram IHΣ XPΣ, which occurs in the sixth century Greek-Latin Codex Claramontanus, as an abbreviation of both Our Lord's Greek names. The Greeks also employed the letters IH as an abbreviation for the name of Jesus, with a peculiar symbolic meaning. According to the Epistle of pseudo-Barnabas the circumcision by Abraham of 318 men of his household had a mystic signification. The Greek letters I E T, used as numerals, amount to 318, and at the same time the first two of these letters are abbreviations of the Name of Jesus, while the third represents the cross (Pseudo-Barnabas, c. ix). The meaning was adopted by the Greek Church, and from them it was borrowed by the Latins. The familiar monogram I H S was first popularized by St. Bernardine of Siena in the early fifteenth century and later, with the addition of a cross over the central letter, by the Society of Jesus. (See I.H.S).

TYRWHITT in *Dict. Christ. Antiq.* (London, 1875–80), s. v. *Monogram;* LOWRIE, *Monuments of the Early Church* (New York, 1901); PIPER HAUCK in *Realencyk. f. prot. Theol.*, s. vv. *Monogramm Christi* (Leipzig, 1903); KRAUS in *Real-encyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer* s. v. (Freiburg, 1886).

MAURICE M. HASSETT.

Monomotapa. — Whatever be the etymological meaning of the word *Monomotapa*, the origin of which is much disputed, it is certain, at any rate, that the Portuguese of the sixteenth century employed it to denote the paramount chief of the Makaranga, a powerful South African tribe dwelling between the Zambesi and Limpopo rivers and extending westward from the Indian Ocean probably as far as the twenty-fifth parallel of east longitude. "Some interest", says Mr. Theal, "is attached to this word Monomotapa, inasmuch as it was placed on maps of the day as if it were the name of a territory, not the title of a ruler, and soon it was applied to the entire region from the Zambesi to the mouth of the Fish River. Geographers, who knew nothing of the country, wrote the word upon their charts, and one copied another until the belief became general that a people far advanced in civilization, and governed by a mighty emperor, occupied the whole of southeastern Africa. . . . Such an empire never existed. The foundation upon which imagination constructed it is nothing more than a Bantu tribe." The empire of the Monomotapa was called Mokaranga. In the fifteenth century, it was united and powerful, but, when the Portuguese arrived in 1505, it was in a state of disruption, as the reigning Monomotapa, Makomba by name, had delegated his authority over the more distant parts of his dominions to members of his family who soon asserted their independence. The Makaranga still live scattered in different parts of Rhodesia over a territory which was once their own. In the matter of civilization they never had much to lose, but their warlike qualities have disappeared, so that the word *Makaranga* is used by their neighbours as a term of reproach and a synonym for coward. The word *Monomotapa* is no longer known among them. They are, at any rate, more intelligent and docile than their neighbours, while their features and many of their customs point to an infusion of Semitic blood. The theory has lately obtained in some quarters, that they built the Great Zimbabwe and other ruins scattered over their country. It is far more probable, however, that these, as well as the numerous rock-mines found in the gold area of Rhodesia and Portuguese East Africa, were the work of some Semitic people who occupied the country as gold seekers long before the arrival of the Bantu. The Makaranga were evangelized in 1561 by the Ven. Father Gonçalo da Silveira, S.J., who baptized the Monomotapa and many of his people. But within three months of his arrival the converted chief, instigated by some Mohammedan refugees from Mozambique, turned against the missionary and had him strangled on 16 March, 1561.

JOÃO DOS SANTOS, *Ethiopia Oriental* (Evora, 1609), tr. THEAL in *Records of South-Eastern Africa*, VII, printed for the Government of Cape Colony, 1901; THEAL, *Hist. and Ethnogr. of South Africa before 1795* (London, 1907); BENT, *The Ruined Cities of Mashonaland* (London, 1896); HALL, *Prehistoric Rhodesia* (London, 1909); WILMOT, *Monomotapa* (London, 1896).

JAMES KENDAL.

Monophysites and Monophysitism.—The history of this sect and of its ramifications has been summarized under EUTYCHIANISM (the nickname somewhat unfairly given by Catholic controversialists). The theology of Monophysitism has also been described under the same heading. Two points are discussed in the following article: first, the literary activity of the Monophysites both in Greek and Syriac; secondly, the question whether they can be exculpated from material heresy in their Christology.

LITERARY HISTORY.—From many points of view the Monophysites are the most important of early heretics, and no heresy or related group of heresies until the sixteenth century has produced so vast and important a literature. A large portion of it is lost; some remains in manuscript, and of late years important publications have brought much of this material to the light of day. Nearly all the Greek literature has perished in its original form, but much of it survives in early Syriac translations, and the Syriac literature itself is extant in yet greater amount. The scientific, philosophical, and grammatical writings of Monophysites must for the most part be passed over here. Ecclesiastical history and biography, as well as dogmatic and polemical writings will be described for the fifth and sixth centuries, together with a few of the chief works of the centuries immediately following.

Dioscurus (q. v.) has left us but a few fragments. The most important is in the "Hist. Misc.", III, i, from a letter written in exile at Gangra, in which the banished patriarch declares the reality and completeness of our Lord's Human Body, intending evidently to deny that he had approved the refusal of Eutyches to admit Christ's consubstantiality with us.

Timothy Ælurus (d. 477) who had been ordained priest by St. Cyril himself, and preserved a profound attachment to that saint, published an edition of some of his works. He accompanied Dioscurus to the Robber Council of Ephesus in 449, as he says himself "together with my brother the blessed priest Anatolius" (the secretary of Dioscurus, promoted by him to the See of Constantinople). It is not necessary to infer that Timothy and Anatolius were brothers. When the death in exile of Dioscurus (September, 454) was known, Timothy assumed the leadership of those who did not acknowledge the orthodox Patriarch Proterius, and demanded a new bishop. He had with him four or five deprived bishops. The riots which followed were renewed at the death of the Emperor Marcian, and Proterius was murdered. Even before this, Timothy had been consecrated patriarch by two bishops. Eusebius of Pelusium and the famous Peter the Iberian, Bishop of Maïuma, the latter not even an Egyptian. At Constantinople Anatolius was scarcely his enemy; the minister Aspar was probably his friend; but the Emperor Leo certainly desired to acquiesce in the demands for Timothy's deposition addressed to him by the orthodox bishops of Egypt and by Pope St. Leo, and he punished the murderers of Proterius at once. Meanwhile Ælurus was expelling from their sees all bishops who accepted the Council of Chalcedon. It was not, however, till Anatolius was dead (3 July, 458) and had been succeeded by St. Gennadius, that the Emperor put into effect the opinions he had elicited from all the bishops of the East in the "Encyclia", by exiling Ælurus first to Gangra in Paphlagonia, and then in 460 to the Cheronesus. During the reign of Basiliscus he was restored, at the end of 475, and Zeno spared his old age from molestation.

Under EUTYCHIANISM something has been said of his theology, and more will be found below. Of his works a fragment on the Two Natures, is in Migne (P. G., LXXXVI, 273). The unpublished Syriac collection of his works (in British Mus., MS. Addit. 12156, sixth cent.) contains (a) a treatise against the "Dyophysites" (Catholics) which consists mainly of a collection of extracts from the Fathers against the Two Natures, the last of the citations being from letters of Dioscurus. This is, however, but a summary of a larger work, which has recently been published entire in an Armenian translation under the title of "Refutation of the Council of Chalcedon". We learn from Justinian that the original was written in exile. (b) Extracts from a letter written to the city of Constantinople against the Eutychianizers Isaias of Hermopolis and Theophilus, followed by another *florilegium* from "the Fathers" (almost entirely from Apollinarian forgeries). This letter is preserved entire by Zacharias (in Hist. Misc., IV, xii, where it is followed by the second letter), and also in the "Chronicle" of Michael the Syrian. (c) A second letter against the same. (d) Extracts from two letters to all Egypt, the Thebaid, and Pentapolis on the treatment of Catholic bishops, priests, and monks who should join the Monophysites. (e) A refutation of the Synod of Chalcedon and of the Tome of Leo, written between 454 and 460, in two parts, according to the title, and concluding with extracts from the "Acts" of the Robber Synod and four documents connected with it. (f) A short prayer which Blessed Timothy used to make over those who returned from the communion of the Dyophysites. (g) Exposition of the faith of Timothy, sent to the Emperor Leo by Count Rusticus, and an abridged narration of what subsequently happened to him. A similar supplication of Ælurus to Leo, sent by the silentiary Diomede, is mentioned by Anastasius Sin. The contents of this MS. are largely cited by Lebon. A translation into Latin of patristic testimonies collected by Ælurus was made by Gennadius Massil, and is to be identified with the Armenian collection. A Coptic list of Timothy's works mentions one on the Canticle of Canticles. The "Plerophoria" (33, 36) speak of his book of "Narrations", from which Crum (p. 71) deduces an ecclesiastical history by Timothy in twelve books. Lebon does not accept the attribution to Timothy of the Coptic fragments by which Crum established the existence of such a work, but he finds (p. 110) another reference to a historical work by the patriarch in MS. Addit. 14602 (Chabot, "Documenta", 225 sqq.).

Peter Mongus (q. v.) of Alexandria was not a writer. His letters in Coptic are not genuine; though a complete Armenian text of them has been published, which is said to be more probably authentic. Peter Fullo (q. v.) of Alexandria similarly left no writings. Letters addressed to him exist, but are certainly spurious. *Timothy IV*, Patriarch of Alexandria (517–535), composed "Antirrhetica" in many books. This polemical work was lost; but a homily of his remains and a few fragments. Theodosius, Patriarch of Alexandria (10–11 February, 535, and again July, 535–537 or 538) has left us a few fragments and two letters. The Severians of Alexandria were called Theodosians after him, to distinguish them from the Gaianites who followed his Incorruptibilist rival Gaianus. The latter left no writings.

Severus: The most famous and the most fertile of all the Monophysite writers was Severus, who was Patriarch of Antioch (512–518), and died in 538. We have his early life written by his friend Zacharias Scholasticus; a complete biography was composed soon after his death by John, the superior of the monastery where Severus had first embraced the monastic life. He was born at Sozopolis in Pisidia, his father being a senator of the city, and descended from the Bishop of Sozopolis who had attended the Council of Ephesus in 431. After his father's death he was sent to study rhetoric at Alexandria, being yet a catechumen, as it was the custom in Pisidia to delay baptism until a beard should appear. Zacharias, who was his fellow-student, testifies to his brilliant talents and the great progress he made in the study of rhetoric. He was enthusiastic over the ancient orators, and also over Libanius. Zacharias induced him to read the correspondence of Libanius with St. Basil, and the works of the latter and of St. Gregory of Nazianzus, and he was conquered by the power of Christian oratory. Severus went to study law at Berytus about the autumn of 486, and he was followed thither by Zacharias a year later. Severus was later accused of having been in youth a worshipper of idols and a dealer in magical arts (so the *libellus* of the Palestinian monks at the council of 536), and Zacharias is at pains to refute this calumny indirectly, though at great length, by relating interesting stories of the discovery of a hoard of idols at Menuthis in Egypt and of the routing of necromancers and enchanters at Berytus; in both these exploits the friends of Severus took a leading part, and Zacharias asks triumphantly whether they would have consorted with Severus had he not agreed with them in the hatred of paganism and sorcery. Zacharias continued to influence him, by his own account, and induced him to devote the free time which the students had at their disposal on Saturday afternoons and Sundays to the study of the Fathers. Other students joined the pious company of which an ascetic student named Evagrius became leader, and every evening they prayed together in the church of the Resurrection. Severus was persuaded to be baptized. Zacharias refused to be his godfather, for he declared that he did not communicate with the bishops of Phœnicia, so Evagrius stood sponsor, and Severus was baptized in the church of the martyr, Leontius, at Tripolis.

After his baptism Severus renounced the use of baths and betook himself to fasting and vigils. Two of his companions departed to become monks under Peter the Iberian. When the news of the death of that famous monk (488) arrived, Zacharias and several others entered his monastry of Beith-Aphthonia, at the native place of Zacharias, the port of Gaza (known also as Maïuma), where Peter had been bishop. Zacharias did not persevere, but returned to the practice of the law. Severus intended to practise in his own country, but he first visited the shrine of St. Leontius of Tripolis, the head of St. John Baptist at Emesa, and then the holy places of Jerusalem, with the result that he joined Evagrius who was already a monk at Maïuma. The great austerities there did not suffice for Severus, and he preferred the life of a solitary in the desert of Eleutheropolis. Having reduced himself to great weakness he was obliged to pass some time in the monastery founded by Romanus, after which he returned to the laura of the port of Gaza, in which was the convent of Peter the Iberian. Here he spent what his charities had left of his patrimony in building a monastery for the ascetics who wished to live under his direction. His quiet was rudely disturbed by Nephalius, a former leader of the Acephali, who was said to have once had 30,000 monks ready to march on Alexandria when, at the end of 482, Peter Mongus accepted the Henoticon and became patriarch. Later on Nephalius joined the more moderate Monophysites, and finally the Catholics, accepting the Council of Chalcedon. About 507–8 he came to Maïuma, preached against Severus, and obtained the expulsion of the monks from their convents. Severus betook himself to Constantinople with 200 monks, and remained there three years, influencing the Emperor Anastasius as far as he could in the support of the Henoticon, against the Catholics on the one hand and the irreconcilable Acephali on the other. He was spoken of as successor to the Patriarch Mace-

donius who died in August 511. The new patriarch, Timotheus, entered into the views of Severus, who returned to his cloister. In the following year he was consecrated Patriarch of Antioch, 6 November, 512, in succession to Flavian, who was banished by the emperor to Arabia for the half-heartedness of his concessions to Monophysitism. Elias of Jerusalem refused to recognize Severus as patriarch, and many other bishops were equally hostile. However, at Constantinople and Alexandria he was supported, and Elias was deposed. Severus exercised a most active episcopacy, living still like a monk, having destroyed the baths in his palace, and having dismissed the cooks. He was deposed in September, 518, on the accession of Justin, as a preparation for reunion with the West. He fled to Alexandria.

In the reign of Justinian the patronage accorded to the Monophysites by Theodora raised their hopes. Severus went to Constantinople where he fraternized with the ascetical Patriarch Anthimus, who had already exchanged friendly letters with him and with Theodosius of Alexandria. The latter was deposed for heresy by Pope Agapetus on his arrival in Constantinople in 536. His successor Mennas held a great council of sixty-nine bishops in the same year after the pope's departure in the presence of the papal legates, solemnly heard the case of Anthimus and reiterated his deposition. Mennas knew Justinian's mind, and was determined to be orthodox: "We, as you know", said he to the council, "follow and obey the Apostolic See, and those with whom it communicates we have in our communion, and those whom it condemns, we condemn." The Easterns were consequently emboldened to present petitions against Severus and Peter of Apamea. It is from these documents that we have our main knowledge of Severus from the point of view of his orthodox opponents. One petition is from seven bishops of Syria Secunda, two others are from ninety-seven monasteries of Palestine and Syria Secunda to the emperor and to the council. Former petitions of 518 were recited. The charges are somewhat vague (for the facts are supposed known) of murders, imprisonments, and chains, as well as of heresy. Mennas pronounced the condemnation of these heretics for contemning the succession from the Apostles in the Apostolic See, for setting at nought the patriarchal see of the royal city and its council, the Apostolic succession from our Lord in the holy places (Jerusalem), and the sentence of the whole Diocese of Oriens. Severus retired to Egypt once more and to his eremitical life. He died, 8 February, 538, refusing to take a bath even to save his life, though he was persuaded to allow himself to be bathed with his clothes on. Wonders are said to have followed his death, and miracles to have been worked by his relics. He has always been venerated by the Jacobite Church as one of its principal doctors.

His literary output was enormous. A long catalogue of works is given by Assemani. Only a few fragments survive in the original Greek, but a great quantity exists in Syriac translations, some of which has been printed. The early works against Nephalius are lost. A dialogue, "Philalethes", against the supporters of the Council of Chalcedon was composed during the first stay of Severus at Constantinople, 509–11. It was a reply to an orthodox collection of 250 extracts from the works of St. Cyril. An answer seems to have been written by John the Grammarian of Cæsarea, and Severus retorted with an "Apology for Philalethes" (remains of the attack and retort in Cod. Vat. Syr. 140 and Cod. Venet. Marc. 165). A work "Contra Joannem Grammaticum" which had a great success, and seems to have long been regarded by the Monophysites as a triumph, was probably written in exile after 519. Severus was not an original theologian. He had studied the Cappadocians and he depended much on the Apollinarian forgeries; but in the main he follows St. Cyril in every point without conscious variation.

A controversy with Sergius the Grammarian, who went too far in his zeal for the "One Nature", and whom Severus consequently styles a Eutychian, is preserved in MS. Addit. 17154. This polemic enabled Severus to define more precisely the Monophysite position, and to guard himself against the exaggerations which were liable to result from the habit of restricting theology to attacks on Chalcedon. In his Egyptian exile Severus was occupied with his controversy with Julian of Halicarnassus. We also hear of works on the two natures "Against Felicissimus", and "Against the Codicils of Alexander". Like all Monophysites his theology is limited to the controversial questions. Beyond these he has no outlook. Of the numerous sermons of Severus, those which he preached at Antioch are quoted as "Homiliæ cathedrales". They have come down to us in two Syriac translations; one was probably made by Paul, Bishop of Callinicus, at the beginning of the sixth century, the other by Jacob Baradai, was completed in 701. Those which have been printed are of astonishing eloquence. A diatribe against the Hippodrome may be especially noticed, for it is very modern in its denunciation of the cruelty to the horses which was involved in the chariot races. A fine exhortation to frequent communion is in the same sermon. The letters of Severus were collected in twenty-three books, and numbered no less than 3759. The sixth book is extant. It contains theological letters besides many proofs of the varied activities of the patriarch in his episcopal functions. He also composed hymns for the people of Antioch, since he perceived that they were fond of singing. His correspondence with Anthimus of Constantinople is found in "Hist. Misc.", IX, xxi–xxii.

Julian, Bishop of Halicarnassus, joined with Severus in the intrigue by which Macedonius was deposed from the Patriarchate of Constantinople in 511. He was exiled on the accession of Justin in 518, and retired to the monastery of Enaton, nine miles from Alexandria. He was already of advanced age. Here he wrote a work "Against the Diphysites" in which he spoke incorrectly according to Severus, who nevertheless did not reply. But Julian himself commenced a correspondence with him (it is preserved in the Syriac translation made in 528 by Paul of Callinicus, and also partially in the "Hist. Misc.", IX, x–xiv) in which he begged his opinion on the question of the incorruptibility of the Body of Christ. Severus replied, enclosing an opinion which is lost, and in answer to a second letter from Julian wrote a long epistle which Julian considered to be wanting in respect, especially as he had been obliged to wait for it a year and a month. Parties were formed. The Julianists upheld the incorruptibility of the Body of Christ, meaning that Christ was not naturally subject to the ordinary wants of hunger, thirst, weariness, etc., nor to pain, but that He assumed them of His free will for our sakes. They admitted that He is "consubstantial with us", against Eutyches, yet they were accused by the Severians of Eutychianism, Manichæism, and Docetism, and were nicknamed Phantasiasts, Aphthartodocetæ, or Incorrupticolæ. They retorted by calling the Severians Phthartolotræ (Corrupticolæ), or Ktistolatræ, for Severus taught that our Lord's Body was "corruptible" by its own nature; that was scarcely consistent, as it can only be of itself "corruptible" when considered apart from the union, and the Monophysites refused to consider the Human Nature of Christ apart from the union. Justinian, who in his old age turned more than ever to the desire of conciliating the Monophysites (in spite of his failure to please them by condemning the "three chapters"), was probably led to favour Julian because he was the opponent of Severus, who was universally regarded as the great foe of orthodoxy. The emperor issued an edict in 565 making the "incor-

ruptibility" an obligatory doctrine, in spite of the fact that Julian had been anathematized by a council at Constantinople in 536, at which date he had probably been dead for some years.

A commentary by Julian on the Book of Job, in a Latin version, was printed in an old Paris edition of Origen (ed. Genebrardus, 1574). A MS. of the original Greek is mentioned by Mai. It is largely quoted in the catena on Job of Nicetas of Heraclea. The great work of Julian against Severus seems to be lost. Ten anathematisms remain. Of his commentaries, one on Matthew is cited by Moses Barkepha (P. G., CXI, 551). It is to be hoped that some of Julian's works will be recovered in Syriac or Coptic translations. An anti-Julianist catena in the British Museum (MS. Addit. 12155) makes mention of Julian's writings. We hear of a treatise by him, "Against the Eutychianists and Manichæans", which shows that Julian, like his great opponent Severus, had to be on his guard against extravagant Monophysites. Part of the treatise which *Peter of Callinicus*, Patriarch of Antioch (578–591), wrote against the Damianists is extant in Syriac MSS. (see Assemani's and Wright's catalogues).

The writers of the Tritheist sect (see TRITHEISTS) next demand our attention. The chief among them, *John Philoponus*, of Cæsarea, was Patriarch of the Tritheists at Alexandria at the beginning of the sixth century, and was the principal writer of his party. He was a grammarian, a philosopher, and an astronomer as well as a theologian. His principal theological work, Διαιτητὴς ἢ περὶ ἑνώσεως, in ten books, is lost. It dealt with the Christological and Trinitarian controversies of his age, and fragments of it are found in Leontius (De sectis, Oct. 5), in St. John Damascene (De hær., I, 101–107, ed. Le Quien) and in Niceph. Call., XVIII (see Mansi, XI, 301). A complete Syriac translation is in Brit. Mus. and Vat. MSS. Another lost theological work, περὶ ἀναστάσεως, described the writer's theory of a creation of new bodies at the general resurrection; it is mentioned by Photius (cod. 21–23), by Timotheus Presbyter and Nicephorus. As a philosopher Philoponus was an Aristotelian, and a disciple of the Aristotelian commentator Ammonius, son of Hermeas. His own commentaries on Aristotle were printed by Aldus at Venice (on "De generatione et interitu", 1527; "Analytica posteriora", 1534; "Analytica priora", 1536; "De nat. auscult.", I–IV, and "De anima", 1535; "Meteorologica", I, 1551; "Metaphysica", 1583). He also wrote much against the Ἐπιχειρήματα of Proclus, the last great Neoplatonist: eighteen books on the eternity of the world (Venice, 1535), composed in 529, and περὶ κοσμοποιΐας (printed by Corderius, Vienna, 1630, and in Gallandi, XII; new ed. by Reichert, 1897), on the Hexæmeron, in which he follows St. Basil and other Fathers, and shows a vast knowledge of all the literature and science accessible in his day. The latter work is dedicated to a certain Sergius, who may perhaps be identified with Sergius the Grammarian, the Eutychianizing correspondent of Severus. The work was possibly written as early as 517 (for 617 in the editions is evidently a clerical error). A "Computatio de Pascha", printed after this work, argues that the Last Supper was on the 13th of Nizan, and was not a real passover. A lost theological work entitled τμήματα is summarized by Michael the Syrian (Chronicle, II, 69). A book against the Council of Chalcedon is mentioned by Photius (cod. 55). A work "Contra Andream" is preserved in a Syriac MS. Another work "Against the Acephali" exists in MS., and may be the work Philoponus is known to have written in controversy with Severus. In grammar his master was Romanus, and his extant writings on the subject are based upon the καθολική of Herodian (τονικὰ παραγγέλματα, ed. Dindorf, 1825; περὶ τῶν διαφόρως τονουμένων, ed. Egenolff, 1880).

This sixth century Monophysite is to be distinguished from an earlier grammarian, also called Philoponus, who flourished under Augustus and Tiberius. Of his life little is known. On account of his Tritheistic opinions he was summoned to Constantinople by Justinian, but he excused himself on account of his age and infirmity. He addressed to the emperor a treatise "De divisione, differentia, et numero", which seems to be the same as a treatise spoken of as "De differentia quæ manere creditur in Christo post unionem"; but it is lost. He addressed an essay on Tritheism to Athanasius Monachus, and was condemned on this account at Alexandria. At a disputation held by the emperor's order before the Patriarch of Constantinople John Scholasticus, Conon, and Eugenius represented the Tritheists; John condemned Philoponus, and the emperor issued an edict against the sect (Photius, cod. 24). In 568 Philoponus was still alive, for he published a pamphlet against John, which Photius describes with great severity (cod. 75). The style of Philoponus, he says, is always clear, but without dignity, and his argumentation is puerile. (For the theological views of the sect, see TRITHEISTS.)

Conon, Bishop of Tarsus, though a Tritheist and, with Eugenius, a supporter of John Philoponus before the emperor, disagreed with that writer about the equality of the three Persons of the Holy Trinity (see TRITHEISTS), and together with *Eugenius* and *Themistius* wrote a book, κατὰ Ἰωάννου, against his views on the Resurrection. Eugenius is called a Cilician bishop by John of Ephesus, but Bar Hebræus makes him Bishop of Seleucia in Isauria (see TRITHEISTS). Themistius, surnamed Calonymus, was a deacon of Alexandria, who separated from his patriarch, Timothy IV (517–535), and founded the sect of Agnœtæ. He wrote against Severus a book called "Apology for the late Theophobius", to which a Severian monk named Theodore replied; the answer of Themistius was again refuted by Theodore in three books (Photius, cod. 108). Other works of Themistius are referred to by St. Maximus Confessor, and some fragments are cited in Mansi, X, 981 and 1117. *Stephen Gobarus* the Tritheist is known only by the elaborate analysis of his book given by Photius (cod. 232); it was a "Sic et Non" like that of Abelard, giving authorities for a proposition and then for the contrary opinion. At the end were some remarks on curious views of a number of Fathers. It was evidently, as Photius remarks, a performance of more labour than usefulness.

HISTORY.—We now turn to the historians. *Zacharias of Gaza*, brother of Procopius of Gaza, the rhetorician, Zacharias Scholasticus, Zacharias the Rhetorician, Zacharias of Mitylene, are all apparently the same person (so Kugener's latest view, Krüger, and Brooks). Of his early life we have a vivid picture in his memoirs of Severus, with whom he studied at Alexandria and at Berytus. His home was at the port of Gaza, near the monastery of the bishop, Peter the Iberian. To the latter he was greatly devoted, and believed that Peter had prophesied his unfitness for the monastic life. He in fact did not become a monk, when his friends Evagrius, Severus, and others did so, but practised law at Constantinople, and reached eminence in his profession. Of his writings, a dialogue "that the world did not exist from eternity" was probably composed in youth while he lived at Berytus. His "Ecclesiastical History" is extant only in a Syriac epitome which forms four books (III–VI) of the "Historia Miscellanea". It begins with a short account from a Monophysite point of view of the Council of Chalcedon, and continues the history, mainly of Palestine and Alexandria, until the death of Zeno (491). From the same history is derived a curious statistical description of Rome in "Hist. Misc.", X, xvi. The very interesting life of Severus carries the author's recollections up to the accession of his hero to the See of Antioch in 512. It was written subsequently to the history, as the *cubicularius* Eupraxius, to whom that

work was dedicated, was already dead. His recollections of Peter the Iberian and of Theodore, Bishop of Antinoe, are lost, but his biography of Isaias, an Egyptian ascetic, is preserved in Syriac. A disputation against the Manichæans, published by Cardinal Pitra in Greek, was probably written after the edict of Justinian against the Manichæans in 527. He seems to have been still a layman. Up to the time he wrote the life of Severus he was a follower of the Henoticon; this was the easy course under Zeno and Anastasius. It would seem that he found it paid to revert to orthodoxy under Justin and Justinian, for he was present as Bishop of Mitylene at the Council of Mennas at Constantinople in 536, where he was one of the three metropolitans who were sent to summon Anthimus to appear. His name does not appear in the incomplete printed list of subscriptions to that patriarch's deposition, but Labbe testifies that it is found in some MSS. (Mansi, VIII, 975); it is absent from the condemnation of Severus in a later session. Zacharias was dead before the œcumenical council of 553.

An important historical work in anecdotal form is the "Plerophoria" of *John of Maïuma*, composed about 515; it contains stories of Monophysite worthies up to date, especially of Peter the Iberian, whose life was also written by Zacharias, but is now lost. A later life of Peter has been printed, which contains curious information about the Iberian princes from whom the Monophysite bishop descended. The life of the ascetic Isaias by Zacharias accompanies it.

The interesting "Historia Miscellanea", often referred to as *Pseudo-Zacharias*, was composed in Syriac in twelve books by an unknown author who seems to have lived at Amida. Though the work was completed in 569, he seems to have used part of the history of John of Ephesus, which was finished only in 571. Certain parts were written earlier (or are borrowed from older writers), VII, xv before 523; X, xii in 545; XII, vii in 555; XII, iv in 561. The first book contains a quantity of legendary matter from Greek sources which are still extant; a few words are added on the Syriac doctors Isaac and Dodo. Book II has the story of the Seven Sleepers. History begins in II, ii, with an account of Eutyches, and the letter of Proclus to the Armenians follows. The next four books are an epitome of the lost work of Zacharias Rhetor. The seventh book continues the story from the accession of Anastasius (491), and together with general ecclesiastical history it combines some interesting details of wars with the Persians in Mesopotamia. A curious chapter gives the Prologue of Moro, or Mara, Bishop of Amida (a Syriac writer whose works appear to be lost), to his edition of the four Gospels in Greek, to which the writer appends as a curiosity the *pericope* of the woman taken in adultery (John, viii) which Moro had inserted in the 89th canon; "it is not found in other MSS." Book VIII, iii, gives the letter of Simeon of Beit-Arsham on the martyrs of Yemen, perhaps an apocryphal document. Book XI is lost, with most of X and XII. Some of X has been restored by Brooks from the "Chronicle" of Michael the Syrian (died 1199). It is necessary to mention the "Chronicle of Edessa", from 495 to 506, which is embedded in the "Chronicle" attributed to *Joshua the Stylite* (who seems to have been a Catholic); this latter is included in the second book of the "Chronicle" attributed to the Patriarch of Antioch, *Dionysius of Tell-Mahre*, a compilation which has a fourth book (from the end of the sixth century to 775) which is an original work by the compiler, who was in reality a monk of Zonkenin (north of Amida), possibly Joshua the Stylite himself.

Some small chronicles of the sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries have been published as "Chronica minora" in the "Corpus Script. Or." Of later histories, those of *Bar Hebræus* (died 1286) must be noted. His "Chronicon Syriacum" is an abridgment of Michael with a continuation; the "Chronicon ecclesiasticum" contains the ecclesiastical history first of Western Syria and then of Eastern Syria, with lives of the patriarchs of Antioch, of the Jacobite missionary bishops (called *maphrians*) and of the Nestorian patriarchs. The "Chronicle" of *Elias of Nisibis* to 1008 is important because it mentions its sources, but it is very defective in the early period through the loss of some pages of the MS. *Basil the Cilician* and *John of Ægea* are counted as Monophysite writers by Ehrhard (in Krumbacher, p. 53), but Photius clearly makes them out Nestorians (cod. 41, 55, 107), and it is by a slip that he conjectures Basil to be the author of a work against Nestorius.

Syriac Writers.—Of the Syriac Monophysite writers none is more important than *Philoxenus*, otherwise *Xenaias*, who was Bishop of Mabug (Hierapolis) from 485. For his life and the version of Scripture which was made by his order, see PHILOXENUS. His dogmatic writings alone concern us here. His letter to the Emperor Zeno, published by Vaschalde (1902) is of 485, the date of his episcopal consecration and of his acceptance of the Henoticon. His treatises on the Incarnation date perhaps before 500; to the same period belong two short works, "A Confession of Faith" and "Against every Nestorian". He wrote also on the Trinity. A letter to Marco, lector of Anazarbus, is attributed to 515–518. After he had been exiled by Justin to Philippolis in Thrace in 518, he attacked the orthodox patriarch, Paul of Antioch, in a letter to the monks of Teleda, and wrote another letter of which fragments are found in MS. Addit. 14533, in which he argues that it is sometimes wise to admit baptisms and ordinations by heretics for the sake of peace; the question of sacramental validity does not occur to him. Fragments of his commentaries on the Gospel are found in MSS. Thirteen homilies on religious life have been published by Budge. They scarcely touch upon dogma. Of his three liturgies two are given by Renaudot. Out of the great mass of his works in MS. at Rome, Paris, Oxford, Cambridge, London, only a fraction has been published. He was an eager controversialist, a scholar, and an accomplished writer. His Syriac style is much admired. His sect had no more energetic leader until Jacob Baradæus himself. He was president of the synod which elevated Severus to the See of Antioch, and he had been the chief agent in the extrusion of Flavian. He was an energetic foe of Catholicism, and his works stand next in importance to those of Severus as witnesses to the tenets of their party. He was exiled by Justin in 519 to Philippolis and then to Gangra, where he died of suffocation by smoke in the room in which he was confined.

James of Sarugh, 451–521 (q. v.), became *periodeutes*, or visitor, of Haura in that district about 505, and bishop of its capital, Batnan, in 519. Nearly all his numerous writings are metrical. We are told that seventy amanuenses were employed to copy his 760 metrical homilies, which are in Wright's opinion more readable than those of Ephraem or Isaac of Antioch. A good many have been published at various times. In the Vatican are 233 in MSS., in London 140, in Paris, 100. They are much cited in the Syriac Liturgy, and a liturgy and a baptismal rite are ascribed to him. Numerous letters of his are extant in Brit. Mus., MSS. Addit. 14587 and 17163. Though his feast is kept by Maronites and even by some Nestorians, there is no doubt that he accepted the Henoticon, and was afterwards in relation with the leading Monophysites, rejecting the Council of Chalcedon to the end of his life. Stephen bar Soudaili was an Edessene Monophysite who fell into Pantheism and Origenism. He was attacked by Philoxenus and James of Sarugh, and retired to Jerusalem. The confession of faith of *John of Tella* (483–538; bishop, 519–521) is extant, and so is his commentary on the Trisagion, and his canons for the clergy and replies to the questions of

the priest Sergius—all in MSS. in the British Museum. The great *James Baradæus*, the eponymous hero of the Jacobites, who supplied bishops and clergy for the Monophysites when they were definitively divided from the Eastern Catholics in 543, wrote but little: a liturgy, a few letters, a sermon, and a confession of faith are extant (see BARADÆUS). Of Syriac translators it is not necessary to speak, nor is there need to treat of the Monophysite scientist Sergius of Reschaina, the writer on philosophy, Ahoudemmeh, and many others.

John of Ephesus, called also *John of Asia*, was a Syrian of Amida, where he became a deacon in 529. On account of the persecution of his sect he departed, and was made administrator of the temporal affairs of the Monophysites in Constantinople by Justinian, who sent him in the following year as a missionary bishop to the pagans of Asia Minor. He relates of himself that he converted 60,000, and had 96 churches built. He returned to the capital in 546, to destroy idol worship there also. But on the death of Justinian he suffered a continual persecution, which he describes in his "History", as an excuse for its confusion and repetitions. What remains of that work is of great value as a contemporary record. The style is florid and full of Greek expressions. The lives of blessed Easterns were put together by John about 565–566, and have been published by Land. They include great men like Severus, Baradæus, Theodosius, etc. (For an account of these works and for bibliography see JOHN OF EPHESUS.)

George, bishop of the Arabians (b. about 640; d. 724) was one of the chief writers of the Assyrian Jacobites. He was a personal follower of James of Edessa, whose poem on the Hexameron he completed after the death of James in 708. In this work he teaches the Apocatastasis, or restoration of all things, including the destruction of hell, which so many Greek Fathers learned from Origen. George was born in the Tchouma in the Diocese of Antioch, and was ordained bishop of the wandering Arabs in November, 686; his see was at Akoula. He was a man of considerable learning. His translation, with introduction and commentary, of part of the "Organon" of Aristotle ("Catagories", "De Interpretatione", and "Prior Analytics") is extant (Brit. Mus., MS. Addit. 14659), as is the collection he made of *scholia* on St. Gregory of Nazianzus, and an explanation of the three Sacraments (Baptism, Holy Communion, and consecration of chrism,—following Pseudo-Dionysius). His letters of 714 till 718 are extant in the same MS. as this last work (Brit. Mus., MS. Addit. 12154). They deal with many things; astronomical, exegetical, liturgical questions, explanations of Greek proverbs and fables, dogma and polemics, and contain historical matter about Aphraates and Gregory the Illuminator. His poems included one in dodecasyllables on the unpromising subject of the calculation of movable feasts and the correction of the solar and lunar cycles, another on the monastic life, and two on the consecration of the holy chrism. His works are important for our knowledge of Syriac Church and literature. His reading was vast, including the chief Greek Fathers, with whom he classes Severus and Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite; he knows the Pseudo-Clementines and Josephus, and of Syriac writers he knows Bardesanes, Aphraates, and St. Ephraem. His correspondence is addressed to literary monks of his sect. The canons attributed to George in the "Nomocanon" of Bar Hebræus are apparently extracts from his writings reduced to the form of canons.

James of Edessa (q. v.), about 633–708, was the chief Syriac writer of his time, and the last that need be mentioned here. His works are sufficiently described in a separate article. The Syriac literature of the Monophysites, however, continued throughout the middle ages. Their Coptic, Arabic, and Armenian literature is large, but cannot be treated in an article like the present one.

ORTHODOXY.—Were the Monophysites really heretics or were they only schismatics? This question was answered in the affirmative by Assemani, more recently by the Oriental scholar Nau, and last of all by Lebon, who has devoted an important work, full of evidence from unpublished sources, to the establishment of this thesis. It is urged that the Monophysites taught that there is but one Nature of Christ, *μία φύσις*, because they identify the words *φύσις* and *ὑπόστασις*. But in just the same way the Nestorians have lately been justified. A simple scheme will make the matter plain:

Nestorians: One person, two hypostases, two natures.

Catholics: One person, one hypostasis, two natures.

Monophysites One person, one hypostasis, one nature.

It is urged by Bethune-Baker that Nestorius and his friends took the word hypostasis in the sense of nature, and by Lebon that the Monophysites took nature in the sense of hypostasis, so that both parties really intended the Catholic doctrine. There is a *prima facie* argument against both these pleas. Granting that for centuries controversialists full of *odium theologicum* might misunderstand one another and fight about words while agreeing as to the underlying doctrine, yet it remains that the words person, hypostasis, nature, (*πρόσωπον*, *ὑπόστασις*, *φύσις*) had received in the second half of the fourth century a perfectly definite meaning, as to which the whole Church was at one. All agreed that in the Holy Trinity there is one Nature (*οὐσία* or *φύσις*) having three Hypostases or Persons. If in Christology the Nestorians used *ὑπόστασις* and the Monophysites *φύσις* in a new sense, not only does it follow that their use of words was singularly inconsistent and inexcusable, but (what is far more important) that they can have had no difficulty in seeing what was the true meaning of Catholic councils, popes, and theologians, who consistently used the words in one and the same sense with regard both to the Trinity and the Incarnation. There would be every excuse for Catholics if they misunderstood such a strange "derangement of epitaphs" on the part of the schismatics, but the schismatics must have easily grasped the Catholic position. As a fact the Antiochene party had no difficulty in coming to terms with St. Leo; they understood him well enough, and declared that they had always meant what he meant. How far this was a fact must be discussed under NESTORIANISM. But the Monophysites always withstood the Catholic doctrine, declaring it to be Nestorian, or half Nestorian, and that it divided Christ into two.

Lebon urges that Severus himself more than once explains that there is a difference in the use of words in "theology" (doctrine of the Trinity) and in "the economy" (Incarnation): "Admittedly hypostasis and *οὐσία* or *φύσις* are not the same in theology; however, in the economy they are the same" (P. G., LXXXVI, 1921), and he alleges the example of Gregory of Nazianzus to show that in a new mystery the terms must take new significations. But surely these very passages make it evident that Severus distinguished between *φύσις* and *ὑπόστασις*. Putting aside the Trinity and the Incarnation, every *φύσις* is a *ὑπόστασις*, and every *ὑπόστασις* is a *φύσις*,—in this statement all Catholics and Monophysites agree. But this means that the denotation of the words is the same, not that there is no difference of connotation. *Φύσις* is an abstraction, and cannot exist except as a concrete, that is to say, as a *ὑπόστασις*. But "admittedly" in the Trinity the denotation as well as the connotation of the words is diverse, it is still true that each of the three Hypostases is identified with the Divine Nature (that is, each Person is God); but

if each Hypostasis is therefore still a *φύσις* (the one *φύσις*) yet the *φύσις* is not one but three Hypostases. The words retain their old sense (connotation) yet have received a new sense in a new relation. It is obvious that this is the phenomenon to which Severus referred. Catholics would add that in the Incarnation conversely two natures are one hypostasis. Thus the meanings of *φύσις* (abstract=*οὐσία*) and *ὑπόστασις* (subsistent *φύσις*, *φύσις ὑφεστῶσα* or *ἐνυπόστατος*) in the Holy Trinity were a common possession; and all agreed further that in the created universe there cannot exist a nature which does not *subsist*, there is no such thing as a *φύσις ἀνυπόστατος*. (*α*) But Catholics hold the Human Nature of Christ *considered in itself* to be *ἀνυπόστατος*, to have no human *ὑπόστασις*, but that the second Person of the Holy Trinity is its *ὑπόστασις*. As the infinity of the Divine Nature is capable of a threefold subsistence, so the infinity of the Hypostasis of the Word is able to be the Hypostasis of the Human Nature assumed as well as of the Divine. The union in Christ is not a union of two natures directly with one another, but a union of the two in one hypostasis; thus they are distinct yet inseparable, and each acts in communion with the other. (*β*) The Nestorians argued thus: There are, according to the Fathers, two natures in Christ; but since every nature is a hypostasis, the Human Nature in Christ is a hypostasis. In order to make one Christ, they tried (in vain) to explain how two hypostases could be united in one person (*πρόσωπον*). They did not mean to divide Christ, but their prosopic union leaked at every seam; it was difficult to express it or argue about it without falling into heresy. The Antiochenes were glad to drop such inadequate formulæ, for it was certain that "person" in the Holy Trinity was only another name for "hypostasis". The Cyrillians were shocked, and could not be induced to believe (though St. Cyril himself did) that the Nestorianizers did not really mean two Christs, two Sons. (*γ*) Conversely, starting from the same proposition that every *φύσις* is a *ὑπόστασις*, the Monophysites argued that as Christ is one Person, one Hypostasis, so He is one Nature, and they preferred "is one nature" to the equivalent "has one nature". They alleged high authority for their formula, not only St. Cyril, but behind him St. Athanasius, Pope St. Julius, and St. Gregory the Wonderworker. These authorities, however, were but Apollinarian forgeries; the favourite formula of St. Cyril, the *μία φύσις σεσαρκωμένη*, had been borrowed unwittingly from an Apollinarian source, and had been meant by its original inventor in a heretical sense. Nay, the "one nature" went back to the Arians, and had been used by Eudoxius himself to express the *incompleteness* of the Human Nature of Christ.

Yet the Monophysites were far from being Apollinarians, still less were they Arians; they were careful from the beginning to explain that Christ is perfect Man, and that He assumed a complete Human Nature like ours. Dioscurus is emphatic on this point in his letter to Secundinus (Hist. Misc., III, i) and with need, since he had acquitted Eutyches who had denied our Lord's "consubstantiality with us". Ælurus is just as clear in the letters by which he refuted and excommunicated Isaias of Hermopolis and Theophilus as "Eutychians" (Hist. Misc., IV, xii), and Severus had an acute controversy with Sergius the Grammarian on this very point. They all declared with one voice that Christ is *μία φύσις*, but *ἐκ δύο φύσεων*, that His Divine Nature is combined with a complete Human Nature in one hypostasis, and hence the two have become together the One Nature of that one hypostasis, howbeit without mixture or confusion or diminution. Ælurus insists that after union the properties of each nature remain unchanged; but they spoke of "the divine and human things", *divina et humana*, not natures; each nature remains in its natural state with its own characteristics (*ἐν ἰδιότητι τῇ κατὰ φύσιν*) yet not as a unity but as a part, a quality (*ποιότης φυσική*), not as a *φύσις*. All the qualities of the two natures are combined into one *ὑπόστασις σύνθετος* and form the one nature of that one hypostasis. So far there is no heresy in intention, but only a wrong definition:—that one hypostasis can have only one nature.

But however harmless the formula "one nature" might look at first sight, it led in fact immediately to serious and disastrous consequences. The Divine Nature of the Word is not merely specifically but numerically one with the Divine Nature of the Son and the Holy Ghost. This is the meaning of the word *ὁμοούσιος* applied to the Three Persons, and if Harnack were right in supposing that at the Council of Constantinople in 381 the word was taken to imply only three Persons of one species, then that Council accepted three Gods, and not three distinct but inseparable Persons in one God. Now if the Divine and Human Natures are united in the Word into one Nature, it is impossible to avoid one of two conclusions, either that the whole Divine Nature became man and suffered and died, or else that each of the three Persons had a Divine Nature of His own. In fact the Monophysites split upon this question. Ælurus and Severus seem to have avoided the difficulty, but it was not long before those who refused the latter alternative were taunted with the necessity of embracing the former, and were nicknamed Theopaschites, as making God to suffer. Vehemently Severus and his school declared that they made the Divinity to suffer not as God, but only as man; but this was insufficient as a reply. Their formula was not "The Word made flesh", "the Son of God made man", but "one Nature of the Word made flesh"; —the Nature became flesh, that is the whole Divine Nature. They did not reply: "We mean hypostasis when we say nature, we do not mean the Divine Nature (which the Word has in common with the Father and the Holy Ghost) but His Divine Person, which in the present case we call His *φύσις*", for the *φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου*, before the word *σεσαρκωμένη* has been added, is in the sphere of "theology" not of "the economy", and its signification could not be doubted.

Just as there were many "Eutychians" among the Monophysites who denied that Christ is consubstantial with us, so there were found many to embrace boldly the paradox that the Divine Nature has become incarnate. Peter Fullo added to the praise of the Trinity the words "who was crucified for us", and refused to allow the natural inference to be explained away. Stephen Niobes and the Niobites expressly denied all distinction between the Human and the Divine Natures after the union. The Actistetæ declared that the Human Nature became "uncreated" by the union. If the greatest theologians of the sect, Severus and Philoxenus, avoided these excesses, it was by a refusal to be logically Monophysite.

It was not only the orthodox who were scandalized by these extreme views. An influential and very learned section of the schism rebelled, and chose the second of the two alternatives,—that of making the Divine Nature itself threefold, in order to ensure that the Human Nature in Christ was made one with the Nature of the Son alone and not with the whole Divine Nature. John Philoponus, the Aristotelian commentator, therefore taught that there are in the Trinity three partial substances (*μερικαὶ οὐσίαι*) and one common substance (*μία κοινή*), thus falling into Polytheism, with three, or rather four, gods. This Tritheistic party was treated with leniency. It split into sections. Though they were excommunicated at Alexandria, the Patriarch Damian held a view not far different. He so distinguished between the Divine *οὐσία* and the three Hypostases which partake (*μετέχουσιν*) in it, that he conceded the *οὐσία* to be existent of Itself (*ἐνύπαρκτος*),

and his followers were nicknamed Tetradites. Thus Peter Fullo, the Actistetæ, and the Niobites on the one hand, and the Tritheists and Damianists on the other, developed the Monophysite formulæ in the only two possible directions. It is obvious that formulæ which involved such alternatives were heretical in fact as well as in origin. Severus tried to be orthodox, but at the expense of consistency. His "corruptibilist" view is true enough, if the Human Nature is considered in the abstract apart from the union (see EUTYCHIANISM), but to consider it thus as an entity was certainly an admission of the Two Natures. All change and suffering in Christ must be (as the Julianists and Justinian rightly saw) strictly voluntary, in so far as the union gives to the Sacred Humanity a right and claim to beatification and (in a sense) to deification. But Severus was willing to divide the Natures not merely "before" the union (that is, logically previous to it) but even after the union "theoretically", and he went so far in his controversy with the orthodox John the Grammarian as to concede *δύο φύσεις ἐν θεωρία*. This was indeed an immense concession, but considering how much more orthodox were the intentions of Severus than his words, it is scarcely astonishing, for St. Cyril had conceded much more.

But though Severus went so far as this, it is shown elsewhere (see EUTYCHIANISM, MAXIMUS CONFESSOR, and especially MONOTHELITISM) that he did not avoid the error of giving one activity to our Lord, one will, and one knowledge. It is true enough that he had no intention of admitting any incompleteness in the Humanity of Christ, and that he and all the Monophysites started merely from the proposition that all activity, all will, and intelligence proceed from the person, as ultimate principle, and on this ground alone they asserted the unity of each in Christ. But it was on this ground that Monothelitism was condemned. It was not supposed by the best Catholic theologians who attacked that doctrine that the Monophysites denied Christ to have exercised human activities, human acts of the will, human acts of cognition; the error was clearly recognized as lying in the failure to distinguish between the human or the mixed (theandric) activity of Christ as Man, and the purely Divine activity, will, knowledge, which the Son has in common with the Father and the Holy Spirit, and which are in fact the Divine Nature. In speaking of one activity, one will, one knowledge in Christ, Severus was reducing Monophysitism to pure heresy just as much as did the Niobites or the Tritheists whom he certainly held in horror; for he refused to distinguish between the human faculties of Christ—activity, will, intellect—and the Divine Nature itself. This is not Apollinarianism, but is so like it that the distinction is theoretical rather than real. It is the direct consequence of the use of Apollinarian formulæ. St. Cyril did not go so far; and in this Monothelite error we may see the essence of the heresy of the Monophysites; for all fell into this snare, except the Tritheists, since it was the logical result of their mistaken point of view.

For general literature see EUTYCHIANISM. In *P. G.* there are more fragments than complete writings. Important collections are ASSEMANI, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* (Rome, 1719–28); CHABOT and others, *Corp. Script. Christ. Orient., Script. Syri;* GRAFFIN AND NAU, *Patrologia Orient.* (1905—, in progress); also DE LAGARDE, *Analecta Syriaca* (Leipzig, 1858); LAND, *Anecdota Syriaca* (Leyden, 1870). For the very numerous Monophysite writings contained in Syriac MSS. see especially the following catalogues: ASSEMANI, *Bibl. Mediceæ Laurentianæ et Palatinæ MS. Orient. catal.* (Florence, 1742); IDEM, *Bibl. Apost. Vatic. catal.*, part I, vol. II–III (Rome, 1758–9); WRIGHT, *Catal. of the Syriac MS. in the Brit. Mus. acquired since 1838* (London, 1870–2); WRIGHT AND COOK, *Catal. of Syriac MSS. of the Univ. of Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1901); SACHAU, *Handschrift-Verzeichnisse der K. Bibl. zu Berlin*, XXIII, *Syrische MSS.* (Berlin, 1899), etc. On the literature in general see ASSEMANI, op. cit., II, *Dissertatio de Monophysitis;* GIESELER, *Commentatio qua Monophysitarum veterum errores ex eorum scriptis recens editis illustrantur* (Göttingen, 1835–8); WRIGHT, *Syriac Literature* (Encyclop. Brit., 9th ed., 1887; published separately as *A Short History of Syr. Lit.*, London, 1894); DUVAL, *La littérature Syriaque* (3rd ed., Paris, 1907); many excellent articles by KRÜGER in *Realencyclopädie.*

On TIMOTHY ÆLURUS see CRUM, *Eusebius and Coptic Church Hist.* in *Proc. of Soc. of Bibl. Arch.* (London, 1902); TER-MEKERTTSCHIAN AND TER-MINASSIANTZ, *Tim. Ælurus' des Patriarchen von Alexandrien, Widerlegung der auf der Synode zu Chalcedon festgesetzten Lehre,* Armenian text (Leipzig, 1908); LEBON, *La Christologie de Tim. Ælure* in *Revue d'hist. eccl.* (Oct., 1908); IDEM, *Le Monophysisme sévérien* (Louvain, 1909), 93–111.

For French tr. of the letters of PETER FULLO see RÉVILLOUT in *Revue des Questions Hist.*, XXII (1877), 83, and (in Coptic and French) AMÉLINEAU, *Mon. pour servir à l'hist. de l'Egypte chrét.* (Paris, 1888); the Armenian text in ISMEREANZ, *The book of Letters,* Armenian only (Tiflis, 1901); the letters to Peter Mongus are in Mansi, VII, 1109 sqq.; in favour of their genuineness see PAGI's notes to BARONIUS, *ad ann.* 485, No. 15; against, VALESIUS, *Observ. eccles.*, 4 (in his edition of EVAGRIUS, Paris, 1673; *P. G.*, LXXXVI), and TILLEMONT, XVI. Greek fragments from the homilies of TIMOTHY IV in *Cosmas Indicopleustes* (*P. G.*, LXXXVIII), an entire homily in MAI, *Script. vet. nova coll.*, V (1831), and *P. G.*, LXXXVI. Fragments of THEODOSIUS in *Cosmas* (*ibid.*), and of letters to Severus in *P. G.*, LXXXVI; see also Mansi, X, 1117 and 1121. A letter from Theodosius to Severus and one to Anthimus in *Hist. Misc.*, IX, 24, 26.

On SEVERUS see ASSEMANI; KRÜGER in *Realencykl.* s. v.; VENABLES in *Dict. Christ. Biog.;* SPANUTH, *Zacharias Rhetor, Das Leben des Severus* (Syr. text, Göttingen, 1893); lives by ZACHARIAS and JOHN OF BEITH-APHTHONIA, followed by a collection of documents concerning Severus, edited by KUGENER in *Patrol. Orient.*, II; *The Conflict of Severus, by* ATHANASIUS, Ethiopic text with English transl., ed. by GOODSPEED, together with Coptic fragments of the same work, edited by CRUM, in *Patrol. Orient.*, III; DUVAL, *Homélies cathédrales de Sévère,* 52–7, Syriac and French, in *Patr. Orient.*, II; BROOKS, *Sixth book of select letters of Severus in the Syriac version of Athanasius of Nisibis* (*Text and Transl. Soc.*, London, 1904); EUSTRATIOS, Σενῆος ὁ Μονοφυσίτης (Leipzig, 1894); PEISKER, *Severus von Antiochien, ein Kritischer Quellenbetrag zur Geschichte des Monophysismus* (Halle, 1903); and especially LEBON, *Le Monophysisme sévérien,* largely founded on the study of unpublished Syriac MSS. in the Brit. Mus. (Louvain, 1909).

On JULIAN see FABRICIUS, CAVE, GIESELER, DORNER, HARNACK; also DAVIDS in *Dict. Christ. Biog.* (1882); KRÜGER in *Realencycl.* (1901); LIETZMANN, *Catenen* (Freiburg, 1897); IDEM, *Aus Julian von Hal.* in *Rheinisch. Mus.*, LV (1900), 321. On JOHN PHILOPONUS see CAVE, FABRICIUS, ASSEMANI, DORNER, etc.; SCHARFENBERG, *Dissert. de Joanne Philop.* (Leipzig, 1768); DAVIDS in *Dict. Christ. Biog.;* NAUCK in *Allgemeine Encycl.;* STÖCKL in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Johannes Philoponus;* GASS AND MEYER in *Realencycl.;* RITTER, *Gesch. der Philos.*, VI; KRUMBACHER, *Gesch. der byz. Litt.* (2nd ed., 1897), 53 and 581, etc.; LUDWICH, *De Joanne Philopono grammatico* (Königsberg, 1888–9). On ZACHARIAS see KUGENER, *La compilation historique de Ps.-Zach. le rhéteur* in *Revue de l'Orient Chrét.*, V (1900), 201; IDEM, *Observations sur la vie de l'ascète Isaïe et sur les vies de Pierre l'Ib. et de Théodore d'Antinoë par Zach. le Schol.* in *Byzant. Zeitschr.*, IX (1900), 464; in these articles KUGENER distinguishes the Rhetor from the Scholastic, whom he identifies with the bishop; but he has changed his mind acc. to KRÜGER, *Zach. Schol.*, in *Realencycl.* (1908). See also below under *Historia Miscellanea.*

The *Plerophoria* of JOHN OF MAÏUMA are preserved in an abridgement in the *Chronicle* of MICHAEL SYR. A French translation by NAU, *Les Plérophories de Jean, évêque de Maïouma* in *Revue de l'Orient chrét.* (1898–9, and separately, Paris, 1899). The life of PETER THE IBERIAN, RAABE, *Petrus der Iberer* (Leipzig, 1895); BROOKS, *Vitæ virorum apud Monophysitas celeberrimorum* in *Corp. Script. Orient., Script. Syri,* 3rd series, 25, including the life of Isaias, which is also in LAND, III (Paris, 1907); a Georgian version of this biography publ. by MARR (St. Petersburg, 1896); KUGENER in *Byzant. Zeitschr.*, IX (Leipzig, 1900), 464; CHABOT, *Pierre l'Ibérien d'après une récente publication* in *Revue de l'Orient latin*, III (1895), 3.

The *Historia Miscellanea* of PSEUDO-ZACHARIAS was published by LAND, *loc. cit.*, III, in Syriac; German tr. by AHRENS AND KUGLER, *Die sogennante Kirchengeschichte von Zach. Rh.* (Leipzig, 1899); HAMILTON AND BROOKS, *The Syriac chronicle known as that of Zach. of Mitylene* (London, 1899, English only); see KUGENER, *op. cit.* For MICHAEL THE SYRIAN, CHABOT, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien* (Paris, 1901–2, in progress). There is an abridged Latin translation of the *Chronicle* of JOSHUA in ASSEMANI, *loc. cit.*, I, 262–283; Syriac and French by MARTIN, *Chronique de Josué le St.* in *Abhandlungen für die kunde des Morgenlandes,* VI (Leipzig, 1876), 1; in Syriac and English by WRIGHT, *The Chronicle of J. the St.* (Cambridge, 1882); Syriac and Latin (*Chronicle of Edessa* only) in *Corpus Script. Orient., Chronica minora* (Paris, 1902); HALLIER, *Untersuchungen über die Edessenische Chronik* in *Texte und Unters.*, IX (Leipzig, 1892), 1; NAU in *Bulletin critique,* 25 Jan., 1897; IDEM, *Analyse des parties inédites de la chronique attribuée à Denys de Tell-mahré* in *Suppl.* to *Revue de l'Orient chrét.* (1897); TULLBERG, *Dionysii Tellmahrensis chronici lib. I* (Upsala, 1851); CHABOT, *Chronique de Denys de T., quatrième partie* (Paris, 1895); BEDJAN, *Barhebræi Chronicon syriacum* (with Latin tr., Paris, 1890); ABBELOOS AND LAMY, *Barhebræi Chron. eccles.* (with Latin tr., Louvain. 1872–7); LAMY, *Elie de Nisibe, sa chronologie* (earlier portion, with French tr., Brussels, 1888).

On PHILOXENUS see ASSEMANI, WRIGHT, DUVAL; KRÜGER'S good article in *Realencycl.*; BUDGE, *The Discourses of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabbôgh,* Syriac and English, with introduction containing many short dogmatic writings, and a list of the works of Philoxenus, in vol. 2 (London, 1894); VASCHALDE, *Three letters of Philoxenus Bishop of M.*, Syr. and Eng. (Rome, 1902); IDEM, *Philoxeni Mabbugensis tractatus de Trinitate et Incarnatione* in *Corpus Script. Or., Scriptores Syri,* XXVII (Paris and Rome, 1907); DUVAL, *Hist. politique, religieuse et littéraire d'Edesse* (Paris, 1892); GUIDI,

La lettera de Filosseno ai Monaci di Tell Adda in *Mém. dell' Acad. dei Lincei* (1886); see especially LEBON, *op. cit.*, 111–118, and *passim*. On JAMES OF SARUG see ABBELOOS, *De vita et scriptis S. Jacobi* (with three ancient Syriac biographies, Louvain, 1867); ASSEMANI, WRIGHT, DUVAL, *loc. cit.; Acta SS.*, 29 Oct.; BARDENHEWER in *Kirchenlex.;* NESTLE in *Realencycl.;* MARTIN, *Un évêque poète au V^e et VI^e siècles* in *Revue des Sciences eccl.* (Oct., Nov., 1876); IDEM, *Correspondance de Jacques de Saroug avec les moines de Mar Bassus* in *Zeitschr. der deutschen Morganlandl. Gesellsch.*, XXX (1876), 217; Liturgy in Latin in RENAUDOT, *Liturg. Or. coll.*, II, 356; ZINGERLE, *Sechs homilien des h. Jacob von S.* (Bonn, 1867); BEDJAN, *70 Homiliæ selectæ Mar Jacobi S.* (Paris and Leipzig, 1905–6); single homilies are found in various publications; several in CURETON, *Ancient Syriac Documents* (1864).

FROTHINGHAM, *Stephen Bar Sudaili, the Syrian mystic, and the book of Hierotheos* (Leyden, 1886). On JOHN OF TELLA, KLEYN, *Het leven van Johannes van Tella* (Leyden, 1882); another life in BROOKS, *Vitæ virorum, loc. cit.;* his confession of faith is cited by LEBON, *loc. cit.* On GEORGE THE ARABIAN see ASSEMANI, WRIGHT, DUVAL, a good article by RYSSEL in *Realencycl.* (1899); IDEM, *Ein Brief Georgs, Bischop der Ar. an den Presb. Josua aus dem Syrischen übersetzt und erlautert, mit einer Einleitung über sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Gotha, 1888); IDEM, *Georges des Araberbischofs Gedichte und Briefe* (Leipzig, 1891), this work gives a German translation of all George's authentic works, apart from the commentaries; Syriac of the letter to Joshua in LAGARDE, *Analecta;* part of poem on chrism in CARDAHI, *Liber thesauri de arte poetica Syrorum* (1875); the whole, with that on the monastic life, ed. by RYSSEL in *Atti della R. Acad. dei Lincei*, IX (Rome, 1892), 1, who edited the *astronomical letters* also, *ibid.*, VIII, 1.

On the question of orthodoxy, see ASSEMANI, II; NAU, *Dans quelle mesure les Jacobites sont-ils Monophysites?* in *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, 1905, no. 2, p. 113; LEBON, *op. cit., passim.*

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Monopoli, DIOCESE OF (MONOPOLITANA), in the Province of Bari, in Apulia, southern Italy. The city has a small but good harbour on the Adriatic. It succeeded the ancient Egnatia, the ruins of which are not far from the modern town. In the eighth and ninth centuries, Monopoli was often ravaged by the Saracens. After the advent of the Norman counts, it became (1042) the seat of Hugues. During the war between France and Spain for the possession of the Kingdom of Naples Monopoli was taken twice by the Venetians (1495 and 1528), and on the second occasion was sacked. In 1552 Charles V surrounded the town with walls and towers that still exist. The episcopal see was created in 1062, and its first prelate was Deodatus. The cathedral was erected by the second bishop, Romualdus, in 1073. In 1118 Polignano, a small town situated on a high promontory along the Adriatic, was united to this diocese. The diocese is immediately subject to the Holy See; it has eight parishes, 65,000 inhabitants, and three educational institutes for girls.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XXI (Venice, 1887).

U. BENIGNI.

Monopoly, MORAL ASPECTS OF.—According to its etymology, monopoly (*μονοπωλία*) signifies exclusive sale, or exclusive privilege of selling. Present usage, however, extends the term to any degree of unified control over a commodity sufficient to enable the person or corporation in control to limit supply and fix price. The proportion of the supply of an article that must be controlled in order to attain these ends, depends upon many factors, and differs considerably in different industries. In the majority of monopolized businesses, it is somewhere between 70 and 90 per cent, although there are cases in which the unified control of a little more than one half the supply of the commodity seems to suffice. In most of the cases in which the monopoly controls less than three-fourths of a business, the independent dealers seem to have the power to overthrow the monopoly but prefer to take advantage of the higher prices and steadier market conditions established by the dominant concern. They are, consequently, passive factors in the monopolized condition of the trade. No matter how great the degree of control which the monopoly enjoys, its power over supply and prices is not absolute. Many economic and prudential considerations will restrain a monopoly from exercising this power to the extent that it might desire—for example, the fear of potential competition, the discovery of a substitute for the monopolized article, or the possibility that people may get on without either the article or a substitute. But in all cases monopoly implies the ability deliberately to regulate supply and prices beforehand, and to fix both at some other point than that which would have been reached by the natural action of the market under normal competition. However inexpedient a monopoly may be, it is not in itself immoral. Its moral character depends entirely upon its actions and its effects. More specifically, its morality is determined by the prices that it establishes, and the methods that it employs toward actual or potential competitors.

I. MONOPOLISTIC PRICES.—According to the older moral theologians, monopoly prices were unjust when they were higher than the prices that would have prevailed under competition (cf. Lugo, "De Justitia et de Jure", disp. xxvi, n. 72). While this rule was substantially correct for the Middle Ages, when the competitive, or rather the customary, price was generally fair to both producers and consumers, it is far from acceptable to-day, when the competitive price is often too low to provide a just return to the agents of production. For competitive prices, as well as for monopoly prices, the objective rule of justice is that a thing should be sold at a price sufficiently high to remunerate fairly all who have contributed to the production of the thing; the subjective rule of justice is the social estimate, the price approved by competent and fair-minded men (cf. Tanquerey, "De Justitia", 776). If the monopoly price does not exceed these limits, it is not unjustly high, even though it be higher than the price that had obtained or would have obtained under the stress of competition. Since the different classes that help to produce a socially useful commodity have a right to a fair return for their services, and since this return can come only from the price at which the commodity is sold, the latter is unjustly low unless it is sufficient for this purpose. There is no hidden force in competition by which an unjust price can be made just. On the other hand, there is no secret virtue in monopoly to justify a selling price that is more than sufficient to render fair returns to the different agents of production. These propositions are accepted by the overwhelming majority of persons, whether experts or not: the practical, and the only serious difficulty is to determine precisely what is a fair return to each of the different agents.

Putting the matter as briefly and as summarily as possible, we may say that a just remuneration to the agents of production comprises: (1) a living wage for all labourers, and something more than this for those workers who possess exceptional ability or skill, who put forth unusual efforts, who perform disagreeable tasks, or who turn out exceptionally large products; (2) fair profits for the business man, on account of his activities as director of industry; (3) a fair rate of interest on the actual capital invested in the business. Fair recompense for the captain of industry in a monopoly will generally mean the amount that he could obtain in return for the same services in a competitive business. Although competition is not of itself a determinant of fair wages in the case of ordinary labour, inasmuch as it often forces remuneration below the level of decent living, it is generally fair to the director of industry, inasmuch as it enables him not merely to obtain a decent livelihood, but to maintain himself in accordance with that higher standard of living to which he has a reasonable claim. And it yields even more than this to those business men whose ability is exceptional. A fair rate of interest on monopoly capital will be the rate that prevails in competitive businesses that are subject to a like amount of risk. The capitalist or interest receiver as such, does not work, but is free to earn his livelihood by his labour from other sources. Thus, since

interest is not his sole means of livelihood, the just rate of interest is not determined by, nor does it bear any definite relation to, the content of a decent livelihood in the individual case. Consequently, competition may be the proper rule of justice for the interest receiver, as well as for the director of industry, although it is not always a just rule for the ordinary wage-earner.

What are the grounds for the assertion that the investor in a monopoly has no right to more than the competitive or prevailing rate of interest? The answer to this question is bound up with the more fundamental question concerning the basis of the right of any investor to receive any interest at all. But, no matter what answer we give to this latter question, no matter what justification of interest we may adopt, we cannot prove, we can have no ground upon which to erect the beginnings of a proof, that the capitalist has a right, as capitalist, to more than the prevailing or competitive rate of interest. If we assume that interest is justified as the product or fruit of capital, we have no reason to assert that the so-called product has a higher value than men attribute to it in the open market under competitive conditions. If we regard interest as the due reward of the capitalist's sacrifices in saving, we have no ground for maintaining that these are not fully remunerated in the current rate. If we adopt the theory that seems to be most satisfactory and least assailable, namely that interest is chiefly justified on grounds of social utility, inasmuch as the community would probably not have sufficient capital unless men were encouraged to save by the hope of interest, we must likewise conclude that the current competitive rate is sufficiently high, since it brings forth sufficient saving and sufficient capital for society's needs. The argument based upon this theory may be stated summarily as follows: Since interest on capital cannot be shown to be unjust on individual grounds, that is as a payment from the purchaser of the product of capital to the owner of capital (for it must be remembered that the consumer is the real and final provider of interest on capital), it will be justified on social grounds if it is necessary in order to evoke sufficient social capital; and there is an overwhelming probability that it is necessary for this purpose. Since interest is justified only for this purpose and to this extent, the just rate of interest cannot be higher than the rate that attains this end, which in our time is the competitive rate.

The doctrine that capital has no right to more than the competitive rate of interest is accepted by the social estimate everywhere (see Final Report of the U. S. Industrial Commission, p. 409). It is implicitly asserted in the teaching of the theologians that the competitive rate is the just rate in the case of money loaned (cf. Tanquerey, "De Justitia", n. 906). Where the risk and other circumstances are the same, men do not value an investment any higher than a loan; they will put their money into the one or the other indifferently; consequently, it would seem clear that, when the circumstances just referred to are the same, a fair return on invested money need not exceed a fair return on loaned money. To be sure, investors and business men do obtain more than the competitive rate of interest in some years and in some enterprises, even where competition is active and constant; but this advantage is either offset by exceptionally low rates in other years, or it is due to unusual business ability, or it arises from an increase in the value of the land connected with the enterprise. In all these cases the exceptionally high rate is undoubtedly lawful morally, but the excess is due to other factors than the capital pure and simple. Since the prevailing or competitive rate is sufficiently high to satisfy the demands of justice in businesses that are subject to competition, there seems to be no good reason why it is not, generally speaking, sufficiently high in monopolistic concerns. The owner of a monopoly has no more right to take advantage of the helplessness of the consumer in order to extort an exceptionally high rate of interest on his investment than the money-lender has to exploit the distress of the borrower in order to exact an exorbitant rate of interest on the loan. It would seem that the only exception to this rule would occur when the monopoly, while paying a fair wage to labour and a fair price to those from whom it buys materials, introduces economies of production which enable it to sell its goods at less than the prices charged by its competitors, and yet make unusual profits and interest on its investment. In such a case it seems reasonable that a monopolistic concern (more properly, its active directors, who alone have effected the productive economies) should receive some of the benefits of the cheaper methods of production. On the other hand, there is no good reason why the monopoly should appropriate *all* the benefits of the improvement. If it does not share them with the consumer by reducing prices below the competitive level, it renders no social service to compensate for the social danger which is inherent in every monopolistic enterprise. As a matter of fact, the great majority of existing monoplies do not pay higher wages nor higher prices for material than competitive concerns, and yet they charge the consumer higher prices than would have prevailed under competition (cf. Final Report of the Industrial Commission, pp. 621, 625, 660).

In the preceding paragraphs reference is had to monopolistic concerns that fix prices without any supervision or restriction by the State. When the public authority exercises adequate control over the charges of public service monopolies, such as gas and street-railway companies, and determines these freely and honestly, it would seem that the monpolistic corporation has a right to collect the full amount of the charges established by the public authorities, even though they should yield unusual profits on the investment, for the presumption is that such charges are fair to both producer and consumer. No such presumption extends to those cases in which the state control over charges is only mildly corrective and partial, instead of fundamental and thorough.

II. Monopolistic Methods.—The methods and practices employed by monopolies in dealing with their rivals did not occupy the attention of the older moral theologians who wrote on the subject of monopoly. Nor have recent writers given this phase of the subject the attention that it deserves. As a consequence, authoritative ethical teaching is as yet silent, whereas public opinion regards as immoral most of the practices by which monopolistic concerns harass and eliminate their competitors. Among the most notable of these methods are discriminative underselling, the factor's agreement, and railway favouritism.

Discriminative underselling occurs, when the monopoly sells its goods at unprofitably low prices in the territory in which it wishes to destroy competition, while imposing unreasonably high prices elsewhere. While the independent dealer who is driven out of business by this device has no strict right to the patronage of the customers who are drawn away from him through the low prices established by the monopoly, he has a right not to be deprived of that patronage by unjust methods. According to a general and far-reaching moral principle, a man is unjustly treated when he is prevented by unjust means from obtaining an advantage which he has a right to pursue (cf. Lehmkuhl, "Theologia Moralis", I, n. 974; Tanquerey, "De Justitia", n. 588). Among the unjust means enumerated by the moral theologians are: force, fraud, deception, falsehood, intimidation, and extortion. Now when a manufacturer or a merchant is deprived of the patronage of his customers through ruinously low prices, which the monopoly is enabled to

maintain by means of the exorbitantly high prices that it establishes at another place or time, he is deprived of this advantage by unjust means. The unjustly high prices are as truly the means by which the independent dealer is injured, as the lying reports brought to a would-be benefactor are the means by which his intended beneficiary is deprived of a legacy. This is the stock example used by the moral theologians to illustrate the general principle stated above. When, however, a business concern eliminates a competitor by lowering prices universally, and keeping them low even after the latter has gone out of business, no injustice is done, because no unjust means are employed. Even when a monopolistic concern lowers prices everywhere at the same time, and raises them to an unjust level only after its competitors have been driven from the field, the latter would seem to be victims of injustice. For, although the unjust prices do not come into existence until after the injury has been accomplished, they are as certainly the means whereby the injury was done, as though they had been established simultaneously with the ruinously low prices. In both cases the exorbitant prices operate as the moral cause of the act by which the unprofitably low prices are established.

The factor's agreement is exemplified when a merchant engages to handle no goods, or no goods of a certain kind, except those manufactured by a monopoly; should the merchant decline to enter into this agreement, the monopolistic concern will refuse to sell him any goods at all. If the agreement is established, the result is that the rivals of the monopolistic manufacturing concern are deprived of the patronage of the merchant through intimidation. It is a species of secondary boycott, inasmuch as the monopoly refuses to have business intercourse with the merchant, unless the latter refuses to do business with the independent manufacturer. It seems sufficiently clear that boycotts of this kind are unreasonable and unjust whenever, as in this instance, there exists no sufficient reason for the intimidation and the refusal of intercourse (see LABOUR UNIONS, MORAL ASPECTS OF). Indeed, the motive of the monopoly is, as a rule, not merely lacking in reasonableness, but positively unjust; for its ultimate aim is not simply to acquire the patronage that now goes to its rivals, but in addition to raise prices to the consumer after its rivals have been eliminated.

Railway favouritism is the most important of all the methods of monopoly. It has in all probability been as effective in creating and maintaining monopolies as all the other methods combined. It appears under many forms, but its essence is found in the fact that the goods dealt in by a monopoly are carried by the railroad at a rate so much below that charged to independent dealers that the latter must either go out of business or be content with insufficient profits. This practice is undoubtedly immoral: (1) because it is forbidden by the civil law; (2) because the railroad, as a quasi-public agency, is under obligation to treat all its patrons with the same distributive justice that the state itself would be obliged to accord them if it were the owner of the railroads; (3) because the lower charges collected from the monopoly imply unjustly high charges extorted from the independent shippers. As a violation of the civil law, railway favouritism is against legal justice; as unequal treatment of different patrons, it is a violation of both distributive and commutative justice, precisely as the unequal imposition of taxes violates both these forms of justice. If the rate accorded to the monopoly for carrying its goods is sufficiently high to be just, the higher rate imposed upon its rivals exceeds the limits of justice. If the former rate is so low as to be unremunerative to the railroad, the injustice done to the independent dealers is still greater, inasmuch as they are compelled to bear a part of the charges that should be defrayed by the monopoly. The favours accorded to the latter are not deducted from the normal revenues and profits of the railway company.

As a matter of purely natural justice, a railroad might concede somewhat lower carrying rates to a monopolistic concern because the monopoly ships goods in larger lots. The cost of such transportation is always smaller than when the same volume of goods is carried in separate lots for several different concerns. Nevertheless, even this degree of favouritism is a violation of legal justice, and frequently a violation of charity as regards the smaller shipping concerns. Inasmuch as the practice of railway favouritism to monopolies is seldom confined within these narrow limits, the question raised in this paragraph is not of much practical importance. Again, the railroad might be absolved from the charge of violating natural justice if the lower rates which it extended to the monopoly did not fall below the lowest level (*pretium infimum*) of justice, while the charges exacted from the independent shippers did not exceed the highest level (*pretium summum*) sanctioned by justice. A private enterprise, such as a mercantile concern, could probably be absolved from the stigma of injustice if it indulged in this practice toward its different customers. But, as we have seen above, a railway is not a purely private concern. Since it performs a quasi-public function, it would seem to be bound by the same rules of distributive justice that would govern the State, if the latter were operating the business of transportation. The share of the monopoly in the immorality and injustice connected with railway favouritism consists in the fact that it requests, urges, and sometimes intimidates the railway to indulge in the practice. The monopoly is therefore a co-operator. In the language of the moral theologians, it is a *mandans*, or principal, and likewise a *participans*, or beneficiary (frequently the only beneficiary) of the injustice done to its rivals through overcharges for transportation.

While monopoly is not necessarily unjust, and while any particular monopoly may be free from unjust practices, experience shows that the power to commit injustice which is included in monopoly cannot be unreservedly entrusted to the average human being or group of human beings. Consequently, it is the duty of public authority to prevent the existence of unnecessary monopolies, and to exercise such supervision over necessary monopolies as to render impossible monopolistic injustice, whether against the independent business man through unjust methods, or the consumer through unjust prices. Many of the moral judgments enunciated in this article will perhaps strike the reader as lacking in positiveness, inasmuch as they are modified by such phrases as "it would seem," "it is probable," "it is reasonable". Yet no other course was possible. Concerning most of the specific questions discussed in the foregoing pages, there exists no specific teaching by the Church, or even by the unanimous voice of theologians. There are not even well-defined bodies of theological opinion. All that can be done is to draw conclusions from, and make specific applications of, the more general principles of justice as found in approved Catholic sources.

ELY, *Monopolies and Trusts* (New York, 1900); RIPLEY, *Trusts, Pools, and Corporations* (New York, 1905); *Reports of U. S. Industrial Commission*, I, IX (Washington, 1903); HOWE, *Privilege and Democracy in America* (New York, 1910); BLISS, *New Encyclopedia of Social Reform*, s. v. *Trusts;* SLATER in *Irish Theological Quarterly* (July, 1906); RYAN, *ibid.* (July, 1908); LUGO, *De Justitia et de Jure* (Lyons, 1670); TANQUEREY, *De Justitia* (New York, 1904); LEHMKUHL, *Theologia Moralis*, I (Freiburg, 1893); VERMEERSCH, *Quæstiones de Justitia* (Bruges, 1901); JANNET, *Le Capital, la Spéculation et la Finance* (Paris, 1892).

JOHN A. RYAN.

Monotheism (from the Greek μόνος "only", and θεός "god") is a word coined in comparatively modern times to designate belief in the one supreme God, the

Creator and Lord of the world, the eternal Spirit, All-powerful, All-wise, and All-good, the Rewarder of good and Punisher of evil, the Source of our happiness and perfection. It is opposed to Polytheism, which is belief in more gods than one, and to Atheism, which is disbelief in any deity whatsoever. In contrast with Deism, it is the recognition of God's presence and activity in every part of creation. In contrast with Pantheism, it is belief in a God of conscious freedom, distinct from the physical world. Both Deism and Pantheism are religious philosophies rather than religions.

On the other hand, Monotheism, like Polytheism, is a term applying primarily to a concrete system of religion. The grounds of reason underlying monotheism have already been set forth in the article GOD. These grounds enable the inquiring mind to recognize the existence of God as a morally certain truth. Its reasonableness acquires still greater force from the positive data associated with the revelation of Christianity. (See REVELATION.)

PRIMITIVE MONOTHEISM.—Was monotheism the religion of our first parents, and hence the primitive form of religion? Many Evolutionists and Rationalist Protestants answer No. Rejecting the very notion of positive, Divine revelation, they hold that the mind of man was in the beginning but little above that of his ape-like ancestors, and hence incapable of grasping so intellectual a conception as that of Monotheism.

They assert that the first religious notions entertained by man in his upward course towards civilization were superstitions of the grossest kind. In a word, primitive man was, in their opinion, a savage, differing but little from existing savages in his intellectual, moral, and religious life. Catholic doctrine teaches that the religion of our first parents was monotheistic and supernatural, being the result of Divine revelation. Not that primitive man without Divine help could not possibly have come to know and worship God. The first man, like his descendants to-day, had by nature the capacity and the aptitude for religion. Being a man in the true sense, with the use of reason, he had the tendency then, as men have now, to recognize in the phenomena of nature the workings of a mind and a will vastly superior to his own. But, as he lacked experience and scientific knowledge, it was not easy for him to unify the diverse phenomena of the visible world. Hence he was not without danger of going astray in his religious interpretation of nature. He was liable to miss the important truth that, as nature is a unity, so the God of nature is one. Revelation was morally necessary for our first parents, as it is for men to-day, to secure the possession of true monotheistic belief and worship.

The conception that Almighty God vouchsafed such a revelation is eminently reasonable to everyone who recognizes that the end of man is to know, love, and serve God. It is repugnant to think that the first generations of men were left to grope in the dark, ignorant alike of the true God and of their religious duties, while at the same time it was God's will that they should know and love Him. The instruction in religion which children receive from their parents and superiors, anticipating their powers of independent reasoning, and guiding them to a right knowledge of God, being impossible for our first parents, was not without a fitting substitute. They were set right from the first in the knowledge of their religious duties by a Divine revelation. It is a Catholic dogma, intimately connected with the dogma of original sin and with that of the Atonement, that our first parents were raised to the state of sanctifying grace and were destined to a supernatural end, namely, the beatific vision of God in heaven. This necessarily implies supernatural faith, which could come only by revelation.

Nor is there anything in sound science or philosophy to invalidate this teaching that Monotheistic belief was imparted by God to primitive man. While it may be true that human life in the beginning was on a comparatively low plane of material culture, it is also true that the first men were endowed with reason, i. e. with the ability to conceive with sufficient distinctness of a being who was the cause of the manifold phenomena presented in nature. On the other hand, a humble degree of culture along the lines of art and industry is quite compatible with right religion and morality, as is evident in the case of tribes converted to Catholicism in recent times; while retaining much of their rude and primitive mode of living, they have reached very clear notions concerning God and shown remarkable fidelity in the observance of His law. As to the bearing of the Evolutionistic hypothesis on this question, see FETISHISM.

It is thus quite in accordance with the accredited results of physical science to maintain that the first man, created by God, was keen of mind as well as sound of body, and that, through Divine instruction, he began life with right notions of God and of his moral and religious duties. This does not necessarily mean that his conception of God was scientifically and philosophically profound. Here it is that scholars are wide of the mark when they argue that Monotheism is a conception that implies a philosophic grasp and training of mind absolutely impossible to primitive man.

The notion of the supreme God needed for religion is not the highly metaphysical conception demanded by right philosophy. If it were, but few could hope for salvation. The God of religion is the unspeakably great Lord on whom man depends, in whom he recognizes the source of his happiness and perfection; He is the righteous Judge, rewarding good and punishing evil; the loving and merciful Father, whose ear is ever open to the prayers of His needy and penitent children. Such a conception of God can be readily grasped by simple, unphilosophic minds—by children, by the unlettered peasant, by the converted savage.

Nor are these notions of a supreme being utterly lacking even where barbarism still reigns. Bishop Le Roy, in his interesting work, "Religion des primitifs" (Paris, 1909), and Mr. A. Lang, in his "Making of Religion" (New York, 1898), have emphasized a point too often overlooked by students of religion, namely, that with all their religious crudities and superstitions, such low-grade savages as the Pygmies of the Northern Congo, the Australians, and the natives of the Andaman Islands entertain very noble conceptions of the Supreme Deity. To say, then, that primitive man, fresh from the hand of God, was incapable of monotheistic belief, even with the aid of Divine revelation, is contrary to well-ascertained fact. From the opening chapters of Genesis we gather that our first parents recognized God to be the author of all things, their Lord and Master, the source of their happiness, rewarding good and punishing evil. The simplicity of their life made the range of their moral obligation easy of recognition. Worship was of the simplest kind.

MOSAIC MONOTHEISM.—The ancient Hebrew religion, promulgated by Moses in the name of Jehovah (Jahweh), was an impressive form of Monotheism. That it was Divinely revealed is the unmistakable teaching of Holy Scripture, particularly of Exodus and the following books which treat explicitly of Mosaic legislation. Even non-Catholic Scriptural scholars, who no longer accept the Pentateuch, as it stands, as the literary production of Moses, recognize, in great part, that, in the older sources which, according to them, go to make up the Pentateuch, there are portions that reach back to the time of Moses, showing the existence of Hebrew monotheistic worship in his day.

Now, the transcendent superiority of this Monotheism taught by Moses offers a strong proof of its Divine origin. At a time when the neighbouring nations representing the highest civilization of that time—Egypt, Babylonia, Greece—were giving an impure and idolatrous worship to many deities, we find the insignificant Hebrew people professing a religion in which idolatry, impure rites, and a degrading mythology had no legitimate place, but where, instead, belief in the one true God was associated with a dignified worship and a lofty moral code. Those who reject the claim of Mosaic Monotheism to have been revealed have never yet succeeded in giving a satisfactory explanation of this extraordinary phenomenon. It was, however, pre-eminently the religion of the Hebrew people, destined in the fullness of time to give place to the higher monotheistic religion revealed by Christ, in which all the nations of the earth should find peace and salvation. The Jewish people was thus God's chosen people, not so much by reason of their own merit, as because they were destined to prepare the way for the absolute and universal religion, Christianity. The God of Moses is no mere tribal deity. He is the Creator and Lord of the world. He gives over to His chosen people the land of the Chanaanites. He is a jealous God, forbidding not only worship of strange gods, but the use of images, which might lead to abuses in that age of almost universal idolatry. Love of God is made a duty, but reverential fear is the predominant emotion. The religious sanction of the law is centred chiefly in temporal rewards and punishments. Laws of conduct, though determined by justice rather than by charity and mercy, are still eminently humane.

CHRISTIAN MONOTHEISM.—The sublime Monotheism taught by Jesus Christ has no parallel in the history of religions. God is presented to us as the loving, merciful Father, not of one privileged people, but of all mankind. In this filial relation with God—a relation of confidence, gratitude, love—Christ centres our obligations both to God and to our fellow-men. He lays hold of the individual soul and reveals to it its high destiny of Divine sonship. At the same time, He impresses on us the corresponding duty of treating others as God's children, and hence as our brethren, entitled not simply to justice, but to mercy and charity. To complete this idea of Christian fellowship, Jesus shows Himself to be the eternal Son of God, sent by His heavenly Father to save us from sin, to raise us to the life of grace and to the dignity of children of God through the atoning merits of His life and death. The love of God the Father thus includes the love of His incarnate Son. Personal devotion to Jesus is the motive of right conduct in Christian Monotheism. Co-operating in the sanctification of mankind is the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of truth and life, sent to confirm the faithful in faith, hope, and charity. These three Divine Persons, distinct from one another, equal in all things, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are one in essence, a trinity of persons in the one, undivided Godhead (see TRINITY, THE). Such is the Monotheism taught by Jesus. The guaranty of the truth of His teaching is to be found in His supreme moral excellence, in the perfection of His ethical teaching, in His miracles, especially His bodily resurrection, and in His wonderful influence on mankind for all time. (Cf. John, xvii, 3; I Cor., viii, 4.) As Christianity in its beginnings was surrounded by the polytheistic beliefs and practices of the pagan world, a clear and authoritative expression of Monotheism was necessary. Hence the symbols of faith, or creeds, open with the words: "I [we] believe in God [*θεόν, deum*]" or, more explicitly, "I [we] believe in one God [*ἕνα θεόν, unum deum*]". (See Denziger-Bannwart, "Enchiridion", 1–40; cf. APOSTLES' CREED; ATHANASIAN CREED; NICENE CREED.) Among the early heresies, some of the most important and most directly opposed to Monotheism arose out of the attempt to account for the origin of evil. Good they ascribed to one divine principle, evil to another. (See GNOSTICISM; MANICHÆISM; MARCIONITES.) These dualistic errors gave occasion for a vigorous defence of Monotheism by such writers as St. Irenæus, Tertullian, St. Augustine, etc. (see Bardenhewer-Shahan, "Patrology", St. Louis, 1908).

The same doctrine naturally held the foremost place in the teaching of the missionaries who converted the races of Northern Europe; in fact, it may be said that the diffusion of Monotheism is one of the great achievements of the Catholic Church. In the various conciliar definitions regarding the Trinity of Persons in God, emphasis is laid on the unity of the Divine nature; see, e. g., Fourth Council of Lateran (1215), in Denzinger-Bannwart, "Enchiridion", 428. The medieval Scholastics, taking up the traditional belief, brought to its support a long array of arguments based on reason; see, for instance, St. Thomas, "Contra Gentes", I, xlii; and St. Anselm, "Monol.", iv. During the last three centuries the most conspicuous tendency outside the Catholic Church has been towards such extreme positions as those of Monism (q. v.) and Pantheism (q. v.), in which it is asserted that all things are really one in substance, and that God is identical with the world. The Church, however, has steadfastly maintained, not only that God is essentially distinct from all things else, but also that there is only one God. "If any one deny the one true God, Creator and Lord of all things visible and invisible, let him be anathema" (Conc. Vatican., Sess. III, "De fide", can. i).

MOHAMMEDAN MONOTHEISM.—Of Mohammedan Monotheism little need be said. The Allah of the Koran is practically one with the Jehovah of the Old Testament. Its keynote is *islam*, submissive resignation to the will of God, which is expressed in everything that happens. Allah is, to use the words of the Koran, "The Almighty, the All-knowing, the All-just, the Lord of the worlds, the Author of the heavens and the earth, the Creator of life and death, in whose hand is dominion and irresistible power, the great all-powerful Lord of the glorious throne. God is the Mighty, . . . the Swift in reckoning, who knoweth every ant's weight of good and of ill that each man hath done, and who suffereth not the reward of the faithful to perish. He is the King, the Holy, . . . the Guardian over His servants, the Shelterer of the orphan, the Guide of the erring, the Deliverer from every affliction, the Friend of the bereaved, the Consoler of the afflicted, . . . the generous Lord, the gracious Hearer, the Near-at-hand, the Compassionate, the Merciful, the Forgiving" (cited from "Islam", by Ameer Ali Syed). The influence of the Bible, particularly the Old Testament, on Mohammedan Monotheism is well known and need not be dwelt on here.

MONOTHEISM AND POLYTHEISTIC RELIGIONS.—What has thus far been said leads to the conclusion that Christian Monotheism and its antecedent forms, Mosaic and primitive Monotheism, are independent in their origin of the Polytheistic religions of the world. The various forms of polytheism that now flourish, or that have existed in the past, are the result of man's faulty attempts to interpret nature by the light of unaided reason. Wherever the scientific view of nature has not obtained, the mechanical, secondary causes that account for such striking phenomena as sun, moon, lightning, tempest, have invariably been mistaken for personal, living causes. The thunder has suggested the thunderer; the tempest, a mysterious living being of destructive tendencies; the sun, moon, and stars have been viewed either as living beings, or as inert bodies kept in movement by invisible, intelligent agents. This personalizing of the striking phenomena of nature was common among the highest pagan nations of antiquity. It is the common view

among peoples of inferior culture to-day. It is only since modern science has brought all these phenomena within the reign of physical law that the tendency to view them as manifestations of distinct personalities has been thoroughly dispelled. Now such a personalizing of nature's forces is compatible with Monotheism so long as these different intelligencies fancied to produce the phenomena are viewed as God's creatures, and hence not worthy of Divine worship. But where the light of revelation has been obscured in whole or in part, the tendency to deify these personalities associated with natural phenomena has asserted itself.

In this way polytheistic nature-worship seems to have arisen. It arose from the mistaken application of a sound principle, which man everywhere seems naturally to possess, namely, that the great operations of nature are due to the agency of mind and will. Professor George Fisher observes: "The polytheistic religions did not err in identifying the manifold activities of nature with voluntary agency. The spontaneous feelings of mankind in this particular are not belied by the principles of philosophy. The error of polytheism lies in the splintering of that will which is immanent in all the operations of nature into a plurality of personal agents, a throng of divinities, each active and dominant within a province of its own" ("Grounds of Christian and Theistic Belief", 1903, p. 29). Polytheistic nature-worship is to be found among practically all peoples who have lacked the guiding star of Divine revelation. Such history of these individual religions as we possess offers little evidence of an upward development towards Monotheism: on the contrary, in almost every instance of known historic development, the tendency has been to degenerate further and further from the monotheistic idea. There is, indeed, scarcely a Polytheistic religion in which one of the many deities recognized is not held in honour as the father and lord of the rest. That this is the result of an upward development, as non-Catholic scholars very generally assert, is speculatively possible. But that it may as well be the outcome of a downward development from a primitive monotheistic belief cannot be denied. The latter view seems to have the weight of positive evidence in its favour. The ancient Chinese religion, as depicted in the oldest records, was remarkably close to pure Monotheism. The gross Polytheistic nature-worship of the Egyptians of later times was decidedly a degeneration from the earlier quasi-Monotheistic belief. In the Vedic religion a strong Monotheistic tendency asserted itself, only to weaken later on and change into Pantheism. The one happy exception is the upward development which the ancient Aryan Polytheism took in the land of the Iranians. Through the wise reform of Zoroaster, the various gods of nature were subordinated to the supreme, omniscient spirit, Ormuzd, and were accorded an inferior worship as his creatures. Ormuzd was honoured as the creator of all that is good, the revealer and guardian of the laws of religious and moral conduct, and the sanctifier of the faithful. The sense of sin was strongly developed, and a standard of morality was set forth that justly excites admiration. Heaven and hell, the final renovation of the world, including the bodily resurrection, were elements in Zoroastrian eschatology. A nobler religion outside the sphere of revealed religion is not to be found. Yet even this religion is rarely classed by scholars among monotheistic religions, owing to the polytheistic colouring of its worship of the subordinate nature-spirits, and also to its retention of the ancient Aryan rite of fire-worship, justified by Zoroastrians of modern times as a form of symbolic worship of Ormuzd.

The so-called survivals in higher religions, such as belief in food-eating ghosts, pain-causing spirits, witchcraft, the use of amulets and fetishes, are often cited as evidence that even such forms of Monotheism as Judaism and Christianity are but outgrowths of lower religions. The presence of the greater part of these superstitious beliefs and customs in the more ignorant sections of Christian peoples is easily explained as the survival of tenacious customs that flourished among the ancestors of European peoples long before their conversion to Christianity. Again, many of these beliefs and customs are such as might easily arise from faulty interpretations of nature, unavoidable in unscientific grades of culture, even where the monotheistic idea prevailed. Superstitions like these are but the rank weeds and vines growing around the tree of religion.

KRIEG, *Der Monotheismus d. Offenbarung u. das Heidentum* (Mainz, 1880); BOEDDER, *Natural Theology* (New York, 1891); DRISCOLL, *Christian Philosophy. God* (New York, 1900); HONTHEIM, *Institutiones Theodicææ* (Freiburg, 1893); LILLY, *The Great Enigma* (2nd ed., London, 1893); RICKABY, *Of God and His Creatures* (St. Louis, 1898); MICHELET, *Dieu et l'agnosticisme contemporain* (Paris, 1909); DE LA PAQUERIE, *Eléments d'apologétique* (Paris, 1898); GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE in *Dictionnaire apologétique de la foi catholique* (Paris, 1910), s. v. *Dieu;* FISHER, *The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief* (New York, 1897); CAIRD, *The Evolution of Religion* (2 vols., Glasgow, 1899); GWATKIN, *The Knowledge of God and its Historic Development* (Edinburgh, 1906); FLINT, *Theism* (New York, 1896); IDEM, *Anti-Theistic Theories* (New York, 1894); IVERACH, *Theism in the Light of Present Science and Philosophy* (New York, 1899); ORR, *The Christian View of God and the World* (New York, 1907); RASHDALL, *Philosophy and Religion* (New York, 1910); SCHURMANN, *Belief in God, its Origin, Nature, and Basis* (New York, 1890).

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

Monothelitism and Monothelites (sometimes written MONOTHELETES, from *μονοθελῆται*, but the *η* is more naturally transliterated into late Latin by *i*), a heresy of the seventh century, condemned in the Sixth General Council. It was essentially a modification of Monophysitism, propagated within the Catholic Church in order to conciliate the Monophysites, in hopes of reunion.

THE THEOLOGICAL QUESTION.—The Monophysites were habitually represented by their Catholic opponents as denying all reality to the human nature of Christ after the union. This was perhaps a logical deduction from some of their language, but it was far from being the real teaching of their chief doctors.

Yet at least it is certain that they made the unity of Christ (on which they insisted against real and supposed Nestorianizers) imply only one principle of intention and will, and only one kind of activity or operation (*ἐνέργεια*). Personality seemed to them to be manifested in will and action; and they thought a single personality must involve a single will and a single category of action. The Person of Christ, being divino-human, must therefore involve one divino-human will and one divino-human activity (see EUTYCHIANISM; MONOPHYSITES AND MONOPHYSITISM).

A. *The two Wills.*—The Catholic doctrine is simple, at all events in its main lines. The faculty of willing is an integral part of human nature: therefore, our Lord had a human will, since He took a perfect human nature. His Divine will on the other hand is numerically one with that of the Father and the Holy Ghost. It is therefore necessary to acknowledge two wills in Christ.

But if the word *will* is taken to mean not the faculty but the decision taken by the will (the will willed, not the will willing), then it is true that the two wills always acted in harmony: there were two wills willing and two acts, but one object, one will willed; in the phrase of St. Maximus, there were *δύο θελήματα* though *μία γνωμή*. The word *will* is also used to mean not a decision of the will, but a mere velleity or wish, *uoluntas ut natura* (*θελήσις*) as opposed to *uoluntas ut ratio* (*βούλησις*). These are but two movements of the same faculty; both exist in Christ without any imperfection, and the natural movement of His human will is perfectly subject to its rational or free movement. Lastly, the sensitive appetite is also

sometimes entitled *will*. It is an integral part of human nature, and therefore exists in the perfect human nature of Jesus Christ, but without any of the imperfection induced by original or actual sin: He can have no passions (in that sense of the word which implies a revolt against the reason), no concupiscence, no "will of the flesh". Therefore this "lower will" is to be denied in Christ, in so far as it is called a will, because it resists the rational will (it was in this sense that Honorius was said by John IV to have denied that Christ had a lower will); but it is to be asserted in Him so far as it is called will, because it obeys the rational will, and so is *voluntas per participationem:* in fact in this latter sense the sensual appetite is less improperly called *will* in Christ than in us, for *quo perfectior est volens, eo magis sensualitas in eo de voluntate habet.* But the strict sense of the word *will* (*voluntas*, θέλημα) is always the rational will, the free will. It is therefore correct to say that in Christ there are but two wills: the Divine will, which is the Divine nature, and the human rational will, which always acts in harmony with and in free subjection to the Divine will. The denial of more than one will in Christ by the heretics necessarily involved the incompleteness of His human nature. They confounded the will as faculty with the decision of the faculty. They argued that two wills must mean contrary wills, which shows that they could not conceive of two distinct faculties having the same object. Further, they saw rightly that the Divine will is the ultimate governing principle, τὸ ἡγεμονικόν, but a free human will acting under its leadership seemed to them to be otiose. Yet this omission prevents our Lord's actions from being free, from being human actions, from being meritorious, indeed makes His human nature nothing but an irrational, irresponsible instrument of the Divinity—a machine, of which the Divinity is the motive power. To Severus our Lord's knowledge was similarly of one kind—He had only Divine knowledge and no human cognitive faculty. Such thoroughgoing conclusions were not contemplated by the inventors of Monothelitism, and Sergius merely denied two wills in order to assert that there was no repugnance in Christ's human nature to the promptings of the Divine, and he certainly did not see the consequences of his own disastrous teaching.

B. *The two operations.*—Operation or energy, activity (ἐνέργεια, *operatio*), is parallel to will, in that there is but one activity of God, *ad extra*, common to all the three Persons; whereas there are two operations of Christ, on account of His two natures. The word ἐνέργεια is not here employed in the Aristotelean sense (*actus*, as opposed to *potentia*, δύναμις), for this would be practically identical with *esse* (*existentia*), and it is an open question amongst Catholic theologians whether there is one *esse* in Christ or two. Nor does ἐνέργεια here mean simply the *action* (as Vasquez, followed by de Lugo and others, wrongly held) but the faculty of action, including the act of the faculty. Petavius has no difficulty in refuting Vasquez, by referring to the writers of the seventh century; but he himself speaks of *duo genera operationum* as equivalent to *duo operationes*, which introduces an unfortunate confusion between ἐνέργεια and πράξεις or ἐνεργήματα, that is between faculty of action and the multiple actions produced by the faculty. This confusion of terms is frequent in modern theologians, and occurs in the ancients, e. g. St. Sophronius. The actions of God are innumerable in Creation and Providence, but His ἐνέργεια is one, for He has one nature of the three Persons. The various actions of the incarnate Son proceed from two distinct and unconfused ἐνέργειαι, because He has two natures. All are the actions of one subject (agent or *principium quod*), but are either divine or human according to the nature (*principium quo*) from which they are elicited. The Monophysites were therefore quite right in saying that all the actions, human and divine, of the incarnate Son are to be referred to one agent, who is the God-man; but they were wrong in inferring that consequently His actions, both the human and the Divine, must all be called "theandric" or "divino-human", and must proceed from a single divino-human ἐνέργεια. St. Sophronius, and after him St. Maximus and St. John Damascene, showed that the two ἐνέργειαι produce three classes of actions, since actions are complex, and some are therefore mingled of the human and the divine. (1) There are Divine actions exercised by God the Son in common with the Father and the Holy Ghost (e. g. the creation of souls or the conservation of the universe) in which His human nature bears no part whatever, and these cannot be called divino-human, for they are purely Divine. It is true that it is correct to say that a child ruled the universe (by the *communicatio idiomatum*), but this is a matter of words, and is an accidental, not a formal predication —He who became a child ruled the universe as God, not as a child, and by an activity that is wholly Divine, not divino-human. (2) There are other Divine actions which the Word Incarnate exercised in and through His human nature, as to raise the dead by a word, to heal the sick by a touch. Here the Divine action is distinguished from the human actions of touching or speaking, though it uses them, but through this close connexion the word *theandric* is not out of place for the whole complex act, while the Divine action as exercised through the human may be called formally theandric, or divino-human. (3) Again, there are purely human actions of Christ, such as walking or eating, but these are due to the free human will, acting in response to a motion of the Divine will. These are elicited from a human *potentia*, but under the direction of the Divine. Therefore they are also called theandric, but in a different sense—they are materially theandric, humano-divine. We have seen therefore that to some of our Lord's actions the word theandric cannot be applied at all; to some it can be applied in one sense, to others in a different sense. The Lateran Council of 649 anathematized the expression *una deivirilis operatio*, μία θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια, by which all the actions divine and human are performed. It is unfortunate that the respect felt for the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius Areopagita has prevented theologians from proscribing the expression *deivirilis operatio* altogether. It has been shown above that it is correct to speak of *deiviriles actus* or *actiones* or ἐνεργήματα. The καινὴ θεανδρικὴ ἐνέργεια, of Pseudo-Dionysius was defended by Sophronius and Maximus as referring to the Divine ἐνέργεια when producing the mixed (formally theandric) acts; theandric thus becomes a correct epithet of the Divine operation under certain circumstances, and that is all.

Though the Monophysites in general spoke of "one theandric operation", yet a speech of St. Martin at the Lateran Council tells us that a certain Colluthus would not go even so far as this, for he feared lest "theandric" might leave some operation to the human nature; he preferred the word θεκοπρέπης, *Deo decibilis* (Mansi, X, 982). The denial of two operations, even more than the denial of two wills, makes the human nature of Christ an inanimate instrument of the Divine will. St. Thomas points out that though an instrument participates in the action of the agent who uses it, yet even an inanimate instrument has an activity of its own; much more the rational human nature of Christ has an operation of its own under the higher motion it receives from the divinity. But by means of this higher motion, the two natures act in concert, according to the famous words of St. Leo's Tome: "Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est; Verbo scilicet operante quod Verbi est, et carne exsequente quod carnis est. Unum horum coruscat miraculis, aliud succumbit in-

juriis" (Ep. 28, 4). These words were quoted by Cyrus, Sergius, Sophronius, Honorius, Maximus, etc., and played a large part in the controversy. This intercommunication of the two operations follows from the Catholic doctrine of the *περιχωρήσις, circuminsessio*, of the two unconfused and inseparable natures, as again St. Leo: "Exprimit quidem sub distinctis actionibus veritatem suam utraque natura, sed neutra se ab alterius connexione disjungit" (Serm. liv, 1). St. Sophronius (Mansi, XI, 480 sqq.) and St. Maximus (Ep. 19) expressed this truth at the very outset of the controversy as well as later; and it is insisted upon by St. John Damascene. St. Thomas (III, Q. xix, a. 1) well explains it: "Motum participat operationem moventis, et movens utitur operatione moti, et sic utrumque agit cum communicatione alterius". Krüger and others have doubted whether it could be said that the question of two operations was already decided (as Loofs held), in Justinian's time. But it seems that St. Leo's words, yet earlier, were clear enough. The writings of Severus of Antioch assumed that his Catholic opponents would uphold two operations, and an obscure monk in the sixth century, Eustathius (De duabus naturis, P. G., LXXXVI, 909) accepts the expression. Many of the numerous citations from the Greek and Latin Fathers adduced at the Lateran Council and on other occasions are inconclusive, but some of them are clear enough. Really learned theologians like Sophronius and Maximus were not at a loss, though Cyrus and Honorius were puzzled. The Patriarch Eulogius of Alexandria (580–607) had written against those who taught one will, but his work was unknown to Cyrus and Sergius.

History.—The origin of the Monothelite controversy is thus related by Sergius in his letter to Pope Honorius. When the Emperor Heraclius in the course of the war which he began about 619, came to Theodosiopolis (Erzeroum) in Armenia (about 622), a Monophysite named Paul, a leader of the Acephali, made a speech before him in favour of his heresy. The emperor refuted him with theological arguments, and incidentally made use of the expression "one operation" of Christ. Later on (about 626) he inquired of Cyrus, Bishop of Phasis and metropolitan of the Lazi, whether his words were correct. Cyrus was uncertain, and by the emperor's order wrote to Sergius the Patriarch of Constantinople, whom Heraclius greatly trusted, for advice. Sergius in reply sent him a letter said to have been written by Mennas of Constantinople to Pope Vigilius and approved by the latter, in which several authorities were cited for one operation and one will. This letter was afterwards declared to be a forgery and was admitted to be such at the Sixth General Council. Nothing more occurred, according to Sergius, until in June, 631, Cyrus was promoted by the emperor to the See of Alexandria. The whole of Egypt was then Monophysite, and it was constantly threatened by the Saracens. Heraclius was doubtless very anxious to unite all to the Catholic Church, for the country was greatly weakened by the dissensions of the heretics among themselves, and by their bitterness against the official religion. Former emperors had made efforts for reunion, but in the fifth century the Henoticon of Zeno had been condemned by the popes yet had not satisfied all the heretics, and in the sixth century the condemnation of the three Chapters had nearly caused a schism between East and West without in the least placating the Monophysites. Cyrus was for the moment more successful. Imagining, no doubt, as all Catholics imagined, that Monophysitism involved the assertion that the human nature of Christ was a nonentity after the Union, he was delighted at the acceptance by the Monophysites of a series of nine *Capitula*, in which the Chalcedonian "in two natures" is asserted, the "one composite hypostasis", and *φυσικὴ καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν ἕνωσις*, together with the adverbs *ἀσυγχύτως*, *ἀτρέπτως*, *ἀναλλοιώτως*. St. Cyril, the great doctor of the Monophysites, is cited; and all is satisfactory until in the seventh proposition our Lord is spoken of as "working His Divine and His human works by one theandric operation, according to the divine Dionysius". This famous expression of the Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite is taken by modern critics to show that he wrote under Monophysite influences. But Cyrus believed it to be an orthodox expression, used by Mennas, and approved by Pope Vigilius. He was triumphant therefore at the reunion to the Church of a large number of Theodosian Monophysites, so that, as Sergius phrases it, all the people of Alexandria and nearly all Egypt, the Thebaid, and Libya had become of one voice, and whereas formerly they would not hear even the name of St. Leo and of the Council of Chalcedon, now they acclaimed them with a loud voice in the holy mysteries. But the Monophysites saw more clearly, and Anastasius of Mount Sinai tells us that they boasted "they had not communicated with Chalcedon, but Chalcedon with them, by acknowledging one nature of Christ through one operation".

St. Sophronius, a much venerated monk of Palestine, soon to become Patriarch of Jerusalem, was in Alexandria at this time. He strongly objected to the expression "one operation", and unconvinced by Cyrus's defence of it, he went to Constantinople, and urged on Sergius, upon whose advice the expression had been used, that the seventh capitulum must be withdrawn. Sergius thought this too hard, as it would destroy the union so gloriously effected; but he was so far impressed that he wrote to Cyrus that it would be well for the future to drop both expressions "one operation" and "two operations", and he thought it necessary to refer the whole question to the pope. (So far his own story.) This last proceeding must warn us not to judge Sergius too harshly. It may be invention that he was born of Monophysite parents (so Anastasius of Sinai); at all events he was an opponent of the Monophysites, and he based his defence of "one operation" on the citations of Fathers in the spurious letter of his orthodox predecessor Mennas, which he believed to have had the approval of Pope Vigilius. He was a politician who evidently knew little theology. But he had more to answer for than he admits. Cyrus had not really been doubtful at first. His letter to Sergius with great politeness explains that he had said the emperor was wrong, and had quoted the famous words of St. Leo's Tome to Flavian: "Agit utraque natura cum alterius communione quod proprium est" as plainly defining two distinct but inseparable operations; Sergius was responsible for leading him into error by sending him the letter of Mennas. Further, St. Maximus tells us that Sergius had written to Theodore of Pharan asking his opinion; Theodore agreed. (It is probable that Stephen of Dora was mistaken in making Theodore a Monothelite before Sergius.) He also worked upon the Severian Paul the one-eyed, the same with whom Heraclius had disputed. He had requested George Arsas, a Monophysite follower of Paul the Black of Antioch, to furnish him with authorities for the "one operation", saying in his letter that he was ready to make a union on this basis. The Alexandrian St. John the Almsgiver (609 or 619) had taken this letter from Arsas with his own hand, and was only prevented by the irruption of the Saracens (619) from using it to obtain the deposition of Sergius.

In the letter to Honorius, Sergius unwittingly develops another heresy. He admits that "one operation", though used by a few Fathers, is a strange expression, and might suggest a denial of the unconfused union of two natures. But the "two operations" are also dangerous, by suggesting "two contrary wills, as though when the Word of God wished to fulfil His saving Passion, His humanity resisted and contradicted His will, and thus two contrary wills would be

introduced, which is impious, for it is impossible that in the same subject there should be two wills at once, and contrary to one another as to the same thing". So far he is right; but he continues: "For the saving doctrine of the holy Fathers clearly teaches that the intellectually animated flesh of the Lord never performs its natural movement apart from, and by its own impetus contrariwise to, the direction of the Word of God hypostatically united to it, but only at the time and in the manner and to the extent that the Word of God wishes," just as our body is moved by our rational soul. Here Sergius speaks of the natural will of the flesh, and of the Divine will, but makes no mention of the higher free will, which indeed is wholly subject to the Divine will. He may indeed be understood to include this intellectual will in "the intellectually animated flesh", but his thought is not clear, and his words simply express the heresy of one will. He concludes that it is best simply to confess that "the only begotten Son of God, who is truly both God and Man, works both the Divine and the human works, and from one and the same incarnate Word of God proceed indivisibly and inseparably both the Divine and the human operations as St. Leo teaches: Agit enim utraque, etc." If these words and the quotation from St. Leo mean anything, they mean two operations; but Sergius's error lies precisely in deprecating this expression. It cannot be too carefully borne in mind that theological accuracy is a matter of definition, and definition is a matter of words. The prohibition of the right words is always heresy, even though the author of the prohibition has no heretical intention and is merely shortsighted or confused. Honorius replied reproving Sophronius, and praising Sergius for rejecting his "new expression" of "two operations". He approves the recommendations made by Sergius, and has no blame for the capitula of Cyrus. In one point he goes further than either, for he uses the words: "Wherefore we acknowledge one Will of our Lord Jesus Christ." We may easily believe the testimony of Abbot John Symponus, who wrote the letter for Honorius, that he intended only to deny a lower will of the flesh in Christ which contradicted His higher will, and that he was not referring at all to His Divine will; but in connexion with the letter of Sergius such an interpretation is scarcely the more obvious one. It is clear that Honorius was not any more a wilful heretic than was Sergius, but he was equally incorrect in his decision, and his position made the mistake far more disastrous. In another letter to Sergius he says he has informed Cyrus that the new expressions, one and two operations, are to be dropped, their use being most foolish.

In one of the last four months of 638 effect was given to the pope's letter by the issue of an "Exposition" composed by Sergius and authorized by the emperor; it is known as the Ecthesis of Heraclius. Sergius died 9 Dec., a few days after having celebrated a council in which the Ecthesis was acclaimed as "truly agreeing with the Apostolic teaching", words which seem to be a reference to its being founded on the letter of Honorius. Cyrus received the news of this council with great rejoicings. The Ecthesis itself is a complete profession of Faith according to the five General Councils. Its peculiarity consists in adding a prohibition of the expression one and two operations, and an assertion of one will in Christ lest contrary wills should be held. The letter of Honorius had been a grave document, but not a definition of Faith binding on the whole Church. The Ecthesis was a definition. But Honorius had no cognizance of it, for he had died on 12 Oct. The envoys who came for the emperor's confirmation of the new Pope Severinus refused to recommend the Ecthesis to the latter, but promised to lay it before him for judgment (see MAXIMUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE). Severinus, not consecrated until May, 640, died two months later, but not without having condemned the Ecthesis. John IV, who succeeded him in December, lost no time in holding a synod to condemn it formally. When Heraclius, who had merely intended to give effect to the teaching of Honorius, heard that the document was rejected at Rome, he disowned it in a letter to John IV, and laid the blame on Sergius. He died Feb., 641. The pope wrote to the elder son of Heraclius, saying that the Ecthesis would doubtless now be withdrawn, and apologizing for Pope Honorius, who had not meant to teach one human will in Christ. St. Maximus Confessor published a similar defence of Honorius, but neither of these apologists says anything of the original error, the forbidding of the "two operations", which was soon to become once more the principal point of controversy. In fact on this point no defence of Honorius was possible. But Pyrrhus, the new Patriarch of Constantinople, was a supporter of the Ecthesis and confirmed it in a great council, which St. Maximus, however, reproves as irregularly convoked. After the death of Constantine and the exile of his brother Heracleonas, Pyrrhus himself was exiled to Africa. Here he was persuaded in a famous controversy with St. Maximus (q. v.) to renounce the appeal to Vigilius and Honorius and to condemn the Ecthesis; he went to Rome and made his submission to Pope Theodore, John IV having died (Oct., 642).

Meanwhile protests from the East were not wanting. St. Sophronius, who, after becoming Patriarch of Jerusalem, died just before Sergius, had yet had time to publish at his enthronization a formal defence of the dogma of two operations and two wills, which was afterwards approved by the sixth council. This remarkable document was the first full exposition of the Catholic doctrine. It was sent to all the patriarchs, and St. Sophronius humbly asked for corrections. His references to St. Leo are interesting, especially his statement: "I accept all his letters and teachings as proceeding from the mouth of Peter the Coryphæus, and I kiss them and embrace them with all my soul". Further on he speaks of receiving St. Leo's definitions as those of Peter, and St. Cyril's as those of Mark. He also made a large collection of testimonies of the Fathers in favour of two operations and two wills. He finally sent to Rome Stephen, Bishop of Dora, the first bishop of the patriarchate, who has given us a moving description of the way in which the saint led him to the holy place of Calvary and there charged him, saying: "Thou shalt give an account to the God who was crucified for us in this holy place, in His glorious and awful advent, when He shall come to judge the living and the dead, if thou delay and allow His Faith to be endangered, since, as thou knowest, I am myself let, by reason of the invasion of the Saracens which is come upon us for our sins. Swiftly pass, then, from end to end of the world, until thou come to the Apostolic See, where are the foundations of the holy doctrines. Not once, not twice, but many times, make clearly known to all those holy men there all that has been done; and tire not instantly urging and beseeching, until out of their apostolic wisdom they bring forth judgment unto victory." Urged by almost all the orthodox bishops of the East, Stephen made his first journey to Rome. On the death of St. Sophronius, his patriarchal see was invaded by the Bishop of Joppa, a supporter of the Ecthesis. Another heretic sat in the See of Antioch. At Alexandria the union with the Monophysites was shortlived. In 640 the city fell into the hands of the Arabians under Amru, and the unfortunate heretics have remained until today (save for a few months in 646) under the rule of the infidel. Thus the whole of the Patriarchates of Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria were separated from Rome. Yet no doubt, except in Egypt, the great number of the bishops and the whole of their flocks were orthodox and had no wish to accept the Ecthesis.

The bishops of Cyprus, independent of any patriarch, held a synod 29 May, 643, against the Ecthesis. They wrote to Pope Theodore a letter of entreaty: "Christ, our God, has instituted your Apostolic chair, O holy head, as a God-fixed and immovable foundation. For thou, as truly spake the Divine Word, art Peter, and upon thy foundation the pillars of the Church are fixed, and to thee He committed the keys of the kingdom of Heaven. He ordered thee to bind and loose with authority on earth and in heaven. Thou art set as the destroyer of profane heresies, as Coryphæus and leader of the orthodox and unsullied Faith. Despise not then, Father, the Faith of our Fathers, tossed by waves and imperilled; disperse the rule of the foolish with the light of thy divine knowledge, O most holy. Destroy the blasphemies and insolence of the new heretics with their novel expressions. For nothing is wanting to your orthodox and pious definition and tradition for the augmentation of the Faith amongst us. For we—O inspired one, you who hold converse with the holy Apostles and sit with them—believe and confess from of old since our very swaddling clothes, teaching according to the holy and God-fearing Pope Leo, and declaring that 'each nature works with the communion of the other what is proper to it'", etc. They declare themselves ready to be martyred rather than forsake the doctrine of St. Leo: but their Archbishop Sergius, when the persecution arose, was found on the side of the persecutors, not of the martyrs. It is abundantly clear that St. Maximus and his Constantinopolitan friends, St. Sophronius and the bishops of Palestine, Sergius and his suffragans, had no notion that the Apostolic See had been compromised by the letters of Honorius, but they look to it as the only port of salvation. Similarly in 646 the bishops of Africa and the adjoining islands held councils, in the name of which the primates of Numidia, Byzacene and Mauritania sent a joint letter to Pope Theodore, complaining of the Ecthesis: "No one can doubt that there is in the Apostolic See a great and unfailing fountain pouring forth waters for all Christians", and so forth. They enclose letters to the emperor and to the patriarch Paul, to be sent to Constantinople by the pope. They are afraid to write directly, for the former governor, Gregory (who had presided at the disputation of his friend St. Maximus with Pyrrhus) had revolted and made himself emperor, and had just been defeated; this was a blow to orthodoxy, which it brought into discredit at Constantinople. Victor, elected primate of Carthage after the letters were written, added one of his own.

Paul, the patriarch whom the Emperor Constans had substituted for Pyrrhus, had not been acknowledged by Pope Theodore, who demanded of him that Pyrrhus should first be tried by a council before two representatives of the Holy See. Paul's reply is preserved: the views he exposes are those of the Ecthesis, and he defends them by referring to Honorius and Sergius. Theodore pronounced a sentence of deposition against him, and Paul retaliated by destroying the Latin altar which belonged to the Roman See in the palace of Placidia at Constantinople, in order that the papal envoys might be unable to offer the Holy Sacrifice; he also persecuted them, together with many orthodox laymen and priests, by imprisonment, exile, or stripes. But Paul, in spite of this violence, had no idea of resisting the definitions of Rome. Until now, Honorius had not been disowned there, but defended. It was said that he had not taught one will; but the prohibition in the Ecthesis of two operations was but an enforcement of the course Honorius had approved, and nothing had as yet, it seems, been officially published at Rome on this point. Paul, somewhat naturally, thought it would be sufficient if he dropped the teaching of one will, and prohibited all reference to one will or two wills as well as to one operation or two operations; it could hardly be urged that this was not in accordance with the teaching of Pope Honorius. It would be a measure of peace, and East and West would be again united. Paul therefore persuaded the emperor to withdraw the Ecthesis, and to substitute for that elaborate confession of Faith a mere disciplinary measure forbidding all four expressions under the severest penalties; none of the emperor's orthodox subjects have any longer permission to quarrel over them, but no blame is to attach to any who may have used either alternative in the past. Transgression of this law is to involve deposition for bishops and clerics, excommunication and expulsion for monks, loss of office and dignity for officials, fines for richer laymen, corporal punishment and permanent exile for the poorer. By this cruel law heresy is to be blameless and orthodoxy forbidden. It is known as the Type of Constans. It is not a Monothelite document, for it forbids that heresy just as much as the Catholic Faith. Its date falls between Sept. 648 and Sept. 649. Pope Theodore died 5 May of the latter year, and was succeeded in July by St. Martin I. In October St. Martin held a great council at the Lateran, at which 105 bishops were present. The pope's opening speech gives a history of the heresy, and condemns the Ecthesis, Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and the Type. John IV had spoken of Sergius with respect; and Martin does not mention Honorius, for it was obviously impossible to defend him if the Type was to be condemned as heresy. Stephen of Dora, then on his third visit to Rome, presented a long memorial, full of devotion to the Apostolic See. A deputation followed, of 37 Greek abbots residing in or near Rome, who had apparently fled before the Saracens from their various homes in Jerusalem, Africa, Armenia, Cilicia, etc. They demanded the condemnation of Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Cyrus and the anathematizing of the Type by the Apostolic and head See. The heretical documents read were part of a letter of Theodore of Pharan, the seventh proposition of Cyrus, the letter of Sergius to Cyrus, excerpts from the synods held by Sergius and Pyrrhus (who had now repented of his repentance), and the approval of the Ecthesis by Cyrus. The letter of Sergius to Honorius was not read, nor was anything said about the correspondence of the latter with Sergius. St. Martin summed up; then the letter of Paul to Pope Theodore and the Type were read. The council admitted the good intention of the latter document (so as to spare the emperor while condemning Paul), but declared it heretical for forbidding the teaching of two operations and two wills. Numerous excerpts from the Fathers and from Monophysite writers were read, and twenty canons were agreed to, the eighteenth of which condemns Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, the Ecthesis, and the Type, under anathema. A letter to the emperor was signed by all. An encyclical letter was sent throughout the Church in the name of St. Martin and the council, addressed to all bishops, priests, deacons, abbots, monks, ascetics, and to the entire sacred fulness of the Catholic Church. This was a final and complete condemnation of the Constantinopolitan policy. Rome had spoken ex cathedra.

Stephen of Dora had been before appointed papal vicar in the East, but he had by error been informed only of his duty to depose heretical bishops, and not that he was authorized to substitute orthodox bishops in their place. The pope now gave this commission to John, Bishop of Philadelphia in Palestine, who was ordered to appoint bishops, priests, and deacons in the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem. Martin also sent letters to these patriarchates, and to Peter, who seems to have been governor, asking him to support his vicar; this Peter was a friend and correspondent of St. Maximus. The pope deposed John, Archbishop of Thessalonica, and declared the appointments of Macarius of Antioch and Peter of Alexandria to be null and void. Constans retaliated by having St.

Martin kidnapped at Rome, and taken a prisoner to Constantinople. The saint refused to accept the Ecthesis, and after sufferings, many of which he has himself related in a touching document, he died a martyr in the Crimea in March, 655 (see MARTIN I, POPE). St. Maximus (662), his disciple the monk Anastasius (also 662), and another Anastasius, a papal envoy (666), died of ill-treatment, martyrs to their orthodoxy and devotion to the Apostolic See.

While St. Martin was being insulted and tortured at Constantinople, the patriarch Paul was dying. "Alas, this will increase the severity of my judgment", he exclaimed to the emperor, who paid him a visit; and Constans was induced to spare the pope's life for the moment. At Paul's death Pyrrhus was restored. His successor Peter sent an ambiguous letter to Pope Eugenius, which made no mention of two operations, thus observing the prescription of the Type. The Roman people raised a riot when it was read in Sta. Maria Maggiore, and would not permit the pope to continue his Mass until he promised to reject the letter. Constans sent a letter to the pope by one Gregory, with a gift to St. Peter. It was rumoured at Constantinople that the pope's envoys would accept a declaration of "one and two wills" (two because of the natures, one on account of the union). St. Maximus refused to believe the report. In fact Peter wrote to Pope Vitalian (657–672) professing "one and two wills and operations" and adding mutilated quotations from the Fathers; but the explanation was thought unsatisfactory, presumably because it was only an excuse for upholding the Type. In 663 Constans came to Rome, intending to make it his residence, on account of his unpopularity at Constantinople, for besides putting the pope to death and proscribing the orthodox faith, he had murdered his brother Theodosius. The pope received him with all due honour, and Constans, who had refused to confirm the elections of Martin and Eugenius, ordered the name of Vitalian to be inscribed on the diptychs of Constantinople. No mention seems to have been made of the Type. But Constans did not find Rome agreeable. After spoiling the churches, he retired to Sicily, where he oppressed the people. He was murdered in his bath in 668. Vitalian vigorously opposed rebellion in Sicily, and Constantine Pogonatus, the new emperor, found the island at peace on his arrival. It does not seem that he took any interest in the Type, which was doubtless not enforced, though not abolished, for he was fully occupied with his wars against the Saracens until 678, when he determined to summon a general council to end what he regarded as a quarrel between the Sees of Rome and Constantinople. He wrote in this sense to Pope Donus (676–78), who was already dead. His successor St. Agatho thereupon assembled a synod at Rome and ordered others to be held in the West. A delay of two years was thus caused, and the heretical patriarchs Theodore of Constantinople and Macarius of Antioch assured the emperor that the pope despised the Easterns and their monarch, and they tried, but unsuccessfully, to get the name of Vitalian removed from the diptychs. The emperor asked for three representatives at least to be sent from Rome, with twelve archbishops or bishops from the West and four monks from each of the Greek monasteries in the West, perhaps as interpreters. He also sent Theodore into exile, probably because he was an obstacle to reunion.

The first session of the Sixth Œcumenical Council took place at Constantinople (7 Nov., 680), Constantine Pogonatus presiding and having on his left, in the place of honour, the papal legates. Macarius of Antioch was the only prelate who stood up for Monothelitism, and he was in due course condemned as a heretic (see MACARIUS OF ANTIOCH). The letters of St. Agatho and of the Roman Council insisted on the decisions of the Lateran Council, and repeatedly affirmed the inerrancy of the Apostolic See. These documents were acclaimed by the council, and accepted by George, the new Patriarch of Constantinople and his suffragans. Macarius had appealed to Honorius; and after his condemnation a packet which he had delivered to the emperor was opened, and in it were found the letters of Sergius to Honorius and of Honorius to Sergius. As these were at best similar to the Type, already declared heretical, it was unavoidable that they should be condemned. The fifth council had set the example of condemning dead writers, who had died in Catholic communion, but George suggested that his dead predecessors might be spared, and only their teaching anathematized. The legates might have saved the name of Honorius also had they agreed to this, but they evidently had directions from Rome to make no objection to his condemnation if it seemed necessary. The final dogmatic decree contains the decisions of the five preceding general councils, condemns the Ecthesis and the Type, and heretics by name, including Honorius, and "greets with uplifted hands" the letters of Pope Agatho and his council (see HONORIUS I, Pope). The address to the emperor, signed by all the bishops, declares that they have followed Agatho, and he the Apostolic teaching. "With us fought the prince of the Apostles, for to assist us we had his imitator and the successor to his chair. The ancient city of Rome proffered you a divinely written confession and caused the daylight of dogmas to rise by the Western parchment. And the ink shone, and by Agatho, Peter spoke; and you, the autocrat king, voted with the Almighty who reigns with you." A letter to the pope was also signed by all the Fathers. The emperor gave effect to the decree in a lengthy edict, in which he echoes the decisions of the council, adding: "These are the teachings of the voices of the Gospels and the Apostles, these are the doctrines of the holy synods and of the elect and patristic tongues; these have been preserved untainted by Peter, the rock of the faith, the head of the Apostles; in this faith we live and reign." The emperor's letter to the pope is full of such expressions; as for example: "Glory be to God, Who does wondrous things, Who has kept safe the Faith among you unharmed. For how should He not do so in that rock on which He founded His Church, and prophesied that the gates of hell, all the ambushes of heretics, should not prevail against it? From it, as from the vault of heaven, the word of the true confession flashed forth," etc. But St. Agatho, a worker of many miracles, was dead, and did not receive the letter, so that it fell to St. Leo II to confirm the council. Thus was the East united again to the West after an incomplete but deplorable schism.

It would seem that in 687 Justinian II believed that the sixth council was not fully enforced, for he wrote to Pope Conon that he had assembled the papal envoys, the patriarchs, metropolitans, bishops, the senate and civil officials and representatives of his various armies, and made them sign the original acts which had recently been discovered. In 711 the throne was seized by Philippicus Bardanes, who had been the pupil of Abbot Stephen, the disciple "or rather leader" of Macarius of Antioch. He restored to the diptychs Sergius, Honorius, and the other heretics condemned by the council; he burned the acts (but privately, in the palace), he deposed the Patriarch Cyrus, and exiled some persons who refused to subscribe a rejection of the council. He fell, 4 June, 713, and orthodoxy was restored by Anastasius II (713–15). Pope Constantine had refused to recognize Bardanes. The intruded patriarch, John VI, wrote him a long letter of apology, explaining that he had submitted to Bardanes to prevent worse evils, and asserting in many words the headship of Rome over the universal Church. This was the last of Monothelitism.

The chief ancient authorities for our knowledge of the Mono-

thelites are the acts of the Lateran synod and of the sixth council, the works of St. Maximus Confessor and Anastasius Sinaita, and the *Collectanea* of Anastasius Bibliothecarius. Of modern works only a few need be specially mentioned: Combéfis, *Auctarium novum*, II (*Historia Monothelitarum et Dissertatio apol. pro actis VI synodi* (Paris, 1648); Petavius, *De Incarnatione*, VIII, IX; Hefele, *Hist. of Councils*, V (Eng. tr.); Bardenhewer, *Ungedruckte Excerpte aus einer Schrift des Patriarchen Eulogius von Alexandria* (in *Theolog. Quartalschrift*, 1896, no. 78); Owsepian, *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des Monotheletismus nach ihren Quellen geprüft* (Leipzig, 1897). See also Honorius I, Pope, and Maximus of Constantinople.

John Chapman.

Monreale, Archdiocese of, in the province of Palermo, Sicily, on the skirts of Mount Caputo. The city is built in a commanding situation over the port of Palermo. It was a pleasure resort of the Norman kings, to whom it owes its foundation. In 1167 William II built there the church of Santa Maria Nuova, with its adjoining monastery for the Benedictines of Cava dei Tirreni—the most superb monastic building of the Benedictine Order in Europe, famous for its cloister and its graceful Moresque colonnade. At the present time only the lower portion of the convent is in the possession of the monks. The church (now the cathedral) is the noblest in Sicily, though the portico of its façade has been restored in a style not in harmony with the remainder of the building. Its bronze doors, the work of Bonanno of Pisa (1186), are notable, as are also the arabesques of the portals.

Cathedral, Monreale
Church, XII Century—Portico, XVI Century

The interior has three naves, and the columns of Egyptian marble have foiled and figured capitals, each different from the others. The apse and the lateral walls are covered with beautiful mosaics, representing scenes from the Old and New Testaments. The high altar is covered with worked sheets of silver (seventeenth century), and, in a chapel to its right, are the tombs of William I the Wicked and of William II. The chapel of Saint Benedict contains sculptures by Marabitti (eighteenth century). In 1811 a fire destroyed the roof, which was restored in a way to leave the rafters exposed to view. On the mountain beyond the city is the monastery of San Martino of the Cassinese Benedictines, whose church is rich in works of art; farther on is the castle of San Benedetto, built by the Saracens. In 1174 the abbey of Monreale was declared a "prælatura nullius"; two years later its abbot was vested with the title and jurisdiction of a bishop, and in 1182 he became the metropolitan of Catania and of Syracuse. At first the archbishops were elected by the monks, but were not always Benedictines; since 1275, however, the election has been reserved to itself by the Holy See. In time Girgenti and Caltagirone also became suffragan to Monreale; but Syracuse, in 1844, and Catania, in 1860, became archiepiscopal sees. The former having become the Metropolitan of Caltagirone, Monreale received the new Diocese of Caltanisetta (1860), which see and Girgenti are now its only suffragans. Among the archbishops of this see have been Cardinal Giovanni Proccamazza (1278); Cardinal Aussio Despuig de Podio (1458); Cardinal Pompeo Colonna (1531); Cardinal Ippolito de' Medici (1532); Alessandro Farnese (1536); Ludovico de Torres (1584), founder of the seminary; Cardinal Vitaliano Visconti (1670); Cardinal Traian d'Acquaviva d'Aragona (1739). From 1775 to 1802 Monreale and Palermo were united. The archdiocese has 30 parishes with 228,600 inhabitants; 352 secular and 66 regular priests; 26 convents of men and one of women; three educational institutes for male students and three for girls.

Cappelletti, *Chiese d'Italia*, XXI (Venice, 1857); Lello, *Historia della chiesa di Monreale* (Rome, 1596).

U. Benigni.

Monroe, James, soldier, convert, b. in Albemarle county, Virginia, U. S. A., 10 Sept., 1799; d. at Orange, New Jersey, 7 Sept., 1870. He was the son of Andrew a brother of President James Monroe, and greatly resembled his illustrious uncle. After the usual course at the U. S. Military Academy at West Point, he graduated in 1815, and was commissioned a lieutenant of artillery. In the war with the Algerian pirates he was wounded, 17 June, 1815, while directing the guns of the frigate La Guerrière in a battle off Cape de Gata, Spain. As an aide to General Scott he served during 1817–22, and did garrison duty as a first lieutenant of the 4th Artillery to 30 Sept., 1832, when he resigned from the army. Settling in New York he entered public life, being elected to the Board of Aldermen, 1833–35, and to Congress, 1839–41. He was nominated to Congress also in 1846, but the election being contested and a new election ordered he declined to run again. In 1850–52 he was a member of the New York legislature, and then retired from public life on the death of his wife. Previous to the outbreak of the Civil War he visited Richmond and sought by speeches and personal influence to prevent the secession of his native State, Virginia. All through the war he was a staunch upholder of the Union. His brother Andrew F. Monroe, b. at Charlottesville, Va., 5 March, 1824, after graduating at the U. S. Naval Academy served during the Mexican War, and while on a naval expedition to China, in 1853, also became a convert. He joined the Society of Jesus in 1854 and was ordained priest in 1860. He was for a number of years one of the faculty of St. Francis Xavier's College, New York, where he died 2 Aug., 1872.

Cullum, *Biog. Register of the Officers and Graduates of the U. S. Military Academy*, I (New York, 1891); Heitman, *Hist. Register and Dictionary of the U. S. Army* (Washington, 1903), s. v.; *National Encycl. of Am. Biog.*, s. v.; *The College of St. Francis Xavier* (New York, 1897).

Thomas F. Meehan.

Monsabré, Jacques-Marie-Louis, celebrated pulpit orator, b. at Blois, France, 10 Dec., 1827; d. at Havre, 21 Feb., 1907. He was ordained as a secular priest 15 June, 1851, but soon felt he had a religious vocation. On the thirty-first of July, 1851, the feast of St. Ignatius, he celebrated his first Mass and thought seriously of entering the Society of Jesus. Four days later, however, the feast of St. Dominic, he decided to become a Dominican and immediately

wrote a letter of application to Père Lacordaire. He had to wait four years for release from the diocese, as the bishop had received authorization from the Holy See to withhold that long his permission for newly ordained priests to enter a religious order. In May, 1855, he received his dimissorials, entered the novitiate at Flavigny, received the habit on the thirty-first of the same month and one year later made his simple profession. A few days later he was sent to the house of studies at Chalais, where he spent a year in solitude and prayer. In the winter he was appointed to preach the Lenten sermons in the church of St. Nizier, at Lyons, where he gave the first indication of that eloquence which was later to illuminate all France. After preaching the Lenten sermons in Lyons, Monsabré was assigned to the convent of St. Thomas, in Paris, where he began to give conferences. After interrupting this ministry for several years he took it up again. In the Advent of 1867 he gave conferences in the convent church. He preached then for a number of years in the principal cities of France, Belgium, and even in London, conducting retreats, novenas, and triduums. His reputation, however, was really first made by the course of Advent sermons which he preached in the Cathedral of Notre Dame, Paris, in 1869, as successor of the unfortunate Carmelite, Père Hyacinthe Loyson. The success of these conferences brought the invitation to preach the Lenten sermons in Notre Dame in 1870, succeeding Père Félix of the Society of Jesus. During the siege of Paris by the Prussian troops, the conferences at Notre Dame were interrupted. On the capitulation of Metz, Monsabré preached from one of its pulpits. Meanwhile the Archbishop of Paris, Monsignor Darboy, had fallen a victim to the Commune and was succeeded by Monsignor Guibert, who lost no time in inviting Monsabré to occupy the pulpit of his cathedral. From this time on, Père Monsabré preached in the Cathedral of Notre Dame for twenty years and proved himself a worthy successor of Bossuet, Lacordaire and all the other great preachers whom the French Church has produced. He conceived and executed the gigantic plan of expounding the whole system of Catholic dogmatic theology. Not often, perhaps never before, did a preacher succeed in holding so large an audience completely under the sway of his eloquence for so long a time.

JACQUES-MARIE-LOUIS MONSABRÉ

The classic and elegant form of Monsabré's discourses attracted the educated class of France. "His intense love of souls and apostolic zeal made his discourses throb with life, and his clear and profoundly theological mind enabled him to shed light even upon the most abstruse tenets of the faith, while his earnest and impassioned appeals to all the noblest impulses of man always met with an enthusiastic response." Monsabré's published works consist of forty-eight volumes, the "L'exposition du Dogme Catholique" being famous for its eloquence and popular exposition of Catholic dogma. In 1890 he preached the Advent sermons in Rome. In 1891 he gave the same course in Toulouse. On the death of Monsignor Freppel, Bishop of Angers, he was invited to fill the vacancy in the Chamber of Deputies, but declined. In 1871 he was sent to the General Chapter of Ghent to represent his province and in 1898 to that of Avila as Definitor. His apostolic labours closed with the magnificent oration delivered at Reims on the occasion of the fourteenth centenary of the baptism of Clovis, King of the Franks. Since 1903 he lived in retirement. In that year the Dominican convent in which he lived was confiscated by the government, and he was obliged to take refuge in a modest little home in which he died.

L'Année Dominicaine, April, 1907, 146; July, 1907, 289; *The Rosary Magazine*, XXX, 459.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

Monseigneur (from *mon*, "my" and *seigneur*, "elder" or "lord", like Lat. *senior*), a French honorific appellation, etymologically corresponding to the English "my lord", and the Italian *monsignore*. It is, after all, nothing but the French *monsieur;* but, while the latter has become current as applied to every man who is in good society, *Monseigneur* has retained its honorific force. In ecclesiastical usage it is reserved for bishops and archbishops, and is chiefly employed when speaking or writing to them. It is used before the name (thus abridged: Mgr Dupanloup). Formerly it was not prefixed to the title of dignity, but it is now, as "Mgr l'évêque de N . . ." The term *Monseigneur* is also used as the equivalent of the Italian *Monsignore*, and as the latter title is given to Roman prelates, some confusion results; in Italy, however, no inconvenience arises from this usage as in that country bishops have the title of *Eccellenza*, i. e., Excellency. In France, only the Archbishop of Reims, as *legatus natus*, has the title of Excellency (see MONSIGNOR).

HÉRICOURT, *Les lois ecclésiastiques de France*, E. V, 22.

A. BOUDINHON.

Monsell, WILLIAM, BARON EMLY, b. 21 Sept., 1812; d. at Tervoe, Co. Limerick, Ireland, 20 April, 1894. His father was William Monsell of Tervoe; his mother, Olivia, daughter of Sir John Walsh of Ballykilcavan. He was educated at Winchester (1826–1830) and Oriel College, Oxford, but he left the university without proceeding to a degree. As his father had died in 1822 he succeeded to the family estates on coming of age and was a popular landlord, the more so as he was resident. In 1836 he married Anna Maria Quin, daughter of the second Earl of Dunraven, but there was no issue of the marriage. After her death in 1855 he married Bertha, youngest daughter of the Comte de Martigny (1857), by whom he had one son and one daughter. In 1847 he was returned to Parliament as member for the County of Limerick in the Liberal interest and represented the constituency till 1874. In 1850 he became a Catholic and thereafter took a prominent part in Catholic affairs, especially in Parliament. As a friend of Wiseman, Newman, Montalambert, W. G. Ward, and other eminent Catholics, he was intimately acquainted with the various interests of the Church, and his parliamentary advocacy was often of great advantage to the hierarchy. In the House itself he was successful and filled many offices. He was clerk of the ordnance from 1852 to 1857; was appointed privy councillor in 1855; was vice-president of the board of trade in 1866; under-secretary for the colonies, 1868–1870; postmaster-general, Jan., 1871, to Nov., 1873. Finally he was raised to the peerage as Baron Emly on 12 Jan., 1874. He lost much of his popularity in Ireland during his later years, owing to his opposition to the land league and to the Home Rule movement. His work being chiefly parliamentary, he wrote little, but published some articles in the "Home and Foreign Review" and a "Lecture on the Roman Question" (1860).

WARD, *W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement* (London, 1890); IDEM, *W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival* (London, 1893); IDEM,

Life of Cardinal Wiseman (London, 1898); PURCELL, *Life of Cardinal Manning* (London, 1895); IDEM, *Life of Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle* (London, 1900); COURTNEY in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, Supp. Vol. III (London, 1901).

EDWIN BURTON.

Monsignor (*dominus meus; monseigneur*, My Lord). —As early as the fourteenth century it was the custom to address persons high in rank or power with the title Monseigneur or Monsignore. In the intercourse of seculars, either of equals or of superiors with inferiors, there was no fixed rule. Until the seventeenth century French nobles demanded from their subjects and dependents the title of Monseigneur. In international intercourse two titles gradually won general recognition, "Monsieur" as the title of the eldest brother of the King of France (if not heir presumptive) and "Monseigneur" for the Dauphin, or eldest son of the French king, who was also crown prince, or for whatever male member of the family was recognized as heir presumptive to the throne. Actually all Bourbon pretenders assume this title as a matter of course, e. g. the late Don Carlos Duke of Madrid, his son Don Jaime, the Count of Caserta, the Duke of Orléans, etc. Moreover, the custom often obtains, especially in Spain, France, and Italy, of extending by courtesy the title Monseigneur to the adult members of the Bourbons and closely allied families usually addressed as "Your Royal Highness". In official usage, however, this would scarcely be permissible. At present the title is no longer borne by other persons of civil rank, and, so far as the author of this article is aware, no one else lays claim to it. Among ecclesiastics the title Monsignore implies simply a distinction bestowed by the highest ecclesiastical authority, either in conjunction with an office or merely titular. In any case it bears with it a certain prescribed dress. To counteract a widely spread misconception we may state here that the pope does not bestow the title Monsignore, but a distinction of some sort to which this title is attached. Accordingly it is quite incorrect to say that any one has been appointed a Monsignor by the pope. If we may be permitted to use a comparison, Monsignor in the spiritual order corresponds to the word officer in the military. The highest general and the youngest lieutenant are equally officers, and the most venerable patriarch bears the title Monsignor as well as the simplest honorary chaplain. Thus among prelates, both higher and lower, it is no badge of distinction except as it denotes in a very general way an elevation above the ranks of the clergy. Those only bear the title of Monsignor, who are *familiares summi pontificis*, those who, by virtue of some distinction bestowed upon them, belong as it were to the family and the retinue of the Holy Father. These *familiares* are entitled to be present in the *cappella pontificia* (when the pope celebrates solemn Mass), and to participate in all public celebrations purely religious or ecclesiastical in character, at which the pope, the cardinals, and the papal retinue assist. It is assumed that they will appear in the robes corresponding to their respective offices.

Up to 1630, when Urban VIII reserved the title Eminence (*Eminentissimus*) for the exclusive use of cardinals, the latter bore the title Monsignor in common with the other prelates of high rank, and in France it is still customary to address a cardinal as Monseigneur. In all other languages this usage has completely disappeared, so that, practically speaking, cardinals are no longer to be counted among the Monsignori. All other prelates, from patriarchs down, who have received a papal distinction or are archbishops, bishops, or mitred abbots (among the secular clergy only), have a right to this title. The fact that it has lapsed in usage in many countries, so far as these are concerned, does not affect the question. Instead of addressing patriarchs as "Vostra Beatitudine", archbishops as "Your Grace", bishops as "My Lord", abbots as "Gracious Lord", one may without any breach of etiquette salute all equally as Monsignor. Following is a list of official and honorary prelates exclusive of those already mentioned: (1) the college of the seven official prothonotaries Apostolic *de numero participantium* (of the number of participants); (2) the supernumerary prothonotaries (*supra numerum*), including, (a) the prelate canons of the three patriarchal basilicas of Rome, (b) the prelate canons of certain cathedral churches, while in office; (3) prothonotaries Apostolic *ad instar participantium* (after the manner of participants), including, (a) prelate canons of certain cathedral churches, as above, (b) prothonotaries appointed *ad personam* (individually); (4) the College of the Auditors of the Sacra Rota Romana, these are official or delegated prelates; (5) the college of official clerics of the Apostolic Camera; (6) all other prelates not members of any of the above named colleges, the numerous domestic prelates scattered throughout the world. All the above-mentioned prelates are entitled to wear the mantelletta and rochet; (7) the private chamberlains constituting the official college of pontifical masters of ceremonies; (8) the official private chamberlains known as *participantes;* (9) the supernumerary private chamberlains (*camerieri segreti soprannumerari*), of whom there are several hundred in various parts of the Catholic world; (10) the honorary chamberlains in violet; (11) the honorary chamberlains *extra urbem* (outside the city), who are not received in their official capacity in the papal court when held at Rome; (12) the official college of private chaplains; (13) the honorary private chaplains; (14) the honorary chaplains *extra urbem* (see 11); (15) the private clerics; and (16) the official college of papal chaplains.

In the case of certain of the above-mentioned classes the honorary office (together with the corresponding title and distinctive dress) lapses at the death of the pope. This is particularly true with regard to the supernumerary private and honorary Chamberlains. The reason for this is self-evident. It is possible to be prothonotary of the Holy Roman Church or cleric of the Apostolic Camera, etc.; but one cannot be chamberlain to the Holy Roman Church, but simply chamberlain to a particular pontiff, whose death dissolves the relation between the two. Unless the newly elected pontiff renews the appointment the former chamberlain returns permanently to the general ranks of the clergy. Nor is there inconsistency in the fact that certain lay chamberlains continue in the papal service immediately after a papal election. Their services are necessary to the new pontiff and he naturally recognizes such persons, which amounts practically to a tacit appointment. It is regrettable that occasionally persons thus distinguished by the pope either assume a dress arranged according to their own notions or, being dissatisfied with the dress conceded, appropriate that of a higher office. The farther a country is from Rome, the more apt are such unfortunate things to occur. It should be noted that members of religious orders may use the title "Monsignor" only if they are bishops or archbishops. All other ranks of the prelacy are of course closed to them, if we except the Master of the Sacred Palace, who being always a Dominican, is one of the prelates, but may not be addressed as Monsignor. The custom introduced in the sixteenth century of giving the generals of religious orders the title "Monsignor" was of short duration.

BOUIX, *De Curia Romana* (Paris, 1880); BANGEN, *Die römische Curie* (Münster, 1854); HUMPHREY, *Urbs et Orbis* (London 1899), 359–60; SICKEL, *Ein Ruolo di Famiglia des Papstes Pius IV* in *Mitteillungen des Instituts für œsterreichische Geschichtsforschung*, suppl. vol. IV (Innsbruck, 1893). See also London *Tablet*, March 12, 26, April 9, 16, May 14, 21, 1910.

PAUL MARIA BAUMGARTEN.



PIETÀ

BARTOLOMMEO MONTAGNA, VATICAN GALLERY, ROME

Monstrance. See OSTENSORIUM.

Monstrelet, ENGUERRAND DE, a French chronicler, b. about 1390 or 1395; d. in July, 1453. He was most probably a native of Monstrelet, a village situated in the present department of the Somme. His life was spent at Cambrai in the service of Philip, Duke of Burgundy, who was also Count of Flanders. The cartulary of the church of Cambrai proves that in 1436 Monstrelet was lieutenant of the *gavenier;* as such it was his duty to collect in the Cambrésis the tax called "gavenne", which was paid to Philip by the tenants of the churches there in return for the protection which he gave them. From 20 June, 1436, to January, 1440, he was bailiff (*bailli*) of the chapter of Cambrai and he was provost (*prévôt*) of Cambrai from 1444 to 1446 (not until his death, as Dacier says); he became bailiff of Walincourt on 12 March, 1445, an office which he held till his death. Monstrelet, who lived during an agitated period, did not take personal part in the conflicts of the day. To him, perhaps, applies a letter of pardon granted in 1424 to a certain Enguerrand de Monstrelet by Henry IV of England, who then ruled a part of France: Enguerrand, according to this letter, had committed certain highway robberies, believing that he had a sufficient excuse because he robbed the Armagnacs, enemies of the Duke of Burgundy. However this may be, his attitude in his "Chronicle" is that of an impartial narrator. He speaks of himself but once, when he relates in the eighty-sixth chapter of the second book that he was present at the interview which Joan of Arc, taken prisoner before Compiègne, had with Philip of Burgundy; and with his usual sincerity and modesty he declares that he does not remember well the words of the duke.

The "Chronicle" of Monstrelet opens with a mention of the coronation of Charles VI, which took place in 1380; but its true starting-point is Easter-day, 1400, when the history of Froissart finishes, and it extends down to 1444. While Froissart confined himself almost entirely to events which took place in France, Monstrelet deals also with other countries, giving many documents. He treats not only of military history, but also gives interesting details of great religious events such as the Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle. We feel, moreover, that the ravages of war and the sufferings of the people therefrom cause him real pain, and he is not over-enthusiastic about great feats of arms. He is occasionally guilty of chronological errors and confusing proper names. Finally, the literary merit of the book is mediocre; the narrative is often heavy, monotonous, diffuse, and lacks the charm of Froissart. In the early editions of Monstrelet—of which the first, published at Paris towards 1470 in three folio volumes, goes back almost to the invention of printing—the chronicles contain a third book, relating the events which took place between April, 1444, and the death of the Duke of Burgundy in 1467. But the "Nécrologe des Cordeliers de Cambrai" and the "Memoriaux" of Jean le Robert prove that Monstrelet died in July, 1453, so that all this book could not possibly have been written by him. Furthermore, the history of years 1444–53, given in this third book, is so bald that it contrasts singularly with the prolixity of the first two books. It is, besides, much more partial to the House of Burgundy than the first two, and, in contrast to these, scarcely contains a single document. Whereas the first two books are preceded by a preface, the third has none; finally, the historian, Matthieu d'Escouchy, in the prologue to his own chronicle, states that Monstrelet's "Chronicle" ends at 20 May, 1444. Modern scholars unanimously accept the statement of Matthieu d'Escouchy and hold that this so-called third book was not written by Monstrelet.

Chronique d'Enguerrand de Monstrelet, ed. D'ARCQ (6 vols., Paris, 1857–62); *Chronique de Matthieu d'Escouchy,* ed. DUFRESNE DE BEAUCOURT, I (Paris, 1863), 2–3; DACIER, *Mémoires de littérature tirés des registres de l'Académie royale des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres,* XLIII (Paris, 1786), 535–62. There is an English translation of Monstrelet by JOHNES (Hafod, 1810).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Montagna, BARTOLOMEO, Italian painter, chief representative of the Vicenza School, b. at Orzinuovi about 1450; d. at Vicenza, 11 October, 1523. Very little is known concerning his life. His work presents not a very original, but happy combination of the dual influence of Padua and Venice. The forms, draperies, grandeur, and often the energy of expression betray the action of Montagna, but the order of his altar-pieces, their harmonious symmetry, and the beauty of their colouring recall Giovanni Bellini or Carpaccio. Perhaps, he even surpassed these two masters as regards power of tone, and resembles Crivelli more closely. Two Madonnas in the gallery of Vicenza and a smaller one in the Lochis Gallery at Bergamo (1487) are characteristic of his early manner, which is not free from stiffness and a certain dryness. Here the artist still retains the old process of distemper. His best period was from 1490 to 1505, his years of work and travel, during which he was busily occupied throughout all the district. At Verona he painted house façades in fresco, and executed the graceful paintings, unhappily much damaged, of the Chapel of St. Blaise in the Church of Sts. Nazzaro and Celso (1493), of which Salconetto was the architect. There is little logic in the construction, but the details, despite the dilapidation of the whole, still present a charming effect. In the cupola there are two circles of panels with figures of angels under figures of saints between pilasters, and a frieze with a procession of Nereids. The whole, supported by the Evangelists painted on pendentives, is a brilliant example of the delightful inconsistency of the Renaissance. There are frescoes by Montagna in the Scuola del Santo at Padua. His best-known works are his altar-pieces, painted in oil in the manner of Bellini.

The large retable of the Brera (1499), the Madonna enthroned in a magnificent chapel with two saints on each side and three angels playing on the steps of the throne, is perhaps his masterpiece. Whether for its architecture, its dignity, the sweetness of its figures, or for the depth and power of its colouring, it is in all respects one of the most beautiful canvases produced at that period in Upper Italy. The "Pietà" of Monte Berico (1500) is of a quite different character: it is a startling picture of grief, the figures being of a violent, almost brutal naturalness. The Academy of Venice possesses some works in his later manner; the tone grows subdued, becoming brown and slightly hard and dull. Such is the "Madonna enthroned between St. Roch and St. Jerome". But there is still a deep sentiment of mystical adoration in the "Christ between St. Roch and St. Sebastian". Vicenza is especially rich in Montagna's works, no less than ten being found at the Academy, not to mention the frescoes of the Duomo of S. Lorenzo and some altar-pieces, such as that of Santa Corona. Nearly all are late works. Outside of Italy may be mentioned the "Ecce Homo" of the Louvre and especially the charming piece, as tender and delicate as a Carpaccio, the "Three Angelic Musicians"; a large and magnificent retable of 1500 at the Museum of Berlin; a beautiful bust of the Madonna at Bremen; a "Holy Family" at Strasburg and some other less important works in England (Butler, Farrer, and Samuelson collections, and at the home of Lord Cowper at Panshanger).

Bartolomeo had a son, Benedetto, who was chiefly notable as an engraver. As a painter he is little more than a feeble imitator of his father, as is proved by a Madonna at Milan and a "Trinity" in the Cathedral of Vicenza. He flourished from 1490 to 1541.

RIDOLFI, *Meraviglie dell' Arte* (Venice, 1648); CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE, *Hist. of Painting in N. Italy* (London, 1891);

BURCKHARDT, *Cicerone*, Fr. ed. (Paris, 1892); MORELLI, *Italian Painters*, tr. (2nd ed., London, 1900); BERENSON, *Venetian Painters of the Renaissance* (3rd ed., London and New York, 1906).

LOUIS GILLET.

Montagnais Indians, Quebec, French for "Mountaineers", the collective designation of a number of bands speaking dialects of a common language of Algonquian stock, and ranging along the shores of the St. Lawrence River and Gulf, from about the St. Maurice River to below Cape Whittle, and inland to about the main divide at the heads of the rivers. They are closely allied and considerably intermixed with the cognate Nascapee (q. v.), who wander generally farther inland in the interior of the Labrador Peninsula, but frequent the same trading and mission stations along the St. Lawrence. Among the Montagnais bands or tribes, when Champlain first met them at the mouth of the Saguenay, in 1603, were the Attikamegue, or "Whitefish", about the head of the St. Maurice; the Kakouchac, or "Porcupine", on Lake St. John; the Tadousac about the mouth of the Saguenay; the Bersamite, farther east; the Papinachois, north of the last-named; the Oumamiwek, farther east, along the St. Lawrence; the Chisedec, about the Bay of Seven Islands. They were without agriculture or pottery, subsisting entirely by hunting and fishing. Polygamy was common, with divorce at will, descent being held in the female line. Their dwellings, as well as their canoes, were of birch bark or brushwood. They were good tempered, patient, peaceable, honest, and musical under instruction.

The Montagnais obtained their first knowledge of Christianity at Tadousac, a French trading post. Regular missionary work was begun among them by the Recollet, Fr. Jean d'Albeau, in 1615. Ten years later the Jesuits were invited to help. Fr. Jean du Quen, S.J., established the mission at Tadousac in 1640; later, stations were erected by the Jesuits at Gaspé and Trois-Rivières. The Iroquois raids drove them from the St. Lawrence, and a smallpox epidemic, in 1670, greatly reduced them, practically destroying the Attikamegue. In consequence, the Montagnais began to resort to the mission at Sillery, near Quebec. The whole tribe is now civilized and Catholic, with the exception of forty-eight officially reported (1909) as Anglican. They still depend mainly on the fur trade for subsistence, but also work at lumbering and the making of canoes, snow-shoes, and moccasins. A few of them are successful farmers. Apart from drunkenness, they are moral, devout, industrious, and said to be "improving every year". Their largest settlements are at Pointe Bleue, on the west shore of Lake St. John, Bersimis, Seven Islands, Romaine, and Mingan. Their total number is probably at least 2500. Father Pierre Laure, S.J. (d. 1738), compiled a grammar, dictionary, and other works in the Montagnais language, most of which are still in manuscript.

Dept. Ind. Affairs, Canada, annual repts. (Ottawa); HIND, *Labrador Peninsula*, II (London, 1863); PILLING, *Bibliog. of the Algonquian Languages* (Washington, 1891); SPECK, *The Montagnais Indians* in *Southern Workman*, XXXVIII (Hampton, Va., March, 1909); *Jes. Relations:* THWAITES ed. (Cleveland, 1896–1901).

JAMES MOONEY.

Montagnais Indians, a name given in error to the CHIPPEWAYANS, owing to a fancied resemblance to the above. The Chippewayans are really a Déné tribe, and derive their name from the Cree words *chipwaw* (pointed) and *iveyan* (skin or blanket), alluding to the original form of the main article of their dress. Their habitat is Lakes Cold, Ile-à-la-Crosse, Heart, and Caribou, and the elevated land in the vicinity of Methy Portage and the English River. To the natives frequenting these localities may be added the Athabascans, who have for habitat Lake Athabasca, the basin of Slave River, and the outlying lands to the east of Great Slave Lake. The total population of the two divisions is about 4000, the majority of whom are nomadic hunters, though not a few have of late taken to a more settled life, and cultivate potatoes. The tribe eagerly welcomed the first Catholic missionaries in 1845, and ever since they have been noted for their attachment to the Faith. They are practically all Catholics.

The Chippewayans, or Montagnais, are in reality the prototype of the entire Déné family, in that sense that they have given it their own name (*déné,* "men"). They were the first of the northern Dénés to come under the notice of the whites, through the travels and journal of Samuel Hearne. At the present day, the flourishing mission of Ile à La Crosse, where about one thousand Montagnais live happy and contented under the ægis of religion, is one of the best evidences of the civilizing power of the Catholic Church.

HEARNE, *A Journey from Prince of Wales Fort to the Northern Ocean* (Dublin, 1796); RICHARDSON, *Arctic Searching Expedition* (London, 1851). See also Father Petitot's works enumerated after the article on the DÉNÉS.

A. G. MORICE.

Montaigne, MICHEL-EYQUEN DE, writer, b. at the château of Montaigne, in Périgord, France, on 28 Feb., 1533; d. there, 13 Sept., 1592. His great-grandfather had been a Bordeaux merchant of wines, salt fish, etc., and it was he who purchased the estate of Montaigne. His father entered the army and married Antoinette de Louppes or Lopes, of Jewish origin, and for two years was mayor of Bordeaux. At an early age Michel had a German tutor, who was obliged to speak to him in Latin only. At the age of six and a half he was sent to the College of Guyenne at Bordeaux, where he remained seven years. Little is known of the ensuing years. It is believed that he studied logic and dialectics for two years at the Bordeaux Faculty of Arts, with Marc-Antoine de Muret as tutor. He afterwards studied law, possibly at Bordeaux, more probably at Toulouse. Having become counsellor at the Cour des Aides of Périgord, he was soon incorporated like his colleagues in the Parlement of Bordeaux. But the new counsellor had no liking for his profession, and he was often absent from the Parlement. From 1561 to 1563 he attended the court. From 1559 he knew La Boétie, his chosen friend, and like himself a counsellor in the Parlement of Périgord and his elder by six years; but death soon separated them (1563).

Two years later Montaigne married Françoise de la Chassaigne, the daughter of a parliamentary advocate. They had five daughters, only one of whom survived him. In 1570 at the age of thirty-seven he sold his post of counsellor, and in the following year retired to the château de Montaigne. There, from 1571 to 1580, he wrote his "Essays". The first edition of this work contained only two books. He then set out on a journey which lasted a year and a half, of which he has written in his "Journal". He went to Lorraine and Alsace, started for Switzerland, crossed Bavaria and came down to the Tyrol, saw Venice and reached Rome, the end of his journey, where he received letters of citizenship. During his absence he had been made mayor of Bordeaux, which office he held for four years (1581–85), his duties coming to an end when the pest broke out. Montaigne being absent from the town did not feel obliged to return to it. In 1588 he published a new edition of his "Essays", corrected and augmented by a third book. He continued to revise his work until his death. In 1595 Mlle de Gournay, the young woman who at the age of twenty-two became his enthusiastic admirer, and whom he called his daughter, issued a new edition, in which she inserted the revisions and additions which he had indicated in a copy in 1588.

It is impossible to analyse the "Essays". They are a long conversation in which the author sets forth in haphazard fashion his memories and his reflections.

His memories are the result of his personal experience and especially of his very extensive reading. According to his own expression he himself is "the subject of his book". But what excuses him is doubtless the fact that in depicting himself he often depicts human nature in general. He is a charming conversationalist, a writer full of pith and colour, artlessness, grace, and life. His literary merits add to the dangers of his book, which is deliberately lascivious and as a whole openly favourable to the Pyrrhonians. He has even written that it is "a slack ear for a shapely head". However, on the other hand, he thanked "our sovereign Creator for having stayed our trust on the everlasting foundation of His holy word". He also said that outside of the path pointed out by the Church reason "is lost, embarrassed, shackled". In a letter he relates in a Christian manner the Christian death of his friend La Boétie. He himself, as soon as he became ill, would not send for a priest, and in his last illness did not depart from this custom. Pasquier relates that he "caused Mass to be said in his chamber and when the priest came to the elevation the poor gentleman raised himself as well as he could in bed with hands joined and thus yielded his soul to God". He died therefore in a supreme act of faith.

Bonnefon, *Montaigne et ses essais* (1892); Guizot, *Montaigne* (1899); Champion, *Introduction aux Essais de Montaigne* (1900).

Georges Bertrin.

Michel-Eyquem de Montaigne

Montalcino, Diocese of (Ilcinensis).—Montalcino is a small town about twenty miles from Siena, some 1900 feet above sea-level and overlooking the valley of the Ombrone. In the neighbourhood are mineral springs and chalk quarries. In the ninth century it belonged to the abbey of San Antonio. In 1212 it was taken by the Sienese, but soon afterwards the inhabitants declared themselves in favour of Florence. In 1260, after the battle of Montaperti, it once more fell into the hands of the Sienese, who made it a stronghold. In 1525 it was besieged by the imperial troops; in 1555, when Siena was annexed by Tuscany, Pietro Strozzi with the aid of French troops endeavoured to set up a free republic at Montalcino, but in 1556 the French were obliged to retreat and the town submitted to Cosimo I. Earthquakes have not been unfrequent, the last being in 1909. Montalcino belonged originally to the Diocese of Arezzo; in the eleventh century the abbots of San Antonio had quasi-episcopal jurisdiction over it; in 1462 it was made a diocese and united with the See of Pienza, which, however, became in 1563 a separate diocese. Its first bishop was Giovanni Cinughi; Francesco Piccolomini (Pius III) administered the see at one time. The diocese is directly subject to the Holy See; it has 34 parishes and 39,130 souls, 1 convent for men and two for women.

Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XVIII (Venice, 1857).

U. Benigni.

Montalembert, Charles-Forbes-René, Comte de, b. in London, 15 April, 1810; d. in Paris 13 March, 1870. His father, Marc René, had fought in the army of Condé, and had afterwards served in an English cavalry regiment; he was chosen by the Prince Regent of England to announce to Louis XVIII the restoration of the French monarchy, and he became under the Restoration plenipotentiary minister to Stuttgart, and, later, to Stockholm. His maternal grandfather, James Forbes, belonged to a very old Scotch Protestant family and had made many important journeys to India, which he related in the four volumes of his "Oriental Memoirs", published in 1813; he also wrote in 1810 a volume entitled "Reflections on the character of the Hindus and the necessity of converting them to Christianity".

Montalembert's mother, converted by Abbé Busson and Père MacCarthy, made her abjuration of heresy to Cardinal de Latil in 1822. The early years of Montalembert's life were passed in England; afterwards he studied at the Lycée Bourbon and at the Collège Sainte-Barbe at Paris, where out of twenty pupils in the sixteenth year of their age hardly one was a practical Catholic. At Sainte-Barbe young Montalembert made a friend of Léon Cornudet, who was also a Catholic, and the letters the boys exchanged in their seventeenth year have remained famous. At that early age Montalembert wrote: "Would it not be a splendid thing to show that religion is the mother of liberty!", a phrase which was to become the motto of his whole life. In 1829 he wrote to Rio: "my age, my tastes, my future call me to support the new ideal; but my religious beliefs and moral emotions cause me to lament bitterly the bygone days, the ages of faith and self-sacrifice. If Catholicism is to triumph it must have liberty as its ally and tributary subject". Soon after its establishment in 1829 by Carné, Cazalès, and Augustin de Meaux, with the motto (borrowed from Canning): "Civil and Religious Liberty for the whole world", the review "Le Correspondant" had Montalembert as a contributor. In September and October, 1830, he travelled in Ireland, where he met O'Connell; he was thinking of assisting the cause for which O'Connell was struggling by writing a history of Ireland, when he learned that the House of Commons had passed the Irish Emancipation Act.

While he was in Ireland he received the prospectus of the new paper "L'Avenir", founded in October, 1830, by Lamennais. On 26 Oct., 1830, he wrote to Lamennais: "All that I know, and all that I am able to do I lay at your feet". On 5 November, 1830, he met Lamennais in Paris, and on 12 November at Lamennais's house he met Lacordaire. At times, Montalembert had to smooth over some of the risky things Lamennais allowed himself to be led into writing against the royalists in the paper; on the other hand he was engaged in controversy with Lacordaire, whose idea of aristocracy and the past glory of the French nobles he considered too narrow. It was Montalembert who, the day after the sack of St. Germain l'Auxerrois by the Parisian mob, published in "L'Avenir" an eloquent article on the Cross of Christ, "which has ruled over the destinies of the modern world." He especially distinguished himself in the "L'Avenir" by his campaigns in favour of freedom for Ireland and Poland, and for these he received the congratulations of Victor Hugo and Alfred de Vigny. In 1831 he thought of going to Poland and joining the

insurgents. When the "Agence générale pour la défense de la liberté religieuse" (Central committee for the safeguarding of religious liberty), founded by the editors of "L'Avenir", had solemnly declared war on the monopoly of the French University by opening a primary school (9 May, 1831), Montalembert was indicted. As at this time by his father's death on 20 June, 1831, he became a peer of France, he demanded that he be tried by the House of Peers; and the famous "Free School Case" was heard before that assembly, 19 and 20 September, 1831.

The speech delivered by Montalembert on that occasion was a gem of eloquence. The trial ended in his condemnation to a fine of one hundred francs; but his eloquence succeeded in calling public attention to the question of freedom of teaching, which was destined not to be solved until 1850. When the last number of "L'Avenir" appeared (15 November, 1831), Montalembert accompanied Lacordaire and Lamennais to Rome. While in March, 1832, Lacordaire divined the wishes of Gregory XVI, and returned to France, Montalembert persisted in remaining in Rome with Lamennais, who insisted on a public decision by the pope concerning "L'Avenir". It was not until July that they left Rome, and the Encyclical "Mirari Vos", which overtook them at Munich, was a cause of great sorrow to them. Montalembert submitted at once, and when early in 1833 Lamennais announced his intention of again taking up his editorial work, excepting the field of theology, and concerning himself only with social and political questions, Montalembert did all he could to dissuade him from so imprudent a step. When Gregory XVI by his Brief dated 5 October, 1833, found fault with the "long and violent preface" Montalembert had written for Mickiewicz's "Livre des Pèlerins Polonais" and when at the end of that same year Lamennais broke away from the Church, Montalembert passed through a period of much sorrow, during which the advice of Lacordaire helped him greatly. He tried in 1834 to dissuade Lamennais from publishing "Les Paroles d'un Croyant", and in vain besought him to submit to the Encyclical "Singulari nos" of 7 July, 1834. He submitted to all Gregory's decisions (8 December, 1834) and his correspondence with Lamennais ceased definitely in 1836.

CHARLES-FORBES-RENÉ, COMTE DE MONTALEMBERT

In 1836 he published his "Vie de Sainte Elizabeth de Hongrie" which restored hagiography in France and brought back to Catholics a taste for the supernatural as shown in the lives of the saints. On 16 August, 1836, Abbé Gerbet blessed his marriage with Mlle de Mérode, daughter of the Felix de Mérode who had taken such an important part in the insurrection of the Belgian Catholics against the government of the Low Countries, and who was descended from Saint Elizabeth of Hungary. She was the sister of Xavier de Mérode, afterwards minister of Pius IX.

In the House of Peers, Montalembert took pride in presenting himself as a Catholic first of all, at a time when as he himself wrote, "to profess or defend the Catholic faith one had to face marked unpopularity". In May, 1837, he spoke in favour of the right of the Church to own property; in Dec., 1838, when ecclesiastical burial had been refused to Montlosier by Bishop Féron of Clermont, he replied in the name of the liberty of the Church to those who assailed this purely ecclesiastical act. He seconded with all his influence the re-establishment of the Benedictines by Dom Guéranger, and of the Dominicans by Lacordaire, and in 1841 he obtained from Martin du Nord, Minister of Worship, permission for Lacordaire to wear his monastic dress in the pulpit of Notre Dame. "L'Univers Religieux", a daily paper founded in 1834 by Abbé Migne, owed its solvency in 1838 to pecuniary sacrifices made by Montalembert, and it soon passed into the hands of Louis Veuillot. In June, 1845 Montalembert questioned the government concerning the measures it was about to take against the Jesuits, and a few days later, when the concessions made by the Holy See to Rossi, whom Guizot had sent to Rome, had brought about the partial dispersion of the French Jesuits, he loudly expressed his surprise and sorrow. "You are our father, our support, our friend", wrote Père de Ravignan to him. In the House he, moreover, defended the interests of foreign Catholics; in 1845, at the time of the Lebanon massacres, he questioned Guizot as to what France was doing to protect Christians in the East; in 1846 he questioned him concerning the massacres committed by Austria in Galicia, and the cruelties practised against the Poles of that province; on 11 January, 1848, he enthusiastically praised the hopes Pius IX held out to the Italian people, and reproached the government of France for the lukewarm support it gave the new pope against Metternich; on 14 January, 1848 in a speech on the Sonderbund, the finest, perhaps, he ever uttered, he impeached European radicalism, and proclaimed that France, in the face of Radicalism, was "destined to uphold the flag and safeguard the rights of liberty". Never did a speech so carry men away, wrote Sainte-Beuve.

But it was especially to secure liberty of teaching (see FRANCE and FALLOUX DU COUDRAY) that Montalembert devoted his efforts. In 1839 he addressed an eloquent letter to Villemain, minister of public instruction, demanding that liberty; in 1841 under pressure from the episcopate, he compelled Villemain to withdraw a bill on education because it was not sufficiently liberal; in his pamphlet "Du Devoir des Catholiques dans la question de la liberté d'enseignement", published in 1843, he summoned the Catholics to take part in the struggle. On 16 April, 1844, in the House of Peers, he undertook the defence of the bishops who had attacked a second bill brought in by Villemain, and he replied to Dupin, who demanded the punishment of the bishops: "We are the sons of the crusaders; and we shall never yield to the sons of Voltaire"; then again he took an active part in the discussion of the bill, which owing to Villemain's mental infirmity was abandoned. Between 1845 and 1846 he solicited petitions among the laity in support of liberty of education, and he succeeded in having 140 supporters of educational liberty elected as deputies in 1846. In 1847 he renewed the attack on the bill introduced by Salvandy and declared it unacceptable. The July monarchy fell before the question was settled. The Revolution of 1848 respected the rights of the Church and Pius IX, 26 March, 1848, wrote to Montalembert: "We gladly believe that it is in part owing to your eloquence, which has endeared your name to your generous countrymen, that no harm has been done to religion or its ministers".

Under the Second Republic Montalembert, in reply to Victor Hugo, who criticized the sending of a French expedition to aid Pius IX, declared amid the applause of two-thirds of the Constituent Assembly that the Church is "a mother, the mother of Europe, the mother of modern society". Once more he took up the struggle for liberty of education; in 1849, together

with Dupanloup he was the chief instigator of the negotiations between the Catholics and a number of liberals such as Thiers, which resulted in spite of the sharp attacks of Louis Veuillot in the definitive grant of liberty of education by the Falloux Law. When in October, 1850, Montalembert went to Rome, Pius IX congratulated him, and caused him to be named *Civis Romanus* by the municipality of Rome. After the Coup d'Etat, 2 Dec., 1851, in an open letter to the "Univers", he invited the Catholics to rally to Louis Napoleon; this manifesto, which he afterwards regretted, was the result of an idea he had that it was unwholesome for Catholics to abstain from taking part in the life of the State. But when in 1852 he had appealed in vain to Louis Napoleon to abrogate the organic articles, to grant liberty of higher education, and freedom of association, he refused to enter the Senate. He was deputy for Besançon to the legislature of 1852–1857, but failed to be re-elected in 1857 owing to the defection of many Catholic voters. He cut himself off entirely from Louis Veuillot and the "Univers", which he thought accepted with too great complacency all the acts of the new government curtailing certain political liberties.

The break began in 1852 when Montalembert's pamphlet "Les Intérêts Catholiques au XIX^{eme} Siècle" was attacked by Dom Guéranger and Louis Veuillot; it became more marked in 1855 when Montalembert, taking from Lenormant's hands the management of the "Correspondant", which had at the time only 672 subscribers, made that review an organ of the political opposition, and took up the side known as "liberal" in contradistinction to the views supported by the "Univers". As an organ of the opposition "Le Correspondant" was often at odds with the imperial government: in 1858 an article Montalembert wrote entitled "Un débat sur l'Inde au Parlement anglais" led to his prosecution, and in spite of the defence set up by Berryer and Dufaure, he was sentenced to three months' imprisonment, which the emperor remitted. In 1859 his article on "Pie IX et la France en 1849 et 1859", in which he attacked the partiality of the empire towards Italy and all the opponents of the temporal power, caused some disquiet in court circles, and won for him the congratulations of Pius IX. His two letters to Cavour, Oct., 1860, and April, 1861, in which he attacked the centralizing spirit of those who were bringing about Italian unity, and took up the defence of the Holy See, drew from Pius IX the enthusiastic exclamation of "Vivat, vivat! our dear Montalembert has surpassed himself". But the hostility between the "Correspondant" and the "Univers" was growing, and in the heat of the struggle Montalembert wished to profit by the Congress of Belgian Catholics at Mechlin (August, 1863) to pour out his whole soul concerning the future of modern society and the Church.

His first speech aimed to show the necessity of Christianizing the democracy by accepting modern liberties. His second speech dealt with liberty of conscience, and the conclusion he drew was that the Church could be in perfect harmony with religious liberty and with the modern state which is founded on that liberty, and that everyone is free to hold that the modern state is to be preferred to the one which preceded it. The future Cardinal Pie, Bishop of Poitiers, the future Cardinal Ledochowski, Nuncio at Brussels, Mgr. Talbot, Chamberlain to Pius IX, Louis Veuillot, and the Jesuits who edited the "Civiltà Cattolica" were alarmed at these declarations. On the other hand Cardinal Sterck, Archbishop of Mechlin, the future Cardinals Guibert and Lavigerie, many well-known Paris Jesuits, such as Pères de Ponlevoy, Olivaint, Matignon, and especially Bishop Dupanloup of Orléans, supported him and took up his defence. At the end of March, 1864, he received a letter from Cardinal Antonelli finding fault with the Mechlin speeches. When, on 8 Dec., 1864, the Encyclical "Quanta Cura" and the Syllabus were issued, Montalembert resisted the advice given him by the Protestant Léon de Malleville to protest publicly against these pontifical documents as a political measure; and the commentary on the Syllabus which Dupanloup published, and Pius IX approved of, 4 Feb., 1865, met with his joyous adhesion.

When the Vatican Council drew near he feared that the council would infer from the Syllabus and define as articles of faith certain affirmative propositions concerning liberty and touching on the State. He encouraged the authors of the Coblenz manifesto who raised doubts as to the opportuneness of the infallibility question, and he drew up under the heading "Questions au futur concile" a great number of disquieting grievances which he circulated among the bishops. The three hundred pages he wished to insert in the "Correspondant" on the causes of Spanish decadence, and in which he made a lively attack on the "Civiltà Cattolica", were refused by the "Correspondant", and so Montalembert broke off his connexion with that review.

His letter to the lawyer Lallemand, published in the "Gazette de France", 7 March, 1870, was intended to reconcile his former "ultramontanism" with his present state of feeling, which had been styled Gallicanism. In that letter he spoke of "The idol which the lay theologians of absolutism had set up in the Vatican". The impression left by this letter, which Abbé Combalot in the pulpit of San Andrea della Valle styled a "satanic work", was still fresh in the mind of Pius IX, when Montalembert died, 13 March, 1870. Pius IX refused to allow a solemn service to be held for him in the Ara Cœli; but a few days later he gave orders that an office should be sung in Santa Maria Transpontina, and he attended there himself in one of the barred galleries.

The letter (published very much later) which on 28 September, 1869, he wrote to M. Hyacinthe Loyson to dissuade him from leaving the Church, is in the opinion of M. Emile Ollivier "one of the most pathetic appeals that ever came from the human heart"; and the future Cardinal Perraud, when pronouncing the panegyric of Montalembert in the Sorbonne, could say that even his latest writings, however daring they might be, were filled with "a noble passion of love for the Church".

A member of the French Academy from 9 January, 1851, Montalembert was both an orator and a historian. As early as 1835 he had planned to write a life of St. Bernard. He was led to publish in 1860, under the title "Les Moines d'Occident", two volumes on the origin of monasticism; then followed three volumes on the monks in England; he died before he reached the period of St. Bernard. But he left among his papers, on the one hand, a manuscript entitled "Influence de l'ordre monastique sur la noblesse féodale et la société laïque jusqu'à la fin du XI^{eme} siècle", and on the other hand a work on Gregory VII and the conflict of investitures; and these two MSS., published in 1877 by his friend Foisset and his son-in-law the Vicomte de Meaux, made up the sixth and seventh volume of the "Moines d'Occident". His work on "L'Avenir politique de l'Angleterre", published in 1856, drew a brilliant picture of the parliamentary institutions of England, and rejoiced in the ascendant march of Catholicity in the British Empire.

Finally, Montalembert was one of the writers who did most to foster in Europe regard and taste for Gothic Art. His letter to Victor Hugo on "Vandalisme en France", published 1 March, 1833, made a strong impression everywhere, and helped to save many Gothic monuments from impending ruin. Auguste Reichensperger and the Catholics of Rhenish Prussia profited by the artistic lessons of Montalembert. In 1838 he addressed to the French clergy an

eloquent appeal, in which he praised the German school of Overbeck, and lamented that French Christian art was debased by pagan infiltrations. He interested himself in the dilapidated condition of the Cathedral of Notre Dame, and caused the House of Peers in 1845 to vote a sum of money to repair it. His speech on vandalism in works of art, before the same assembly, 27 June, 1847, denounced the demolitions and ignorant restorations carried on by government architects, and brought about a change for the better. It was partly due to him that in 1837 the Historical Committee of Arts and Monuments, for the preserving of works of art, was established; and on the other hand, churchmen laid such weight on his artistic opinions, that even from far-off Kentucky Mgr Flaget, Bishop of Bardstown, wrote to him asking him to draw up a plan for the cathedral he was about to build at Louisville.

Montalembert's "Speeches" have been published in three volumes; his "Polemics" in three volumes also.

LECANUET, *Montalembert* (3 vols., Paris, 1895–1905); DE MEAUX, *Montalembert* (Paris, 1900); FOLLIOLEY, *Montalembert et Mgr Parisis* (Paris, 1906); OLIPHANT, *Memoir of Count de Montalembert* (2 vols., London).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Montalto, DIOCESE OF (MONTIS ALTI), in Ascoli Piceno. The situation of the little town of Montalto is very attractive. Originally (1074) under the jurisdiction of the abbots of Farfa, it was annexed in 1571 by Pius V to the Diocese of Ripatransone. In 1586 Sixtus V, a native of Montalto, made it an episcopal see. The first bishop was Paolo Emilio Giovannini; other bishops were Orazio Giustiniani (1640), later a cardinal, and Francesco Saverio Castiglioni (1800), who became pope under the name of Pius VII. The diocese has 33 parishes with 29,000 inhabitants; 79 secular and 4 regular priests; 1 religious house of men, and 1 of sisters.

CAPPELLETTI, *Chiese d'Italia*, III (Venice, 1887).

U. BENIGNI.

Montana, the third largest of the United States of America, admitted to the Union 8 November, 1889; called the "Treasure State".

BOUNDARIES AND AREA.—Its northern boundary line, which divides it from Canada, extends along the forty-ninth parallel from meridian 27 west of Washington (104 west of Greenwich), its eastern boundary, to meridian 39—that is, 549 miles. Starting from the east, the forty-fifth parallel marks its southern boundary as far as meridian 34, where the line drops south to the crest of the main range of the Rocky Mountains, which, with the extreme summits of the Bitter Root and the Cœur d'Alêne Mountains, divides it from Idaho on the southwest and west until meridian 39 is reached. This last meridian then becomes the western dividing line to the international boundary. The area of the state is 146,080 square miles.

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS.—As its name suggests, the state is mountainous in character, being crossed from north to south by the system known collectively as the Rocky Mountains. Yet it would be erroneous to regard the state as everywhere mountainous. The eastern half of the state is an expanse of plain and prairie, though there are few places within it which do not reveal on the horizon elevations sufficiently imposing to be called mountains. The highest mountain in the state is Granite Peak, the elevation of which is 12,600 feet. The Northern Pacific railroad crosses the continental divide twenty miles west of Helena, at an elevation of 5573 feet; the Great Northern main line crosses at an elevation of 5202, and the Montana Central, a branch of the last-named system, near Butte, at an elevation of 6343. The eastern portion of the state has a mean elevation of from 2000 to 3000 feet. The state is blessed with many magnificent river systems. The Missouri and its tributaries drain the eastern portion, and the confluents of the Columbia the western. The former is formed by the junction of the Jefferson, Madison, and Gallatin, the two last-named having their source in the Yellowstone National Park and the other in the mountains in the extreme south-western part of the state. The main tributary of the Missouri, the Yellowstone, likewise takes its rise in the park, in a lake of the same name. Another tributary of the Missouri, the Milk River, has its origin in the north-western section of the state, which is noted for its scenic beauty. From the summit of the mountains there one may overlook a country within which are the head-waters of three great continental river-systems—the Mississippi-Missouri, the Saskatchewan, and the Columbia. This region has lately been made a national reservation under the name of Glacier Park. The Missouri traverses the state from Three Forks, named from its location at the confluence of the three rivers mentioned above, a distance of approximately 550 miles. The Yellowstone, following a course roughly parallel to the main stream, makes a waterway within Montana's borders 450 miles long. The Kootenai drains a portion of the extreme northwestern part of the state, but the great bulk of the western waters in that region comes south, by the Flathead, to meet with those from the southern portion which flow north and west to make the Missoula. These two streams unite to form the Clark's Fork of the Columbia. The Flathead feeds and empties, in its course, Flathead Lake, the largest fresh-water lake between the Mississippi and the Pacific.

SEAL OF MONTANA

The climate is very similar in character throughout the state, except, of course, on the lofty mountains, where snow lies perpetually or far into the summer—a providential condition, in consequence of which water for irrigation is supplied in comparative abundance in the period of drought. The extremes of temperature are not quite so great and rain falls somewhat more abundantly on the western slope of the mountains. The climate, except for brief periods in the winter season, is mild and agreeable. In the northern part of the state the severity of the colder months is tempered by an occasional warm west wind, known as the *chinook*, which tempers the climate without bringing excessive moisture. A very low temperature is endured with much less discomfort than in regions where the atmosphere is more dense, the humidity greater, and the sunshine less abundant. The mean temperature at Helena is 65° (Fahr.) for the months of June, July, and August; 44° for September, October, and November; 22° for December, January, and February, and 41° for March, April, and May. The mean annual rainfall for the entire state, based on reports for ten years, is 15.57 inches.

HISTORY.—The state has an interesting history. About a third of a century before the Revolution, in 1742, it was visited by a party of French explorers headed by two young sons of Pierre Gauthier de Varennes de la Vérendrye, on a quest for a river leading to the Pacific. They started from Fort La Reine, one of the most remote of a chain of posts, which the elder de la Vérendrye had established in the wilderness north and west of Lake Superior in an effort to reach the western sea. The wanderings of the youthful adventurers led them from Fort La Reine on the Assini-

boine, west of Winnipeg, to the village of the Mandans on the Missouri River, near the present city of Bismarck, North Dakota, whither their father had preceded them four years before. Thence, proceeding in a general southwesterly direction through the counties of Custer and Rosebud, they crossed the rivers falling into the Yellowstone until they reached the Big Horn Mountains, near or across the Wyoming line. Sixty-two years later, the expedition of Lewis and Clark gave to the world authentic information of the country. It followed the Missouri to the Three Forks, then ascended the Jefferson to its source in the Bitter Root range, and crossed the mountain barrier. Returning, the leaders travelled together until they reached the Big Blackfoot, a tributary of the Missoula. Here they parted, Lewis ascending that stream to its source and reaching the Missouri in the neighbourhood of Great Falls, whence he returned by the route the party had come. Guided by the Shoshone woman Sacajawea, whom the expedition picked up on the outward journey among the Mandans, whither she had been carried as a captive when a child, Clark pursued the route later followed in the construction of the Northern Pacific Railroad to the Yellowstone near Livingston, and, descending that stream, rejoined his companion at its mouth.

The Astor expedition, which set out for the mouth of the Columbia in 1811, purposed following the route which had been opened up by the Lewis and Clark party. But the fierce Blackfeet being on the warpath, they abandoned the river near the mouth of the Cheyenne and set out over the plains with the aid of horses purchased from the Indians. After proceeding some distance to the northwest, doubtless into Montana, they pursued a more southerly route and reached the headwaters of the Columbia as they issue from the Yellowstone National Park. The Astor project, in its commercial aspect, took form later in the organization of the American Fur Company. But it was anticipated by the daring Manuel Lisa of St. Louis, who as early as 1807 established a fort at the mouth of the Big Horn River. Clark the explorer, the brothers Chouteau, and others united with him in the organization of the Missouri Fur Company. In 1832 the steamboat "Yellowstone," owned by the American Fur Company, which had absorbed its rival, ascended the Missouri to Fort Union, near the mouth of the river after which the craft was named. The region east of the mountains was a part of the Louisiana Purchase, over which the United States acquired dominion by the treaty with Napoleon in 1803. The western slope constituted a part of that ill-defined district known as the "Oregon Country". The conflicting claims of the United States and Great Britain to this country were not settled until 1846. Meanwhile hunters and trappers bearing allegiance to both nations overran the country. A few homebuilders established themselves within the borders of the State in the late fifties, but the history of the development of the commonwealth begins with the discovery of gold at Gold Creek and Bannack in 1862. The Alder Gulch placers were discovered in 1863, giving rise to Virginia City, and those of Last Chance Gulch in 1864, bringing Helena into existence. The story of the fabulous wealth of these deposits attracted a great multitude, who made the journey either by ox-teams from Omaha, or came up the river by boat to Fort Benton, which was established in 1846. Every promising gulch in the state was quickly prospected, many of them proving very remunerative. The source of the placer deposits was soon sought in the ledges, and quartz-mining speedily began. The enormous price which food-stuffs commanded operated as an incentive to those having some skill in agriculture to engage in ranching, and the fertile valleys of the Gallatin, the Deer Lodge, the Bitter Root, and the Prickly Pear were subjected to tillage. The abundant nutritious grasses of the plains, that had supported immense numbers of buffalo and antelope, and of the parks in the mountains, where deer and elk abounded, invited the pursuit of raising cattle, sheep, and horses.

Long before this period, however, as early as 1840, Father Peter J. De Smet, S.J., had come from St. Louis in response to an invitation conveyed by a deputation from the Flathead Indians to Christianize that tribe. He established St. Mary's Mission in the Bitter Root valley near the present town of Stevensville. In 1844 he founded the Mission of St. Ignatius in the midst of a beautiful valley, within what is now the Flathead Reservation. Father Nicholas Point preached to the Blackfeet in the winter of 1846–7, laying the foundations of St. Peter's Mission which however was not permanently established until 1859. Father A. Ravalli, who shares the veneration in which the memory of the founder of St. Mary's is held, came to that mission in 1845. The county in which it was located is named in his honour. The western part of the state was successively a part of Oregon Territory, Washington Territory, and Idaho Territory. The eastern portion became a part of the Louisiana Territory on the cession of the latter to the United States, and was attached to various territories organized out of that region. But there was no organized government anywhere. Even after the rush consequent upon the gold discoveries, though nominally subject in those parts to the government of Idaho Territory, the constituted authorities were so remote that the people themselves administered a rude but effective justice through miners' courts and vigilance committees. In 1864 the Territory of Montana was organized with boundaries identical with those which now define the limits of the state. Hon. Sidney Edgerton was appointed governor. The first legislative assembly convened at Bannack on 12 December, 1864. The next session was held at Virginia City in 1866, from which place the capital was moved to Helena in 1874, the migrations of the seat of government indicating to some extent the variations in the centres of population. General Thomas Francis Meagher was appointed secretary of the territory in 1865 and, in the absence of the governor, assumed, under the law, the duties of that office, which he continued to discharge until his unfortunate death by drowning in 1867. Samuel McLean was the first delegate to Congress from the territory. The state was admitted to the Union by proclamation of President Harrison on 8 November, 1889, pursuant to an Act of Congress approved on 22 Feb., 1889, the constitution having been meanwhile framed and adopted.

In 1880 the Utah and Northern Railroad Company, subsequently merged in the Union Pacific system, built into Butte from Ogden. Three years later the Northern Pacific completed its line across the territory aided by a grant made by Congress in 1864, by which it acquired every alternate section of land within forty miles of its line. The Great Northern was completed to the coast across Montana in 1891, and the year 1909 witnessed the construction of another transcontinental line crossing the state from east to west,—that of the Chicago, Milwaukee, and Puget Sound Railway Company. The Montana Central, since a part of the Great Northern system, was built in the very heart of the mountain country in 1887, to connect the mines at Butte with the smelters at Great Falls. Since the opening of the railroads, resulting in the extinction of the buffalo, the main reliance of the Indians for subsistence, the task of keeping them in check on the reservations has become comparatively simple. In the struggle with them theretofore, three events attain special prominence—the brush with General Sully at the Bad Lands in 1864, while escorting a party of 250 emigrants from Minnesota bound for the mines of Montana; the Custer Massacre in 1876, and the raid of Chief Joseph after the Battle of

the Big Hole and his masterly retreat, followed by his capture in the Bear Paw Mountains in 1877 by General Miles.

Resources.—The industry which gave rise to the original settlement of Montana was mining. In 1863 gold valued at $8,000,000 came from the sluices. The next year produced double that amount. The total production of gold up to and including the year 1876 is conservatively estimated at $140,000,000. At about that time silver mining began to assume paramount importance, but about 1890 it yielded preeminence to copper, which is at present the chief metal produced. The copper mines are at Butte, while the smelters are located at Anaconda and Great Falls. A silver and lead smelter is in operation at East Helena. In 1907 there was produced copper to the value of $44,021,758, silver $6,149,619, and gold $3,286,212. Montana's stores of coal are very great. Estimates made by the authorities of the United States Geological Survey give the area of bituminous and lignitic-bituminous coal at 13,000 square miles, and the lignite areas at from 25,000 to 50,000 square miles. Coal-mining is extensively carried on in the counties of Carbon, Gallatin, Cascade, and Fergus. Lumbering is an industry of the western portion of the state, where there are dense forests of pine, fir, larch, cedar, and hemlock. It is, however, by no means confined to that region, as all the mountains of any considerable height bear a more or less abundant growth of timber. Nearly 20,000,000 acres of the public lands within the state, of which there are about 50,000,000, are included within the national forest reserves.

Stock-raising early assumed an important place in the business life of the state. Vast herds of cattle, horses, and sheep were reared and matured on the open range with little or no provision for feeding even in the depth of winter. The appropriation of the public domain by settlers has progressed to such an extent, however, as to enforce a radical change in the method by which the business is carried on. Provision for feeding is now almost universally made, but, except in stormy weather, sheep especially thrive without much regard to temperature on the native grasses that cover the plains and foot-hills, cured by the hot sun of the summer season when comparatively little rain falls. The annual production of wool in the state is about 40,000,000 pounds, the clip of approximately five and a half million sheep. The number of cattle in the state is in excess of 600,000. Agriculture is undergoing a marvellous development, both as to the area under cultivation and the methods of farming. All the cereals yield bountifully. Recent immigration to the state has been markedly to the more promising agricultural sections which, within the past two years, have received an influx hitherto unknown. In earlier years irrigation was universally resorted to, but more recently great areas have been cultivated with marked success by the "dry farming" system. Eight great works of irrigation are being carried on, or have been completed by the government reclamation service. The state is directing others under the Carey Land Act, and private corporations are engaged in many similar enterprises. Montana produced in 1908: 3,703,000 bushels of wheat on 153,000 acres; 10,556,000 bushels of oats on 254,000 acres; and 875,000 bushels of barley on 25,000 acres. Fruit-raising is a profitable business in many parts of the state, particularly in the counties of Ravalli, Missoula, and Flathead, where it is extensively carried on. Apples are the staple fruit crop, the quality being excellent and the yield large. The culture of sugar beets has been stimulated by the construction of a factory at Billings, which has been in operation since 1896. It will be supplied (in 1910) with over 115,000 tons of beets. The abundance of sunshine and the character of the soil gives to the Montana beet an exceptionally high percentage of saccharine matter. Manufacturing is still in its infancy, but is destined to a great growth owing to the extent of available water-power. Three power dams now turn the flow of the Missouri River, and three more are in process of construction. Another large dam utilizes in part the energy of the Madison River. The Flathead River tumbles over seven miles of cascades, as it issues from Flathead Lake, offering stupendous opportunities for power development.

State Institutions.—The capitol at Helena was erected in 1900 at a cost of $350,000. The growth of the state is shown by the fact that additions were authorized by the last session of the legislature to cost half a million dollars. The funds for the original construction, as well as the work now to be undertaken, are derived from lands donated to the state on its admission to the Union by the general government. The state maintains a university at Missoula, an agricultural college at Bozeman, a school of mines at Butte, a normal school at Dillon, a soldiers' home at Columbia Falls, a deaf, dumb, and blind asylum at Boulder, a reform school at Miles City, and a penitentiary at Deer Lodge. The insane are cared for at a private institution at Warm Springs. The usual system of public schools prevails, and nearly all the towns of consequence maintain public libraries.

Education.—In 1908 there were enrolled 61,928 of the 77,039 children of school age. The total expense for all school purposes was $2,178,322.90. The average monthly salary paid to male teachers was $99, and to female teachers $60. The educational interests of the state are under the direction of a state superintendent and a state board of education, consisting of that officer, the governor and the attorney-general, and eight other members appointed by the governor. County superintendents supervise the administration of the school system in the rural communities, and city superintendents in the municipalities. The chief revenues are derived from taxes collected by the county treasurer. The school fund consists of the revenues from grants of lands made by the general government, and other grants from the federal authority, the avails of escheated estates, and fines for violations of various laws. The fund must be kept intact and only the income used. The state university has a grant of 45,000 acres from the nation, which may be sold at not less than $10 per acre. The avails constitute a fund the income of which only is subject to use. For the year 1909 there were appropriated for its support $67,500, and it has other revenues amounting to about $75,000 in all. Its corps of professors numbers twenty. In 1908 it had 184 students, exclusive of those doing special work and not including those taking the course at the biological station, which is maintained in connexion with it.

Early Missionaries and Missions.—It is not improbable that Father C. G. Coquart, S.J., accompanied the Vérendyre brothers on their expedition into Montana. He was a member of the party when they set out from Montreal on their great enterprise and is quoted as saying that the Vérendyres on some of their excursions went beyond the great falls of the Missouri, and as far as the Gate of the Mountains near Helena. The establishment of the early missions has been mentioned. Besides those referred to, the Holy Family Mission among the Blackfeet, originally a dependency of St. Peter's, became a fixed establishment in 1885. St. Paul's, another offspring of St. Peter's, was established about the same time among the Gros Ventres and Assiniboines on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation. St. Labre, the mission among the Cheyennes, dates from 1884, when Rev. Joseph Eyler came from Cleveland with six members of the Ursuline Sisterhood, with Mother Amadeus at their head in response to a call issued by Bishop Gilmore at the appeal of Bishop Brondel, lately appointed to the newly created See of Montana. St. Xavier's, among the Crows, dates

from 1887. Schools, as a matter of course, are maintained at all the missions, those at St. Ignatius particularly being models. The Ursulines have a convent at St. Peter's. The Jesuits were the pioneer missionaries to both Indians and whites in Montana. The ministrations of Father De Smet extended to all the tribes that have been mentioned, and he, as well as all of his associate "black robes", was held in the highest reverence by them. His labours were prodigious. In 1869 he induced five sisters of the community of Leavenworth to come to Helena, where they founded St. Vincent's Academy.

Dioceses.—In the earlier territorial days, the western part of the state was included in the Vicariate of Idaho, and the eastern part in that of Nebraska. An episcopal visit was made to these then remote regions by Bishop James O'Connor of Omaha in 1877, and by Archbishop Charles J. Seghers of the Province of Oregon in 1879 and again in 1882. Upon the urgent recommendation of the last-named prelate, Montana was made a vicariate on 7 April, 1883, and the Rt. Rev. John B. Brondel, then Bishop of Victoria, Vancouver Island, was appointed administrator. On 7 March, 1884, the Diocese of Helena was created, embracing the whole of Montana, and Bishop Brondel was appointed to the see. He was at the head of its affairs until his death in 1903, when the diocese was divided, the eastern part of the state becoming the Diocese of Great Falls and the remainder continuing as the Diocese of Helena. The Rt. Rev. John P. Carroll, D.D., was then appointed bishop of the latter, and the Rt. Rev. Mathias Lenihan, D.D., of the former diocese.

Catholic Population.—The Catholic population of the Great Falls diocese is about 15,000; of the Helena diocese about 50,000. Thirty priests minister to the people of the new, fifty-three to those of the old diocese. No statistics are available giving the nationality or ancestry of either the Catholic population or that of the whole people of the state. Among the former, the dominant blood is probably Irish, a very large percentage of the adults being native Americans. But almost every Catholic country of Europe has contributed to the truly cosmopolitan citizenship of Montana. China and Japan have added to some extent to the population. In recent years Italians, Austrians, Bulgarians, and Servians have come in considerable numbers. Most of these are more or less closely attached to the ancient Faith.

Charitable Institutions.—Hospitals are conducted by sisters of various orders at Great Falls, Billings, Fort Benton, Lewistown, Helena, Anaconda, Butte, and Missoula. There are a House of the Good Shepherd and an orphanage at Helena, and academies at Lewistown, Miles City, St. Peter's, Helena, and Deer Lodge. The parochial schools enrolled 5536 pupils in 1908, not including those attending the mission schools on the reservations.

Distinguished Catholics.—The spirit of religious intolerance has had scant encouragement in Montana, and many Catholics have occupied prominent positions in her industrial development and political history. Among those who have served in high official station are General Thomas Francis Meagher, acting governor from 1865 to 1867; Hon. James M. Cavanaugh, delegate in Congress from 1867 to 1872; Hon. Martin Maginnis, delegate in Congress from 1873 to 1885; Hon. Thomas H. Carter, delegate in Congress from March to November, 1889, and representative from the admission of the state to 1891; afterwards, from 1895 to 1901 United States Senator, and now serving his second term, having been again elected in 1905; and Hon. Thomas C. Power, United States Senator from 1889 to 1895. Among those who have written their names large in the industrial history of the state are Marcus Daly, Thomas Cruse, Peter Larson, and John D. Ryan, the latter being at present at the head of the Amalgamated Copper Company.

Freedom of Worship.—Freedom of religion is guaranteed by the following provision of the constitution: "Art. III, Sec. 4. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall forever hereafter be guaranteed, and no person shall be denied any civil or political right or privilege on account of his opinions concerning religion, but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations, excuse acts of licentiousness, by bigamous or polygamous marriage, or otherwise, or justify practices inconsistent with the good order, peace or safety of the state, or opposed to the civil authority thereof, or of the United States. No person shall be required to attend any place of worship or support any ministry, religious sect or denomination, against his consent; nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship." The diversion of the public funds to the promotion of sectarian purposes is forbidden by the following: "Art. V, Sec. 35. No appropriation shall be made for charitable, industrial, educational or benevolent purposes to any person, corporation or community not under the absolute control of the state, nor to any denominational or sectarian institution or association."

Oaths.—Every court or officer authorized to take testimony or decide on evidence may administer oaths or affirmations, the witness being entitled to elect whether he shall be sworn or shall simply affirm.

Sunday Observance, etc.—Sunday is a holiday, as is Christmas, New Year's, and Columbus Day (12 October). If Christmas or New Year's Day falls on Sunday, the day following is a holiday. Whenever any secular act, other than a work of necessity or mercy, is appointed by law or contract to be done on a certain day, and it so happens that such a day is a holiday, it may be done on the day following with like effect as if done on the day appointed. It is a misdemeanour to keep open or maintain on Sunday any barber-shop, theatre, play-house, dance-house, race-track, concert saloon, or variety hall. It is likewise a misdemeanour to disturb any assembly of people met for religious worship by profane discourse or in any other manner. Neither blasphemy nor profanity is otherwise made punishable.

Prayer in the Legislature.—The law provides for the election of a chaplain of each house of the legislature and the daily sessions are opened with prayer by that officer. The Bannack session seems to have had no chaplain, but Rev. Joseph Giorda, S.J., officiated in that capacity for both houses, apparently, at the second session held at Virginia City in 1866. Rev. L. Palladino, S.J., the historian of the Montana Missions, universally revered for his saintly life, who came to Saint Ignatius in 1867, acted in the same capacity at the ninth session.

Seal of Confession.—Disclosures made in the confessional are held sacred by express statute. A clergyman will be neither compelled nor permitted to testify as to them.

Incorporation of Churches.—Special provision is made for the incorporation of religious bodies and congregations. The method is simple. At a meeting, trustees are elected and they are authorized by resolution to file articles with the county clerk or the secretary of state, according as the organization is to be local or general in its nature. The articles state the name of the corporation, its purpose, and the number of trustees. It then has continual succession, and the usual powers of a corporation. Another act provides for the organization of corporations sole "whenever the rules, regulations or discipline, of any religious denomination, society or Church, permit or require the estate, property, temporalities, and business thereof, to be held in the name of, or managed by a bishop, chief priest, or presiding elder, of such religious denomination, society or church." The passage of this

act was procured by Bishop Brondel who incorporated under the name of the "Roman Catholic Bishop of Helena".

Exemption of Clergymen and Church Property.—All clergymen are exempt from jury duty. The constitution declares that "such property as may be used exclusively for agricultural and horticultural societies, for educational purposes, places for actual religious worship, hospitals and places of burial not used or held for private or corporate profit, and institutions of purely public charity may be exempt from taxation" (Art. XII, Sec. 2), and the statutes declare the exemptions in the same terms.

Marriage and Divorce.—Marriage may be contracted by mutual consent followed by a solemnization or public assumption of the marital relation. The marriageable age is eighteen in the case of males, and sixteen in females. Marriages between ancestors and descendants of every degree, between brothers and sisters of the half as well as the whole blood, and between aunts and nephews or uncles and nieces, are declared void *ab initio*. So likewise are marriages between a white person on one side, and a negro or a person part negro, or a Chinese or Japanese, on the other side. Marriages contracted without the state and valid where contracted are valid within the state. Licences are required to be issued by the clerk of the court of the county where the marriage is to be solemnized, and a return must be made by the officiating clergyman or officer. Licences cannot be granted to minors without the written consent of the parents or guardian. Marriage may be solemnized by a justice of the Supreme Court, judge of the district court, justice of the peace, priest or minister of any denomination, or mayor of the city, or by religious societies. It need not be solemnized at all if the parties make and file a joint declaration giving their names, the fact of marriage, the date of marriage, and that it has not been solemnized. Marriages licensed and not solemnized as provided by law are forbidden, but are expressly declared not to be void.

Divorces are authorized for six causes, viz. adultery, extreme cruelty, wilful desertion, wilful neglect, habitual intemperance, and conviction of felony. The constitution forbids the passage by the legislature of any special law granting divorce, or separation *a mensa et toro*, or decrees for separate maintenance, a power the early territorial legislatures freely exercised. Residence in the state one year by the plaintiff is a requisite of jurisdiction.

Liquor.—The sale of liquor is permitted under licences issued by counties and cities. Local option is authorized by law, but the traffic is not prohibited in any county. The employment of women in places where liquor is sold is forbidden, as is its sale in places of public amusement, or at any camp meeting, or near any cemetery. A law, known as the "Wine Room Law", makes it punishable to have in connexion with a saloon any room or apartment into which females are permitted to enter.

Wills and Testaments.—Wills may be made by any person over eighteen. If in his own handwriting it need be neither witnessed nor attested; if not, it must bear the signatures of two witnesses. A nuncupative will may be made orally disposing of an estate less than $1000 in value, when the testator is in actual military service in the field, or doing duty on shipboard and in peril or fear of death, or when he is expecting death from injury received the same day. A wife has a dower right in her husband's real estate, but he has no interest in her property except that she cannot without his written consent deprive him by will of more than two-thirds of her estate. The will of an unmarried woman is revoked by her subsequent marriage, as is that of a man made before he marries by his subsequent marriage, unless his wife is provided for by contract or in the will, or unless the will expressly excludes her from taking.

Charitable Bequests.—Charitable bequests contained in wills made within thirty days of the death of the testator are void. If the aggregate of such bequests in any will exceed in amount one-third the value of the estates, and the testator have legal heirs they are scaled down until their sum does not exceed such amount.

Cemeteries.—A law applicable specially to that subject authorizes the incorporation of cemetery associations. Burial without a certificate of death is made punishable, as is violation of sepulture, defacing of graves or monuments, or neglecting to bury the bodies of dead kindred.

Mont. Rev. Statutes of 1907; Historical Society of Montana Contributions; Parkman, *A Half-Century of Conflict* (St. Helena); Palladino, *Indian and White in the Northwest* (New York); Dye, *The Conquest* (New York); Irving, *Astoria* (New York); Chittenden, *Early Steamboat Navigation of the Missouri* (New York); Hall, *Montana* (New York); *Report of Supt. of Pub. Instruction of Montana for 1908.*

T. J. Walsh.

Montañés, Juan Martínez (d. 1649), a noted Spanish sculptor of the seventeenth century, sometimes called "the Sevillian Phidias". Like many of his countrymen, he confined himself almost exclusively to sculpture in wood. According to Palomino, he was born at Seville; according to Gordillo, his contemporary, at Alcalá la Real. He studied under Pablo de Rojas at Granada; and later settled at Seville where most of his works are to be found. One of the earliest is a charming Infant Jesus (cathedral sacristy, Seville) bearing the date 1607 and the sculptor's signature. In 1610 he modelled the head and hands of the statue of St. Ignatius Loyola—used in the religious celebrations of the beatification of the saint (chapel of the university, Seville). This image, clothed and coloured by Pacheco, is esteemed one of the truest and most æsthetic representations ever made of the soldier saint. The St. Francis Xavier in the same place is attributed to Montañés. In 1612 he executed for the Hieronymite monastery of S. Isidro del Campo, near Seville, the life-size penitent St. Jerome, one of his most masterly productions, and the reredos and statues for the altar; in 1614 the famous large crucifix for the Carthusians of S. María de las Cuevas; 1617 to 1618 two reredos in the lay choir of the same monastery, with statues of Our Lady, the two St. Johns, figures representing the theological virtues, and lovely reliefs of the Adoration of the Magi and Shepherds; the expressive St. Bruno, now in the museum, was made for the Carthusians in 1620. In 1635 the sculptor went to Madrid and spent seven months there modelling a portrait of Philip IV, which was to be used by Pietro Tacca for his equestrian statue of the king, finished in Florence, 1640, and now in Madrid (Plaza del Oriente). The likeness of Montañés by Velasquez (Prado Gallery), was probably painted at this time. As a reward for his services the king granted Montañés the rights in a merchant ship "whether in the fleet of the Continent or of New Spain" (America). This promise was fulfilled to the sculptor's widow and children after his death in 1649. Other works at Seville are the St. Dominic of heroic size in the museum, from the convent of Portaceli; a beautiful St. John Evangelist in the church of San Juan de las Palmas; the high altar of the church of San Lorenzo and a statue of the patron saint; and, at the cathedral (Seville), a very fine life-size Immaculate Conception, a large crucifix in the Sacristy of the Chalices, and that renowned "Christ bearing the Cross" carried in Holy Week processions, so vivid and sorrowful, the sculptor would station himself at the corners of streets to see it pass, "absorbed and wondering at the work of his own hands". Montañés is noted for the majesty and religious character of his types, his profound sense of beauty, and his elegant and correct

modelling. His child forms, infant and cherub, are peculiarly happy. He would not consent that any of his figures should be tinted except under his own supervision.

PALOMINO Y VELASCO, *Vidas de los Pintores y Estatuarios eminentes Españoles* (London, 1742); CEÁN-BERMÚDEZ, *Diccionario histórico de los más ilustres profesores de las Bellas artes en España* (Madrid, 1800); MONTANER Y SIMÓN, *Diccionario Enciclopédico Hispano-Americano*, XII (Barcelona, 1893); STIRLING-MAXWELL, *Annals of the Artists of Spain* (London, 1891; DIEULAFOY, *La Statuaire polychrome en Espagne* (Paris, 1908).

M. L. HANDLEY.

Montanists, schismatics of the second century, first known as Phrygians, or "those among the Phrygians" (*οἱ κατὰ Φρύγας*), then as Montanists, Pepuzians, and (in the West) Cataphrygians. The sect was founded by a prophet, Montanus, and two prophetesses, Maximilla and Prisca, sometimes called Priscilla.

CHRONOLOGY.—An anonymous anti-Montanist writer, cited by Eusebius, addressed his work to Abercius Marcellus, Bishop of Hieropolis, who died about 200. Maximilla had prophesied continual wars and troubles, but this writer declared that he wrote more than thirteen years after her death, yet no war, general or partial, had taken place, but on the contrary the Christians enjoyed permanent peace through the mercy of God (Eusebius, "Hist. eccl.",V, xvi, 19). These thirteen years can be identified only with the twelve and a half years of Commodus (17 March, 180—31 December, 192). The wars between rival emperors began early in 193, so that this anonymous author wrote not much later than January, 193, and Maximilla must have died about the end of 179, not long before Marcus Aurelius. Montanus and Priscilla had died yet earlier. Consequently the date given by Eusebius in his "Chronicle"—eleventh (or twelfth) year of Marcus, i. e. about 172—for the first appearance of Montanus leaves insufficient time for the development of the sect, which we know further to have been of great importance in 177, when the Church of Lyons wrote to Pope Eleutherius on the subject. Again, the Montanists are co-ordinated with the martyr Thraseas, mentioned chronologically between Polycarp (155) and Sagaris (under Sergius Paulus, 166–7) in the letter of Polycrates to Pope Victor; the date of Thraseas is therefore about 160, and the origin of Montanism must be yet earlier. Consequently, Zahn, Harnack, Duchesne, and others (against Völter and Voigt, who accept the late date given by Eusebius, regard St. Epiphanius (Hær., xlviii, 1) as giving the true date of the rise of the sect, "about the nineteenth year of Antoninus Pius" (that is, about the year 156 or 157).

Bonwetsch, accepting Zahn's view that previously (Hær., xlvi, 1) Epiphanius had given the twelfth year of Antoninus Pius where he should have said M. Aurelius, wishes similarly to substitute that emperor here, so that we would get 179, the very date of the death of Maximilla. But the emendation is unnecessary in either case. In "Hæreses", xlvi, 1, Epiphanius clearly meant the earlier date, whether right or wrong; and in xlviii, 1, he is not dating the death of Maximilla but the first appearance of the sect. From Eusebius, V, xvi, 7, we learn that this was in the proconsulship of Gratus. Such a proconsul of Asia is not known. Bonwetsch accepts Zahn's suggestion to read "Quadratus", and points out that there was a Quadratus in 155 (if that is the year of Polycarp's death, which was under Quadratus), and another in 166, so that one of these years was the real date of the birth of Montanism. But 166 for Quadratus merely depends on Schmid's chronology of Aristides, which has been rejected by Ramsay and others in favour of the earlier chronology worked out by Waddington, who obtained 155 for the Quadratus of Aristides as well as for the Quadratus of Polycarp. Now it is most probable that Epiphanius's authority counted the years of emperors from the September preceding their accession (as Hegesippus seems to have done), and therefore the nineteenth year of Pius would be Sept., 155–Sept., 156. Even if the later and Western mode of reckoning from the January after accession is used, the year 157 can be reconciled with the proconsulship of Quadratus in 155, if we remember that Epiphanius merely says "about the nineteenth year of Pius", without vouching for strict accuracy. He tells us further on that Maximilla prophesied: "After me there shall be no prophetess, but the end", whereas he was writing after 290 years, more or less, in the year 375 or 376. To correct the evident error Harnack would read 190, which brings us roughly to the death of Maximilla (385 for 379). But *ἑκατον* for *διακόσια* is a big change. It is more likely that Epiphanius is calculating from the date he had himself given. 19th of Pius=156, as he did not know that of Maximilla's death; his "more or less" corresponds to his former "about". So we shall with Zahn adopt Scaliger's conjecture *διακόσια ἐννεακαιδέκα* for *διακόσια ἐνενήκοντα*, which brings us from 156 to 375=219 years. As Apollonius wrote forty years after the sect emerged, his work must be dated about 196.

MONTANISM IN ASIA MINOR.—Montanus was a recent convert when he first began to prophesy in the village of Ardabau in Phrygia. He is said by Jerome to have been previously a priest of Cybele; but this is perhaps a later invention intended to connect his ecstasies with the dervish-like behaviour of the priests and devotees of the "great goddess". The same prophetic gift was believed to have descended also upon his two companions, the prophetesses Maximilla and Prisca or Priscilla. Their headquarters were in the village of Pepuza. The anonymous opponent of the sect describes the method of prophecy (Eusebius, V, xvii, 2–3): first the prophet appears distraught with terror (*ἐν παρεκστάσει*), then follows quiet (*ἄδεια καὶ ἀφοβία*, fearlessness); beginning by studied vacancy of thought or passivity of intellect (*ἀκούσιος ἀμαθία*), he is seized by an uncontrollable madness (*ἀκούσιος μανία ψύχης*). The prophets did not speak as messengers of God: "Thus saith the Lord," but described themselves as possessed by God and spoke in His Person. "I am the Father, the Word, and the Paraclete," said Montanus (Didymus, "De Trin.", III, xli); and again: "I am the Lord God omnipotent, who have descended into a man", and "neither an angel, nor an ambassador, but I, the Lord, the Father, am come" (Epiphanius, "Hær.", xlviii, 11). And Maximilla said: "Hear not me, but hear Christ" (ibid.); and: "I am driven off from among the sheep like a wolf [that is, a false prophet—cf. Matt., vii, 15]; I am not a wolf, but I am speech, and spirit, and power." This possession by a spirit, which spoke while the prophet was incapable of resisting, is described by the spirit of Montanus: "Behold the man is like a lyre, and I dart like the plectrum. The man sleeps, and I am awake" (Epiphanius, "Hær.", xlviii, 4).

We hear of no false doctrines at first. The Paraclete ordered a few fasts and abstinences; the latter were strict *xerophagiæ*, but only for two weeks in the year, and even then the Saturdays and Sundays did not count (Tertullian, "De jej.", xv). Not only was virginity strongly recommended (as always by the Church), but second marriages were disapproved. Chastity was declared by Priscilla to be a preparation for ecstasy: "The holy [chaste] minister knows how to minister holiness. For those who purify their hearts [reading *purificantes enim corda*, by conjecture for *purificantia enim concordal*] both see visions, and placing their head downwards (!) also hear manifest voices, as saving as they are secret" (Tertullian, "Exhort." X, in one MS.). It was rumoured, however, that Priscilla had been married, and had left her hus-

band. Martyrdom was valued so highly that flight from persecution was disapproved, and so was the buying off of punishment. "You are made an outlaw?" said Montanus, "it is good for you. For he who is not outlawed among men is outlawed in the Lord. Be not confounded. It is justice which hales you in public. Why are you confounded, when you are sowing praise? Power comes, when you are stared at by men." And again: "Do not desire to depart this life in beds, in miscarriages, in soft fevers, but in martyrdoms, that He who suffered for you may be glorified" (Tertullian, "De fuga", ix; cf. "De anima", lv). Tertullian says: "Those who receive the Paraclete, know neither to flee persecution nor to bribe" (De fuga, 14), but he is unable to cite any formal prohibition by Montanus.

So far, the most that can be said of these didactic utterances is that there was a slight tendency to extravagance. The people of Phrygia were accustomed to the orgiastic cult of Cybele. There were doubtless many Christians there. The contemporary accounts of Montanism mention Christians in otherwise unknown villages: Ardabau on the Mysian border, Pepuza, Tymion, as well as in Otrus, Apamea, Cumane, Eumenea. Early Christian inscriptions have been found at Otrus, Hieropolis, Pepuza (of 260), Trajanopolis (of 279), Eumenea (of 249) etc. (see Harnack, "Expansion of Christianity", II, 360). There was a council at Synnada in the third century. The "Acta Theodoti" represent the village of Malus near Ancyra as entirely Christian under Diocletian. Above all we must remember what crowds of Christians were found in Pontus and Bithynia by Pliny in 112, not only in the cities but in country places. No doubt, therefore, there were numerous Christians in the Phrygian villages to be drawn by the astounding phenomena. Crowds came to Pepuza, it seems, and contradiction was provoked. In the very first days Apollinarius, a successor of St. Papias as Bishop of Hierapolis in the southwestern corner of the province, wrote against Montanus. Eusebius knew this letter from its being enclosed by Serapion of Antioch (about 191–212) in a letter addressed by him to the Christians of Caria and Pontus. Apolinarius related that Ælius Publius Julius of Debeltum (now Burgas) in Thrace, swore that "Sotas the blessed who was in Anchialus [on the Thracian coast] had wished to cast out the demon from Priscilla; but the hypocrites would not allow it." Clearly Sotas was dead, and could not speak for himself. The anonymous writer tells us that some thought Montanus to be possessed by an evil spirit, and a troubler of the people; they rebuked him and tried to stop his prophesying; the faithful of Asia assembled in many places, and examining the prophecies declared them profane, and condemned the heresy, so that the disciples were thrust out of the Church and its communion.

It is difficult to say how soon this excommunication took place in Asia. Probably from the beginning some bishops excluded the followers of Montanus, and this severity was growing common before the death of Montanus; but it was hardly a general rule much before the death of Maximilla in 179; condemnation of the prophets themselves, and mere disapproval of their disciples was the first stage. We hear of holy persons, including the bishops Zoticus of Cumana and Julian of Apamea, attempting to exorcize Maximilla at Pepuza, doubtless after the death of Montanus. But Themison prevented them (Eusebius, V, xvi, 17; xviii, 12). This personage was called a confessor but, according to the anonymous writer, he had bought himself off. He published "a catholic epistle, in imitation of the Apostle", in support of his party. Another so-called martyr, called Alexander, was for many years a companion of Maximilla, who, though a prophetess, did not know that it was for robbery, and not "for the Name", that he had been condemned by the proconsul Æmilius Frontinus (date unknown) in Ephesus; in proof of this the public archives of Asia are appealed to. Of another leader, Alcibiades, nothing is known. The prophets are accused of taking gifts under the guise of offerings; Montanus sent out salaried preachers; the prophetesses painted their faces, dyed their eyelids with stibium, wore ornaments and played at dice. But these accusations may be untrue. The great point was the manner of prophesying. It was denounced as contrary to custom and to tradition. A Catholic writer, Miltiades, wrote a book to which the anonymous author refers, "How a prophet ought not to speak in ecstasy". It was urged that the phenomena were those of possession, not those of the Old Testament prophets, or of New Testament prophets like Silas, Agabus, and the daughters of Philip the Deacon; or of prophets recently known in Asia, Quadratus (Bishop of Athens) and Ammia, prophetess of Philadelphia, of whom the Montanist prophets boasted of being successors. To speak in the first person as the Father or the Paraclete appeared blasphemous. The older prophets had spoken "in the Spirit", as mouthpieces of the Spirit, but to have no free will, to be helpless in a state of madness, was not consonant with the text: "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets." Montanus declared: "The Lord hath sent me as the chooser, the revealer, the interpreter of this labour, this promise, and this covenant, being forced, willingly or unwillingly, to learn the gnosis of God." The Montanists appealed to Gen., ii, 21: "The Lord sent an ecstasy [ἔκτασιν] upon Adam"; Ps. cxv, 2: "I said in my ecstasy"; Acts, x, 10: "There came upon him [Peter] an ecstasy"; but these texts proved neither that an ecstasy of excitement was proper to sanctity, nor that it was a right state in which to prophesy.

A better argument was the declaration that the new prophecy was of a higher order than the old, and therefore unlike it. It came to be thought higher than the Apostles, and even beyond the teaching of Christ. Priscilla went to sleep, she said, at Pepuza, and Christ came to her and slept by her side "in the form of a woman, clad in a bright garment, and put wisdom into me, and revealed to me that this place is holy, and that here Jerusalem above comes down". "Mysteries" (sacraments?) were celebrated there publicly. In Epiphanius's time Pepuza was a desert, and the village was gone. Marcellina, surviving the other two, prophesied continual wars after her death—no other prophet, but the end.

It seems on the whole that Montanus had no particular doctrine, and that his prophetesses went further than he did. The extravagances of his sect were after the deaths of all three; but it is difficult to know how far we are to trust our authorities. The anonymous writer admits that he has only an uncertain report for the story that Montanus and Maximilla both hanged themselves, and that Themison was carried into the air by a devil, flung down, and so died. The sect gained much popularity in Asia. It would seem that some Churches were wholly Montanist. The anonymous writer found the Church at Ancyra in 193 greatly disturbed about the new prophecy. Tertullian's lost writing "De Ecstasi", in defence of their trances, is said by Prædestinatus to have been an answer to Pope Soter (Hær., xxvi, lxxxvi), who had condemned or disapproved them; but the authority is not a good one. He has presumably confounded Soter with Sotas, Bishop of Anchialus. In 177 the Churches of Lyons and Vienne sent to the Churches of Asia and Phrygia their celebrated account of the martyrdoms that had been taking place. Eusebius tells us that at the same time they enclosed letters which had been written in prison by the martyrs on the question of the Montanists. They sent the same by Irenæus to Pope Eleutherius. Eusebius says only that they took

a prudent and most orthodox view. It is probable that they disapproved of the prophets, but were not inclined to extreme measures against their followers. It was not denied that the Montanists could count many martyrs; it was replied to their boast, that all the heretics had many, and especially the Marcionites, but that true martyrs like Gaius and Alexander of Eumenea had refused to communicate with fellow-martyrs who had approved the new prophecy (Anon. in Eusebius, V, xvi, 27). The acts of Carpus, Papylus, and Agathonice (the last of these threw herself into the fire), martyrs of Thyatira under Marcus Aurelius (about 161–9), may exhibit an influence of Montanism on the martyrs.

MONTANISM IN THE WEST.—A second-century pope (more probably Eleutherius than Victor) was inclined to approve the new prophecies, according to Tertullian, but was dissuaded by Praxeas (q. v.). Their defender in Rome was Proclus or Proculus, much reverenced by Tertullian. A disputation was held by Gaius against him in the presence of Pope Zephyrinus (about 202–3, it would seem). As Gaius supported the side of the Church, Eusebius calls him a Churchman (II, xxv, 6), and is delighted to find in the minutes of the discussion that Gaius rejected the Johannine authorship of the Apocalypse, and attributed it to Cerinthus. But Gaius was the worse of the two, for we know from the commentary on the Apocalypse by Bar Salibi, a Syriac writer of the twelfth century (see Theodore H. Robinson in "Expositor", VII, sixth series, June, 1906), that he rejected the Gospel and Epistles of St. John as well, and attributed them all to Cerinthus. It was against Gaius that Hippolytus wrote his "Heads against Gaius" and also his "Defence of the Gospel and the Apocalypse of John" (unless these are two names for the same work). St. Epiphanius used these works for his fifty-first heresy (cf. Philastrius, "Hær.", lx), and as the heresy had no name he invented that of Ἄλογοι, meaning at once "the unreasoning" and "those who reject the Λόγος". We gather that Gaius was led to reject the Gospel out of opposition to Proclus, who taught (Pseudo-Tertullian, "De Præsc.", lii) that "the Holy Ghost was in the Apostles, but the Paraclete was not, and that the Paraclete published through Montanus more than Christ revealed in the Gospel, and not only more, but also better and greater things"; thus the promise of the Paraclete (John, xiv, 16) was not to the Apostles but to the next age. St. Irenæus refers to Gaius without naming him (III, xi, 9): "Others, in order that they may frustrate the gift of the Spirit, which in the last days has been poured upon the human race according to the good pleasure of the Father, do not admit that form [the lion] which corresponds with the Gospel of John in which the Lord promised to send the Paraclete; but they reject the Gospel and with it the prophetic Spirit. Unhappy, indeed, in that, wishing to have no false prophets [reading with Zahn *pseudoprophetas esse nolunt* for *pseudoprophetæ esse volunt*], they drive away the grace of prophecy from the Church; resembling persons who, to avoid those who come in hypocrisy, withdraw from communion even with brethren." The old notion that the Alogi were an Asiatic sect (see ALOGI) is no longer tenable; they were the Roman Gaius and his followers, if he had any. But Gaius evidently did not venture to reject the Gospel in his dispute before Zephyrinus, the account of which was known to Dionysius of Alexandria as well as to Eusebius (cf. Eusebius, III, xx, 1, 4). It is to be noted that Gaius is a witness to the sojourn of St. John in Asia, since he considers the Johannine writings to be forgeries, attributed by their author Cerinthus to St. John; hence he thinks St. John is represented by Cerinthus as the ruler of the Asiatic Churches. Another Montanist (about 200), who seems to have separated from Proclus, was Æschines, who taught that "the Father is the Son", and is counted as a Monarchian of the type of Noetus or Sabellius.

But Tertullian (q. v.) is the most famous of the Montanists. He was born about 150–5, and became a Christian about 190–5. His excessive nature led him to adopt the Montanist teaching as soon as he knew it (about 202–3). His writings from this date onwards grow more and more bitter against the Catholic Church, from which he definitively broke away about 207. He died about 223, or not much later. His first Montanist work was a defence of the new prophecy in six books, "De Ecstasi", written probably in Greek; he added a seventh book in reply to Apollonius. The work is lost, but a sentence preserved by Prædestinatus (xxvi) is important: "In this alone we differ, in that we do not receive second marriage, and that we do not refuse the prophecy of Montanus concerning the future judgment." In fact Tertullian holds as an absolute law the recommendations of Montanus to eschew second marriages and flight from persecution. He denies the possibility of forgiveness of sins by the Church; he insists upon the newly ordained fasts and abstinences. Catholics are the *Psychici* as opposed to the "spiritual" followers of the Paraclete; the Catholic Church consists of gluttons and adulterers, who hate to fast and love to remarry. Tertullian evidently exaggerated those parts of the Montanist teaching which appealed to himself, caring little for the rest. He has no idea of making a pilgrimage to Pepuza, but he speaks of joining in spirit with the celebration of the Montanist feasts in Asia Minor. The Acts of Sts. Perpetua and Felicitas are by some thought to reflect a period at Carthage when the Montanist teaching was arousing interest and sympathy, but had not yet formed a schism.

The following of Tertullian cannot have been large; but a Tertullianist sect survived him and its remnants were reconciled to the Church by St. Augustine (Hær., lxxxvi). About 392–4 an African lady, Octaviana, wife of Hesperius, a favourite of the Duke Arbogastes and the usurper Maximus, brought to Rome a Tertullianist priest who raved as if possessed. He obtained the use of the church of Sts. Processus and Martinianus on the Via Aurelia, but was turned out by Theodosius, and he and Octaviana were heard of no more. Epiphanius distinguished a sect of Montanists as Pepuzians or Quintillians (he calls Priscilla also Quintilla). He says they had some foolish sayings which gave thanks to Eve for eating of the tree of knowledge. They used to sleep at Pepuza in order to see Christ as Priscilla had done. Often in their church seven virgins would enter with lamps, dressed in white, to prophesy to the people, whom by their excited action they would move to tears; this reminds us of some modern missions rather than of the Irvingite "speaking with tongues", with which the Montanist ecstasies have often been compared. These heretics were said to have women for their bishops and priests, in honour of Eve. They were called "Artotyrites", because their sacrament was of bread and cheese. Prædestinatus says the Pepuzians did not really differ from other Montanists, but despised all who did not actually dwell at the "new Jerusalem". There is a well-known story that the Montanists (or at least the Pepuzians) on a certain feast took a baby child whom they stuck all over with brazen pins. They used the blood to make cakes for sacrifice. If the child died it was looked upon as a martyr; if it lived, as a high-priest. This story was no doubt a pure invention, and was especially denied in the "De Ecstasi" of Tertullian. An absurd nickname for the sect was *Tascodrugitæ*, from Phrygian words meaning peg and nose, because they were said to put their forefinger up their nose when praying "in order to appear dejected and pious" (Epiphanius, Hær., xlviii, 14).

It is interesting to take St. Jerome's account, written in 384, of the doctrines of Montanism as he be-

lieved them to be in his own time (Ep., xli). He describes them as Sabellians in their idea of the Trinity, as forbidding second marriage, as observing three Lents "as though three Saviours had suffered". Above bishops they have "Cenones" (probably not κοινωνοί, but a Phrygian word) and patriarchs above these at Pepuza. They close the door of the Church to almost every sin. They say that God, not being able to save the world by Moses and the Prophets, took flesh of the Virgin Mary, and in Christ, His Son, preached and died for us. And because He could not accomplish the salvation of the world by this second method, the Holy Spirit descended upon Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla, giving them the plenitude which St. Paul had not (I Cor., xiii, 9). St. Jerome refuses to believe the story of the blood of a baby; but his account is already exaggerated beyond what the Montanists would have admitted that they held. Origen ("Ep. ad Titum" in "Pamph. Apol.", I fin.) is uncertain whether they are schismatics or heretics. St. Basil is amazed that Dionysius of Alexandria admitted their baptism to be valid (Ep., clxxxii). According to Philastrius (Hær., xlix) they baptized the dead. Sozomen (xviii) tells us that they observed Easter on 6 April or on the following Sunday. Germanus of Constantinople (P. G., XCVIII, 44) says they taught eight heavens and eight degrees of damnation. The Christian emperors from Constantine onwards made laws against them, which were scarcely put into execution in Phrygia (Sozomen, II, xxxii). But gradually they became a small and secret sect. The bones of Montanus were dug up in 861. The numerous Montanist writings (βίβλοι ἄπειροι, "Philosophumena", VIII, xix) are all lost. It seems that a certain Asterius Urbanus made a collection of the prophecies (Euseb., V, xvi, 17).

A theory of the origin of Montanism, originated by Ritschl, has been followed by Harnack, Bonwetsch, and other German critics. The secularizing in the second century of the Church by her very success and the disappearance of the primitive "Enthusiasmus" made a difficulty for "those believers of the old school who protested in the name of the Gospel against this secular Church, and who wished to gather together a people prepared for their God regardless alike of numbers and circumstances". Some of these "joined an enthusiastic movement which had originated amongst a small circle in a remote province, and had at first a merely local importance. Then, in Phrygia, the cry for a strict Christian life was reinforced by the belief in a new and final outpouring of the Spirit. . . . The wish was, as usual, father to the thought; and thus societies of 'spiritual' Christians were formed, which served, especially in times of persecution, as rallying points for all those, far and near, who sighed for the end of the world and the *excessus e sæculo*, and who wished in these last days to lead a holy life. These zealots hailed the appearance of the Paraclete in Phrygia, and surrendered themselves to his guidance" (Harnack in "Encycl. Brit.", London, 1878, s. v. Montanism). This ingenious theory has its basis only in the imagination, nor have any facts ever been advanced in its favour.

TILLEMONT, *Mémoires*, II; SCHWEGLER, *Der Montanismus* (Tübingen, 1841); RITSCHL, *Entstehung der Altkatholischenkirche* (2nd ed., Bonn, 1857); BONWETSCH, *Gesch. des Montanismus* (Erlangen, 1881); IDEM, *Die Prophetie im apost. u. nachapost. Zeitalter* in *Zeitschr. für kirchl. Wissenschaft u. Leben* (1884), 460; IDEM in *Realencyclop. für prot. Theol.* (1903), s. v. *Montanismus;* WEIZSÄCKER in *Theol. litt. Zeitung* (1882), 74; SALMON in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, s. v. *Montanus;* DE SOYRES, *Montanism and the primitive Church* (London, 1878); CUNNINGHAM, *The Churches of Asia* (London, 1880); VÖLTER, *Der Ursprungsjahr des Mont.* in *Zeitschr. für wiss. Theol.*, XXVII, 23; HARNACK in *Encycl. Britannica* (9th ed., 1878), s. v. *Montanism;* IDEM, *Gesch. der altchr. Litt.*, I, 114; II, 363; ZAHN, *Gesch. des N. T. Kanons*, I, iv (Erlangen, 1888); IDEM, *Forschungen*, V, 3–57: *Die Chronologie des Mont.* (Erlangen, 1893); VOIGT, *Eine verschollene Urkunde des antimont. Kampfes* (Leipzig, 1891); FRIEDRICH, *Ueber die Cenones der M. bei Hieronymus* in *Sitzungsber. Akad. München* (1895), 207; A. H., *Die Cenonen der Mont.* in *Zeitschr. für wiss. Theol.*, III (1895), 480; FUNK in *Kirchenlex.* (1893), s. v. *Montanismus;* JULICHER, *Ein gall. Bischofschreiben des 6. Jahrh. als Zeuge für die Verfassung der Montanistenkirche* in *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, XVI (1896), 664; WEINEL, *Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister im nachapost. Zeitalter bis auf Irenäus* (Freiburg, 1899); SELWYN, *The Christian prophets and the prophetic Apocalypse* (London, 1900); ERMONI, *La crise montaniste* in *Revue des questions hist.*, LXXII (1902), 61; TIXÉRONT, *Hist. des dogmes*, I, 210; BATIFFOL, *L'église naissante* (3rd ed., 1909), 261; DUCHESNE, *Hist. ancienne de l'Eglise*, I, 270.

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Montauban, DIOCESE OF (MONTIS ALBANI), suffragan of Toulouse, comprises the entire department of Tarn and Garonne. Suppressed in 1802 and divided between the three neighbouring dioceses of Toulouse, Agen, and Cahors, Montauban was re-established by imperial decree of 1809, but this measure was not approved by the Holy See. Re-established by the concordat of 1817, it was filled only in 1824.

In 820 the Benedictine monks had founded the Abbey of Montauriol under the patronage of St. Martin; subsequently it adopted the name of its abbot St. Theodard, Archbishop of Narbonne, who died at the abbey in 893. The Count of Toulouse, Alphonse Jourdan, took from the abbey in 1144 its lands on the heights overlooking the right bank of the Tarn, and founded there the city of Montauban; a certain number of inhabitants of Montauriol and serfs of the abbey formed the nucleus of the population. The monks protested, and in 1149 a satisfactory agreement was concluded. Notwithstanding the sufferings of Montauban during the Albigensian wars, it grew rapidly. John XXII, by the Bull "Salvator" (25 June, 1317), separated from the ecclesiastical province of Narbonne, the See of Toulouse, made it an archiepiscopal see, and gave it as suffragans four dioceses created within its territory: Montauban, St.-Papoul, Rieux, Lombez. Bertrand de Puy, abbot at Montauriol, was first Bishop of Montauban. Montauban counts among its bishops: Cardinal Georges d'Amboise (1484–1491), minister of Louis XII, and Jean de Lettes (1539–1556), who married and became a Protestant. Despite the resistance of Jacques des Prés-Montpezat (1556–1589), a nephew of Jean de Lettes who succeeded him as bishop, the Calvinists became masters of the city; in 1561 they interdicted Catholic worship; the destruction of the churches, and even of the cathedral, was begun and carried on until 1567. In 1570 Montauban became one of the four strongholds granted the Protestants and in 1578, 1579, and 1584 harboured the synods held by the députés of the Reformed Churches of France. For a short time, in 1600, Catholic worship was re-established but was soon suppressed; Bishop Anne Carrion de Murviel (1600–1652) withdrew to Montech during the greater part of his reign and administered thence the Church of Montauban. In spite of the unsuccessful siege of Montauban by Louis XIII (August–November, 1621), the fall of La Rochelle (1629) entailed the submission of the city, and Richelieu entered it on 20 August, 1629. Other bishops of note were: Le Tonnellier de Breteuil (1762–1794), who died during the Reign of Terror in the prison of Rouen, after converting the philosopher La Harpe to Catholicism; the future Cardinal de Cheverus (q. v.), 1824–26.

The Church of Moissac, whose portal built in 1107 is a veritable museum of Romanesque sculpture, deserves notice; its cloister (1100–1108) is one of the most remarkable in France. Legend attributes to Clovis the foundation of the Abbey of Moissac in 506, but St. Amand (594–675) seems to have been the first abbot. The abbey grew, and in a few years its possessions extended to the gates of Toulouse. The threats and incursions of the Saracens, Hungarians, and Northmen brought the monks of Moissac to elect "knight abbots" who were laymen, and whose mission was to defend them. From the tenth to the thirteenth century several of the counts of Toulouse were knight-

abbots of Moissac; the death of Alfonso II (1271) made the King of France the legitimate successor of the counts of Toulouse, and in this way the abbey came to depend directly on the kings of France, henceforth its "knight-abbots". Some of the abbots were saints: St. Ausbert (663–678); St. Léotadius (678–691); St. Paternus (691–718); St. Amarandus (718–720). The union of Moissac with Cluny was begun by Abbot Stephen as early as 1047, and completed in 1063 under Abbot Durand. Four filial abbeys and numerous priories depended on the Abbey of Moissac. Among the commendatory abbots were Louis of Lorraine, Cardinal de Guise (1556–1578); Charles of Lorraine, the Cardinal de Vaudemont (1578–1590). In 1618 Moissac was transformed into a collegiate church which had, among other titulars, Cardinal Mazarin (1644–1661), and Cardinal de Loménie de Brienne, minister of Louis XVI (1775–1788). On 25 July, 1523, fifteen inhabitants of Moissac, after they had made a pilgrimage to Compostella, grouped themselves into a confraternity "à l'honneur de Dieu, de Notre Dame et Monseigneur Saint Jacques". This confraternity, reorganized in 1615 by letters patent of Louis XIII, existed for many years. As late as 1830 "pilgrims" were still seen in the Moissac processions. In fact Moissac and Spain were long closely united; a monk of Moissac, St. Gérault, was Archbishop of Braga from 1095 to 1109. The general synod of the Reformers held at Montpellier, in May, 1598, decided on the creation of an academy at Montauban; it was opened in 1600, was exclusively Protestant, and gathered students from other countries of Europe. In 1632 the Jesuits established themselves at Montauban, but in 1659 transferred the Academy to Puylaurens. In 1808 a faculty of Protestant theology was created at Montauban and still exists.

The principal pilgrimages of the diocese are: Notre Dame de Livron or de la Déliverance, visited by Blanche of Castille and Louis XIII; Notre Dame de Lorm, at Castelferrus, dating from the fifteenth century; Notre Dame de la Peyrouse, near Lafrançaise. Before the application of the law of 1901 as to associations, the diocese counted Jesuits, Redemptorists, Marianists, and various orders of School Brothers. Among the congregations of women which originated in the diocese we mention: Sisters of Mercy, hospitallers and teachers, founded in 1804 (mother-house at Moissac); Sisters of the Guardian Angel, hospitallers and teachers, founded in 1839 at Quillan in the Diocese of Carcassonne by Père Deshayes, Superior of the Daughters of Wisdom, whose mother-house was transferred to the château of La Molle, near Montauban in 1858. At the beginning of the twentieth century the religious congregations had charge of: 1 crèche, 24 day nurseries, 10 girls' orphanages, 1 refuge (*œuvre de réhabilitation*), 2 houses for the relief of the poor, 11 hospitals or asylums, 30 houses for the care of the sick in their own homes. In 1908 the Diocese of Montauban counted 188,563 inhabitants, of whom 7000 were Protestants; 31 parishes; 296 succursal parishes; 58 vicariates.

Gallia Christiana, XIII (*nova*, 1785), 226–260, *instrumenta*, 181–224; Daux, *Rectifications et additions au tome XIII^e du Gallia Christiana (diocèse de Montauban)* in *Bulletin de la Société archéologique de Tarn et Garonne*, IV (1876), 105–112; Idem, *Histoire de l'église de Montauban* (2 vols., Montauban, 1879–1886); Rupin, *Les Cloîtres et l'Abbaye de Moissac* (Paris, 1897); Daux, *Le pèlerinage à Compostelle et la confrérie des pèlerins de Monseigneur Saint Jacques de Moissac* (Paris, 1898).

Georges Goyau.

Montault, Xavier Barbier de, b. at Loudun, 6 February, 1830; d. at Blaslay, Vienne (France), 29 March, 1901. He came of a noble and large family, and, when only eight years old, was confided to the care of his great-uncle, Mgr Montault des Isles, Bishop of Angers. He studied theology at the Seminary of St. Sulpice, and went to Rome to continue his studies in theology and archæology at the Sapienza and the Roman College. After four years his health obliged him to return to France (1857), where he was appointed historiographer of the Diocese of Angers. He searched the archives of the diocese with great diligence, studied its inscriptions and monuments, and founded a diocesan museum, a project in which de Caumont took a lively interest. Another sojourn of fourteen years in Rome (1861–75) enabled him to augment his already extensive knowledge of liturgy and Christian antiquities. Meanwhile he was of great service to different French bishops as canonical consultor, and at the Vatican Council acted as theologian to Mgr Desflèches, Bishop of Angers. His first archæological study appeared in 1851 in the "Annales archéologiques", and Didron assigned him the task of making an index for this publication. Mgr Barbier de Montault was one of the most prolific contributors to the "Revue de l'art chrétien" from the inception of this periodical, his articles continuing to appear until 1903 (two years after his death). He also wrote numerous articles for other reviews as well as several separate works on iconography, ecclesiastical furniture, liturgy, canon law, etc. In 1889 he began to reprint his scattered works, classifying them according to subjects. This publication was to comprise sixty volumes, but went no further than the sixteenth, and is to be recommended more for its erudition than for its critical value. Works: "Œuvres complètes" (unfinished): I. "Inventaires ecclésiastiques"; II. "Le Vatican"; III. "Le Pape"; IV–V. "Droit papal"; VI–VIII. "Dévotions populaires"; IX–XVI. "Hagiographie" (Rome, 1889–1902); "Traité d'iconographie chrétienne" (2 vols., Paris, 1890); "Collection des décrets authentiques des ss. congrégations romaines" (8 vols., Rome, 1872).

Helbig, *Mgr Xavier Barbier de Montault* in *Revue de l'art chrétien*, (1901), 357–60; Giron, *Mgr X. B. de Montault, bio-bibl.*, Hommes (1910).

R. Maere.

Montboissier, Peter of (better known as Peter the Venerable), Blessed, born in Auvergne, about 1092; died at Cluny, 25 December, 1156. His mother, Blessed Raingarde, offered him to God in the monastery of Sauxillanges of the Congregation of Cluny, where he made his profession at the age of seventeen. He was only twenty years old when he was appointed professor and prior of the monastery of Vèzelay, and he discharged his duties in that house, and later in the monastery of Domène, with such success that at the age of thirty he was elected general of the order. The order, which then counted not less than 2000 houses throughout Europe, was in need of reform. The abbot had begun this work when his predecessor, the Abbot Pontius, who had been deposed by the pope, attempted to be reinstated in his office by violence. Our saint had to face other attacks made on his order by St. Bernard himself, who did not fail however to acknowledge the eminent virtue of Peter and was the first to call him Venerable. Peter resisted the attacks with both firmness and meekness, and took occasion of them to write the rules of the Congregation of Cluny, one of the most complete and perfect codes of religious life. He was prominent in resisting the schism caused by the Antipope Anacletus II, after the death of Honorius II (1130). With St. Bernard, he was the soul and the light of the General Council of Pisa (1134), and having encouraged Innocent II to stand firm in the midst of persecutions, he predicted the end of the schism, which happened in 1138.

During a visit to Spain (1139) he became interested in Mohammedanism and had the Koran for the first time translated into Latin. He made several journeys to Rome, where the popes entrusted him with delicate missions, and he accompanied Eugene III to the Council of Reims (1147), where the doctrines of Gilbert de la Porée were condemned. Kings and emperors came to him for advice and in the midst of his

labours he found time to write numerous letters, valuable theological works on the questions of the day, the Divinity of Christ, the Real Presence, against the Jews and the Mohammedans, and concerning the statutes and the privileges of his order, besides sermons and even verses. Theologians praise the precision of his teaching. When Abelard's doctrine had been condemned at Soissons, Peter opened his monastery to him, reconciled him with St. Bernard and with the pope, and had the joy of seeing him spend the rest of his life under his guidance. He died on Christmas Day, according to his wish, "after a sublime sermon to his brethren on the mystery of the day". Honoured as a saint both by the people and his order, he was never canonized; Pius IX confirmed the cult offered to him (1862).

Petri Venerabilis opera in *P. L.*, CLXXXIX; RODULPHUS, *Vita Petri Venerabilis* in *P. L.*, CLXXXIX, 5–27; MARIE AND DUCHESNE, *Bibliotheca Cluniacensis*, 589–618; MARTÈNE, *Amplissima Collectio*, VI, 1187–1202; *Gallia Christiana*, IV, 1137–1140; PIGNOT, *Histoire de l'ordre de Cluny*, III, 49–509; DEMIMUID, *Pierre le Vénérable et la vie monastique au XII^me siècle* (Paris, 1895).

A. FOURNET.

Montcalm-Gozon, LOUIS-JOSEPH, MARQUIS DE, a French general, b. 28 Feb., 1712, at Candiac, of Louis-Daniel and Marie-Thérèse de Lauris; d. at Quebec 14 Sept., 1759. He was descended from Gozon, Grand Master of Rhodes of legendary fame. The warlike spirit of his ancestors had given rise to the saying: "War is the tomb of the Montcalms." Though less clever than a younger brother, a prodigy of learning at seven, Louis-Joseph was a classical scholar. A soldier at fifteen, he spent his leisures in camp reading Greek and German. He served successively at the sieges of Kehl and Philipsbourg, and became a knight of St. Louis (1741) after a campaign in Bohemia, and was appointed colonel of the Auxerrois regiment (1743). He received five wounds at the battle of Piacenza. In 1736 he had married Angélique-Louise Talon de Boulay, grand-niece of the famous intendant of that name. Of this union were born ten children. In 1755 he succeeded the ill-fated Dieskau, in the command of the French army in Canada, under governor Vaudreuil. The dissonance of character between the two chiefs was to cause much friction during this trying period. Unlike his superior, Montcalm was quick in conception, fearless, generous and impulsive, self-reliant and decisive in action. Intendant Bigot's unscrupulous dishonesty, the apathy of the French court for the "few arpents of snow", an impoverished colony, an ill-fed, ill-clad and badly provided army, all this enhances Montcalm's heroic courage and faithfulness to duty. He was ably seconded by the skilful, prudent and brave chevalier de Lévis. The disproportion in numbers and resources between the belligerent forces rendered more arduous the problem to be solved. Yet it was only after a record of three brilliant victories that he was to end his glorious career on the Plains of Abraham. First in order of time comes the capture of Chouaguen (Oswego), an undertaking wherein all the odds were against the besiegers. Overcoming all diffidence, Montcalm succeeded (14 Aug., 1756), thereby winning the region of Ontario to the domination of France, and with a few badly armed troops taking 1600 prisoners, 5 flags, 100 guns, at the cost of only 30 killed and wounded. Attributing his success to God, he raised a cross with the inscription: "In hoc signo vincunt." In connexion with a later triumph, the capture of Fort William Henry (9 Aug., 1757), Montcalm has been accused of tolerating the massacre by the Indians of the English prisoners. Yet, even Bancroft admits that he exposed himself to death to stop the savages infuriated by the rum given them by the English contrary to his orders. The last and greatest of Montcalm's victories, shared by Lévis and Bourlamaque, was at Carillon (Ticonderoga), a battle which was to result either in the salvation or destruction of New France. Although a first encounter (5 July, 1758) had proved disastrous to the French, the death of the valiant young Lord Howe, the real head of the English troops, deprived Abercromby of his chief support. On the 8th the onslaught of the entire Anglo-American army was rendered impossible by the earthworks and complicated barricade of felled trees protecting Fort Carillon; while a deadly fire decimated the assailants. When the fray was over 2000 English soldiers lay killed or wounded, while the French losses were only 104 killed and 248 wounded; 3800 men had repulsed 15,000. In thanksgiving to the God of Hosts, Montcalm raised a cross with an inscription.

After arresting the invasion by land, Montcalm had to face the attack of the naval forces. During the siege of Quebec by Wolfe, Montcalm with Lévis won a first victory at Montmorency Falls, with a loss of 450 to the English (31 July, 1759). But the final act was drawing nigh, which was to seal the fate of New France. On 13 Sept. the enemy stealthily scaled the Heights of Abraham, and at early morn was ranged in battle. Montcalm, thunderstruck by the unexpected tidings, hurried from Beauport and arrayed his troops. Though about equal in numbers, they were doomed to defeat for several reasons, including surprise, hardship, privation, fatigue, and a disadvantageous position. Both generals fell, Wolfe dying on the battle-field, and Montcalm the next morning. This battle, considered in its results, was one of the greatest events of the eighteenth century. It saved Canada from the French Revolution and heralded the dawn of American Independence. Montcalm was a brave and generous commander, a high-minded and disinterested patriot; a faithful Christian giving to God the glory of his victories. His memory is cherished in the Old and the New World. In Canada he shares the honours awarded to his victor, as the following inscription on their joint monument testifies:—

Mortem virtus
Communem famam historia
Monumentum posteritas dedit.

—a tribute duly anticipated by the French Academy in the last words of the hero's epitaph in the chapel of the Ursuline monastery:—

Galli lugentes deposuerunt et generosæ hostium fidei commendarunt.

(The French mourned and buried him and commended him to the enemies' generosity).

CASGRAIN, *Montcalm et Lévis* (Tours, 1898); DOUGHTY, *The Siege of Quebec and the Battle of the Plains of Abraham* (Quebec, 1901); CHAPAIS, *La prise de Chouaguen* in *La Nouvelle-France* (1909); CANDIDE, *Au pays de Montcalm* in *La Nouvelle-France* (1909).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Monte Cassino, ABBEY OF, an abbey *nullius* situated about eighty miles south of Rome, the cradle of the Benedictine Order. About 529 St. Benedict left Subiaco, to escape the persecutions of the jealous priest, Florentius (see BENEDICT OF NURSIA, SAINT). Accompanied by a chosen band, among them Sts. Maurus and Placid, he journeyed to Monte Cassino, one of the properties made over to him by Tertullus, St. Placid's father. The town of Cassinum (Cassino), lying at the foot of the mountain, had been destroyed by the Goths some thirty-five years earlier, but a temple of Apollo still crowned the summit of the mountain, and the few remaining inhabitants were still sunk in idolatry. Benedict's first act was to break the image of Apollo and destroy the altar, on the site of which he built a church dedicated to St. John the Baptist, and an oratory in honour of St. Martin of Tours. Around the temple there was an enclosing wall with towers at intervals, the *arx* (citadel) of the destroyed city of Cassinum. In one of these towers the saint took up his abode, and to this fact its preservation is due, for, while the rest of the Roman *arx* has been destroyed, this tower has been carefully pre-

served and enclosed in the later buildings. Outside the existing monastery, however, there still remains a considerable part of a far more ancient enclosure, viz. a cyclopean wall some twenty-six feet high and fourteen and a half feet in thickness, which once ran down the mountain side enclosing a large triangular space that contained the Cassinum of pre-Roman times. Once established at Monte Cassino, St. Benedict never left it. There was written the Rule whose influence was to spread over all Western monachism; there he received the visit of Totila in 542, the only date in his life of which we have certain evidence; there he died, and was buried in one tomb with his sister, St. Scholastica. After the saint's death, the abbey continued to flourish until 580, when it was pillaged and burned by the Lombards, the surviving monks fleeing to Rome. Here, welcomed by the pope, Pelagius II, and permitted to establish a monastery beside the Lateran Basilica, they remained for a hundred and thirty years, during which time Monte Cassino seems not to have been entirely deserted, though nothing like a regular community existed there. To this period also is assigned the much discussed translation of St. Benedict's body to Fleury in France, the truth of which it seems almost impossible to doubt. (See FLEURY, ABBEY OF.)

The restoration of Monte Cassino took place in 718, when Abbot Petronax, a native of Brescia, was entrusted with this task by Gregory II. Aided by some of the monks from the Lateran monastery, Petronax restored the buildings at Monte Cassino and built a new church over the tomb of St. Benedict. This was consecrated in 748 by Pope Zachary in person, who at the same time confirmed all the gifts made to the monastery and exempted it from episcopal jurisdiction. The fame of the abbey at this period was great, and, among the monks professed, may be mentioned Carloman, the son of Charles Martel, Rachis, brother of the great Lombard Duke Astolf, and Paul Warnefrid (usually called Paul the Deacon), the historian of the Lombards. Towards the middle of the ninth century the Saracens overran this part of Italy and Monte Cassino did not escape. In 884 Abbot Bertharius and some of his monks were killed, the rest fleeing to Teano. Within two years the restoration of Monte Cassino was begun, but Teano retained the



CHOIR-STALLS, ABBEY CHURCH, MONTE CASSINO

bulk of the community intil 949, when Abbot Aligernus effected the return. The autograph copy of St. Benedict's Rule, which had been preserved till now through all the vicissitudes of the community's existence, perished in a fire during the stay at Teano. The high state of discipline at Monte Cassino about this time is vouched for by St. Nilus, who visited it in the latter half of the tenth century and again by St. Odilo of Cluny some fifty years later. The abbey's reputation reached its zenith, however, during the reign of Abbot Desiderius, who ruled from 1058 until 1087, when he was elected pope under the title of Victor III (q. v.). Under this abbot, the most famous of all the series after St. Benedict himself, the number of monks rose to over two hundred, and the school of copyists and miniature painters became famous throughout the West. The buildings of the monastery were reconstructed on a scale of great magnificence, artists

CLOISTER OF THE STATUES AND FAÇADE OF THE ABBEY CHURCH, MONTE CASSINO

being brought from Amalfi, Lombardy, and even Constantinople to supervise the various works. The abbey church, rebuilt and decorated with the utmost splendour, was consecrated in 1071 by Pope Alexander II, who was assisted by ten archbishops, forty-four bishops, and so vast a crowd of princes, abbots, monks, etc. that, the enthusiastic chronicler declares, "it would have been easier to number the stars of heaven than to count so great a multitude." A detailed account of the abbey at this date exists in the "Chronica monasterii Cassinensis" of Leo of Ostia (see Pertz, "Mon. Germ. Hist. Scriptores", VII).

From this date a decline set in. The unsettled condition of Italy and the great strategical value of Monte Cassino involved the abbey in the constant political struggles of the period. In 1239 the monks were driven out of their cloister by Frederick II, but returned thither under Charles of Anjou. In 1294 Celestine V endeavoured to unite Monte Cassino to his new order of Celestines (q. v.), but this scheme collapsed on his abdication of the papacy. In 1321 John XXII made the church of Monte Cassino a cathedral, the abbot becoming bishop of the newly constituted diocese, and his monks the chapter. There is no doubt that this was done with the best of intentions, as an additional honour to the great abbey; in practice, however, it proved disastrous. The bishops of Monte Cassino, nominated at Avignon, were secular prelates who never visited the diocese, but who appropriated the income of the abbey to their personal use. The number of monks thus dwindled, the observance declined, and utter ruin became a mere question of time. In view of this danger Urban V, who was a Benedictine monk, proclaimed himself Abbot of Monte Cassino, collected monks from other houses to reinforce the community, and in 1370 appointed Andrew of Faenza, a Camaldolese, as superior. The revival, however, was short-lived; in 1454 the system of commendatory abbots was reintroduced and lasted until 1504, when Julius II united Monte Cassino to the recently established Congregation of St. Justina of Padua (see BENEDICTINES), which was thenceforth known as the Cassinese Congregation. In 1799 the abbey was taken and plundered by the French troops who had invaded the Kingdom of Naples, and in 1866 the monastery was suppressed in common with all other Italian religious houses. At

the present day Monte Cassino is the property of the Italian Government, which has declared it a national monument; the abbot, however, is recognized as Guardian in view of his administration of the diocese. The reigning abbot is Dom Gregorio Diamare (elected 1909); the community (1909) consists of thirty-seven choir monks and thirty lay brothers. The vast buildings contain, besides the monastery, a lay school with 126 boarders and two seminaries, one open to all and the other reserved for the Diocese of Monte Cassino with 76 and 50 pupils respectively. In the management of these institutions the monks are assisted by a number of secular priests.

The present buildings form a vast rectangular pile externally more massive than beautiful. The ancient tower of St. Benedict, now a series of chapels elaborately decorated by monastic artists of the Beuron school, is the only portion dating back to the foundation of the abbey. The entrance gate leads to three square court-yards opening out of one another with arcades in the Doric order. These date from 1515 and are attributed, on somewhat slight evidence, to Bramante. From the middle court-yard an immense flight of steps leads to the atrium or forecourt of the basilica. This quadrangle has an arcade supported by ancient columns taken from the basilica of Abbot Desiderius, and probably once in the destroyed temple of Apollo on the site of which the present church stands. The existing church, the fourth to occupy the site, is from the designs of Cosimo Fansaga. It was begun in 1649, and was consecrated in 1727 by Benedict XIII. In richness of marbles, the interior is said to be surpassed only by the Certosa at Pavia, and the first impression is certainly one of astonishing magnificence. On closer inspection, however, the style is found to be somewhat decadent, especially in the plasterwork of the ceiling, while the enormous profusion of inlaid marble and gilding produces a slightly restless effect. Still it is undoubtedly the finest example of Florentine mosaic work in Europe, and the general colour scheme is excellent. The church is cruciform in plan, with a dome at the crossing, beneath which is the high altar. Behind this altar is the choir with its elaborately carved stalls. The tomb of St. Benedict is in a crypt chapel beneath the eastern portion of the church, but it is extremely doubtful whether any relics of the saint now remain there. This chapel has recently been decorated with mosaics from designs by artists of the Beuron school, the severity of which contrasts markedly with the slightly Rococo paintings by Luca Giordano in the church above. The sacristy contains the ancient pavement of *opus alexandrinum*, which was formerly in the basilica of Abbot Desiderius. In the left transept is the monument of Pietro di Medici, son of Lorenzo the Magnificent, and brother of Leo X. This tomb, which is by the great architect Antonio di Sangallo, is unquestionably the most beautiful and dignified work in the whole building. The great west door, a bronze piece of the twelfth century, is engraved with the names of all the parishes in the Diocese of Monte Cassino. The kitchens are approached from the ground-floor by a long covered passage on an inclined plane, large enough for two mules laden with provisions to pass. This curious structure dates from the twelfth century and is lit by an exquisite marble window of four arches in the style known as Cosmatesque. The buildings as a whole produce an effect of great dignity and magnificence, all the more unexpected from the inaccessible position of the monastery and the extreme severity of the exterior. The view from the "Loggia del Paradiso" or forecourt, is one of the most famous in Southern Italy.

The archives (*archivium*), besides a vast number of documents relating to the history of the abbey, contains some 1400 manuscript codices chiefly patristic and historical, many of which are of the greatest value. The library contains a fine collection of modern texts and *apparatus criticus*, which is always most courteously put at the disposal of scholars who come to work on the manuscripts. When the abbey was declared a national monument, orders were given to transport the whole collection of manuscripts to the National Library at Naples; but, owing to the personal intercession of Mr. Gladstone, then Prime Minister of England, the order was reversed, and instead one of the community was appointed as Archivist with a salary from the Government, an arrangement which still continues.

The Diocese of Monte Cassino includes most of the Abruzzi, and is one of the most extensive in Italy. It was formed by uniting seven ancient dioceses, a fact which is borne in mind by the interesting custom that, when the abbot sings pontifical High Mass, he uses seven different precious mitres in succession. As ordinary the abbot is directly subject to the Holy See, and the choir monks take rank as the chapter of the diocese, of which the abbatial basilica of Monte Cassino is the cathedral. The conferring of sacred orders, blessing of Holy Oils, and administration of the Sacrament of Confirmation are the only pontifical functions which the abbot does not exercise. The vicar-general is usually one of the conmmunity.

Annales Casinenses in PERTZ, *Mon. Germ. Hist. Script.*, III, VII, XIX; GATTULA, *Hist. abbatiæ Casin.* (4 vols., Venice, 1733); MARGARINUS, *Bullar. Casin.* (2 vols., Venice, 1650); ARMELLINI, *Bibl. Benedictino-Casinensis* (Assisi, 1732); GROSSI, *La Scuola e la bibliografia di Monte Cassino* (Naples, 1820); TOSTI, *Storia della Badia di Monte Cassino* (3 vols., Naples, 1842); VAN DEN NEST, *Naples et le Mont Cassin* (Antwerp, 1850); GUILLAUME, *Description . . . du Mont Cassin* (Monte Cassino, 1874); IDEM, *Mont Cassin et le XIVe centenaire de St. Benoît* (Paris, 1880); BARTOLINI, *L'antico Cassino e il primitivo monastero di S. Benedetto* (Monte Cassino, 1880); CLAUSSE, *Les origines bénédictines* (Paris, 1899); UGHELLI, *Italia Sacra*, II (Venice, 1647), 1027–35; LONGFELLOW in *Atlantic Monthly*, XXXV (1875), 161; BERNARDI, *L'archivio e la bibliotheca di M. C.* (Monte Cassino, 1872); *Dict. des MSS.*, II (Migne, 1853), 923–52; *Spicilegium Casinense* (Monte Cassino, 1893—); PISCICELLI-TAEGGI, *La paleografia artistica di M. C.* (5 vols., Monte Cassino, 1878–83).

G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

Montefeltro, DIOCESE OF (FERETRANA), in the province of Urbino, in the Marches, Central Italy. The earliest mention of it, as Mons Feretri, is in the diplomas by which Charlemagne confirmed the grants of Pepin the Short to the Holy See. Montefeltro was then the seat of counts, who became imperial vicars in 1135, and Counts of Urbino in 1213. Their rule was interrupted from 1322 to 1375, when Ederigo I of Montefeltro amd Urbino lost possession of the city. This prince and his successors made several attempts to recover Montefeltro, from which Cardinal Albornoz (1359) again expelled them in the person of Nolfo. The elder Guido of Montefeltro, a famous Ghibelline captain, finally became a Franciscan, and died in 1298.

The first known bishop of Montefeltro was Agatho (826), whose residence was at San Leo; other bishops were Valentino (1173), who finished the cathedral; Benvenuto (1219), deposed as a partisan of Count Ederigo; Benedetto (1390), a Benedictine monk, rector of Romagna and Duke of Spoleto; the Franciscan Giovanni Seclani (1413), who built the episcopal palace of Calamello; Cardinal Ennio Filonardi (1549); Giovanni Francesco Sarmani (1567), founder of the seminary of Pennabilli, thenceforth residence of the bishops, the episcopal see having been transferred to that town from San Leo, an important fortress of the Pontifical States. Under Bishop Flaminios Dondi (1724) the see was again transferred to San Leo, but later it returned to Pennabilli. This diocese is suffragan of Urbino, and has 120 parishes, 173 secular priests, 30 regulars, 60,350 Catholics, 91 religious houses of men, 9 of women, 2 educational institutes for male students, and 3 for girls.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, III (Venice, 1857).

U. BENIGNI.

Montefiascone, Diocese of (Montis Falisci), in the province of Rome. The city is situated nearly 2000 feet above sea-level, on a tufa mass that overlooks the Lake of Bolsena; it is famous for its wine. The town is of Etruscan origin and was called Faliscodunum. Some believe that it is the ancient Fanum Voltumnæ. For the Faliscans, and later for the popes, it was a most important strategic position; Gregory IX fortified it in 1235 against Frederick II, but the town surrendered to that prince in 1240, and thenceforth never regained its earlier importance. The castle, now in ruins, was restored by Leo X. The cathedral is the work of Sammicheli (1519). Outside the city, on the road to Bolsena, is the famous double basilica of San Flaviano, the lower portion of which dates from 1030, while the upper basilica, dating from 1262, presents the interesting feature of alternating ogive and round arches. There also is the tomb of that famous drinker whom the wine of Montefiascone brought to his death (Est, Est, Est), and who, contrary to report, was neither a canon nor one of the Fugger family of Augsburg. Montefiascone is the birthplace of the poet Giambattista Casti, who died in 1802. This city, originally in the Diocese of Bagnorea, was made an episcopal see in 1369; its first bishop was the French Augustinian Pierre d'Anguiscen (1376), a partizan of the antipope Clement VII. In 1435 the see was united with that of Corneto, and so remained until, in 1854, Corneto became a part of the Diocese of Civitavecchia.

Palace of the Prince, Cetinje, Montenegro

Among its bishops were Alessandro Farnese (1499), later Paul III; the two brothers and cardinals Paolo Emilio Zacchia (1601) and Ludovico Zacchia (1605), both of whom did much for the building of the cathedral; Cardinal Paluzio Albertoni Altieri (1666), founder of the seminary and restorer of the cathedral, which was damaged by a fire in 1670; the learned cardinal M. Antonio Barbarigo (1687), who was transferred later to Padua; he gave great assistance after the earthquake of 1695; Cardinal Pompeo Aldobrandini (1734); the learned Giuseppe Garampi (1776), who gave its library to the seminary, and Cardinal Giovanni Sifredo Manzy (1794); the attitude of this prelate towards Napoleon was not imitated by his clergy, who therefore suffered imprisonment and exile. The diocese is directly dependent on the Holy See; it contains 18 parishes, 74 secular priests, 21 regulars, 26,147 inhabitants, 3 religious houses of men, 14 of women, and 3 convent schools for girls.

Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia* (Venice, 1887); de Angelis, *Commentario storico-critico su l'origine e le vicende di Montefiascone* (Montefiascone, 1841).

U. Benigni.

Montemayor (Montemôr), Jorge de, writer, b. at Montemôr, province of Coimbra, Portugal, about 1520; d. at Turin, 26 February, 1561. Although of Portuguese birth, Montemayor occupies a prominent place in the history of Spanish letters. Little is known of his life. We are informed, however, that he was not a man of university training, being not even acquainted with Latin.

The work which has given him fame is his pastoral novel "La Diana", published, according to common report, at Valencia, in 1542, but thought by others, from allusions in the work itself, to have been published after 1554, probably in 1558 or 1559. This book, which for a long time served as a model for novels of its kind, is written in good Spanish, and in it the author describes certain incidents in his own life, among others an unfortunate love affair. The portions written in verse are not as meritorious as those written in prose. The author promises a sequel which never appeared. Three other "Dianas" appeared, however, which purported to be continuations of Montemayor's. One by Alonzo Perez, a physician of Salamanca, who claimed that Montemayor had entrusted to him his plans for finishing the work, appeared in 1564 and was a failure. The two others, by Gaspar Gil Polo in 1564 and by Jerónimo de Tajada in 1627, were more deserving of praise.

The "Diana" enjoyed great popularity and led to many imitations by famous authors, notably "La Arcadia" of Lope de Vega, and "La Galatea" of Cervantes, and it is said that Shakespeare based his "Two Gentlemen of Verona" upon an episode in "La Diana". It went through many editions both in and out of Spain. There are six French, two German, and one English translation of the book, the latter the work of Bartholomew Young (London, 1598). Montemayor has also left a number of lyric poems, published in 1554 under the title of "Cancionero", and reprinted in 1562, 1572, and 1588. These are also written in Spanish, but are not of any particular merit.

Revue Hispanique (Paris, 1895); Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *A History of Spanish Literature* (New York, 1906); Ticknor, *A History of Spanish Literature* (Boston, 1866).

Ventura Fuentes.

Montenegro, a kingdom in the Balkan Peninsula, on the east coast of the Adriatic Sea; the territory was in ancient times a portion of the Roman province of Dalmatia. Emperor Diocletian made Southern Dalmatia a separate province, Prævalis (Dioclea, Diocletia) with Dioclea as its capital. From the seventh century the north-western portion of the peninsula began to be invaded by Slav tribes; one of these, the Serbs, settled in the territory which they still possess, and founded there several principalities (Zupanate), the most southern of which was called Zeta, or (after the ancient Dioclea) Duklja. From Zeta sprang the Nemanjiden family, under whose autocracy the Servian Empire attained its greatest power (see Servia). Stefan I Nemanja was recognized as Chief Zupan by Emperor Manuel I, in 1165; having reduced into submission the stubborn lesser Zupans, he embraced the Orthodox Faith, and then began to organize the Servian Church. His youngest son, Sawa, or Sabas, after being appointed first Orthodox Archbishop of Servia in 1221, founded a see for Zeta in the monastery of St. Michael near Cattaro. In the Empire of the Serbs, each heir apparent to the throne was first appointed administrator of the Province of Zeta. However, under King Stefan Dušan (1331–55) a member of the Balscicz family was named Governor

of Zeta. From 1360 to 1421 this family ruled in Zeta, notwithstanding the constant opposition of the Cernojević family, settled in Upper Zeta. On the destruction of the Great Servian Empire by the Turks after the battle of Amsfeld in 1389 Zeta became the refuge of the most valiant of the Serbs, who refused to submit to the Turkish yoke.

At the beginning of the fifteenth century, the Venetians established a settlement on the eastern coast of the Adriatic, and conquered a portion of the Servian Empire in spite of the opposition of the people. As vassal of the Venetians, Iwan Cernojewić, the son of Stefan (brother-in-law of Skanderbeg), secured for himself sovereign authority. He founded the monastery of Cetinje about 1478 or 1485. It was during this period that the land received the name of Crnagora, or Montenegro. Under Iwan's son, George (1490—), the first Slav liturgical books were printed at Obod (1493–5). In 1516 he abdicated and the people invested the bishop (vladika), who was also superior of the monastery at Cetinje, with supreme secular authority. Subsequently the bishop, who until 1697 was always chosen by the National Assembly, was both spiritual and temporal ruler of the little state, although he named a secular governor to conduct war and administer justice. The Turks made repeated attacks during the fifteenth century on the freedom of the mountain kingdom. The Montenegrins, notwithstanding their heroic opposition, were finally forced to make their submission, and from about 1530 had to pay tribute to the Sanjak of Scutari. In domestic affairs, however, they remained independent, and the sovereignty of the Porte was mostly of a purely nominal character. Frequently the little nation, which (according to the description of the Italian Mariano Bolizza in 1611) then contained 90 settlements and 8027 armed men, engaged in war with the Turks, being often assisted with money and arms by the Venetians.

National Costumes, Cetinje, Montenegro

In 1696 Danilo Petrović, of the Njegoš family, was elected vladika, and made the episcopal dignity hereditary in his house, the vladika, who as bishop could not marry, being succeeded on his death by his nephew or brother. As prince of a nation recognizing the Orthodox Church, Danilo inaugurated closer relations with Russia, which held the same religious beliefs, and Peter the Great undertook the protectorate of Montenegro in 1710. Since that date the Montenegrins have always shown themselves the faithful allies of Russia in its wars against the Turks, although at the end of these wars they usually reaped no advantages. The Russians, however, often made large contributions of money to their poor allies: in 1714 Peter I contributed 10,000 rubles towards the relief of those whose property had been burnt and for the rebuilding of the destroyed monasteries; in 1715 he assigned an annual contribution of 500 rubles and other presents to the monastery of Cetinje; and in 1837 Emperor Nicholas I assigned to the prince a fixed annual income of 9000 ducats.

The most prosperous era of Montenegro opened with the reign of Vladika Peter I Petrović (1777–1830), who repelled unaided a fierce attack of the Turks in 1796 and rendered valuable aid to the Russians against the French during the Napoleonic wars. Because of his glorious reign, Peter was proclaimed a saint by the people in 1834. He was succeeded by Peter II Petrović (1830–51), who was educated at St. Petersburg; this monarch, who was a distinguished poet, rendered valuable services to his country by raising its intellectual and commercial condition. Having abolished the office of governor, which had been too frequently the occasion of strife, he took into his own hands the secular administration, founded schools, instituted a system of taxation, organized a guard as the nucleus of a standing army, and established a senate of twelve members. His successor and nephew, Danilo (1851–60), changed Montenegro into a secular state, dispensed with episcopal consecration, and undertook the administration as a secular prince. At a national assembly held at Cetinje on 21 March, 1852, the separation of the spiritual and secular powers of the vladika was decreed, and the supreme ecclesiastical authority entrusted to the archimandrite of the monastery of Ostrog. In the same year Russia and Austria recognized Montenegro as an hereditary, secular, and independent state. The Porte, however, which still regarded the country as "a portion of its Rajahs temporarily in revolt", refused its recognition and sent an expedition of 60,000 men against it. When the land seemed about to be overwhelmed by such huge forces, Austria interfered in its behalf, and compelled the Porte to discontinue the war. The political position of the land, however, remained still undefined. In 1858, when the Turks attacked Montenegro without any declaration of hostilities, the European Great Powers, especially France and Russia, came forward as its protectors, and a commission of the Powers fixed the frontiers of the country, whose territory was increased by a few districts.

In 1860 Danilo was shot by a Montenegrin deserter, and, as he left behind only a daughter two years old, his widow secured on 14 August, 1860, the election of the youngest son of Danilo's brother, who still reigns. Montenegro's participation in the insurrection of Herzegovina led in 1862 to a war with Turkey, during which the Turks invaded the land and occupied Cetinje. The Peace of Scutari conceded to the Turks various fortresses along the road leading from Herzegovina through Montenegro to Scutari. In 1870, however, the Porte surrendered its right to occupy these fortresses. In 1875, when the insurrection occurred in Bosnia, Nikita, who controlled an army of 15,000 well-armed troops, formed an alliance with the Bosnians against the Turks, and prosecuted the war with success until 1878. Not only did he repel all the Turkish attacks, but he even succeeded in capturing Antivari (thus securing a long-desired maritime outlet for his country) and Dulcigno in 1878. At the Congress of Berlin Turkey recognized the political independence of Montenegro (13 July, 1878),

the territory of which was now more than doubled. According to Article 29 of the Treaty of Berlin, however, Montenegro might neither keep ships of war, nor fortify the coast, and was obliged to recognize the right of Austria to police the coast. It was only in 1909 that the country secured a release from these conditions. When Austria-Hungary annexed Bosnia and Herzegovina in October, 1908, and thereby annihilated the dreams of Montenegro and Servia of a United Servian Empire, Montenegro protested in common with Servia and, encouraged by Russia, demanded from Austria the annulment of Article 29 of the Treaty of Berlin and the evacuation of Spizza. In April, 1909, Austria agreed to the abrogation of Article 29, but refused to surrender Spizza, and secured the retention of that portion of the Berlin Treaty, which forbade the transformation of Antivari into a naval station. In 1905 Nikita granted the country a constitution and a national assembly elected by popular suffrage. Although the economical resources of the land are small, and its cultural conditions, notwithstanding the great progress made in the last fifty years, leave much to be desired, it occupies a position of increased consideration and importance with regard to the Balkan politics of the European powers on account of the ability of its ruler and its intimate relations with Russia, Italy, and Servia. In 1900 Prince Nikita received the title of Royal Highness, and in August, 1910, with the consent of all the powers he had himself crowned king. On that occasion Russia gave expression to the ancient friendship existing between the countries by naming the new king General Field-Marshal, the heir-apparent Major General, and Prince Mirleo Lieutenant Colonel of the Russian Army.

Montenegro has an area of 3630 sq. miles and a population of 250,000 inhabitants, of whom the great majority are of unmixed Serb stock. About 223,500 belong to the Greek Orthodox Church; 12,900 are Catholics (mostly Albanians), and about 14,000 are Mohammedans. The capital is Cetinje. The earlier plenary power of the prince has not been substantially lessened by the Constitution of 6 (19) December, 1906. The members of the popular assembly (Skupschtina) are elected by public direct suffrage every four years; the assembly includes twelve ex-officio members, among whom are the Orthodox metropolitan, the Catholic Archbishop of Antivari, the Mufti of Montenegro, the president of the Supreme Court of Justice, etc. The state religion is the Greek Orthodox; all other religious bodies recognized by the State are at liberty to practice their religion, but every attempt on their part to gain converts from among the Orthodox is forbidden. The Orthodox Church of Montenegro is autocephalous, i. e., independent of the Patriarch of Constantinople; its spiritual head, who bears the titles of Metropolitan of Skanderia and Parathalassia, Archbishop of Tsetinia, etc., is chosen by the National Assembly from the ranks of the native unmarried secular clergy or monks, and is consecrated by the Russian Holy Synod at St. Petersburg. He resides at the monastery of St. Peter at Cetinje. In 1877 a second see, that of Brda and Ostrog, was erected. The protopresbyterates number 17, and the parishes about 160. The priestly office is as a rule hereditary, since each priest trains his son for the priesthood: the office of protopresbyter is similarly in the possession of certain families.

Since the convention between the Holy See and the Prince of Montenegro of 18 August (ratified 8 October), 1886, the Catholic Church enjoys the official recognition of the State. Its head is the Archbishop of Antivari, who is immediately subject to the Holy See. There are 13 secular priests, 10 regular priests, 27 churches and chapels, and eleven elementary schools. The number of parishes is thirteen, but a law recently passed by the Skupschtina, in contravention of the Convention and without consulting the Roman authorities, reduced the number to seven. The archiepiscopal see is at present (1910) vacant, its administration being carried on by Don Metodio O.S.F. Negotiations concerning the filling of the see and the alteration of the Convention are being carried on between the Holy See and the Montenegrin Government (1910).

The earlier literature will be found in VALENTINELLI, *Bibliografia della Dalmatia e del Montenegro* (Zagabria, 1855; Supplement, 1862). Consult ANDRIĆ, *Gesch. des Fürstentums Montenegro bis 1852* (Vienna, 1853); LENORMANT, *Turcs et Monténégrins* (Paris, 1866); DENTON, *Montenegro, its People and History* (London, 1877); CHIUDINA, *Storia del Montenero da' tempi antichi fino a'nostri* (Spalato, 1882); COQUELLE, *Histoire du Monténégro et de la Bosnie* (Paris, 1895); CAPPELLETI, *Il Montenegro ed i suoi principi* (Livorno, 1896); MACSWINEY DE MASHANAGLASS, *Le Monténégro et la Saint-Siège* (Rome, 1902); ROVINSKY, *Montenegro in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (St. Petersburg, 1905), in Russian; SCHWARZ, *Montenegro* (Leipzig, 1888); HASSERT, *Beiträge zur physischen Geographie von Montenegro* (Gotha, 1895), with bibliography; MARTINI, *Il Montenegro* (Rome, 1897); WYON AND PRANCE, *The Land of the Black Mountain* (London, 1903); PASSARGE, *Dalmatien und Mont.* (Leipzig, 1904); *Montenegro und sein Herrscherhaus* (1906); PAGLIANO. *La constituzione del Mont.* (Rome, 1906); NOLTE, *Essai sur le Mont.* (Paris, 1907).

JOSEPH LINS.

Monte Oliveto Maggiore. See OLIVETANS.

Montepeloso. See GRAVINA AND MONTEPELOSO, DIOCESE OF.

Montepulciano, DIOCESE OF (MONTIS POLITIANI), in the province of Siena, in Tuscany The city is built on the summit of Monte Poliziano. It is the

PALAZZO PUBBLICO, MONTEPULCIANO
XIV Century

ancient Etruscan city of Nocera Alfaterna, which in 308 B. C. made an alliance with Rome against the Samnites. In the Middle Ages it acknowledged the suzerainty of Florence, but was conquered by Siena in 1260. The cathedral was built in 1619, from plans by Scalzo; until the eighteenth century it held the tomb of Bartolomeo Arragazzi, secretary of Martin V, a work of Michelozzo. The church of the Madonna di San Biagio is a notable structure planned by Antonio da Sangallo (1518–37). The façades of the church of

Saint Agostino and of the Oratorio della Misericordia are worthy of mention. Among the civic buildings are notable the Tarugi palace, like the Mercato a work of Pignola; the Contucci palace designed by Sangallo, and the fourteenth-century Palazzo Municipale, which contains a small gallery of Sienese and of Umbrian art. The most famous men of Montepulciano are Cardinal Bellarmine, Pope Marcellus II, Cervini, Angelo Ambrogini, better known as Poliziano (1454–1494), and the humanist Bartolomeo of Montepulciano. St. Agnes of Montepulciano died in 1137.

The city belonged originally to the Diocese of Arezzo, and had a collegiate church, whose archpriest became a mitred abbot in 1400; in 1480 it became a *prælatura nullius*, and in 1561 was made the seat of a bishop. Its first bishop was Spinello Benci (1562); among the others the following are well known: Talento de' Talenti (1640), a great savant; Antonio Cervini (1663), who did much for the cathedral and the episcopal palace; Pietro Francesi (1737) opposed the novelties of the Council of Florence in 1787; Pellegrino Maria Carletti (1802), author of several works and of eighteen letters on the National Council of Paris of 1810, at which he assisted. The diocese is immediately dependent on the Holy See, and has 18 parishes, 15,879 inhabitants, two religious houses of men, and two of women.

Cathedral, Montepulciano

Cappelletti, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XIII (Venice, 1857).

U. Benigni.

Monterey and Los Angeles, Diocese of (Montereyensis et Angelorum), comprises that part of the State of California which lies south of 37° 5′ N. lat. and covers an area of 80,000 square miles. It thus embraces eighteen of the twenty-one Indian missions which made California famous. Originally the whole state with the peninsula of Lower California formed the Diocese of Both Californias whose first bishop was the Rt. Rev. Francisco García Diego y Moreno. On his arrival in Upper California he established his residence at Santa Barbara Mission. On 1 May, 1850, the pope organized the Diocese of Monterey and named Rt. Rev. Joseph Sadoc Alemany, O.P., its first bishop, but Lower California was not withdrawn from his jurisdiction until 21 Dec., 1851. In 1853 the peninsula was placed under the administration of the Metropolitan of Mexico. When on 29 July, 1853, the Archdiocese of San Francisco was erected, the boundaries of the Monterey Diocese were drawn as they exist at present. Archbishop Alemany on 29 July, 1853, was promoted to the See of San Francisco, and on the same date Rt. Rev. Thaddeus Amat, C.M., was appointed Bishop of Monterey. The new bishop resided at Santa Barbara, however, until 9 July, 1859, on which date the pope permitted him to remove his residence to Los Angeles, but with instructions to retain the old title.

Around the former missions and the four military garrisons in the course of time immigrants from almost every part of the world took up their abode and founded cities, but the names of the saints under whose invocation the Indian missions had been established were retained, and thus it is that so many of the towns, rivers, and mountains still bear the names of various saints. The most noted among the early missionaries were the holy and energetic Fr. Junípero Serra, the founder of the missions; Fr. Francisco Palóu, his biographer and the historian of the early missionary period; Fr. Fermin de Lasuen, the wise and firm successor of Fr. Serra; Fr. Luis Jayme, the first martyr; Fr. Juan Crespi, one of the discoverers of San Francisco and Monterey Bays and author of a lengthy description of the expedition; Fr. Buenaventura Sitjar, author of a dictionary of the Telame language (New York, 1861); Fr. Geronimo Boscana, author of "Chinigchinig", an account of the Indian character and customs (New York, 1846); Fr. Felipe Arroyo de la Cuesta, author of a dictionary of 2884 words and expressions in the Mutsun language (New York, 1862); Fr. Vincente de Sarriá, first *comisario-prefecto* and eminent for learning and piety; Fr. Mariano Payeras, author of an Indian catechism; Fr. Narciso Duran; Fr. Magin Catalá; Fr. Francisco Dumetz; Fr. José Señan; Fr. Estévan Tapis; and Fr. José Maria Gonzalez Rúbio, administrator of the diocese after Bishop Diego's death. The first bishop of both Californias, Rt. Rev. Francisco García Diego y Moreno, O.F.M., was consecrated 4 October, 1840, and died 30 April, 1846, at Santa Barbara Mission, where his remains were interred on the Epistle side of the altar. During his administration the first seminary for the education of secular priests on the western coast was opened 4 May, 1844, at Mission Santa Inez; Fr. José Joaquin Jimeno, O.F.M., was the first rector. Very Rev. José Maria Gonzalez Rúbio, O.F.M., was administrator from 1846 to 1851 when Bishop Alemany arrived. Fr. Rúbio was later proposed for a diocese but declined the mitre. While in charge of the See of Monterey, which included both Californias, he enjoyed the privilege of administering the sacrament of Confirmation. Unable to procure priests to replace the old missionaries who were fast dying away, Fr. Rúbio in 1849 invited the Jesuit Fathers to come to California and found a college in the territory. They consented and opened their college in 1851. He was born at Guadalajara, Mexico, in 1804, and entered the Franciscan Order at Zapópan in 1824. In 1833 he arrived in California and was given charge of Mission San José. In 1842, at the request of the bishop, he removed to Santa Barbara, and lived there continuously until his death 2 November, 1875. His remains were buried in the vaults of the mission church.

Rt. Rev. Thaddeus Amat, C.M. (q. v.), after his consecration at Rome, 12 March, 1854, reached California in 1855. In 1856 he called the Sisters of Charity (Vincentians) to the diocese. They founded and still conduct the orphan asylums at Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz, and an academy at Hollister. He also brought the Lazarists or Vincentian Fathers to Los Angeles where they erected St. Vincent's College. At his request the Sisters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary came from Spain to California, 30 August, 1871, and opened schools for girls at Los

Angeles, San Luis Obispo, and San Bernardino. In 1871 Bishop Amat laid the cornerstone for the cathedral at Los Angeles, and placed it and the diocese under the patronage of St. Vibiana (Bibiana), virgin and martyr. The building was completed and dedicated 30 June, 1876. In 1870 he attended the Vatican Council. Owing to constant ill-health he asked for a coadjutor who was given him in the person of Rt. Rev. Francis Mora. Bishop Amat died 12 May, 1878. His remains lie buried in the cathedral which he erected.

Rt. Rev. Francis Mora was born at Vich, Catalonia, Spain, 25 Nov., 1827; he attended the seminary of his native city; in 1855 he accompanied Bishop Amat to California, and was ordained priest at Santa Barbara 19 March, 1856. From July of that year to the end of 1860 he was stationed at the Indian mission of San Juan Bautista, and from September, 1861, to July, 1866, he had charge of Mission San Luis Obispo. After that he resided at Los Angeles. On 20 May, 1873, Father Mora was consecrated Bishop of Mosynopolis *in partibus infidelium* and made coadjutor of Bishop Amat. At the death of the latter he succeeded to the See of Monterey and Los Angeles. In 1894 he asked for a coadjutor, who was appointed in the person of Rt. Rev. George Montgomery. On 1 February, 1896, Bishop Mora resigned, and when Rome, 20 June, accepted his resignation he returned to Spain. He died at Sarria, Catalonia, 3 August, 1905. During his administration the Sisters of St. Joseph and of St. Dominic were invited into the diocese to open schools. Bishop Mora was remarkable for his financial ability, and succeeded in paying off many of the important debts of the diocese, and by his careful investments left it in a splendid financial condition.

Rt. Rev. George Montgomery was born in Daviess County, Kentucky, 30 December, 1847, and was ordained priest at Baltimore, 20 December, 1879. He held the post of Chancellor of the Archdiocese of San Francisco until his consecration as titular Bishop of Tumi 8 April, 1894, when he became coadjutor to Bishop Mora. Two years later he succeeded to the see and at once displayed remarkable energy. At this period immigrants from the eastern States began to flock to southern California in great numbers. Los Angeles more than doubled its population. New needs arose which it was the endeavour of the bishop to meet by building churches and schools, and by calling to his aid more priests and religious. In season and out of season Bishop Montgomery insisted on the necessity of educating children in Catholic schools. It was his fearless attitude which compelled the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to recognize the right of Indian parents and guardians to send their children to the schools of their choice independent of the reservation agent. Subsequently this same view was adopted by the Government, and made the rule for all the Indians in the United States. The bishop thus in every way manifested a watchful solicitude for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the diocese. His personality won friends for the Church on all sides, whilst his vigorous defence of Catholic doctrine, as well as his clean-cut, outspoken advocacy of American rights and duties, gave to the Church in southern California a great onward movement and prepared the way for Bishop Conaty's administration. In 1903 Bishop Montgomery was appointed Archbishop of Osino *in partibus* and made coadjutor to the Archbishop of San Francisco. He died 10 January, 1907, sincerely lamented by all classes, especially by the poor. During his administration the following congregations of religious were received into the diocese: Christian Brothers, Sisters of Mercy, Sisters of the Holy Cross, Sisters of the Holy Names, Sisters of Notre Dame, Sisters of the Presentation, and the Ursuline Sisters.

Rt. Rev. Thomas James Conaty was born in Kilnaleck, County Cavan, Ireland, 1 August, 1847, and came to America with his parents in 1850. He attended the home schools of Taunton, Mass., graduated from Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass., in 1869, was ordained priest at Montreal Seminary 21 December, 1872, was made assistant at St. John's Church, Worcester, Mass., 1 January, 1873, and pastor of the church of the Sacred Heart, Worcester, 10 January, 1880. During these years he was actively engaged in the cause of total abstinence and education. He was president of the Total Abstinence Union of America, and for several years president of the Catholic Summer School at Cliff Haven. At different times he was elected to public positions of trust in the city of Worcester. On 10 January, 1897, he was appointed Rector of the Catholic University, Washington, D. C., by Leo XIII. On 1 November, 1897, he was made domestic prelate, and 14 July, 1901, named titular Bishop of Samos, and was consecrated at the cathedral, Baltimore, 21 November, 1901, by Cardinal Gibbons. On 27 March, 1903, he was appointed Bishop of Monterey and Los Angeles to succeed Bishop Montgomery. The influx of immigrants from the East, especially into the city of Los Angeles, has been phenomenal. From his arrival in the latter part of 1903 to the latter part of 1910 twelve new parishes have been added to the episcopal city, and nine parish schools have been erected in various parts of the diocese for 2500 additional pupils. The number of priests has increased from 101 in 1903 to 206 in 1910, 73 of whom belong to eight different religious orders. The character of the Catholic population numbering 100,000, of whom 60,000 live in Los Angeles, is cosmopolitan. The percentage of Catholics to the inhabitants of the diocese is about one-sixth. Besides the English-speaking races, there are large colonies of Spaniards or Mexicans, Germans, Italians, Portuguese, Poles, Slavonians, French, Basques, Lithuanians, and Syrians. Churches and priests are caring for the spiritual interests of these different nationalities. One feature of the diocesan work is the care of the Indians, most of whom are descendants of the former Mission Indians. About 4000 are cared for by seven priests who devote themselves entirely or to a great extent to their spiritual needs, speaking to the young people in English and to their elders in Spanish, which is generally understood by the natives. Churches have been built for them at all reservations. A church and parochial residence have also been erected near the Government Indian School at Sherman, and a priest acts as chaplain for the Catholic children of that institution. The Catholic Indian Bureau maintains a large boarding school for Indian children at Banning which is in charge of the Sisters of St. Joseph. As the diocese annually receives its share of the Pious Fund of Mexico, it has been able to provide for many of the religious necessities of the Indians, but there are many demands calling for diocesan help. The rapidly growing population of the diocese impelled Bishop Conaty to call to his assistance the following additional religious orders and congregations: Benedictine Fathers for the Basques, Fathers of the Society of the Divine Saviour for the Poles, Sons of the Immaculate Heart of Mary for the Mexicans, Jesuit Fathers, Redemptorist Fathers, Sisters of the Good Shepherd, Little Sisters of the Poor, Missionary Sisters of the Immaculate Heart (Italian), and Sisters of St. Francis.

STATISTICS.—Besides the items already mentioned above, there are 166 churches and chapels, 43 stations without churches, 33 ecclesiastical students, 1 seminary for Franciscan Fathers, 2 colleges for young men with 407 students, 1 college and 16 academies for girls and young ladies, 29 parochial schools with (including the pupils of the academies) 5424 children, 9 orphan asylums with 1048 inmates, 1 Catholic Indian boarding school with 118 pupils, 2 Government Indian schools with 355 Catholic pupils, 5 hospitals and 3

homes for the aged. A new cathedral is contemplated which will be worthy of the city of Los Angeles.

Santa Barbara Mission Archives; Bishop's Archives (Los Angeles); ENGELHARDT, *The Franciscans in California* (Harbor Springs, Mich., 1897); REUSS, *Biogr. Cyclop. of the Hierarchy of the U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898); *Catholic Directory.*

ZEPHYRIN ENGELHARDT.

Montesa, MILITARY ORDER OF.—This order was established in the Kingdom of Aragon to take the place of the Order of the Temple, of which it was in a certain sense the continuation. It derived its title from St. George of Montesa, its principal stronghold.

A KNIGHT OF MONTESA

The Templars were received with enthusiasm in Aragon from their very foundation (1128). Berenger III, Count of Barcelona, wished to die in the habit of a Templar (1130). King Alfonso I, "The Fighter", having no direct heir, bequeathed his dominions to be divided among the Templars, the Hospitallers, and the Canons of the Holy Sepulchre, but naturally this bequest was annulled by his subjects (1131). The Templars had to be contented with certain castles, the chief of which was Monzon. Although the Aragonese branch of the order was pronounced innocent at the famous trial of the Templars, Clement V's Bull of suppression was applied to them in spite of the protests of King James II (1312). By way of compensation, however, this monarch obtained from Pope John XXII authority to dispose of the possessions of the Templars in his Kingdom of Valencia in favour of a military order not essentially differing from that of the Templars, which should be charged with the defence of his frontier against the Moors and the pirates. It was affiliated to the Order of Calatrava, from which its first recruits were drawn, and it was maintained in dependence upon that order. The first of the fourteen grand masters, who ruled the Order of Montesa until the office was united with the Crown by Philip II in 1587, was Guillermo d'Eril.

LAMPER, *Montesa illustrata* (Valencia, 1669); *Definiciones de la orden y cavalleria de Montesa* (Valencia, 1573); LA FUENTE, *Hist. Ecl. de España* (Madrid, 1874).

CH. MOELLER.

Montesino, ANTONIO, Spanish missionary, date of birth unknown; d. in the West Indies, 1545. Of his early life little is known. He entered the Order of St. Dominic and made his religious profession in the convent of St. Stephen, Salamanca, where in all probability he studied. He was noted for his exemplary piety, his love of strict observance, his eloquence, and moral courage. In September, 1510, under the leadership of Pedro de Cordova, he landed with the first band of Dominicans in Hispaniola. He was the first, in 1511, to denounce publicly in America the enslavement and oppression of the Indians as sinful and disgraceful to the Spanish nation. Being censured for this, he was cited to Spain in 1512, where he pleaded the cause of the Indians so successfully that the king took immediate measures towards ameliorating their condition. In June, 1526, with Father Anthony de Cervantes, he accompanied several hundred colonists under the leadership of Ayllon to Guandape, probably where the English subsequently founded Jamestown; or, as some are inclined to think, proceeded even as far as New York. In either case, however, we are safe in asserting that Holy Mass was celebrated for the first time in the present territory of the United States by these Dominicans. On the death of Ayllon (Oct., 1526) the colony abandoned the country and returned to San Domingo. According to Helps, "Spanish Conquest in America", he went to Venezuela about 1528 with twenty of his brethren. Nothing more is known of him except the slight information furnished by a note in the margin of the registry of his profession in the convent of St. Stephen at Salamanca, which says: "Obiit martyr in Indiis". He is the author of "Informatio juridica in Indorum defensionem".

QUÉTIF-ECHARD, *SS. Ord. Præd.*, II, 123; HELPS, *Spanish Conquest in America* (New York), passim; MACNUTT, *Life of Las Casas* (New York), passim; TOURON, *Hom. ill. de l'ordre S. Dominique*, IV (Paris, 1747), 245–48; SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, I (New York, s. d.), 101–08.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

Montesinos, LUIS DE, Spanish theologian, date and place of birth unknown; d. 7 Oct., 1621. He entered the Dominican Order and studied philosophy and theology in the Spanish universities where he gained a reputation for sound scholarship and solid piety that made him illustrious among the savants of his time. Beginning his career as professor of philosophy, he was gradually promoted to the most important chairs. He was the foremost exponent of Thomistic theology at the University of Alcalá. His vast erudition, power of penetration, and clearness of exposition won for him the surname *Doctor clarus*. He possessed a singular charm of manner which secured for him at once love and respect. Such was his success in teaching that his lecture hall, though one of the largest in Spain, was too small to admit his audiences. For thirty years he taught with untiring zeal and devotion, refusing all ecclesiastical honours. Though threatened with total blindness in his latter years, he continued to teach till his death. He is the author of "Commmentaria in primam secundæ S. Thomæ" (Alcalá, 1622).

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

Montes Pietatis are charitable institutions of credit that lend money at low rates of interest, or without interest at all, upon the security of objects left in pawn, with a view to protecting persons in want from usurers. Being charitable establishments, they lend only to people who are in need of funds to pass through some financial crisis, as in cases of general scarcity of food, misfortunes, etc. On the other hand, these institutions do not seek financial profit, but use all profits that may accrue to them for the payment of employees and to extend the scope of their charitable work. Formerly there were not only pecuniary montes (*numarii*) which lent money, but also grain montes (*grantatici*), flour montes, etc. In the history of these establishments it may be observed that the word *mons*, even in ancient Latin (Plautus, Prudentius), was used to signify a "great quantity", or heap, with reference to money, while the juridic term for a monetary "fund" was rather *massa;* and long before the creation of the montes pietatis the word *mons* (in Italian, *monte*) was used to designate collected funds, destined to various ends, which in time came to be called montes profani. Thus the public debt that was contracted by the Republic of Venice between 1164 and 1178 was called Mons or Imprestita, and similar montes were created by Genoa (1300) and by Florence (1345); the stock companies of the Middle Ages, also, were

called montes, as, for example, the "mons aluminarius", which operated the alum deposits of Tolfa. The same was true of insurance societies and of the banks of exchange or of credit that for the greater part were in the hands of Jews or of the so-called Lombards. As these banks often lent money on objects delivered to them in pawn, the charitable institutions which were created for transactions of that class also took the name of *mons, pietatis* being added to express the fact that the establishments in question were beneficent and not speculative.

In the Middle Ages it was very difficult to obtain money, as much on account of its scarcity as of the prohibitions by which Christians were bound in relation to usury, which second condition gave a species of monopoly of the credit business to the Jews, who were excluded from all other kinds of trade or industry, and who were often accorded great privileges by the towns, on condition of the establishment of pawn banks. They lent money at excessive rates of interest—as much as 60 per cent—or, when that was prohibited, as at Florence, where they were not allowed to charge more than 20 per cent, they resorted to subterfuges that made it possible for them to obtain as high rates as elsewhere. And in this way, they soon became rich and hated. Not less hated, however, were the so-called *coarsini* (named not after the city of Cahors in France, but after that of Cavour in Piedmont); likewise the Lombards, who were a kind of travelling bankers, and whose extortions were often even greater than those of the Jews, their usual rate of interest being 43½ per cent, and frequently as high as 80 per cent. It was often a question, during the Middle Ages, of finding a remedy for this exploitation of the misfortune of others; although it is not true that St. Anthony of Padua founded a mons pietatis. The celebrated Doctor Durand de Saint Pourçain, Bishop of Mende, proposed that the magistrates of cities be compelled to lend money at low rates of interest. It is not known whether this proposition was accepted or not, but, in either event, it did not suggest the idea of the monte, for there lacked the condition of objects pawned, which was the case, also, in the institution of the "Mont de Salins", established later than 1350. The first true mons pietatis was founded in London, where Bishop Michael Nothburg, in 1361, left 1000 marks of silver for the establishment of a bank that should lend money on pawned objects, without interest, providing that the expenses of the institution be defrayed from its foundation capital. In this way, of course, the capital was eventually consumed, and the bank closed. In 1389 Philippe de Maizières published his project for the establishment of an institution that should lend money without interest, but should receive remuneration from those who might profit by its loans; this project, however, was not realized. Finally (1462), the first mons pietatis was established at Perugia, and in a few years there were similar institutions throughout Italy. The establishment and dissemination of montes pietatis is one of the brightest glories of the followers of the "Poverello" of Assisi, for the mons pietatis of Perugia was founded in consequence of the preaching at that city of the Franciscan Michele Carcano of Milan, who inveighed against the usury of the Jews (1461). The fund for that charitable establishment was made up in part by voluntary contributions and in part by money lent by the Jews themselves. But the idea of the mons pietatis was devised by the Franciscans Barnabò da Terni and Fortunato Coppoli of Perugia. In fact it seems that for a long time the preachers of the Franciscan Order had considered the problem of applying an effectual remedy to the evils of usury (cf. Holzapfel, 32 sq.). The assistance and the influence of the Apostolic delegate to Perugia, Ermolao Barbaro, Bishop of Verona, greatly facilitated the work at the former town, and it was soon repeated at Orvieto (1463) through the action of the Franciscan Bartolommeo da Colle, and also at Gubbio and at other towns of Umbria. In the Marches the first mons was established at Monterubbiano, in 1465, through the efforts of the Franciscan Antonuzzo and the Dominican Cristoforo; the first city of the Papal States that established a mons pietatis was Viterbo (1469); in Tuscany, Siena (1472); in Liguria, Savona, and Genoa (1480), and in the Milanese territory, Milan (1483); everywhere it was the Franciscan Observants who took the initiative. But the greatest development was given to this work by Blessed Bernardino da Feltre, whose apostolic journeys were marked by montes pietatis, either instituted or re-established; he introduced them at Mantua (1484) and at various cities of the Venetian Republic, where they had to struggle against the ill-will of the Government; he carried them also to the Abruzzi, to Emilia, and to Romagna.

The montes pietatis were either autonomous establishments, or, as at Perugia, municipal corporations; they had a director, called *depositarius*, an appraiser, a *notarius* or accountant, salesmen, and other employees; and all were paid either with a fixed salary or with a percentage in the profits of the establishment. It should be noted that in the beginning the montes did not lend money gratuitously, but, on the contrary, the expressed intention of the founders was that the money should be lent at interest, varying from 4 per cent to 12 per cent. After opposition had been shown to these establishments *montes gratuiti* were instituted in some places, especially in Lombardy, but as these charities were not self-supporting they were altered to establishments that lend with interest, for Blessed Bernardino da Feltre always insisted on the necessity of interest to ensure the permanency of the institution. At the end of each month or of each year the net profits were applied to the capital, and if they were considerable, the rate of interest was lowered. In order to increase the funds of these institutions in some cities, collections were regularly taken on appointed days—at Padua on Easter day—or boxes were set up for contributions, as at Gubbio and Orvieto. At Gubbio there was a tax of 1 per cent on all property bequeathed by will, and at Spello the notary was required to remind the testator that he should leave something to the monte.

At first the sums loaned were very small, the maximum limit at Perugia being six florins, and at Gubbio four. Thus it was hoped that speculation and extravagance would be avoided, but little by little the limit was increased in some places to 100 and even to 1000 ducats. The amount of a given loan was equal to two-thirds the value of the object pawned, which, if not redeemed within the stipulated time, was sold at public auction, and if the price obtained for it was greater than the loan with the interest, the surplus was made over to the owner.

The opposition to the montes which has been referred to came in the first place from those whose interests were affected, the Jews and the Lombards, who were able to prevent the introduction of these charities into some cities, as Venice and Rome, until 1539. At Florence their efforts were directed to the same end, but the people rising in tumult obtained the recall of Blessed Bernardino da Feltre to the city. At Aquila the Jews sent a commission to Blessed Bernardino to ask him not to appear in the pulpit. But the most serious opposition the montes encountered was from certain theologians and canonists, who censured these establishments because they lent money at interest, which in those times was considered illicit even by the promoters of the montes. The controversy was long and bitter. The opposition was not directed against the montes pietatis as such,

but merely against the condition of requiring interest. It was not admitted that the use of the interest to maintain the charity justified the usury, since a good end could not justify evil means, and it was held that lending money at interest was intrinsically bad, money being unfruitful by its nature, and since Christ expressly forbids the practice (Luke, vi, 33). The term interest was not readily admitted by the friends of the montes, who replied that there were in reality two contracts between the montes and the borrower: one that of the loan, which should be gratuitous, the other implying the custody of the object pawned, therefore, the use of space and personal responsibility, which should not be gratuitous; and it was precisely on account of these two conditions that interest was charged. The loan, therefore, was regarded merely as a *conditio sine qua non*, and not as a direct cause of the interest. On the other hand, even the adversaries of the montes admitted that the *damnum emergens* or the *lucrum cessans* were legitimate titles upon which to require interest; and these two principles may be applied to the mons pietatis. Many other objections to which it was easy to reply were adduced, and in these disputations the friends of the montes were victorious. Only at Fænza, in 1494, was the defender of the montes unable to answer the objections of the Augustinian Bariano, who is the author of a work entitled "De Monte Impietatis". It was among the Dominicans, however, that the montes found a greater number of antagonists, notably the young Tommaso de Vio, who became Cardinal Cætano. It cannot be said that the order as a whole was opposed to these institutions, for several of its members favoured the establishment of the montes as has been seen in the case of Monterubbiano, and as was the case at Florence, where Savonarola (1495) reopened the montes which had been established in 1484. Meanwhile other Dominicans, e. g. Annio da Viterbo and Domenico da Imola, wrote juridicial opinions in favour of the montes, but the writer who most exerted himself in their defence was the Franciscan Bernardino de Bustis (Defensorium Montis Pietatis). The legal and theological faculties of the universities, as well as individual jurists, gave opinions favourable to the montes. The popes had approved of several of these institutions that appealed to the Holy See, either for its sanction, in general, or for special concessions; Holzapfel (10 sq.) refers to sixteen of these acts, anterior to the Bull "Inter multiplicis" of Leo X (4 May, 1515). By this Bull the pope and the Lateran Council, which took up the case of the montes in its tenth session, declared the institutions in question in no way illicit or sinful, but on the contrary meritorious, and that whosoever preached or wrote against them in the future, incurred excommunication. This Bull also provided that montes established thereafter should obtain the Apostolic approbation. The Bishop of Trani was the only member of the council who spoke against the montes, and Cardinal Cætano, general of the Dominicans, who was absent at that session, subsequently abandoned his position on the subject of these establishments.

The question of moral right having been determined in their favour, the montes pietatis spread rapidly, especially in Italy, where, in 1896 there were 556 of them, with a combined capital of nearly 72,000,000 lire. Outside of Italy the first mons pietatis to be established was at Ypres in Belgium, (1534) but the institution did not develop in that country until 1618, when the Lombards were forbidden to receive objects in pawn; since 1848 the law has transformed the montes into municipal establishments. In France the first mons pietatis appeared at Avignon, then a papal possession (1577); the next at Beaucaire (1583); and in 1626, an ordinance prescribed the creation of montes pietatis in all the cities that might need them. However, they were not merely charitable institutions, because they were bound to lend money to all applicants, whether in need or not, while not infrequently the rate of interest was high. They were reorganized by the law of 1851, with the special feature that their directors be appointed by the Government. In Germany and in Austria the montes pietatis were introduced at the end of the fifteenth century. At present they are municipal establishments—although some of them belong to the Government—and their net profits are applied to the account of public charities. The first mons pietatis in Spain was created in 1702 at Madrid. In England this form of charity never obtained a foothold, on the contrary it was held in aversion on account of its connexion with the papacy; an attempt to establish such an institution at London in 1797 failed in less than twenty years, through default on the part of its managers.

The aversion in which montes pietatis are held by many, even in our own day, leads to the question of the advantages and of the defects of these institutions; it is held that they promote carelessness in contracting debts, that they destroy love for labour, incite to theft, are often the cause of financial ruin, and, lastly, that they are contrary to the principle of free competition. On the other hand, they are a necessity; for without them the needy would be exposed either to the extortions of private lenders or to ruin, into which they might be plunged by some misfortune from which a momentary loan might save them. Their disadvantages are undeniable, but disadvantages are common to all human contrivances. For the rest the montes pietatis, besides the relief that they brought to the poor, exerted great influence upon the ideas concerning interest on loans; for the rigid views of the theologians of the Middle Ages in that connexion underwent a first modification, which prepared the way for a generalization of the principle that moderate interest might justly be charged, and also the mere existence of the montes pietatis compelled private speculators to reduce their rates of interest from the usurious rates that had hitherto prevailed.

HOLZAPFEL, *Die Anfänge der Montes Pietatis* (Munich, 1903); ARNOULT, *Avantages et inconvénients des Monts de Piété* (Namur, 1831); BEYERLINK, *Magnum Theatrum vitæ humanæ, Mons Pietatis* (Lyons, 1656); BLAIZE, *Des Monts de Piété etc.* (Paris, 1856); CERETTI, *Storia dei Monti di Pietà* (Padua, 1752), Fr. tr. (Padua, 1772); DE BESSE, *Le bienheureux Bernardin de Feltre et son œuvre* (Tours and Paris, 1902); FUNK, *Gesch. des kirchl. Zinsverbots* (Tübingen, 1876); JANNET, *Le crédit populaire et les banques en Italie du XV^e au XVIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1885); MANASSEI, *Barnabò da Terni e i suoi Monti di Pietà* in *Bull. Storia Patria per l'Umbria*, VIII, fasc. iii (Perugia, 1902); SCALVANTI, *Il Mons Pietatis di Perugia* (Perugia, 1892); IDEM, *Il Mons Pietatis di Gubbio* (Perugia, 1896); VANLAER, *Les Monts de Piété en France* (Lille, 1895); TAMILIA, *Il Sacro Monte di Pietà di Roma* (Rome, 1900); WADDING, *Annales Minorum*, XIII–XVI passim.

U. BENIGNI.

Montesquieu, CHARLES-LOUIS DE SECONDAT, BARON DE, French writer and publicist, b. in the Château de la Brède near Bordeaux, 18 January, 1689; d. at Paris, 10 February, 1755. His family was of noble rank; his grandfather, President of the Bordeaux Parliament, his father, a member of the royal bodyguard, and his mother, Marie de Penel, who died when he was eleven, traced her ancestry to an old English family. Young Charles de la Brède, as he was then known, was sent to the Oratorian College at Juilly (1700–11), where he received a wholly literary and classical education in which religion held but a minor place. When, at twenty-five years of age he returned home, after having been called to the bar, he received from his paternal uncle the style and title of Baron de Montesquieu, by which he was afterwards known, and became councillor of the Bordeaux Parliament. He married a Protestant, Jeanne Lartigue,

and they had three children; but neither his profession nor his family seem to have claimed much of his attention. At the end of nine years he sold his office, and gave himself up entirely to study which henceforth became his life's one and only passion. "Study", he wrote afterwards, "has been my sovereign remedy against the worries of life. I have never had a care that an hour's reading could not dispel". As a matter of fact the story of his life is but the chronicle of the preparation and composition of his books. His earliest productions were read before the Academy of Bordeaux, of which he became a member (1716). They deal with a variety of subjects, but mainly with scientific topics, history, and politics. For a time he thought of writing a "physical history of the Earth" for which he began collecting material (1719), but two years later was busy in a very different direction, publishing the "Lettres persanes" (Amsterdam, 1721), so named because it pretended to be a correspondence between two Persian gentlemen travelling in Europe, and their friends in Asia, who sent them the gossip of their seraglio.

Under this fictitious guise the writer goes on to describe or rather satirize French, and especially Parisian manners between 1710 and 1720. The king, the absolute monarchy, the Parliament, the Academy, the University, are all very transparently ridiculed; but it was the Catholic religion, its dogmas, its practices, its ministers from pope to monks that came in for his bitterest raillery. Because of its ideal of celibacy, the Catholic Church is accused of being a cause of depopulation, and because of its teaching concerning this world's goods, it is charged with weakening the prosperity of the nation, while its intolerant proselytism is a source of disturbance to the state. On the other hand Protestantism is held up as more favourable to material progress. Coming ostensibly from Mohammedans these criticisms may have seemed less shocking to thoughtless minds, but they were none the less one of the first and rudest attacks directed against the Church during the eighteenth century. In them, he showed himself as incapable of understanding the Church's dogmas as he was of appreciating her services to society. Though in later years he was to find a juster point of view, his witty criticisms in their lively setting of romance and sensualism, quite to the taste of that age, assured a great success for the "Lettres persanes". Eight editions were published within a year. Montesquieu had not signed his name to them, but the author was quickly discovered, and the public nominated him for the French Academy. He was elected in 1726, but owing to the scandal the "Lettres persanes" had caused, the king did not approve and an excuse was given that the author did not live in Paris, as the rules of the Academy required. Whereupon Montesquieu took up his residence in Paris, and was elected once more, and admitted in 1728.

Side by side with their frivolous levity the "Lettres persanes" contain some profound observations on history and politics. They show even then Montesquieu's meditation on the laws and customs of mankind, from which was to result his later work, "L'Esprit des lois". As a preparation for this work he set out (1728) on a long series of travels through Europe, and visited Vienna, and Hungary, spent some time in Venice, Florence, Naples, Genoa, and Rome, where he was received by Cardinal de Polignac and Benedict XIII. In the suite of Lord Chesterfield he went to England where he remained eighteen months, and was the guest of Prime Minister Walpole, of Swift, and Pope. Wherever he went he made the acquaintance of statesmen, took copious notes of what he saw and heard, and read with avidity. After an absence of three years he returned to his family, his business, his vineyards and the farming of his estates at Château de la Brède. As a relaxation he paid occasional visits to Paris, and mixed with literary men and their friends in the salons of Madame de Tencin, Madame Geoffrin, and Madame du Deffand. Yet he studiously avoided over familiarity with what was known as the philosophical set. Though his religious convictions were not deep, his serious and moderate turn of mind had nothing in common with the noisy and aggressive impiety of Voltaire and his friends.

Henceforth his great aim in life was to write the "Esprit des lois", and all his spare time in the studious seclusion at La Brède was devoted to it. To begin with, ancient Rome gave him ample material for thought, but took up so much space in his work that in order not to mar the proportions of his book he published all that concerned it as a distinct work, "Les Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur et de la décadence des Romains" (Amsterdam, 1734). In this book he shows successively the glorious progress and slow decay which the Empire experienced from the foundation of Rome to the capture of Constantinople by the Turks. He does not narrate events, but supposing that they are already known, he seeks to discover the links in the chain of events, and to point out the sources from which they sprang, choosing preferably political causes, that is, institutions. By exhibiting them in their natural relationships he throws unexpected light on certain events of ancient history and those of more recent date. Bossuet had already devoted two chapters of his "Histoire Universelle" to explaining "the sequence of changes at Rome". Montesquieu treats the same subject in a larger way and with closer correlation of facts. His point of view is that of the statesman rather than of the moralist, and every religious preoccupation is left aside. Such indeed is his indifference that he has not a word about religion. This concession to the prejudices of his age was a mistake, as modern criticism has shown, especially in the works of Fustel de Coulanges, that religion played a greater part in the political conduct of the Romans than Montesquieu credited it with.

"Les Considérations" was but an advance chapter of "L'Esprit des lois" which Montesquieu published after twenty years of labour (2 vols., Geneva, 1748). In this second work the author studies human laws in their relationships with the government, climate, and general character of the country, its customs, and its religion. He undertakes, not to examine various laws and discover their meaning, but to point out their underlying principles and to lay down the conditions which must be verified if such laws are to work for the happiness of man in society. In his judgments and conclusions Montesquieu is careful to take into account experience and tradition. He believes that laws can be enacted only for men in definitely known conditions of time and place. In so far he differs from the theorizers and utopians of his day and of a later age, who had no hesitation in drafting laws for man in the abstract or for a humanity freed from all spatial and temporal determinations, and who took as the basis

of their deductions either the idea of a social contract in primitive times, or of a state of nature which had to be developed or restored. He thus avoids the errors of Hobbes, Locke, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau.

His personal sympathies went rather with the liberal ideas which have triumphed almost everywhere in the civilized world of to-day, but which were novelties then. He declared himself in favour of separating the executive, legislative, and judiciary powers (XI, vi), condemned slavery and torture, and advocated gentler treatment of criminals, toleration in religious belief, and freedom of worship. But in this work he treats the religious issue with more gravity than he had done in the "Lettres persanes". True, he passes over the truth of its teaching and the sanctity of its moral precepts, and treats of it "only as regards its advantages for civic life". But far from thinking that there can be a conflict between religion and society, he insists that the one is useful to the other. "Something", he says, "must be fixed and permanent, and religion is that something." He says again, more clearly: "What a wonderful thing is the Christian religion! it seems to aim only at happiness in a future life, and yet it secures our happiness in this life also." He does not dream of separating Church and State, nor of subjecting the former to the latter: "I have never claimed that the interests of religion should give way to those of the State, but that they should go hand in hand." Nevertheless on various points he seriously misunderstood Catholic teaching: "Les Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques" (Oct., 1749) called attention to several statements of this sort, and the Sorbonne drew up a list of passages from his writings that seemed to call for censure (August, 1752). Before this (March, 1752), "L'Esprit des lois" had been placed on the Roman Index. But these measures created no great stir. The success of the book was enormous, its political influence world-wide. The early American statesmen were very familiar with "L'Esprit des lois" and from it (XI, vi) derived much of their idea of federal government. Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, Hamilton, Madison, and Jay who wrote in the "Federalist" in defence of the new Constitution, were all enthusiastic readers of Montesquieu. Montesquieu's reputation became universal, and he was able to enjoy peacefully the homage it brought him until his death, for which he prepared himself by receiving the sacraments of the Church, and showing every outward mark of perfect obedience to her laws. The influence of his ideas was to be felt long afterwards both in France and elsewhere.

Besides the works which we have mentioned, and which are the most important, Montesquieu left a few papers which he read before the Academy of Bordeaux, and a few incomplete writings. "Le temple de Gnide", a short novel of a sensuous turn written for the licentious society of the Regency epoch, does him little credit. He wrote an "Essai sur le goût", a "Dialogue de Sylla et d'Eucrate", "Arsace et Isménie", an uninteresting novel, and over one hundred letters. These have all been collected in: the "Œuvres complètes de Montesquieu", edited by Edward Laboulaye (7 vols., Paris, 1875–79); "Mélanges inédits de Montesquieu" published by Baron de Montesquieu (Bordeaux, 1892); "Voyages de Montesquieu", published by the same (Bordeaux, 1894–96); "Pensées et fragments inédits de Montesquieu", published by the same (Bordeaux, 1899–1901: two volumes have appeared; others are in course of preparation).

D'ALEMBERT, *Eloge de Montesquieu* in *l'Encyclopédie*, V (Paris, 1755); VIAN, *Histoire de Montesquieu* (2nd ed., Paris, 1879); BELIN, *Etude sur Montesquieu* (Paris, 1874); SOREL, *Montesquieu* (Paris, 1887); ZÉVORT, *Montesquieu* (Paris, 1887); LEFÈVRE-PONTALES, *Eloge de Montesquieu* (Châteaudun, 1891); FAGUET, *La politique comparée de Montesquieu, Rousseau et Voltaire* (Paris, 1902); BARCKHAUSEN, *Montesquieu ses idées et ses œuvres* (Paris, 1907); CHURTON COLLINS, *Voltaire, Montesquieu, and Rousseau in England* (London, 1908); DEDIEU, *Montesquieu et la tradition politique anglaise en France* (Paris, 1909); Eng. tr. of his chief work, *The Spirit of Laws*, by NUGENT, revised ed. with introd. by F. R. COUDERT (London and New York, 1900). For his influence upon the founders of the United States, see *The Federalist*, xxxxvi, xxxxvii, 1788, ed. GIDEON (Washington, 1818).

ANTOINE DEGERT.

Monteverde, CLAUDIO, distinguished musician, b. at Cremona, May, 1567; d. at Venice, 29 Nov., 1643. He studied under Ingegneri (composer of the "Responsoria", that until recently were regarded as by Palestrina), and at the age of sixteen he published a book of canzonets, followed by four volumes of madrigals. Although the majority of his early works show little trace of the inventive genius which afterwards revolutionized the prevalent system of harmony, one of his madrigals, printed in 1592, is remarkable for its many suspensions of the dominant seventh, and its inversion, as also suspended ninths. He was appointed Maestro di Cappella to the Duke of Mantua in 1602, and in 1613, was elected Maestro at Venice in succession to Martinengo, at a salary of three hundred ducats a year. So highly was he appreciated at St. Mark's that in 1616, the Procuratori increased his salary to five hundred ducats. From that date until his death he produced numerous choral compositions, as also operas, cantatas, ballets, most of which cannot now be traced. Fortunately, the score of his opera "Orfeo", printed in 1609, has come down to us, and is quite sufficient to indicate the inventive powers of a musician who broke away from the trammels of the older school and created a school of his own.

Monteverde not only showed his genius in his dramatic writing but in the employment of new instrumental effects, and the combination of instruments in the theatre band. In his interlude written for the festival at the palace of Girolamo Mocenigo, he employed the device of an instrumental tremolo, till then unknown. Another novel effect was his employment of trombones to accompany the "Gloria" and "Credo" of a Mass, in 1631. At this date he was studying for the priesthood, and he was ordained in 1633. Six years later he composed an opera "Atone" for the opera house of San Cassiano, followed by two others, and a ballet for the carnival at Piacenza, in 1641. His enduring fame consists in his use of unprepared discords, his improvement of recitative, his development of orchestral resources and his revolution of instrumentation. He may justly be claimed as the founder of dramatic music, as we now understand it, and he anticipated Wagner in the employment of *Leitmotiv*.

EDWARDS, *Hist. of the Opera* (London, 1862); EITNER, *Quellen Lexikon* (Leipzig, 1900–04); LEE, *Story of Opera* (London, 1909).

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

Monte Vergine (MONTIS VIRGINIS), an abbey in the province of Naples, Italy, near the town of Avellino, commanding a magnificent view of the Mediterranean along the Bays of Naples, Salerno, and Gaeta, and inland as far as the Abruzzi Mountains. Monte Vergine was formerly known as Mons Sacer because of a temple sacred to Cybele that stood there; also as Mons Virgilianus, from the legend that Virgil retired thither to study the Sibylline books. St. Felix of Nola is said to have taken refuge there, and in the seventh century St. Vitalian of Capua erected on the hill a chapel to the Blessed Virgin Mary, called "Sancta Maria de Monte Vergine". Whatever the origin of the name it is certain that a pagan shrine existed there, and the ruins of the temple of Cybele lie all about the hill. In 1119 St. William of Vercelli built a monastery of strict observance and perpetual abstinence on Monte Vergine, and in 1149 his successor Blessed Robert, with the approval of Alexander III, gave it to the Benedictines. According to Castellain, St. William was canonized by this pope, and his feast is kept on 25 June. As early as 1191 the abbey is spoken of as be-

longing "ad Dominum Papam specialiter". It received throughout the Middle Ages many marks of consideration from the kings of the Two Sicilies, within whose domains there were at one time no less than one hundred monasteries of this branch of the Benedictine order. After many vicissitudes, laxity of rule threatened ruin to the abbey, and in the sixteenth century Clement VIII charged Blessed John Leonard, founder of the Clerks Regular of the Mother of God, to restore the monastic spirit. The new constitutions were approved by Paul V in 1611, and included among other things a regulation that the monks of Monte Vergine should use the Camaldolese Breviary. The habit of the monks was to be white, and they were to wear a white scapular.

From the beginning the abbey seems to have been freed from diocesan control, and its abbots had the faculty of conferring the four minor orders and confirmation. Between 1440 and 1515 it was held *in commendam* by five cardinals, and in that year was united with the Hospital of the Nunziata at Naples. The governors of the hospital sent as their representative to Monte Vergine a sacristan who interfered with the discipline of the place, and from this indignity the monks were freed by St. Pius V in 1557. In 1579 Gregory XIII gave them charge of St. Agatha's in Subura, Rome; Paul V made it a privileged abbey, and it remained in their care until Gregory XVII gave it to the Irish students (see IRISH COLLEGE, ROME).

The monastery chapel contains an ancient Byzantine picture of the Blessed Virgin Mary, said to have come originally from Antioch. The dark features of the Blessed Virgin standing out from a background of bright gold have won for it from peasants and pilgrims the name of "Schiavona". The story runs, that the head of the picture was cut from its frame by Baldwin, the Latin Emperor of Jerusalem, to save it from desecration, that it was found among his possessions by his grand-niece Catherine of Valois (who lies buried in the chapel), and that she gave it to Monte Vergine. The lower portion of the picture as it exists in the shrine was added at a later date by the brush of Montana di Arezzo. The church is also said to contain relics of the bodies of the young men, Sidrach, Misach, Abdenago, who were saved from the fiery furnace. These relics were brought from Jerusalem by Frederick II. Pentecost and the eighth of September are the two great days of pilgrimage and rejoicing at Monte Vergine. The nearest town is Mercogliano and on these days its population is more than doubled. The present abbot is Mgr. Victor Corvaia, O.S.B., born at Palermo, 19 June, 1834, succeeded 18 January, 1884. The chapter consists of 15 canons. The abbot's jurisdiction extends over 7 parishes forming part of four communes in the border provinces of Avellino and Benevento. There are 27 chapels within the prelacy, and the population of 8070 souls is ministered to by 31 secular priests and 18 regulars.

Vita S. Gulielmi Abbatis in *Acta SS.*, June, V; GIORDANO, *Croniche di Monte Vergine* (Naples, 1648); MABILLON, *Ann. Bened.*, VI; DE CESARE, *Memoria per Monte Vergine* (Rome, 1840); CRAWFORD, *Southern Italy and Sicily* (London, 1905); *Annuario Ecclesiastico* (1908); *Gerarchia* (1910); *Ann. Pont.* (1910).

J. C. GREY

Montevideo, ARCHDIOCESE OF (MONTISVIDEI), in Uruguay, comprises the whole of the republic. This territory was under the jurisdiction of the Paraguayan Church till 1620, when it became subject to Buenos Aires. In 1828 the Holy See erected it into a vicariate Apostolic. On 15 July, 1878, it was raised to episcopal rank, Mgr. Hyacinth Vera being first bishop; on 19 April, 1897, it was made an archdiocese. It was decided at that time to erect two suffragan sees, Melo and Saltó, but no appointments have yet been made (1910). Since colonial days ended, the Church has been persecuted at times, especially between 1880 and 1890 under Santos, who forbade religious under forty to make vows, instituted civil marriage, and made it a crime to baptize a child before its birth was registered civilly. To-day, however, the Church is flourishing, and the archdiocese contains many congregations of men (Jesuits, Capuchins, Redemptorists, Salesians, etc.), and over 300 nuns engaged in teaching and charitable work. The diocese contains 72,210 square miles, and about 1,103,000 inhabitants (in 1906), almost all Catholics, of whom 308,000 were in the Department of Montevideo. There are 46 parishes, 7 filial cures, 122 priests, and about 100 chapels and churches. The present occupant of the see is Mgr. Mariano Soler, b. at San Carlo, Uruguay, 25 March, 1846; elected bishop, 29 June, 1891; consecrated archbishop, 19 April, 1897; he has two auxiliary bishops: Mgr. Ricardo Isasa (titular Bishop of Anemurium), b. at Montevideo, 7 February, 1847; elected, 15 February, 1891; and Mgr. Pio Gaetano Secondo Stella (titular Bishop of Amizona), b. at Paso del Molino, Uruguay, 7 August, 1857; elected, 22 December, 1893. Almost all the inhabitants are Catholics, there is, however, a small Piedmontese Waldensian agricultural colony in the East of Colonia.

Among the noteworthy buildings of the City of Montevideo may be mentioned the cathedral, begun in 1803, completed and restored in 1905; and the Jesuit, Redemptorist, and Franciscan churches. Within recent years conferences of St. Vincent de Paul have been established in all the city parishes; likewise an excellent Catholic club; and an institute for Catholic working-men. The city dates back to early in the seventeenth century; a small fort, San José, was built there in 1724; in January, 1728, the town was founded by Bruno de Zabala with the name San Felipe y Santiago; in 1807 it was captured by the British; in 1828 it became the capital of the republic; from 1842 to 1851 it withstood the nine years' siege by Oribe and his Argentine allies. Montevideo has within recent years grown to be one of the seven greatest seaports in the world (see URUGUAY). San José de Mayo (9000) contains a magnificent church, more massive than the cathedral; and also the college of the Sisters of Nuestra Señora del Huerto, which has a very pretty chapel attached. (For the early Uruguayan missions among the Indians see REDUCTIONS OF PARAGUAY.)

ARAÚJO, *Geografía nacional* (Montevideo, 1892); MULHALE, *Handbook of the River Plate Republics* (Buenos Aires, 1892); KEANE, *Central and South America*, I (London, 1809).

A. A. MACERLEAN.

Montfaucon, BERNARD DE, French scholar, b. in 1655, at the château de Soulatge, Department of Aude, *arrondissement* of Carcassone; d. in Paris, at the Abbey of St-Germain-des-Prés, in 1741. He was the son of Timoléon de Montfaucon and of Flore de Maignan. His family, originally of Gascony, had settled in Languedoc after the Albigensian Crusade of the thirteenth century; its principal seat was the château of Roquetaillade (*arrondissement* of Limoux), where Bernard was reared. He was instructed by Pavillon, Bishop of Aleth, his father's friend, and in 1672, at the age of thirteen, he entered the Académie des Cadets at Perpignan, to prepare for a military career. After his father's death, he left home with his relative, the Marquis d'Hautpol, a captain of grenadiers in the Regiment of Languedoc, and served as a volunteer under Turenne (1673). He went through the campaign of Alsace, was at the battle of Marienthal, and fell dangerously ill at Saverne. In pursuance of a vow made to the Blessed Virgin, he then returned to his own country, resolved upon entering religion. On 13 May, 1676, he made his profession in the Benedictine monastery of Durade, at Toulouse. Being sent to the Abbey of Sorèze, he there learned Greek, making rapid progress. He next spent eight years at the priory of la Grasse (Aude). Claude Martin, assistant superior of the Congregation of St-Maur, noted his zeal and

caused him to be sent to the Abbey of Sainte-Croix at Bordeaux. Finally, in 1687, he was transferred to Paris, to the Abbey of St-Germain-des-Prés, which, under the rule of Mabillon, had become one of the chief centres of French erudition. He was then chosen to assist in preparing the edition of the Greek Fathers which the Benedictines had undertaken. To perfect his own training, he also began the study of Hebrew, Chaldean, Syriac, and Coptic, as well as that of numismatics, and in 1694 was appointed curator of the numismatic collection at St-Germain-des-Prés.

In 1690 Montfaucon had published a treatise on "La vérité de l'histoire de Judith". The monumental edition of the works of St. Athanasius, on which he laboured with Dom Pouget and Dom Lopin, appeared in 1698 and was well received (3 vols., folio, Paris; reproduced in P.G., XXV–XXVIII). Before undertaking new patristic labours, he resolved to study the manuscripts in the libraries of Italy. Obtaining permission in 1698, he set out with Dom Paul Briois. At Milan he made the acquaintance of Muratori; at Venice he was received very coldly, and was not even allowed to see the manuscripts in the Benedictine monasteries of San Giorgio Maggiore and San Marco. On the other hand, he was welcomed at Mantua, Ravenna, and especially at Rome by Innocent XI. Having been named by his superiors procurator general at Rome of the Order of St. Benedict, certain difficulties with the Jesuits led to his resignation of that office which brought with it so many distractions from his chief work, and in 1701 he secured his recall to France. The scientific results of his journey were embodied in the quarto volume of his "Diarium Italicum" (Paris, 1702). He also collected the notes of his companion, Dom Paul Briois, who had died on the journey (edited by Omont, "Revue des Bibliothèques", XIV, 1904).

In the full maturity of his powers, at liberty to satisfy his passion for work, with a large experience of life and an immense fund of general information, Montfaucon now took up his abode at the Abbey of St-Germain-des-Prés, where he spent the last forty years of his life. Here a choice body of scholars gathered around him, his avowed disciples, whose affection for their master prompted them to take the name of "Bernardins". Among these were Claude de Vic and Joseph Vaissette, authors of the "Histoiré de Languedoc", the hellenist Charles de la Rue (his favourite disciple), Dom Lobineau, the historian of Brittany, and even the Abbé Prévost, who was then a collaborator on the "Gallia Christiana". Montfaucon, moreover, corresponded with scholars all over Europe, and, in spite of the heavy tasks he took upon himself, he succeeded, thanks to his abstemious and regular life, in working almost to his last day. During this, his most productive period, he supplemented the former edition of the Greek Fathers with a "Collectio nova patrum et scriptorum græcorum" (2 vols., folio, Paris, 1706). In 1709 he translated into French the "De vita contemplativa" of Philo Judæus, and essayed to prove that the Therapeutæ there mentioned were Christians. Next appeared the edition of Origen (2 vols., fol., Paris, 1713) and that of St. John Chrysostom (13 vols., folio, Paris, 1718), prepared with the assistance of François Faverolles, treasurer of St-Denis, and four Benedictines, who spent thirteen years in collating 300 manuscripts.

The thoroughly scientific bent of Montfaucon's mind led him to elaborate a new auxiliary science out of the studies he had made for the verification of his Greek texts. As Mabillon had created the science of diplomatics, so Montfaucon was the father of Greek palæography, the principles of which he established by the rigour of his method in grouping his personal observations. His great "Palæographia Græca" (folio, Paris, 1708) inaugurated the scientific study of Greek texts. Another auxiliary science of history, that of bibliography, owes to him a work still of considerable value, the "Bibliotheca bibliothecarum manuscriptorum nova" (2 vols., folio, Paris, 1739), a catalogue of the Greek manuscripts of the chief libraries of Europe. Lastly, Montfaucon intuitively saw what benefit might accrue to history from the study of figured monuments, and, if he was not the creator of archæology, he was at least the first to show what advantages might be derived from it. Two of his works show him to be an originator. In 1719 he published "L'Antiquité expliquée et représentée en figures" (10 vols., folio, Paris), in which he reproduces, methodically grouped, all the ancient monuments that might be of use in the study of the religion, domestic customs, material life, military institutions, and funeral rites of the ancients. Of this work, which contains 1120 plates, the whole edition of 1800 copies was exhausted in two months, in spite of its enormous size. The regent, Philippe d'Orléans, desired that the author should become a member of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, and he was elected to replace Père Letellier (1719). Montfaucon then conceived a more daring idea, a work, similar to "l'Antiquité expliquée", which should embrace the entire history of France. This work, the "Monuments de la monarchie française", dedicated to Louis XV, appeared from 1729 to 1733 (5 vols., folio, Paris). In it Montfaucon studies the history, as it is shown in the monuments, of each successive reign down to that of Henry IV. His reproductions are inexact, and the work remained incomplete. On 19 December, 1741, he read before the Academy of Inscriptions a plan for completing this work; two days later he passed away tranquilly, without any premonitory symptoms of illness. An indefatigable scholar, a bold thinker, an originator of scientific methods, he left after him a mighty generation of disciples to form the connecting link between the old Benedictine learning and modern scholarship.

De Broglie, *La Société de St-Germain-des-Prés au XVIII^e siècle: Bernard de Montfaucon et les Bernardins 1715–1750* (2 vols., Paris, 1891); Gigas, *Lettres des Bénédictins de la congrégation de St-Maur, 1705–1741* (2 vols., Paris, 1893); Omont, *Bernard de Montfaucon, sa famille et ses premières années* in *Annales du Midi*, I (1892), 84, 90; *Histoire de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, XVI (Paris, 1751).

Louis Bréhier.

Montfort, Simon de, Earl of Leicester, date of birth unknown, d. at Toulouse, 25 June, 1218. Simon (IV) de Montfort was descended from the lords of Montfort l'Amaury in Normandy, being the second son of Simon (III), and Amicia, daughter of Robert de Beaumont, third Earl of Leicester. Having succeeded his father as Baron de Montfort in 1181, in 1190 he married Alice de Montmorency, the daughter of Bouchard (III) de Montmorency. In 1199 while taking part in a tournament at Ecry-sur-Aisne in the province of Champagne he heard Fulk de Neuilly preaching the crusade, and in company with Count Thibaud de Champagne and many other nobles and knights he took the cross. Unfortunately, the crusade got out of control, and the French knights, instead of co-operating with the pope, decided on a campaign in Egypt, and on their arrival at Venice entered on a contract for transport across the Mediterranean. Being unable to fulfil the terms of the contract, they compounded by assisting the Venetians to capture Zara in Dalmatia. In vain the pope urged them to set out for the Holy Land. They preferred to march on Constantinople, though Simon de Montfort offered energetic opposition to this proposal. Notwithstanding his efforts, the expedition was undertaken and the pope's plans were defeated.

In 1204 or 1205 Simon succeeded to the Earldom of

Leicester and large estates in England, for on the death of the fourth Earl of Leicester in that year, his honour of Leicester devolved on his sister Alicia, Simon's mother; and as her husband, Simon (III), and her eldest son were already dead, the earldom devolved on Simon himself. But though he was recognized by King John as Earl of Leicester, he was never formally invested with the earldom, and in February, 1207, the king seized all his English estates on pretext of a debt due from him. Shortly afterwards they were restored, only to be confiscated again before the end of the year. Simon, content with the Norman estates he had inherited from the de Montforts and the de Beaumonts, remained in France, where in 1208 he was made captain-general of the French forces in the Crusade against the Albigenses. At first he declined this honour, but the pope's legate, Arnold, Abbot of Cîteaux, ordered him in the pope's name to accept it, and he obeyed.

Simon thus received control over the territory conquered from Raymond (VI) of Toulouse and by his

Death of Simon de Montfort at the Storming of Toulouse, 1218
Stone bas-relief in the cathedral of Carcassonne

military skill, fierce courage, and ruthlessness he swept the country. His success won for him the admiration of the English barons, and in 1210 King John received information that they were plotting to elect Simon King of England in his stead. Simon, however, concentrated his fierce energies on his task in Toulouse, and in 1213 he defeated Peter of Aragon at the battle of Muret. The Albigenses were now crushed, but Simon carried on the campaign as a war of conquest, being appointed by the Council of Montpellier lord over all the newly-acquired territory, as Count of Toulouse and Duke of Narbonne (1215). The pope confirmed this appointment, understanding that it would effectually complete the suppression of the heresy. It is ever to be deplored that Simon stained his many great qualities by treachery, harshness, and bad faith. His severity became cruelty, and he delivered over many towns to fire and pillage, thus involving many innocent people in the common ruin. This is the more to be regretted, as his intrepid zeal for the Catholic faith, the severe virtue of his private life, and his courage and skill in warfare marked him out as a great man.

Meanwhile the pope had been making efforts to secure for him the restitution of his English estates. The surrender of his lands by John was one of the conditions for reconciliation laid down by the pope in 1213; but it was not till July, 1215, that John reluctantly yielded the honour of Leicester into the hands of Simon's nephew, Ralph, Earl of Chester, "for the benefit of the said Simon". Simon's interest in England was shown by his efforts to dissuade Louis of France from invading England in July, 1216, in which matter he was seconded, though fruitlessly, by the legate Gualo. Having at this time raised more troops in Paris, Simon returned to the south of France, where he occupied himself in waging war at Nîmes, until in 1217 a rebellion broke out in Provence, where Count Raymond's son re-entered Toulouse. Simon hastened to besiege the city, but was hampered by lack of troops. On 25 June, 1218, while he was at Mass he learned that the besieged had made a sortie. Refusing to leave the church before Mass was over, he arrived late at the scene of action only to be wounded mortally. He expired, commending his soul to God, and was buried in the Monastery of Haute-Bruyère. He left three sons, of whom Almeric the eldest ultimately inherited his French estates; the youngest was Simon de Montfort, who succeeded him as Earl of Leicester, and who was to play so great a part in English history.

Canet, *Simon de Montfort et la croisade contre les Albigeois* (Lille, 1891); Douais, *Soumission de la Vicomté de Carcassonne par Simon de Montfort* (Paris, 1884); L'Hermite, *Vie de Simon, Comte de Montfort* (s. l. a.); Molinier, *Catalogue des actes de Simon et d'Amauri de Montfort* in *Biblioth. de l'école des Chartes (1873)*, XXXIV (Paris, 1874); Norgate in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, s. v. *Simon* (V) *de Montfort*.

Edwin Burton.

Montgolfier, Joseph-Michel, inventor; b. at Vidalon-lez-Annonay, Department of Ardèche, France, 26 August, 1740; d. at Balaruc-les-Bains, Department of Hérault, France, 26 June, 1810. His father was a prosperous paper-manufacturer, who brought up nine children, presenting to them an example of high virtue, honesty, economy, and piety. Joseph was educated at the local college in a very unsatisfactory manner. When he returned home he found in the manufacture of paper subjects of study more to his liking. He set up an independent establishment with his brother Augustine in order to exercise the inventive faculties that were held in check by his economical father. His numerous ideas and projects and his simplicity of character exposed him to financial losses, and eventually brought upon him an unjust temporary imprisonment.

He improved the manufacture of paper, invented a method of stereotyping, and constructed an air-pump for rarefying the air in the moulds. Numerous objects of everyday life occupied his inventive genius. His most important work, however, was in connexion with hydraulics and aeronautics. He interested his brother Etienne in these so-called chimerical projects. They invented the hydraulic ram, which uses the energy from a copious flow of water under a small head in order to force a small portion of that water to a considerable height. Observations on the behaviour of a sheet hung over a fire led them to attempt a number of experiments with balloons made of taffetas and filled with heated air. On 5 June, 1783, a successful exhibition took place before the Estates of Vivarais, assembled at Annonay. A globe, 110 feet in circumference and weighing about 500 pounds, was filled with air half as heavy as the atmosphere. This balloon rose to a height of 6600 feet and came down very gently at a distance of a mile and a half. This attempt naturally excited enormous interest throughout the civilized world. Joseph left to his brother the honour and duty of reporting to the Academy of Sciences at Paris and of repeating experiments at the expense of the Government. Balloons were constructed that carried with them a furnace for the purpose of keeping the air heated and therefore light, and two courageous physicists, Biot and Gay-Lussac made a successful ascent. At Lyons, Joseph and six others went up in a balloon 126 feet high and 102 feet in diameter. On 20 August, 1783, the brothers were placed by acclamation on the list of correspondents of the Academy, "as scientists to

whom we are indebted for a new art that will make an epoch in the history of human science". Etienne received the decoration of Saint-Michel for himself, and letters of nobility for his father. Joseph obtained a pension, and 40,000 livres for the construction of an experimental dirigible balloon. This he was unable to realize.

He was noted for extraordinary bodily strength and for courageous philanthropy. During the stormy days of the Revolution he offered and ensured protection and asylum to many proscribed persons, who were often not known to him even by name. "Siding with no faction, he submitted to the political laws unless they were in opposition to the laws of humanity, and awaited with confidence the return of order". His business having been ruined, he went to Paris, where the new Government welcomed and rewarded him. He was called to the consulting bureau of arts and manufactures, was named demonstrator of the Conservatory of Arts and Trades, was received at the Institute, 1807, as the successor of Coulomb, and was made a Knight of the Legion of Honour.



JOSEPH-MICHEL AND JACQUES-ETIENNE MONTGOLFIER

Apart from a few memoirs in "Journal des Mines" and "Journal de l'Ecole polytechnique", he published very little, viz.: "Discours sur l'aérostat" (with his brother Etienne), Paris, 1783; "Voyageurs aériens" (with Etienne), Paris, 1784; "Mémoires sur la machine aérostatique", Paris, 1784; "Notes sur le bélier hydraulique", Paris, 1803.

DELAMBRE, notice in *Mémoires de l'Institut, Sciences math. et phys., 1810* (Paris, 1811); WISE, *System of Aeronautics* (Philadelphia, 1850).

WILLIAM FOX.

Months, SPECIAL DEVOTIONS FOR.—During the Middle Ages the public functions of the Church and the popular devotions of the people were intimately connected. The laity assisted at the daily psalmody, the sacrifice of the Mass, the numerous processions, and were quite familiar with the liturgy. Those few religious practices outside of official services, e. g. the Rosary (a substitute for the 150 Psalms) originated in the liturgy. Later, however, especially since the sixteenth century, popular devotion followed its own channels; unliturgical practices like the Stations of the Cross, the *Quarant 'Ore*, various litanies and rosaries (*coronæ*), prevailed everywhere; novenas and series of Sundays and week-days in honour of particular saints or mysteries were instituted. Entire months of the year were given over to special devotions. Following is a list of the more common devotions with the indulgences attached: (1) *January*, the Holy Name of Jesus (feast of the Holy Name, second Sunday after Epiphany); indulgences, one hundred days each day if the devotion is made privately, three hundred days each day, if the devotion be in a public church or chapel, plenary indulgence for daily assistance at the public functions, under the usual conditions (Leo XIII, "Brief", 21 Dec., 1901; "Acta S. Sedis", XXXIV, 425). (2) *March*, St. Joseph (feast, 19 March); indulgences, three hundred days daily for those who privately or publicly perform some pious practice in honour of St. Joseph, during the month, a plenary indulgence on any day of the month under the usual conditions (Pius IX, "Rescript Congr. Indulg.", 27 April, 1865). This month of devotions may commence in February and be concluded 19 March (Pius IX, 18 July, 1877). March can be replaced by any other month in case of legitimate impediment (Raccolta, 404). The practice of a triduum before the feast of St. Joseph has been recommended by Leo XIII (Encycl. "Quamquam pluries", 15 August, 1889). (3) *May*, the Blessed Virgin Mary. The May devotion in its present form originated at Rome where Father Latomia of the Roman College of the Society of Jesus, to counteract infidelity and immorality among the students, made a vow at the end of the eighteenth century to devote the month of May to Mary. From Rome the practice spread to the other Jesuit colleges and thence to nearly every Catholic church of the Latin rite (Albers, "Bluethenkränze", IV, 531 sq.). This practice is the oldest instance of a devotion extending over an entire month. Indulgences, three hundred days each day, by assisting at a public function or performing the devotion in private, plenary indulgence on any day of the month or on one of the first eight days of June under the usual conditions (Pius VII, 21 March, 1815, for ten years; 18 June, 1822 *in perpetuum*).

(4) *June*, the Sacred Heart. This devotion, long privately practised, was approved by Pius IX, 8 May, 1873 (Rescr. auth., n. 409), and urgently recommended by Leo XIII in a letter addressed by the Cardinal Prefect S.R.C. to all the bishops, 21 July, 1899. Indulgences: (a) seven years and seven quarantines each day for performing the devotion publicly or privately; (b) if the devotion is practised daily in private, or if a person assists at least ten times at a public function, a plenary indulgence on any day in June or from 1–8 July (Decr. Urbis et orbis, 30 May, 1902); (c) the indulgence *toties quoties* on the thirtieth of June or the last Sunday of June (26 Jan., 1908) in those churches where the month of June is celebrated solemnly. Pius X (8 Aug., 1906) urged a daily sermon, or at least for eight days in the form of a mission (26 Jan., 1908); (d) to those priests, who preach the sermons at the solemn functions in June in honour of the Sacred Heart and to the rectors of the churches where these functions are held, the privilege of the Gregorian Altar on the thirtieth of June (Pius X, 8 Aug., 1906); (e) plenary indulgence for each Communion in June and to those who promote the solemn celebration of the month of June ("Acta Pontificia", IV, 388, 8 Aug., 1906). (5) *July*, the Precious Blood (feast of the Precious Blood, first Sunday of July). This devotion was propagated by Bl. Caspar Buffalo (d. at Rome, 28 Dec., 1837), founder of the Congregation of the Precious Blood of Jesus Christ. Indulgences, for the public devotion: seven years and seven quarantines each day; plenary indulgence on any day in July or 1–8 August, after having assisted eight times at a public function under the usual conditions; if the devotion be held privately three hundred days each day with plenary indulgence on 31 July, or 1–8 of August (Pius IX, 4 June, 1850). For this practice any other month or any period of thirty days during the year may be chosen (Raccolta, 178). (6) *September*, the Seven Dolours of the Blessed Virgin Mary (feast of the Seven Dolours, third Sunday in September); indulgences, three hundred days each day and the devotions may be performed in public or private; plenary indulgence on any day of September or 1–8 October under the usual conditions (Leo XIII, "Raccolta", 27 Jan., 1888, 232).

(7) *October*, the Holy Rosary (feast of the Holy Rosary, first Sunday in October). Leo XIII personsonally instituted this practice in an Encyclical (1 Sept., 1883) in which he admonished the faithful to

dedicate the month of October to the Queen of the Holy Rosary in order to obtain through her intercession the grace that God may console and defend His Church in her sufferings, and for nineteen years he published an encyclical on this subject. By the decree of the Congregation of Rites (20 Aug., 1885; 26 Aug., 1886; 2 Sept., 1887) he ordained that every year during the entire month of October, including the first and second of November, in every cathedral and parochial church, and in all other churches and chapels which are dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary, five decades of the Rosary and the Litany of Loreto are to be recited, in the morning during Mass or in the afternoon whilst the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, and by the encyclical letter of 15 August, 1889, a prayer in honour of St. Joseph was added. Indulgences (S. C. Indulg., 23 July, 1898): (a) seven years and seven quarantines every day for the public or private recitation of five decades; (b) plenary indulgence on the feast of the Holy Rosary or during the octave for those who during the entire octave recite daily five decades and fulfil the other usual conditions; (c) plenary indulgence on any other day of the month for those who, after the octave of the feast, recite for at least ten days five decades ("Raccolta", 354; Albers, "Bluethenkränze", III, 730 sq.). Also in October there are devotions in honour of St. Francis of Assisi (feast, 4 Oct.); indulgences, three hundred days each day by assisting at the public devotions in honour of St. Francis in a church or public oratory; plenary indulgence on the feast of St. Francis or during the octave (11 June, 1883, for ten years; 29 Feb., 1904, *in perpetuum;* "Acta Minorum", 1904, 106). Any other month may be selected instead of October. (8) *November*, the Holy Souls in Purgatory (2 Nov., Commem. of all the Faithful Departed); indulgences, seven years and seven quarantines each day; plenary indulgence on any day of month under the usual conditions (Leo XIII, 17 Jan., 1888). Popular devotion has also selected other mysteries and has dedicated January to the Holy Childhood and the hidden life of Jesus according to the Gospel of the first Sunday after Epiphany; March, to the Holy Family, on account of the feast of St. Joseph and the Annunciation (25 March); August, to the Maternal Heart of Mary (feast on the Sunday after twenty-second of August); October, to the Holy Angels (feast, 2 Oct.); December, to the Immaculate Conception (feast, 8 Dec.) or to the Holy Child in the stable at Bethlehem (25 Dec.). These practices, however, are not formally approved by the Church, nor enriched with indulgences.

These devotions, of course, vary with conditions in different countries. Though there is a wide variety, constantly changing, the prayers more commonly used are the litanies of the Holy Name, Sacred Heart, St. Joseph, the Blessed Virgin, the indulgenced prayers of the Raccolta, the rosary of the Dominicans. For the May and June devotions, a short sermon or instruction usually follows, with Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament concluding the services.

BERINGER, *Die Ablasse* (13th ed., Paderborn, 1906); SCHWEIGHOFER, *Ablass-Brevier* (Munich, 1907).

FREDERICK G. HOLWECK.

Monti di Pietà. See MONTES PIETATIS.

Montmagny, CHARLES HUAULT DE, second French Governor of Canada, b. in France towards the end of the sixteenth century, of Charles Huault and Antoinette du Drac; d. in the Antilles after 1651. Educated by the Jesuits, he joined the Order of Malta in 1622, and fought against the Moslems and the corsairs of Africa. Appointed to replace Champlain before the announcement of the latter's death, he reached Quebec on 15 June, 1636. He rebuilt Fort St-Louis, and traced the plan of the city, giving to its four primitive streets the names they still bear in honour of King Louis, of the queen-mother, and the patron saints of Paris, and of his order. With him had come several noble families destined to contribute to the country's development and renown. During his administration were built the Jesuit College (founded 1635), the Ursuline monastery, and Hôtel-Dieu (1639). Isle Jésus, lying parallel to Montreal, was first called by the Jesuit Lejeune *Isle Montmagny* in his honour. From the outset, he was ardent for the conversion of the aborigines. In 1636 was begun the *reduction* of Sillery, where Montmagny strove to have the Indians instructed. When Maisonneuve, in the autumn of 1641, came with forty colonists to found Montreal, Montmagny kept them for the winter, and in the spring personally escorted them to their destination. He built Fort Richelieu (now Sorel) at the mouth of the river of the same name, where he victoriously repulsed the onslaught of 700 Iroquois. At the expiration of a third term of office, he was replaced by Daillebout (1648), and departed sincerely regretted by all and leaving behind him an undying reputation for prudence and wisdom. He had efficaciously aided in the progress of the colony by the concession of twenty large domains to the enterprising heads of as many noble families. Shortly after his return to France, he was sent to St. Christopher in the Antilles, a possession of his order, where he died. He lies buried in the church of Basseterre. Parkman accuses him of being a tool in the hands of the Jesuits, but his refusal to develop actively their missions in the region of the Great Lakes, to the detriment of the interests of Quebec, gives ample proof of his independent government. Awed by his imposing stature and dignity, the aborigines called him *Ononthio* or "High Mountain" (a translation of his name, Montmagny, *Mons magnus*). He was withal mild, courteous, and affectionate, winning the attachment of both Indians and whites. He was charitable and sincerely pious, free alike from bigotry and dissimulation.

FERLAND, *Cours d'Histoire du Canada* (Quebec, 1882); ROY, *L'Ordre de Malte en Amérique* (Quebec, 1888); IDEM in *Nouvelle France* (March, April, 1906); ALEXIS in *Nouvelle France* (Oct., Nov., Dec., 1908).

LIONEL LINDSAY.

Montmirail (MONTE-MIRABILI), JOHN DE, son of Andrew, Lord of Montmirail and Ferté-Gaucher, and Hildiarde d'Oisy, b. in 1165; d. 29 Sept., 1217. He was trained in piety by his mother, and well instructed in the secular sciences. Whilst young he embraced a military career, and was presented at the Royal Court, where he formed a lasting friendship with Philip Augustus, later King of France. The dissipations of court life led him to neglect the training of his youth; even his marriage with a most estimable lady, Helvide de Dampierre, failed to effect a change for the better. However, in his thirtieth year he met Jobert, Prior of St-Etienne de Montmirail, whose words of counsel proved sufficient to cause his conversion; and he turned to God with generosity and fidelity. He built an hospital for the sick of all kinds, but the objects of his predilection were the lepers, and those hopelessly afflicted. He loved the poor as brothers, and provided for them. He was severe on himself, wearing a coarse hair-shirt, passing frequently entire nights in prayer. Not satisfied with a life of holiness in the world, nor with that of a recluse, which he tried for a while, he entered the Cistercian monastery of Longpont, after having distributed amongst the poor all his possessions not needed by his wife and family; and he gave himself wholly to prayer and penance, so much so that he had to be reprimanded for going to excess. He had to bear every kind of insult from his former friends; even members of his own family abused him for having abandoned honour and wealth for poverty and subjection. But none of these things could weaken the fervor with which he sought perfection. Innumerable miracles were wrought at his

tomb, and attract pilgrims even to the present day. Leo XIII granted a special office in his honour for the Diocese of Soissons.

Ménologe Cistercien (Saint-Brieuc, 1898); CHALEMOT, *Series SS. . . . Ord. Cist.* (Paris, 1670); SARTORIUS, *Cistercium Bis-Tertium* (Prague, 1700); *Acta SS.*, Sept., VIII, 186 sqq.; MANRIQUE, *Annales Cistercienses*, IV (Lyons, 1659).

EDMOND M. OBRECHT.

Montmorency, ANNE, FIRST DUKE OF, b. at Chantilly, 15 March, 1492; d. at Paris, 12 November, 1567. He belonged to that family of Montmorency whose members from 1327 held the title of first Barons of France. Educated with the future Francis I, appointed marshal in 1522 as a reward for his services in the capture of Novara, his successful efforts to obtain the freedom of Francis I, taken prisoner at Pavia (1525), assured him of his favour. He immediately became grand master of the royal house and Governor of Languedoc. To his cleverness was due the treaty of Cambrai (1529), by which the two sons of Francis I, retained as hostages by Charles V since 1526, were released; in 1530 his power became unlimited. He inaugurated a new policy; his foremost aim was that France should regain her strength and live at peace with the emperor and the pope. He arranged the interview at Marseilles (1533) between Francis I and Clement VII in which the marriage of Catherine de Médicis with Prince Henry, the second son of the king, was arranged. The continued friendship of Francis I with certain German princes and his ambitions in Italy which were opposed to those of the emperor, made an understanding with Charles V very difficult. With the outbreak of war in 1536, Montmorency adopted the tactics of never giving battle; he laid waste Provence so that when the imperial forces invaded that province they were obliged by famine to retreat. The articles of agreement which Charles V and Francis I signed (July, 1538), were the work of Montmorency, who declared afterwards that "the interests of both might be considered identical". The journey of Charles V to France (January, 1540) led Francis I to believe that the emperor was about to cede Milan to him; but he was soon undeceived. Montmorency, constable since 1538, was disgraced (June, 1541) through the influence of the favourite, Mme. d'Etampes. In 1547 Henry II, hardly become king, recalled Montmorency and made him really his favourite: Charles V made advances to the constable who in 1551 became a duke and a peer. He soon found himself opposed to the Guises. In spite of the military glory of occupying Metz (April, 1552), his one desire was to secure peace between France and the Empire, and in 1555 he made a vain effort to bring this about through the mediation of Mary Tudor. The war was prolonged: at Saint-Quentin (August, 1557) Montmorency, defeated, was taken prisoner; it was in prison that he commenced the negotiations which terminated in the treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis (April, 1559) by which France obtained Metz, Toul, Verdun, and Calais but renounced any claim to Italy, Savoy, Brescia, and Bugey. Montmorency, in retirement during the reign of Francis II, under the regency of Catherine de Médicis found his position very complicated. The uncle of Coligny and an enemy of the Guises, it seemed as if he ought to have sustained that policy of toleration towards the Protestants at first inaugurated by the queen-regent; but his Catholic convictions led him with the Duke of Guise and the Maréchal de Saint-André to form a triumvirate (6 August, 1561) to save Catholicism. Wounded and captured by the Huguenots at the battle of Dreux (19 December, 1562) after the peace, he joined with the Protestant Condé in the effort to take Havre from the English (30 July, 1563). In the second war of religion he again opposed Condé; and it was a follower of Condé who mortally wounded him at the battle of Saint-Denis (10 November, 1567).

ANNE DE MONTMORENCY

Of indomitable courage, his cruelty towards conquered soldiers was shocking. He preferred defensive to offensive warfare. Although definitively the first of the great French lords, he worked towards the development of royal absolutism; under Francis I and Henry II he showed himself a faithful defender of the royal authority and suspected the Guises of being its enemies. A conservative in religion, he could not understand the intrigues of Catherine de Médicis and throughout the religious wars he fought vigorously for Catholicism under the same banner as the Guises whom he detested. An enlightened and generous protector of the writers and artists of the Renaissance, in his castle at Chantilly finished in 1530, he gathered together a numismatic collection which later, after the condemnation of the Duke of Montmorency, the descendant of Anne, Louis XIII gave to his brother, Gaston d'Orléans, and which was the beginning of the Cabinet des Médailles of the national library of Paris. The library of Chantilly as formed by Anne contained wonderful copies, luxuriously edited, of the first French translations of Latin authors. The Institut de France in 1900 bought "Les Heures du connétable" to add them again to this library from which they had been taken; they form one of the most admirable illuminated manuscripts of the sixteenth century, and we find in them a very beautiful prayer to Saint Christopher, composed by Anne himself during his years of disgrace; this manuscript was completed in 1549. During his disgrace Anne built the chateau of Ecouen where Jean Goujon, Rosso, and Bernard Palissy worked, and where were to be found two slaves in marble of Michael Angelo.

JEAN DE LUXEMBOURG, *Le triomphe et les gestes de Mgr Anne de Montmorency*, ed. DELISLE (Paris, 1904); DELISLE, *Les heures du connétable Anne de Montmorency au Musée Condé* (Chantilly, 1900); DE LASTEYRIE, *Un grand seigneur du XVI^e siècle: le connétable de Montmorency* (Paris, 1879); DECRUE, *Anne de Montmorency, grand maître et connétable de France à la cour, aux armées, et au conseil du roi François I^er* (Paris, 1885); IDEM, *Anne, duc de Montmorency, connétable et pair de France sous les rois Henri II, François II et Charles IX* (Paris, 1889). See also bibliography under GUISE and CATHERINE DE MÉDICIS.

GEORGES GOYAU.

Montor, ALEXIS-FRANÇOIS ARTAUD DE, diplomat and historian, b. at Paris, 31 July, 1772; d. at Paris, 12 Nov., 1849. An *émigré* during the Revolution, he was entrusted by the royal princes with missions to the Holy See and served during the campaign of Champagne in Condé's army. Bonaparte made him secretary of the French Legation at Rome; Artaud occupied this post under Cacault, left Rome for a short time when Cardinal Fesch, Cacault's successor, brought Chateaubriand with him, and returned to Rome in the same capacity after Chateaubriand had resigned. Appointed chargé d'affaires of France to Florence in 1805 he was recalled in 1807 because he was wrongfully suspected of having employed his power in behalf of the Queen of Etruria whose possessions Napoleon wished to give to Elisa Bonaparte. Made censor during the last years of the empire, he became under the Restoration secretary of the embassy at Vienna, then again at Rome. In 1830 he retired upon a pension to devote himself exclusively to literary works. Besides

his translation of Dante's "Divina Commedia" (1811–1813) which was rated very highly, Artaud de Montor left important historical works: "Machiavel, son génie et ses erreurs" (Paris, 1833); the volume on the history of Italy in the collection of the "Univers pittoresque" (Paris, 1834); "Histoire du pape Pie VII" (2 vols., Paris, 1836); "Histoire de Dante Alighieri" (Paris, 1841); "Histoire des souverains pontifes romains" (8 vols., Paris, 1842); "Histoire de Léon XII" (Paris, 1843); "Histoire de Pie VIII" (Paris, 1843). Shortly before his death, he published in 1849 when Pius IX was banished to Gæta, a work entitled: "La papauté et les émeutes romaines". His recollections and his observations as a diplomat form the valuable feature of Artaud de Montor's historical works. He was a member of the Académie des Inscriptions et belles lettres from 17 Dec., 1830.

QUÉRARD, *La littérature française contemporaine*, I (Paris, 1840), 78–82; LORENZ, *Catalogue Général de la Librairie Française*, I (Paris, 1892), 79.

GEORGES GOYAU.

Montpellier, DIOCESE OF (MONTIS PESSULANI), comprises the department of Hérault, and is a suffragan of Avignon. When the Concordat of 1802 re-established this diocese, it accorded to it also the department of Tarn, which was detached from it in 1822 by the creation of the Archdiocese of Albi; and from 1802 to 1822, Montpellier was a suffragan of Toulouse. A Brief of 16 June, 1877, authorized the bishops of Montpellier to call themselves bishops of Montpellier, Béziers, Agde, Lodève, and Saint-Pons, in memory of the different dioceses united in the present Diocese of Montpellier.

(A) Diocese of Montpellier.—Maguelonne was the original diocese. Local traditions, recorded in 1583 by Abbé Gariel in his "Histoire des évêques de Maguelonne", affirm that St. Simon the Leper, having landed at the mouth of the Rhône with St. Lazarus and his sisters, was the earliest apostle of Maguelonne. Gariel invokes in favour of this tradition a certain manuscript brought from Byzantium. But the chronicler, Bishop Arnaud de Verdale (1339–1352) was ignorant of this alleged Apostolic origin of Maguelonne. It is certain that the tombstone of a Christian woman named Vera was found at Maguelonne; Le Blant assigns it to the fourth century. The first historically known Bishop of Maguelonne was Bœtius, who assisted at the Council of Narbonne in 589. Maguelonne was completely destroyed in the course of the wars between Charles Martel and the Saracens. The diocese was then transferred to Substantion, but Bishop Arnaud (1030–1060) brought it back to Maguelonne which he rebuilt. Near Maguelonne had grown up by degrees the two villages of Montpellier and Montpellieret. According to legend, they were in the tenth century the property of the two sisters of St. Fulcran, Bishop of Lodève. About 975 they gave them to Ricuin, Bishop of Maguelonne. It is certain that about 990 Ricuin possessed these two villages; he kept Montpellieret and gave Montpellier in fief to the family of the Guillems. In 1085 Pierre, Count of Substantion and Melgueil, became a vassal of the Holy See for this countship, and relinquished the right of nomination to the Diocese of Maguelonne. Urban II charged the Bishop of Maguelonne to exercise the papal suzerainty, and he spent five days in this town when he came to France to preach the Crusade. In 1215 Innocent III gave the countship of Melgueil in fief to the Bishop of Maguelonne, who thus became a temporal lord.

From that time the Bishop of Maguelonne had the right of coinage. Clement IV reproached (1266) Bishop Bérenger de Frédol with causing to be struck in his diocese a coin called "Miliarensis", on which was read the name of Mahomet; in fact at that date the bishop, as well as the King of Aragon and the Count of Toulouse, authorized the coinage of Arabic money, not intended for circulation in Maguelonne, but to be sold for exportation to the merchants of the Mediterranean.

In July, 1204, Montpellier passed into the hands of Peter of Aragon, son-in-law of the last of the Guillems; Jaime I, son of Peter II, united the city to the Kingdom of Majorca. In 1282 the King of Majorca paid homage to the King of France for Maguelonne. Bérenger de Frédol, Bishop of Maguelonne, ceded Montpellier to Philip IV (1292). Jaime III of Majorca sold Montpellier to Philip VI (1349); and the city, save for the period from 1365 to 1382, was henceforth French. Urban V (Guillaume de Grimoard) had studied theology and canon law at Montpellier and was crowned pope by Cardinal Ardouin Aubert, nephew of Innocent VI, and Bishop of Maguelonne from 1352 to 1354; hence the attachment of Pope Urban for this diocese which he favoured greatly. In

CATHEDRAL, MONTPELLIER

1364 he caused the foundation at Montpellier, of a Benedictine monastery under the patronage of St. Germain, and came himself to Montpellier to see the new church (9 Jan.–8 March, 1367). He caused the city to be surrounded by ramparts, in order that the scholars might work there in safety; and finally he caused a large canal to be begun by which Montpellier might communicate with the sea. At the request of King Francis I, who pleaded the epidemics and the ravages of the pirates which constantly threatened Maguelonne, Paul III transferred the see to Montpellier (27 March, 1536). Montpellier, into which Calvinism was introduced in Feb., 1560, by the pastor, Guillaume Mauget, was much troubled by the wars of religion. Under Henry III a sort of Calvinistic republic was installed there. The city was reconquered by Louis XIII (October, 1622).

Among the 54 bishops of Maguelonne, and the 18 bishops of Montpellier, may be mentioned: Blessed Louis Aleman (1418–23), later Bishop of Arles; Guillaume Pellicier (1527–68), whom Francis I sent as an ambassador to Venice, and whose learning as a humanist and naturalist made him after Scévole de Sainte-Marthe, "the most learned man of his century"; the preacher Pierre Fenouillet (1608–52); François de Bosquet (1657–76), whose historical labours were

very useful to the celebrated Baluze; the bibliophile Colbert de Croissy (1696–1738), who induced the Oratorian Pouget to compose in 1702 the famous "Catechism of Montpellier", condemned by the Holy See in 1712 and 1721 for Jansenistic tendencies; Fournier (1806–34), who in 1801 was confined for a time in the madhouse at Bicêtre at the command of Napoleon, for a sermon against the Revolution. Among the numerous councils and synods held at Montpellier, the following merit mention: the council of 1162 in which Alexander III excommunicated the antipope, Victor; the provincial synod of 1195, which was occupied with the Saracens of Spain and the Albigenses; the council of 1215, which was presided over by Peter of Benevento, legate of the Holy See and passed important canons concerning discipline, and declared also that subject to the approval of the pope, Toulouse and all the other towns taken from the Albigenses should be given to Simon de Montfort; the council of 1224, which rejected the request of Raymond, Count of Toulouse, who promised to protect the Catholic Faith and demanded that Amaury de Montfort withdraw his claims to the countship of Toulouse; the council of 1258, which by permitting the seneschal of Beaucaire to arrest ecclesiastics taken in the act of crime, in order to hand them over to the bishop, made way for royal magistrates to exercise a certain power within the limits of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and thus inaugurated the movement as a result of which, under the name of "privileged cases", a certain number of offences committed by ecclesiastics became amenable to lay justice.

(B) Diocese of Agde.—Local traditions designate as the first Bishop of Agde, St. Venustus, said to have suffered martyrdom during the legendary invasion of the barbarian, Chrocus, about 407 or 408. The first historically known Bishop of Agde is Sophronius who assisted at the Council of Agde in 506.

(C) Diocese of Béziers.—Local traditions assign as the first Bishop of Béziers the Egyptian saint, Aphrodisius, said to have sheltered the Holy Family at Hermopolis and to have become a disciple of Christ, also to have accompanied Sergius Paulus to Gaul when the latter went thither to found the Church of Narbonne, and to have died a martyr at Béziers. The first historically known bishop is Paulinus mentioned in 418; St. Guiraud was Bishop of Béziers from 1121 to 1123; St. Dominic refused the See of Béziers to devote himself to the crusade against the Albigenses.

Among the fifteen synods held at Béziers must be mentioned that of 356 held by Saturninus of Arles, Arian archbishop, against St. Hilary; those of 1233, 1246, and 1255 against the Albigenses.

Local traditions made St. Aphrodisius arrive at Béziers mounted on a camel. Hence the custom of leading a camel in the procession at Béziers on the feast of the saint; this lasted until the Revolution.

(D) Diocese of Lodève.—Since the fourteenth century local tradition has made St. Florus first bishop of Lodève, and relates that as a disciple of St. Peter, he afterwards evangelized Haute-Auvergne and died in the present village of St-Flour. It is historically certain that bishops of Lodève have existed since 421; the first historically known bishop is Maternus, who was present at the Council of Agde in 506. Among the bishops of Lodève are: St. George (863–884), previously a Benedictine monk; St. Fulcran (949–1006), who in 975 dedicated the cathedral of St. Genès and founded the Abbey of St. Sauveur; the Dominican Bernard Guidonis (1324–1331); Cardinal Guillaume d'Estouteville (1450–1453), who played an important part as papal legate, also in the rehabilitation of Joan of Arc; the brothers Guillaume Briçonnet (1489–1516) and Denis Briçonnet (1516-1520).

(E) Diocese of Saint-Pons-de-Thomières.—The Abbey of St-Pons was founded in 936 by Raymond, Count of Toulouse, who brought thither the monks of St. Géraud d'Aurillac. By a Bull of 18 Feb., 1318, John XXII raised the abbey to a see.

Special honour is paid in the present Diocese of Montpellier to St. Pons (Pontius) de Cimiez, martyr under Valerian, patron of St-Pons-de-Thomières; Sts. Tiberius and Modestus and St. Florence, martyrs at Agde under Diocletian; St. Severus, Abbot of St. André, at Agde (d. about 500); St. Maxentius, a native of Agde and founder of the Abbey of St-Maixent, in Poitou (447–515); St. Benedict of Aniane, and his disciple and first historian, Saint Ardo Smaragdus (d. in 843); St. Guillem, Duke of Aquitaine, who in 804, founded near Lodève, on the advice of St. Benedict of Aniane, the monastery of Gellone (later St-Guillem du Désert), died there in 812, and under the name of "Guillaume au Court Nez" became the hero of a celebrated epic chanson; St. Etienne, Bishop of Apt (975–1046), born at Agde; Blessed Guillaume VI, Lord of Montpellier from 1121 to 1149 and who died a Cistercian at Grandselve; Bl. Peter of Castelnau, Archdeacon of Maguelonne, inquisitor (d. in 1208); St. Gérard (or Géri), Lord of Lunel (end of thirteenth century); the celebrated pilgrim, St. Roch, who was born at Montpellier about the end of the thirteenth century, saved several cities of Italy from the pest, and returned to Montpellier to live as a hermit, where he died in 1325. The Benedictine Abbey of Aniane (see BENEDICT OF ANIANE) was in the ninth century a centre of monastic reform. The Benedictine Abbey of Valmagne was founded in 1138 by Raymond of Trencavel, Viscount of Béziers. As early as 1180 the Hospital of the Holy Ghost at Montpellier received exposed or abandoned children.

The chief pilgrimages of the diocese are: Notre Dame de l'Ermitage at St-Guillem du Désert (fourteenth century); Notre Dame de Grâce at Gignac, on the site of a sanctuary built by St. Flour, first Bishop of Lodève; Notre Dame de Grau near Agde, on the site of an oratory built in 456 by St. Severus; Notre Dame de Mougères at Mougères (fifteenth century); Notre Dame de Montaigu at Ceyras, a pilgrimage founded by the Franciscans in the first half of the seventeenth century; Notre Dame de Roubignac (dating from the tenth century); Notre Dame du Suc at Brissac, established by the Benedictines; Notre Dame de Trédos, a pilgrimage already in existence in 1612; Notre Dame des Tables at Montpellier, dating from the ninth century, and particularly developed after miracles in 1189. The Church of Notre Dame des Tables disappeared after the Revolution; but the cult transferred to the chapel of the Jesuits is still in vogue, and in 1889, Mgr de Cabrières crowned the statue in the name of the pope. Before the application of the Law of 1901 there were in the diocese, Carthusians, Jesuits, Franciscans, Lazarists, Missionaries of la Salette, Carmelites, Salesians of Dom Bosco, and various orders of teaching brothers. Congregations of women native to the diocese are: The Augustinian Sisters of Charity of Our Lady, hospitallers, founded at Béziers in 1646; Sisters of Christian Doctrine, founded in 1853 (mother-house at Ceilhes); Dominican religious founded in 1855 (mother-house at Cette); the Nursing Sisters of Notre Dame auxiliatrice, founded 1845 by the Abbé Soulas (mother-house at Montpellier). At the beginning of the twentieth century the congregations directed in the diocese 2 crèches, 53 infant schools, 1 school for the blind, 1 school for deaf mutes, 8 orphanages for boys, 15 orphanages for girls, 1 institution of preservation, 1 establishment for correction, 1 institution of rehabilitation, 8 houses of mercy, 15 establishments for nursing the sick in their homes, 1 hospital for the insane, 6 hospitals or infirmaries.

In 1908 the diocese numbered 482,779 inhabitants, 43 parishes, 310 chapels, 27 vicariates.

Gallia Christiana, VI (*nova*, 1739), 223–256, 293–383, 525–579, 664–706, 727–831, 1123; and *instrumenta*, 73–102, 127–166, 263–

COPYRIGHT, 1911, BY ROBERT APPLETON CO.

Continuation of
ONTARIO
Showing North-Western part of the Diocese of Sault Ste. Marie and Eastern part of the Ecclesiastical Province of St. Boniface
Same Scale as Main Map
ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCES OF
MONTREAL, OTTAWA, TORONTO, AND KINGSTON
Seat of Archbishopric
Seat of Bishopric
Seat of Vicariate Apostolic
Eccl. Prov. of Montreal
I. Archdiocese of Montreal
II. Diocese of St. Hyacinthe
III. Diocese of Sherbrooke
IV. Diocese of Valleyfield
V. Diocese of Joliette
Eccl. Prov. of Ottawa
I. Archdiocese of Ottawa
II. Diocese of Pembroke
III. Vic. Ap. of Temiscaming
Eccl. Prov. of Toronto
I. Archdiocese of Toronto
II. Diocese of Hamilton
III. Diocese of London
Eccl. Prov. of Kingston
I. Archdiocese of Kingston
II. Diocese of Peterboro
III. Diocese of Alexandria
IV. Diocese of Sault Ste. Marie
English Statute Miles
THE MATTHEWS-NORTHRUP WORKS, BUFFALO, N. Y.
Greenwich

94, 311–40, 341–411; FISQUET, *France pontificale: Montpellier* (2 vols., Paris, 1868); DUCHESNE, *Fastes épiscopaux*, I; GROUSSET, *Hist. du diocèse de Montpellier dans les premiers siècles* (Montpellier, 1903); CHARLES D'AIGREFEUILLE, *Hist. de la ville de Montpellier*, ed. LA PIJARDIÈRE (4 vols., Montpellier, 1875–82); ARNAUD DE VERDALE, *Catalogus Episcoporum Magalonensium*, ed. GERMAIN (Montpellier, 1881); FABRÈGE, *Hist. de Maguelonne* (2 vols., Montpellier, 1894–1900); CARTIER, *Notice sur la monnaie frappée au XIII^e siècle par les évêques de Maguelonne avec le nom de Mahomet* in *Revue numismatique*, XX (1855), 199–227: GUIRAUD, *Les fondations du pape Urbain V à Montpellier* (3 vols., Montpellier, 1889–91); *Cartulaire des abbayes d'Aniane et de Gellone*, ed. ALAUS, CASSAN, and MEYNIAL (Montpellier, 1898); SABATIER, *Hist. de la ville et des évêques de Béziers* (Béziers, 1854); PARIS, *Hist. de la ville de Lodève, de son ancien diocèse et de son établissement actuel* (Montpellier, 1851); MARTIN, *Hist. de la ville de Lodève* (2 vols., Montpellier, 1900); SOUPAIRAC, *Petit dict. géog. et hist. du diocèse de Montpellier: arrondissement de Saint-Pons-de-Thomières* (Montpellier, 1880); BONNET, *Bibl. du diocèse de Montpellier* in *Mélanges de litt. et d'hist. religieuse publiés à l'occasion du jubilé de Mgr de Cabrières*, III (Paris, 1899).

GEORGES GOYAU.

UNIVERSITY OF MONTPELLIER.—It is not known exactly at what date the schools of literature were founded which developed into the Montpellier faculty of arts; it may be that they were a direct continuation of the Gallo-Roman schools. The school of law was founded by Placentinus, a doctor from Bologna, who came to Montpellier in 1160, taught there during two different periods, and died there in 1192. The school of medicine was founded perhaps by a graduate of the Spanish medical schools; it is certain that, as early as 1137, there were excellent physicians at Montpellier. The statutes given in 1220 by Cardinal Conrad, legate of Honorius III, which were completed in 1240 by Pierre de Conques, placed this school under the direction of the Bishop of Maguelonne. Nicholas IV issued a Bull in 1289, combining all the schools into a university, which was placed under the direction of the bishop, but which in fact enjoyed a large measure of autonomy. Theology was at first taught in the convents, in which St. Anthony of Padua, Raymond Lullus, and the Dominican Bernard de la Treille lectured. Two letters of King John prove that a faculty of theology existed at Montpellier independently of the convents, in January, 1350. By a Bull of 17 December, 1421, Martin V granted canonical institution to this faculty and united it closely with the faculty of law.

In the sixteenth century the faculty of theology disappeared for a time, when Calvinism, in the reign of Henry II, held complete possession of the city. It resumed its functions after Louis XIII had re-established the royal power at Montpellier in 1622; but the rivalries of Dominicans and Jesuits interfered seriously with the prosperity of the faculty, which disappeared at the Revolution. The faculty numbered among its illustrious pupils of law Petrarch, who spent four years at Montpellier, and among its lecturers Guillaume de Nogaret, chancellor to Philip the Fair, Guillaume de Grimoard, afterwards pope under the name of Urban V, and Pedro de Luna, antipope as Benedict XIII. But after the fifteenth century this faculty fell into decay, as did also the faculty of arts, although for a time, under Henry IV, the latter faculty had among its lecturers Casaubon. The Montpellier school of medicine owed its success to the ruling of the Guilhems, lords of the town, by which any licensed physician might lecture there; there was no fixed limit to the number of teachers, lectures were multiplied, and there was a great wealth of teaching. Rabelais took his medical degrees at Montpellier. It was in this school that the biological theory of vitalism, elaborated by Barthez (1734–1806), had its origin. The French Revolution did not interrupt the existence of the faculty of medicine. The faculties of science and of letters were re-established in 1810; that of law in 1880. It was on the occasion of the sixteenth centenary of the university, celebrated in 1889, that the Government of France announced its intention—which has since been realized—of reorganizing the provincial universities in France.

Cartulaire de l'Université de M., I (Montpellier, 1890); FOURNIER, *Statuts et privilèges des universités*, II (Paris, 1891), 1–300; III (1892), 541–5; BOISSIER, *Le sixième centenaire de l'univ. de M.* in *Revue des Deux Mondes* (July, 1890); GERMAIN, *La faculté de Théol. de M.* (Montpellier, 1883); ASTRUC, *Mém. pour servir à l'hist. de la faculté de médecine de M.* (Paris, 1767).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Montreal, ARCHDIOCESE OF, Metropolitan of the ecclesiastical Province of Montreal. Suffragans: the Dioceses of Saint-Hyacinthe, Sherbrooke, Valleyfield, and Joliette. Catholic population, 470,000; clergy, 720, of whom 395 are secular priests. Protestant population, 80,000, composed of different sects. The diocese, separated from Quebec by Gregory XVI (1836), has a maximum length of sixty and breadth of fifty-two miles. (See the official reports of His Grace the Archbishop to the Holy See, in the Archives of Montreal.)

The present article will be divided into: I. History; II. Present Conditions. Division I will be subdivided by periods: A. Before the Cession (1763); B. From the Cession to the Formation of the Diocese (1836); C. From 1836 to the present time (1910), in the last subdivision including an account of the Eucharistic Congress of 1910.

I. HISTORY.—A. *Before the Cession.*—On his second voyage (1535), Jacques Cartier, the discoverer of Canada, after stopping at Stadaconè (Quebec), went up the St. Lawrence to the savage village of Hochelaga, now Montreal. It was Cartier, who bestowed the beautiful and well deserved name of *Mont Royal* on the mountain that overhangs the present city. In 1608 Quebec was founded by Samuel de Champlain. While, in Canada, the youthful colony was endeavouring to live under the rather weak, because too selfish and mercantile, government of the Compagnie des Cent-Associés, the Compagnie de Notre-Dame-de-Montréal was being formed in France. Two men of God, M. Olier, of Saint-Sulpice, and M. de la Dauversière, were the life of this Compagnie de Montréal. They offered themselves without imposing any burden on the king, the clergy, or the people, having as their sole aim, the glory of God and the establishment of religion in New France. This association having addressed itself to M. Chomodey de Maisonneuve, found in him one who would carry out its wishes faithfully. The island of Montreal was purchased from the Compagnie des Cent-Associés, for purposes of colonization (7 August, 1640). On 18 May, 1642, M. de Maisonneuve arrived at the foot of Mount Royal, and landed with Mlle Jeanne Mance, the future foundress of the Hôtel-Dieu. Ville-Marie, as he first named Montreal, was then founded. (See CANADA.) For thirty years an heroic struggle had to be carried on against the Iroquois. In 1653 there arrived Marguerite Bourgeoys, who a little later established the Sisters of the Congregation. In 1657 the first Sulpicians, sent by M. Olier on his death-bed, settled under the direction of M. de Queylus. From that time the spiritual wants of Montreal have been entrusted mainly to the Fathers of Saint-Sulpice (see SAINT-SULPICE, CONGREGATION OF). It was at Montreal that Dollard formed his famous battalion in 1660. There also, Lemoyne and, before him, Lambert Closse, after Maisonneuve, had won great distinction.

M. de Queylus, the Sulpician, had come to Canada as Vicar-General of Rouen (1657). Rightly or wrongly, the Archbishop of Rouen believed that Canada was subject to him in spiritual matters, as the missionaries had gone thither from his diocese; neither the pope nor the king had raised any objection. Mgr de Laval arrived at Quebec in 1659. M. de Queylus, not having been informed directly, either by the Court or by the Holy See, of the nomination of Laval by Alexander VII, hesitated a moment before

yielding up the spiritual rights which he believed to be his (see LAVAL, SAINT-SULPICE). On 28 October, 1678, Mgr de Laval erected canonically the parish of Notre-Dame at Montreal, which was naturally confided to the Sulpicians. From that time to the cession, the successive curés were MM. François Dollier de Casson (30 Oct., 1678); François Vachon de Bellemont (28 Sept., 1701); Louis Normant (25 May, 1732); Etienne Montgolfier (21 June, 1759). The third successor of Mgr de Laval, Mgr Dosquet, from 1725 till 1739 Coadjutor, and later Bishop, of Quebec, was an old Sulpician from Montreal. In 1682, the Recollects were called to Montreal. From the time of their arrival at Quebec in 1615, these religious had been travelling through the country, and one of their number, Father Viel, had perished, with his disciple Ahuntsic, in the Sault-au-Récollet, near Montreal, both victims of the treachery of a Huron.

The Jesuit missionaries constantly journeying through these regions, frequently passed by Montreal in these early days. It was in 1669 that the Prairie

NOTRE-DAME DE LOURDES, MONTREAL

de la Magdeleine was established south of Montreal. This Jesuit Mission was transferred later to Sault-Saint-Louis, now Caughnawaga. The house, and the desk at which the celebrated Père Charlevoix wrote his "Relations", are still to be seen there. It was there, too, that the saintly Iroquois, Catherine Tegakwitha, lived. The Iroquois mission of Caughnawaga has lately been again taken under the care of the Jesuits. Mlle Mance had founded the Hôtel-Dieu, on her arrival, in 1642. In 1658 the Venerable Marguerite Bourgeoys established the Sisters of the Congregation, for the instruction of young girls. Then, in 1738, Venerable Marguerite Dufrost de la Jemmerais (the widow d'Youville) laid the foundations of the Institute of the Grey Sisters. The superiors of Saint-Sulpice, in addition to being curés of Notre-Dame, were also vicars-general of the Bishop of Quebec. After the victory of Wolfe over Montcalm on the plains of Abraham and the capitulation of Quebec (1760), Mgr de Pontbriant, the last bishop of the French period, withdrew to the Sulpicians at Montreal.

B. *From the Cession to the Formation of the Diocese* (1836).—Montreal remained a part of the Diocese of Quebec until 1836. The curés of Notre-Dame during this period were after M. Montgolfier, MM. Jean Brassier (30 August, 1791); Jean-Auguste Roux (24 Oct., 1798); Joseph-Vincent Quiblier (12 April, 1831). The Treaty of Paris (1763) provided that the Canadians should enjoy "the free exercise of their religion, as far as is permissible under the laws of Great Britain". A great struggle followed. The Sulpicians of Montreal, as well as the Recollects and the Jesuits, were forbidden to receive any additions to their ranks. They had numbered 30 in 1763, but in 1793 there remained only two, who were septuagenarians. The British Government, however, at that time allowed the French priests who were driven out by the Revolution to settle in Canada, and of the thirty-four who came twelve were Sulpicians. In 1767 the College of Montreal was founded by the Sulpician, M. Curatteau de la Blaiserie. In 1765, the Hôtel-Dieu, and in 1769 the establishment of the Sisters of the Congregation, which had been burnt, arose from their ruins, thanks to Saint-Sulpice. In 1801, Mgr Plessis (b. at Montreal in 1763) was consecrated at Quebec. This was the great bishop (1801–1815) who fought so ably and so resolutely for religious liberty. The clergy of Montreal supported him. Mgr Plessis, having asked for auxiliaries, obtained, among others Mgr Provencher for the West and Mgr Lartigue, a Sulpician, for Montreal. The latter was consecrated Bishop of Telmessus in 1820. In 1809 the College of St. Hyacinthe was founded by M. Girouard; in 1825 the College of Saint-Thérèse, by M. Ducharme; in 1832, the College of the Assumption, by M. François Labelle. This was the answer given to the English Protestants, who, with their Institution Royale, wished to monopolize education in all its branches. In 1824 the *fabriques* (administrative councils in charge of church revenues) were authorized to acquire and hold property for the support of the schools. In 1838 normal schools were established by the help of the clergy. In 1832, and again in 1834, a cholera epidemic afforded opportunities for the display of heroic zeal. In 1836 the Society for the Propagation of the Faith was established at Montreal, on the model of the society founded at Lyons in 1822, with which it became affiliated in 1843, but from which it separated in 1876. Mgr Plessis was succeeded in the See of Quebec by Mgr Panet, in 1825, and Mgr Signay (Sinai) followed in 1832. Finally, on 13 February, 1836, Montreal was erected into a diocese by Pope Gregory XVI.

C. *From 1836 to the Present Time* (1910).—This was a disturbed, but very fruitful and prosperous period. After the unfortunate events of 1837–38 (when several Montreal villages, on the Richelieu and at Deux Montagnes, inspired by a noble-hearted generosity rather than by prudence, rose up in arms against the encroachments of British bureaucracy) there followed the period called the Union of the Two Canadas (1840–67). Parliamentary institutions dependent on the people were established by the efforts of Lafontaine and Cartier. The Confederation was established in 1867. (See CANADA). During this period the bishops and archbishops of Montreal were: Mgr Lartigue, consecrated in 1821, titular in 1836, d. 1840; Mgr Bourget, coadjutor in 1837, titular in 1840, resigned in 1876, d. 1885; Mgr Fabre, coadjutor in 1873, titular bishop in 1876, archbishop in 1886, d. 1896; Mgr Bruchési, archbishop from 1897 to the present time. The superiors of Saint-Sulpice, after M. Quiblier, were MM. Bilaudèle (1846), Granet (1856), Bayle (1866), Colin (1881), and Lecoq (1902).

The foundation of the Grand Séminaire at Montreal took place in 1840; of the Canadian College at Rome, in 1888; of the Séminaire de Philosophie, near the Grand Séminaire, at Montreal, in charge of the Sulpicians, in 1894. The Brothers of the Christian Schools arrived in 1837; the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, in 1841. The Jesuits returned in 1842, their novitiate was opened in 1843, and the Collège Sainte-Marie, in 1848. The Viateurs and the Fathers of the Holy Cross arrived in 1847. Of the communities of women, the Religious of the Society of the Sacred Heart arrived from France in 1842; the Sisters of the Good Shepherd of Angers, for teaching and establishing homes for penitents, arrived in 1843; in the same year the Sisters of Providence were founded by Madame Gamelin, for teaching and works of charity, as were the teaching Sisters of the Holy Names of

Jesus and Mary; the Sisters of the Holy Cross, also a teaching institute from France, arrived in 1847; in 1848 the institute of Sœurs de la Miséricorde were founded for the care of Magdalenes and in 1850 the Sisters of St. Anne, for teaching. Colleges were founded at Joliette and Bourget, by the Clerics of Saint-Viateur, in 1846 and 1850; at Saint-Laurent, by the Fathers of the Holy Cross, in 1847. (For the Laval University, chartered in 1852, and its succursal at Montreal, see LAVAL UNIVERSITY OF QUEBEC.) In 1852 the Diocese of St. Hyacinthe was erected, and in 1874 that of Sherbrooke; both of these became suffragan of Montreal in 1886, when Montreal became a metropolitan see. The other two suffragans, Valleyfield and Joliette, were erected in 1892 and 1904 respectively. Other notable events were: in 1840, the missions of Mgr Forbin Janson, and the Act granting separate schools (denominational); in 1843, the preaching of temperance; in 1848, the establishment of colonization societies (celebrated later under the direction of Mgr Labelle, parish priest of St. Jérôme) to counteract the emigration movement towards the United States; in 1866, division of the parish of Notre-Dame (since divided further into more than 50 parishes); in 1868, the condemnation by Bishop Bourget, confirmed by the Holy See, of the "Institut Canadien", a club which by means of its books and its lectures had become a centre of Voltaireanism and irreligion; also "the Guibord affair", a famous lawsuit in reference to the burial in consecrated ground of a member of the same club. About 1884, began at Montreal the Lenten lectures in Notre Dame, then those in the Gesù, and lastly those in the cathedral (in 1898) under Mgr Bruchési. In 1896 Loyola College was founded by the Jesuits for English-speaking Catholics; in 1905, Mgr Racicot was appointed auxiliary bishop to the Archbishop of Montreal.

The Eucharistic Congress of 1910.—The Twenty-first International Eucharistic Congress was held at Montreal, 7–11 September, 1910. (For the origin and object of these congresses, see CONGRESSES, CATHOLIC: *International Congresses*.) At the Eucharistic Congress of London, in 1908, the Committee offered Mgr Bruchési the opportunity to hold the Congress of 1910 in his archiepiscopal city. For a year the various committees at Montreal worked energetically in preparation for the event. Pius X sent as legate *a latere* His Eminence Vincenzo Vannutelli, Cardinal-Bishop of Palestrina. All the bishops of Canada and the United States and a large number from Europe were present in person or sent their representatives. Three cardinals, one hundred and twenty archbishops and bishops, between three and four thousand priests, and more than a half million lay visitors came to Montreal. The literary reunions of the French-speaking section were held at the house of the Fathers of the Blessed Sacrament, Laval University, and the National Monument, while those of the English-speaking section took place at the Convent of the Sacred Heart, Windsor Hall, and Stanley Hall. More than a hundred studies on the Blessed Eucharist—in relation to dogma, moral, history, discipline, pious practices, devotions, and associations—were read and discussed. Each séance was presided over by a bishop. Special reunions for priests, men and women, and for the young were held with great success.

A splendid gathering of twenty thousand young men received the papal legate with enthusiasm; thirty thousand school-children passed in review before him. It is estimated that a hundred thousand men marched in procession on the occasion of the solemn closing of the Congress, Sunday, 11 September, in the presence of 700,000 spectators. The streets of the city were magnificently decorated for the occasion with triumphal arches, draperies, and flags, under the direction of the committee of architects. On the side of Mont Royal, in the Parc Mance, an immense park in the form of an amphitheatre, a monumental altar had been erected; there Mass was celebrated in the open air on 10 September, and there on the following day, the great procession terminated, when nearly 800,000 Christians assembled to welcome Jesus in the Eucharist held in the hands of the cardinal legate, blessing Montreal, Canada, America, and the whole world. Besides the literary reunions already mentioned, two great meetings were held on Friday and Saturday evenings at Notre-Dame, where speeches in honour of the Christian Faith and the Blessed Sacrament were delivered by: Cardinal Vannutelli, Cardinal Logue, Archbishops Bruchési, Bourne, and Ireland, Bishops Touchet and Rumeau, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Lomer Gouin, Hon. Thomas Chapais, Judge Doherty, Deputy Tellier, Judge O'Sullivan, Deputy Henri Bourassa, M. Gerlier, and many other distinguished ecclesiastics and laymen of the Old and New World. These memorable displays of eloquence made a deep impression in the souls of the twelve to fifteen thousand auditors. Also in the church of Notre-Dame, at the first hour of Thursday, 8 September, as a religious prelude to the literary séances, an imposing midnight Mass was celebrated, at which thousands of men received Holy Communion, the Mass having been preceded by an hour's solemn adoration under the direction of members of the Association Adoration Nocturne of Montreal. The ceremony of the official reception of the papal legate, the special Mass on Thursday, 8 September, in favour of the numerous religious communities of Montreal, and also the high Mass on Sunday, 11 September, sung by the cardinal legate, at which Cardinal Gibbons and Mgr Touchet preached, all took place in the cathedral of St. James. At the open-air Mass on Saturday, 10 Sep., sung by Mgr. Farley, the preachers were Mgr O'Connell and the Rev. Father Hage.

BOURGET MONUMENT, MONTREAL

What specially distinguished the Congress of Montreal from any previous Eucharistic Congress was the official participation of the civil, federal, provincial, and municipal authorities. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company had sent a representative to meet the legate in Rome, and His Eminence

crossed the ocean on board one of the Empress liners of the same company. At Quebec the Federal Government yacht met the cardinal and his suite, and conveyed them thence to Montreal. All along the route, the population on the banks of the river greeted the legate as he passed. At Montreal, despite most inclement weather, an immense crowd gave him an enthusiastic reception. Mayor Guerin presented addresses of welcome in French and English. During the congress, the Federal Government, the Provincial Government, and the City of Montreal each held a reception for the legate and other official personages.

Under the immediate direction of Archbishop Bruchési and the more remote direction of the Permanent Committee of the Eucharistic Congresses, presided over by Mgr Heylen, Bishop of Namur, four great committees laboured to organize the Congress of Montreal: Committee of Works: president, Canon Gauthier; vice-presidents, MM. Lecoq, McShane, Perrier, and Auclair. Committee of Finance: president, Canon Martin; vice-presidents, Sir Thomas Shaughnessy and Hon. L. J. Forget. Committee of Reception: presidents, Canon Dauth and Father Donnelley; vice-presidents, Canon Roy and Father Troie. Committee of Decorations and Procession: president, Canon Le Pailleur; vice-presidents, Fathers Bélanger, Laforce, Piette, Rusconi, O'Reilley, Martin, Deschamps, Heffernan. To these committees there had been added for press purposes a special committee presided over by Father Elie J. Auclair.

PRESENT CONDITIONS.—The Diocese of Montreal, at the present time (1910) is under the direction of Mgr Paul Bruchési, with an auxiliary bishop (at present the Rt. Rev. Mgr Zotique Racicot, titular Bishop of Pogla), and a cathedral chapter. The Catholic population is about 470,000, served by 720 priests; the non-Catholics, about 80,000; there are 150 parishes or missions, 66 of which are in the city and suburbs. Besides Laval University (see above), the seminaries and colleges are: the Grand Séminaire, with 350 students; the Seminary of Philosophy, 120; the Montreal College, 300; and Sacerdotal College, recently founded and under the direction of the Sulpicians; St. Mary's and Loyola College, under the direction of the Jesuits; those of Ste Thérèse and l'Assomption, under secular priests, and of Saint Laurent, under the Fathers of the Holy Cross. In all, some 2000 boys and young men are trained in these colleges. In addition to these, 64,000 children are taught in the schools or convents of religious orders, and 24,000 by lay Catholic teachers, men and women. Some 1500 Brothers, and more than 3700 Sisters devote themselves, in the diocese, to works of teaching or of charity. There are nearly 60 hospices, asylums, or orphanages, where some 45,000 old people, orphans, sick, and infirm are charitably cared for. Moreover, according to the latest official diocesan report, from which the above details are gathered, more than 200 secular priests from this diocese and more than 4000 Sisters minister or teach in other parts of Canada or in the United States.

In 1909, there were some 390 secular priests in the diocese, 80 Sulpicians, 150 Jesuits, 20 Oblates of Mary Immaculate, 30 Franciscans (in Montreal since 1890), 30 Trappists, 50 Redemptorists (in Montreal since 1884), 30 Fathers of the Holy Cross, 20 of the Holy Sacrament (1890), 8 of St. Viator, 5 of the Company of Mary, 10 Dominicans (1901), 2 Brothers of St. Vincent de Paul (1908). It would be impossible to give all the details of this useful and fruitful religious life. The Carmelites (1875) and the Sisters of the Precious Blood (1874) are vowed to the contemplative life. To these communities have been added the Little Sisters of the Poor (1887), the Sœurs de l'Espérance (1901), the Sisters of the Immaculate Conception (1904), the Daughters of Wisdom (1910), and the Brothers of the Presentation (1910). The parishes, in town and country, are in a flourishing condition. Mgr Bruchési has devised a plan of giving poor churches help and protection by making certain rich, older parishes act as their sponsors. Every year, on one of the Sundays of September, all Montreal visits the cemetery, near the top of Mount Royal, where, in the presence of 50,000 Catholics, a service for the dead takes place, possibly the only one of its kind in the world. On the eve of the civic Labour Holiday, the archbishop has, for some years past, invited the workmen of his diocese to be present at a religious service.

Archives de l'archévêché de Montréal; La Sém. Religieuse (Montreal), files; DE CELLES, *Papineau* (Montreal, 1905); CADIEUX AND DEROME, *Calendr er ecclésiastique* (1905); CHASSEGROS, *Hist. du noviciat des Jésuites;* FOURNET in *Dict. de théol. cath.* (Paris, 1904), s. v. CANADA; TANGUAY, *Répertoire du clergé canadien* (Montreal, 1893); GARNEAU, *Histoire du Canada*, II, III; GUERARD, *La France Canadienne* in *Le Correspondant* (April, 1877); CHRISTIE, *History of Canada* (Quebec, 1848); *Relation de Jacques Cartier* in LESCARBOT, *Hist. de la Nouvelle-France* (Paris, 1609); DIONNE, *La Nouvelle-France de Cartier à Champlain* (Quebec, 1891); BEAUBIEN, *Hist. de Sault-au-Récollet* (Montreal, 1897); FAILLON, *Vie de Mme d'Youville* (Montreal, 1852); JETTE, *Vie de la Vénérable Mère d'Youville* (Montreal, 1900); GARNEAU, *Histoire du Canada*, I; DOLLIER DE CASSON, *Histoire de Montréal* (Montreal, 1869); FAILLON, *Histoire de la Colonie Française en Canada* (Montreal, 1865); IDEM, *Vie de la Vén. Mère Bourgeoys* (Paris, 1853); IDEM, *Vie de Mlle Mance* (Paris, 1854); IDEM, *Vie de M. Olier* (Paris, 1873); ROUMAN, *Vie de Paul Chomodey de Maisonneuve* (Montreal, 1886); *The Narrative of the Eucharistic Congress, September 7-11, 1910* (Montreal, 1910).

ELIE J. AUCLAIR.

Montreuil, Charterhouse of Notre-Dame-des-Prés, at Montreuil, in the Diocese of Arras, Department of Pas-de-Calais, France, founded by Robert, Count of Boulogne and Auvergne. The charter of foundation is dated from the château d'Hardelot on 15 July, 1324; the church was consecrated in 1338. The foundation, being close to Calais, was liable to disturbance in time of war. Thus it was often sacked by the English during the wars in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and was for a time abandoned. The religious returned when peace was restored. In 1542 the monastery was again wrecked by the Imperial troops and in the wars of religion fresh troubles attended the community. Finally the house was rebuilt by Dom Bernard Bruyant in the latter part of the seventeenth century and remained undisturbed until the Revolution. In 1790 the monastery was suppressed and its property sold by auction the following year. Eighty-two years later the Carthusians repurchased a portion of their old estate and the first stone of the new monastery was laid on 2 April, 1872. The work was pushed forward with such energy by the Prior, Dom Eusèbe Bergier, that the whole was finished in three years. The monastery contains twenty-four cells in its cloister. Montreuil has taken a special position among Carthusian houses, owing to the establishment there of a printing press from which has been issued a number of works connected with the order. Dom le Couteulx's "Annales" (in eight vols.) and the edition of Denys the Carthusian may be quoted as examples of the fine printing done by the monks. By the recent "Association Laws" the community of Montreuil has been once more ejected. The monks are now lodged in the Charterhouse of Parkminster, England; the printing works have been transferred to Tournai in Belgium.

TROMBY, *Storia . . . dell' ordine Cartusiano* (Naples, 1773); LE COUTEULX, *Annales ordinis Cartusiensis* (Montreuil, 1901); LEFEBVRE, *S. Bruno et l'ordre des Chartreux* (Paris, 1883).

G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

Montreuil Abbey, a former convent of Cistercian nuns in the Diocese of Laon, now Soissons, France. Some incorrectly claim that it was the first convent of Cistercian nuns. It was founded in 1136 by Bartholomew, Bishop of Laon, and within a few years it numbered nearly three hundred. In early days the community busied themselves not merely in weaving and embroidery, but also in tilling the fields, clearing the forest, and weeding the soil.

So large a number in one community had its disadvantages, for within a century of its foundation the convent was forbidden by the Abbot of Clairvaux to take novices until the number of nuns at Montreuil was reduced to one hundred, which figure was not in future to be exceeded. In the seventeenth century the convent was so much disturbed by the wars which raged in the neighbourhood that the nuns abandoned it and settled in the hospital of St-Lazare close to the city. The list of abbesses is in Gallia Christiana (IX, 639); the convent was suppressed at the French Revolution.

Throughout the Middle Ages Montreuil was a place of pilgrimage, being famous for the "Sainte Face" or Veil of St. Veronica. This picture, which was regarded by many as the original relic, was really a copy of the "Vera Effigies" in St. Peter's at Rome. It was presented in 1249 to the Abbess of Montreuil by her brother Jacques Pantaleon, afterwards Urban IV. The painting, apparently of Eastern origin and already ancient when it came into the hands of the nuns, bore an inscription that seemed undecipherable, even Mabillon being completely baffled by it. Subsequently, however, some Russian savants declared the words to be Slavonic, and to read "Obraz gospoden na-oubrouse" or "Imago Domini in linteo". It seems to have perished with the convent in the French Revolution.

BEAUNIER, *Receuil Historique . . . des Abbayes et Prieurez de France* (Paris, 1726), 605–07; *Gallia Christiana* (Paris, 1751), IX, 639; MIGNE, *Dictionnaire des Abbayes* (Paris, 1856), 561; JANAUSCHEK, *Origines Cisterciensium* (Vienna, 1877), p. lix.

G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

Mont-St-Michel, a Benedictine Abbey, in the Diocese of Avranches, Normandy, France. It is unquestionably the finest example both of French medieval architecture and of a fortified abbey. The buildings of the monastery are piled round a conical mass of rock which rises abruptly out of the waters of the Atlantic to the height of 300 feet, on the summit of which stands the great church. This rock is nearly a mile from the shore, but in 1880 a causeway was built across the dangerous quicksand that occupies this space and is exposed at low water, so that there is now no danger in approaching the abbey. The monastery was founded about the year 708 by St. Aubert, Bishop of Avranches, and according to the legend, by direct command of the Archangel Michael himself, who appeared to the bishop in a dream on three separate occasions. About 966, Richard the Fearless, third Duke of Normandy, finding the community in a relaxed condition, installed Benedictines from Monte Cassino at Mont-St-Michel. A few years later, in 1017, Abbot Hildebert II began the colossal scheme of buildings all round the rock which should form a huge platform level with the summit, on which the abbey church might stand. In spite of the enormous difficulties involved in the design, difficulties increased by fire and the collapse of portions of the edifice, the great scheme was persevered in during five centuries and crowned by the completion of the flamboyant choir in 1520. Even among religious communities, such an instance of steadfast purpose and continuity of plan stands unrivalled; but the completion was only just in time. In 1523 the abbey was granted *in commendam* to Cardinal Le Veneur and the series of commendatory Abbots continued until 1622 when the abbey, its community reduced almost to the vanishing point, was united to the famous Congregation of St-Maur. At the French Revolution the Maurist monks were ejected and the splendid buildings became a prison for political offenders while, with unconscious irony, the name of the place was changed from Mont St-Michel to Mont Libre. In 1863 the prison was closed and for a few years the abbey was leased to the Bishop of Avranches, but in 1872 the French Government took it over as a national monument and undertook, none too soon, the task of restoration. The work has gone on almost continually ever since, and the restorers must be praised for the skill with which the great pile has been saved from ruin, and the good taste with which the whole has been done.

This vast group of buildings has been the subject of several important monographs. Speaking generally, the monastic buildings consist of three main stories. Of these, the two lower take the form of vast irregular rings completely enclosing the natural rock, which forms a core to the whole edifice. The third story rests partly on the two lower stories and partly on the apex of the rock which is found immediately beneath the pavement of the church. The most remarkable part of all is the mass of buildings known as "la merveille" (the marvel) on the north side of the rock facing the ocean. This vast structure, half military,

GENERAL PLAN OF MONT-SAINT-MICHEL

half monastic, is built wholly of granite quarried on the mainland, and was entirely constructed between the years 1203 and 1228. Its foundations are one hundred and sixty feet above the sea level, and it consists of three stories of which two are vaulted. The lowest contains the almonry and cellar; above these come the refectory and "hall of the knights", on which again rest the dormitory and the cloister. The last named building, which is perhaps the finest gem of all, has a double arcade so planned that the columns in one row are opposite the centre of the arches in the other—a unique arrangement of wonderful beauty. The church is cruciform with a Norman nave which was formerly seven bays in length, but the three western bays were destroyed in 1776. The central tower has lately been restored and crowned with a copper-covered spire surmounted by a gilded statue of St. Michael by M. Frémiet. The choir is apsidal and has a chevet of chapels with a crypt or lower church beneath.

The position of the abbey rendered it of the highest strategic importance especially during the wars with England, and both it and the little town that had grown up at the foot of the rock on the land side, were enclosed by strong fortifications during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. So impregnable was the rock made in this way that, although frequently attacked by superior forces, it was never captured. The abbot was also commandant of the place by appointment of the King of France, and

he was empowered to bestow feoffs on the nobles of the province who bound themselves in return to guard the abbey in time of war. In 1469 King Louis XI founded the Order of St. Michael, and held the first chapter of its knights in the "salle des chevaliers." It is said that the cockle shell, horn, and staff, which became the recognized insignia of a pilgrim from the thirteenth century onwards, take their origin from Mont-St-Michel. The staff was used to test the path across the treacherous quicksand; the horn served to summon aid should tide or fog surprise the pilgrim; while the cockle shell was fixed in the hat as a souvenir to show that the pilgrim had accomplished his journey in safety. The abbey bore as its arms a cockle shell and fleurs-de-lis with the significant motto "Tremor immensi Oceani".

HUYNES, *Histoire générale du Mont-St-Michel* (Rouen, 1872–73); BEAUREPAIRE, *Curieuses recherches sur le Mont-St-M.* (Rouen, 1873); GOUT, *L'Histoire et l'Architecture Française au M.-St-M.* (Paris, 1899); CORROYER, *Description de l'Abbaye du M.-St-M.* (Paris, 1877); IDEM, *L'Architecture Romane* (Paris, 1888), tr. ARMSTRONG, *Gothic Architecture* (London, 1893); BRIN, *St. Michel et le M.-St-M. dans l'histoire et la littérature* (Paris, 1880); BOUILLET, *La Normandie monumentale et pittoresque, Le M.-St-M.* (Paris, 1896); DE POTICHE, *La Baie du M.-St-M. et ses approches* (Paris, 1891); DUBOUCHET, *L'Abbaye du M.-St-M.* (Paris, 1895); FEVAL, *Les merveilles du M.-St-M.* (Paris, s. d.); GIRARD, *Histoire du M.-St-M. comme prison d'Etat* (Paris, 1849); DAVID, *Les Grands Abbayes d'Occident* (Paris, 1907), 359–378.

G. ROGER HUDLESTON.

Montyon, ANTOINE-JEAN-BAPTISTE-ROBERT AUGET, BARON DE, famous French philanthropist; b. at Paris, 23 December, 1733; d. there 29 December, 1820. He was the son of a wealthy official of the Exchequer. As soon as he had completed his education, young Montyon was made king's advocate at the court of Le Châtelet (Paris) where his inflexible integrity won for him the surname of "Grenadier of the Bar." In 1758 he entered the Great Council and in 1760 was appointed master of the petitions. In 1767 he became intendant of Auvergne, where his liberality to the poor endeared him to the people. It is said that he yearly spent as much as twenty thousand francs of his private income to give work and help to needy families. On his refusal to install the new magistrates appointed by Maupeou after the suppression of the Parliaments, he was transferred to the intendance of Provence and then to La Rochelle. In 1775, through the influence of the duc de Penthièvre, he was recalled to Paris and appointed councillor of State. Amidst the cares of public life, he had found time for the study of economics and belles-lettres. The French Academy awarded a distinction to his "Eloge de Michel de l'Hôpital" (Paris, 1777). The following year he published "Recherches et considérations sur la population de la France." Montyon's great concern, however, was philanthropy, which he delighted to practice in an anonymous way. In order to foster emulation for the good among his countrymen, he founded a number of prizes to be awarded by the French Academy, the Academy of Science, or the Academy of Medicine.

At the beginning of the French Revolution, he thought it was his duty to share the fortunes of the princes of the House of Bourbon, and he left the country. He travelled in Switzerland and Germany, but spent the greater part of his exile in London; during his stay in that city, he gave each year ten thousand francs to relieve the French refugees, and the French soldiers who were prisoners in England; the same amount was sent to the poor of Auvergne. Montyon returned to France in 1815 at the time of the second restoration and henceforth devoted all his time to the work that had made his name famous. He re-established the prizes which he had founded before the Revolution and which had been abolished by the National Convention. The best known of these prizes are "le prix de vertu", to reward a virtuous act done by a poor Frenchman, and the prize to be bestowed on the author of the work most useful to morals. These prizes are to be awarded by the French Academy. Montyon also distributed large sums of money among the bureaus of charities in Paris. His will, in which are expressed sentiments of the deepest piety, bequeathed the bulk of his property to the hospitals and homes of his native city.

LACRETELLE, *Discours sur M. de Montyon* in *Recueil de l'Académie* (1820–29); CHAZET, *Vie de M. de Montyon* (Paris, 1829); WAILLY, *Eloge de M. de Montyon* (Paris, 1826).

PIERRE MARIQUE.

Moor, HUGH, VENERABLE. See MORTON, ROBERT, VENERABLE.

Moore, ARTHUR, Count, b. at Liverpool, 1849; d. at Mooresfort, Tipperary, Ireland, 1904, was the son of Charles Moore, M.P. for Tipperary. Educated at Ushaw, he afterwards travelled in Spain, and in 1874 was elected M.P. for the Borough of Clonmel. In Parliament he was a follower of Mr. Butt, and strongly advocated land reform, better treatment of children in workhouses, university education for Irish Catholics, and Home Rule; and he specially interested himself in providing Catholic chaplains for the navy. In 1877 he married a daughter of an English baronet, Sir Charles Clifford, and the same year received the title of Count from the pope. During the Gladstone Parliament of 1880–85 Count Moore was usually on the side of Parnell. He favoured land purchase as the best settlement of the Irish land question; he advocated the providing of suitable cottages for Irish labourers, and better treatment of Irish emigrants on board ship; he always voted for Home Rule, and vehemently denounced coercion. But he had no faith in violent agitation, and did not favour the full programme of the Land League or that of the National League; and he voted for the second reading of Gladstone's Land Bill though Parnell and his friends abstained from voting. Count Moore would only follow where his convictions led, and he was too independent to be blindly obedient to Mr. Parnell: when the Redistribution Act of 1885 disfranchised Clonmel, he was left without a seat in Parliament. He had therefore no share in the stirring scenes which followed the general election of 1885. But he was not content to lead a life of ease and inactivity, believing that "a Catholic layman should be up and doing and not merely telling his beads in a corner". Blessed with ample wealth he was a generous contributor to schools, churches, convents, and hospitals; a militant but not an aggressive Catholic he was always ready to do battle for Catholic truth, and in speeches, lectures, and newspaper articles often did splendid service for the advancement of Catholic interests. He spared no effort to secure that Catholic sailors should not be left without religious instruction during life, or without a priest at the hour of death; and so valuable was his work in this matter that the Irish Bishops, at their meeting at Maynooth in 1903, thanked him by special resolution. He supported the Catholic Truth Society and attended its meetings; he desired to have a branch of the Benedictine Order in Ireland, and would have helped to endow it. He established and generously endowed the Cistercian Abbey at Roscrea. Always ready to help others he did not forget his own personal sanctity. He attended Mass every day, spent hours before the tabernacle in his own private oratory, fasted rigorously, made frequent retreats; and he went, year after year, to Lourdes and to the Holy Land, not as a mere sight-seeing traveller but as a pilgrim and a penitent. At home he was the kindest and the most indulgent of landlords, and no beggar went unrelieved from his door. When he died, his body, clothed in the Franciscan habit, was interred near the high altar in the church of the Cistercians at Roscrea.

BARRY, *Life of Count Arthur Moore* (Dublin, 1905).

E. A. D'ALTON.

MONT-SAINT-MICHEL

FROM AN ETCHING BY DELAUNAY

Moore (or Moor), Michael, priest, preacher, and professor, b. at Dublin, Ireland, 1640; d. at Paris, 22 Aug., 1726. Educated at Nantes and Paris, he taught philosophy and rhetoric at the Collège des Grassins. Returning to Ireland, he was ordained priest in 1684, and appointed Vicar-General of the Diocese of Dublin by Archbishop Russell. When the Revolution of 1688 drove James II from his British dominions, Ireland was held for him by Richard Talbot, Earl (afterwards Duke) of Tyrconnell. The provost of Trinity College, Dublin, Dr. Huntingdon, fled to England when James landed in Ireland. The college was seized by the Jacobites, the chapel was made a powder magazine, one portion of the building was turned into a barrack, and another into a gaol for persons suspected of disaffection to the royal cause. Moore was chaplain and confessor to Tyrconnell through whose influence and on the recommendation of the Irish Catholic bishops, he was appointed (1689) by James, provost of Trinity College—the only Catholic who ever held that position. He upheld the rights of the college, secured it from further pillage, and endeavoured to mitigate the treatment of the prisoners. With the librarian, Father McCarthy, he prevented the soldiery from burning the library, and by preserving its precious collections rendered an incalculable service to letters. A sermon which he preached in Christ Church cathedral offended the king so deeply that he was obliged to resign (1690), and retired to Paris. When James, after the battle of the Boyne (1690), fled to Paris, Moore removed to Rome, became Censor of Books, and won the favour of Innocent XII and Clement XI. When Cardinal Barbarigo established his college at Montefiascone, he appointed Moore rector, and professor of philosophy and Greek. The college attracted men of learning, and received from Innocent XII an annual grant of two thousand crowns. After the death of James II (1701), Moore returned to France, where, through Cardinal de Noailles, he was appointed Rector of the University of Paris (10 Oct., 1701 to 9 Oct., 1702). He was also made principal of the Collège de Navarre, and professor of philosophy, Greek, and Hebrew in the Collège de France. In 1702 he was selected to deliver the annual panegyric on Louis XIV, founded by the City of Paris. Moore joined Dr. Farrelly (Fealy) in purchasing a house near the Irish College for poor Irish students. Blind for some years, he had to employ an amanuensis, who took advantage of his master's affliction to steal and sell many hundred volumes of his choice library. What remained Moore bequeathed to the Irish College. He died in the Collège de Navarre, and was buried in the vault under the chapel of the Irish College. His published works include: "De Existentia Dei, et Humanæ Mentis Immortalitate, secundum Cartesii et Aristotelis Doctrinam" (Paris, 1692); "Hortatio ad Studium Linguæ Græcæ et Hebraïcæ" (Montefiascone, 1700); "Vera Sciendi Methodus" (Paris, 1716).

Ware, *The Writers of Ireland*, ed. Harris (Dublin, 1745); Moreri, *Morus* (*Michel*) in *Le Grand Dictionnaire Historique* (1740); Taylor, *History of the University of Dublin* (1845); Gilbert, *History of Dublin* (1861); Jourdain, *Histoire de l'Université de Paris au XVII^e^ et au XVIII^e^ siècle* (Paris, 1862–66); Webb, *Compendium of Irish Biography;* Macaulay, *History of England; Dict. of National Biography.*

P. J. Lennox.

Moore, Thomas, poet and biographer, b. 28 May, 1779, at Dublin, Ireland; d. 26 February, 1852, at Devizes, England. His father was a grocer till 1806 when he was appointed barrack-master at Dublin. His mother, a woman of varied accomplishments, did much to train him for his remarkable success in society. Thomas early manifested a remarkable power of rhyming, singing, and acting. When fifteen he was entered at Trinity College, Dublin, which by the Catholic Relief Act of 1793 had opened its doors to Catholics, who were, however, hardly more than tolerated. Denied all incentive because of his religious belief, Moore gave little or no heed to academic honours. A curious point noted by a recent biographer is that Moore was entered as a Protestant, possibly by his school-master, Mr. Whyte, who himself a Protestant, wished to qualify his favourite pupil for all the good things that the college offered to non-Catholics. Moore probably was not aware of this; at any rate he never availed himself of it. Though his education and associations were mostly Protestant, and though he himself was in fact after his first year in college scarcely more than a nominal Catholic, he never changed his creed. Among his intimate friends was Robert Emmet, whose tragic death made on him a lasting impression. Moore shows this in his writings, as in the beautiful lyric, "O breathe not his name", and also in the veiled allusions in "The Fire Worshippers", one of the four long poems of "Lalla Rookh".

After graduating in 1798 he set out in the following spring for London to study law. He was never admitted to the Bar, as legal studies had for him no attraction. Literature was more to his liking. When scarcely fifteen, some verses of his appeared in a Dublin magazine "The Anthologia Hibernica". While in college he wrote a metrical translation of the "Odes of Anacreon" which he published in London in 1800, with a dedication "by permission" to the Prince of Wales. He published in the following year his first volume of original poems under the title of "The Poetical Works of the late Thomas Little", which met with severe criticism on the grounds of indecency. Later editions were expurgated; but Moore showed his fondness for amorous poetry by recurring to it in "The Loves of the Angels". Again criticized, he bent to the storm by "turning his poor Angels into Turks". Moore's success almost from the day he set foot in England was extraordinary. It was no doubt his personal charm and the masterly singing of his own songs that gave him the start in his successful career. Like the ancient bard he sang his own verses to his own accompaniment, and was welcomed everywhere.

Early in 1803 the Government proposed to establish an Irish laureateship and offered Moore the position with the same salary and emoluments as the English office of similar title; but Moore declined the honour. Another offer later in the year, that of Registrar of the Admiralty Court of Bermuda, he accepted and left England in September for his post of duty. After four months' trial, finding the office not to his liking he appointed a deputy and sailed for New York. He visited the principal cities of the States, and then went to Canada. He was delighted with his Canadian tour, but was far differently impressed by "the land of the free" and its people. Judging everything from his pro-English viewpoint, he could find scarcely anything to admire in the young republic which had so lately gained its independence from England. After an absence of fourteen months he returned to London "with a volume of poetic travels in his pocket" which with later additions he published in 1806 under the title of "Epistles, Odes and other Poems". In addition to his animadversions on America it contained several amatory pieces. The famous critic, Jeffrey, in an article in the "Edinburgh Review" attacked the book severely and called its author "the most licentious of modern versifiers". This brought on the famous "leadless duel", and paved the way for the lifelong friendship between the poet and the critic. Another challenge from Moore, this time to Lord Byron for his sarcastic reference to the "leadless pistols" used in the meeting with Jeffrey, resulted in another close friendship between "hostile forces".

In 1807 Moore published the first numbers of his "Irish Melodies". Were all his other works lost, these would give him the right to the title he so much prized, "The Poet of the people of Ireland". The importance and the difficulty of this undertaking—to

fit words to the old national airs of Ireland—Moore fully realized. But the task of marrying words to these airs was no easy one. "The Poet", as Moore himself wrote, "who would follow the various sentiments which they express, must feel and understand that rapid fluctuation of spirits, that unaccountable mixture of gloom and levity which composes the character of my countrymen and has deeply tinged their Music". Almost all contemporary writers, among them Shelley and Landor, spoke enthusiastically of the melodies, saying that they were lyrics of the highest merit. His friend and biographer, Lord John Russell, wrote in 1853 that "of all lyrical poets, Moore is surely the greatest". Moore continued to write these at intervals for twenty-seven years, receiving $500 for each, which gave him an annual income of $2500. Six of the ten numbers of his melodies were published, when he tried his hand with like success at "Sacred Songs" and "National Airs".

The lyrics, however, did not take up all his time. In 1808 he published poems on "Corruption" and on "Intolerance" and in the following year "The Sceptic". These attempts at serious satire, in which he used the heroic couplet of Pope, did not meet with success. Quite different was his next venture, this time in a lighter strain and directed against the prince, his former patron, who on becoming regent through the insanity of his father had changed front and broken with the Whigs, with whom Moore had previously allied himself. These pieces, together with those he wrote against several members of the Ministry, were gathered together and published in 1813 with the title "Intercepted Letters or The Two-penny Post-bag". In this sort of light-hearted satire Moore had struck a rich vein which he worked for more than twenty years with his "Fudge Family in Paris", "The Fudges in England", and "Fable of the Holy Alliance". Moore's reputation in the literary world of his time was of the highest, as is shown from the business arrangements made for the copyright of "Lalla Rookh" (1817). Longmans, the publishers, agreed to give the highest price ever paid for a poem, $15,000, and that, too, without seeing a line of the work. And twenty years later they still called it the "cream of the copyrights". After considerable reading and some discouraging experiments, he hit upon the idea of founding a story on the long and fierce struggle between the Persian fire-worshippers and their haughty Moslem masters—a theme that had much to recommend it to an Irishman familiar with the long struggle between his countrymen and their rulers. Men who had lived long in the East marvelled at his skill in reproducing so faithfully life in the Orient with its barbaric splendours.

Scarcely was this off his hands when the news arrived that he must make good the loss of $30,000 caused by his agent in Bermuda. Moore had not saved anything out of his large income. His friends would have come to his assistance; but he would not allow them. To escape arrest he took refuge in 1819 on the continent. More than three years he had of rather enjoyable exile, most of which was spent in Paris where his family joined him in 1820. He had in 1811 married a young actress, Miss Bessy Dyke. Towards the close of 1822, after settling the Bermuda claim, which had been reduced to $5,000, he took up his residence again in England. Heretofore he had been almost exclusively a writer of verse; from this on he is primarily a writer of prose:—he becomes a biographer, a controversialist, an historian. During the summer of 1823, he accompanied Lord Lansdowne on a visit to the south of Ireland. While there he learned much of the discontent among the peasants, of their secret organizations, and of their mysterious leader, Captain Rock. On his return he read history, and as a result of his reading and his sight-seeing, he wrote a "History of Captain Rock and his Ancestors" in which he gives the history of agrarian crimes and denounces, not the Shanavests of "Foggy Boggy Tipperary" whom eight years before he called murderous savages deserving the sword, but the bad laws of England that generated all sorts of crime. The book made its way everywhere. In England, perhaps for the first time, the cause of Ireland received a hearing. Naturally it became popular in Ireland where even Catholics, notwithstanding (in the words of Moore) "some infidelities to their religion which break out now and then in it", expressed in a formal manner their gratitude for his defence of their country.

This favourable reception delighted Moore; only now he began to know Ireland and her people. He came back at times to his own and endeavoured to make amends for his former lack of sympathy, as may be seen in some of his later writings, as the "Life of Lord Edward Fitzgerald" (1831). This, which is probably his best prose work, was a labour of love; for in writing a sympathetic account of a young Irish patriot who suffered for his country in the uprising of 1798, Moore could hardly hope for encouragement from an English reading public. In the meantime he had published the "Life of Sheridan" (1825), a work which had engaged his attention during the preceding seven years. So successful was it financially that the publishers added $1500 to the original price of the copyright. Its chief value lay, as the critic Jeffrey said, in the historical view it gave of public transactions for the past fifty years. The next prose work, "The Epicurean" (1827), has some merit as a story, but not as a study of ancient manners or as a presentation of the Epicurean philosophy. Moore was to be Byron's editor; he became, instead, his biographer. His "Life of Byron" (1830) is one of the most popular biographies ever written, though the picture given is not wholly true to life.

After finishing the life of Fitzgerald he wrote a theological treatise which he dedicated "to the people of Ireland in defence of their Ancient National Faith", and called it "The Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion" (1834). The Irish Gentleman wishes to become a Protestant, studies hard at home and abroad, but fails to find anything either in Scripture or the Church Fathers to justify a change. This vindication of the Catholic Church is a curious book written as it was by one who had married a Protestant, and was glad to have his children brought up as Protestants. In his fifty-fifth year Moore doubtless took a different view of life, and saw the folly of mere worldly advantages when these involved a sacrifice of religious truth. Similar motives likely influenced him in his next and last work, "The History of Ireland" (1835–46). During much of his life he had been more of an English Whig than an Irish Nationalist. But the last of it he gave generously to his country by calling the attention of the English people to their misgovernment of Ireland. The task which he undertook was, however, too much for him; the one volume intended lengthened out into four, and then stopped at the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

Moore was now broken down. Financial troubles had constantly harassed him, notwithstanding his large income. He had expected, and with good reason, great things from the Government when his friends the Whigs got in power. A recognition came in 1833 when he received a literary pension of $1500, to which was added, a few years before his death, another pension of $500. He was not spared domestic troubles. Two daughters died in infancy; the third lived only to be a girl of sixteen. Of his two sons one died from consumption in 1841; the other, Thomas, wild and extravagant, died in Africa in 1845. At this time Moore wrote in his "Diary": "The last of our five children is now gone and we are left desolate and alone. Not a single relative have I now left in the world".

He had previously lost his parents and his sisters, his favourite Ellen dying suddenly at about the same time as his son Thomas. His life was now practically over, and he died in his seventy-third year and was buried at Bromham, near Devizes in Wiltshire. Moore's biographer, Lord John Russell, declared: "When these two great men" (Scott and Byron) "have been enumerated, I know not any writer of his time who can be put in comparison with Moore"; and yet when Moore wrote, England was rich in great writers. Such praises as this may appear exaggerated to-day when critical opinion has swung to the opposite extreme, especially among younger writers. The truth, as usual, seems to lie between two extremes. Much of Moore's work is ephemeral, but there remains a group of lyrics that are as perfect of their kind as anything in the world of literature. In 1841 Moore collected and arranged his poems, to which he wrote interesting prefaces.

Moore, *Memoirs, Journals, and correspondence*, edited by Lord John Russell (London, 1853–6); Gwynn, *Thomas Moore* (London, 1905); Gunning, *Moore, Poet and Patriot* (Dublin, 1900); *Memoirs of the author* prefixed to the poems collected by Moore himself (1841); Vallet, *Etude sur la vie et les œuvres de Thomas Moore* (Paris, 1886).

M. J. Flaherty.

Mopsuestia, a titular see of Cilicia Secunda in Asia Minor and suffragan of Anazarbus. The founding of this city is attributed to the soothsayer, Mopsus, who lived before the Trojan war, although it is scarcely mentioned before the Christian era. Pliny calls it the free city of Mopsos (Hist. nat., V, 22), but the ordinary name is Mopsuestia or better Mompsuestia, as found in all the Christian geographers and chroniclers. At one time the city took the name of Seleucia, but gave it up at the time of the Roman conquest; under Hadrian it was called Hadriana, under Decius Decia, etc., as we know from the inscriptions and the coins of the city. Constantius built there a magnificent bridge over the Pyramus (Malalas, "Chronographia", XIII; P. G., XCVII, 488) afterwards restored by Justinian (Procopius, "De Ædificiis", V, 5) and still to be seen in a very bad state of preservation. Christianity seems to have been introduced very early into Mopsuestia and during the third century there is mention of a bishop, Theodorus, the adversary of Paul of Samosata. Worthy of mention are Saint Auxentius, who lived in the fourth century and whose feast is kept on 18 December, and Theodore, the teacher of Nestorius. The Greek diocese which depended on the Patriarch of Antioch, still existed at the beginning of the fourteenth century (Le Quien, "Oriens christianus", II, 1002). At first a suffragan of Anazarbus, Mopsuestia was an autocephalous archbishopric in 879 (Mansi, "Concil. Collectio", XVII, XVIII, 472, 476–480, etc.), and perhaps it was already so in 713 (Le Quien, II, 1000). The city was taken by the Arabs at the very beginning of Islamism; in 686 we find all the surrounding forts occupied by them and in 700 they fortified the city itself (Theophanes, "Chronogr.", A. M. 6178, 6193). Nevertheless because of its position on the frontier, the city fell naturally from time to time into the hands of the Byzantines; about 772 its inhabitants killed a great number of Arabs (op. cit., A. M. 6264). Being besieged in vain by the Byzantine troops of John Tzimisces in 964, Mopsuestia was taken the following year after a long and difficult siege by Nicephorus Phocas. The city then numbered 200,000 inhabitants, some of whom were killed, some transported elsewhere and replaced by a Christian population. Its river, the Pyramus, formed a great harbour extending twelve miles to the sea.

In 1097 the Crusaders took possession of the city and engaged in a fratricidal war under its walls; it remained in the possession of Tancred who annexed it to the Principality of Antioch. It suffered much from Crusaders, Armenians, and Greeks who lost it and recaptured it alternately, notably in 1106, in 1152, and in 1171. The Greeks finally abandoned it to the Armenians. Set on fire in 1266, Mamissa, as it was called in the Middle Ages, became two years afterwards the capital of the Kingdom of Lesser Armenia, at the time that a council was held there. Although it was by this time in a state of decline it still possessed at least four Armenian churches. In 1322, the Armenians suffered a great defeat under its walls; in 1432 the Frenchman, Bertrandon, found the city occupied by the Mussulmans and largely destroyed. Since then it has steadily declined and to-day, under the name of Missis, is a little village of about 800 inhabitants, partly Armenians, partly Mussulmans; it is situated in the sanjak and the vilayet of Adana. The list of its Latin bishops may be found in Le Quien, III, 1197–200; in Ducange, "Les familles d'outre-mer", 770; in Eubel, "Hierarchia catholica medii ævi", I, 338; that of the Armenian bishops in Alishan, "Sissouan", 290.

Alishan, *Sissouan* (Venice, 1899), 284–291; Langlois, *Voyage dans la Cilicie* (Paris, 1861), 446–463; Schlumberger, *Nicéphore Phocas* (Paris, 1890), 402–404, 480–488.

S. Vailhé.

Mopsuestia, Theodore of. See Theodore of Mopsuestia.

Mor (Moor), Antonis Van Dashorst, commonly called Antonio Moro, or Anthonis More, a Dutch painter, b. at Utrecht, in 1519; d. at Antwerp, between 1576 and 1578. Of his early life we only know that his artistic education was commenced under Jan van Scorel, and his earliest work is probably the portrait at Stockholm, dated 1538. Recent investigations would indicate that the group of knights of St. John, at Utrecht, supposed to have been painted about 1541, and a picture of two pilgrims at Berlin, dated 1544, together with the portrait of a woman unknown, in the Lille gallery, were probably among his earliest works, although their authenticity has not been proven. In 1547, he was received as a member of the Venerable Guild of St. Luke at Antwerp, and shortly afterwards (about 1548) he attracted the attention of Cardinal Granvelle, Bishop of Arras, who became his steady patron, and presented him to the Emperor Charles V. Of the portraits executed during the commencement of his Granvella career, two are especially notable: of the bishop himself in the Imperial gallery at Vienna, and of the Duke of Alba, which now belongs to the Hispanic Society of New York. He probably visited Italy first in 1550, for we hear of him in Rome, where he copied some works by Titian, notably the "Danaë". He was sent by Queen Mary of Hungary to Portugal, doubtless his first visit to that country, and among its notable results are a portrait of the Infanta Maria and one of Queen Catharine of Portugal, both in the Prado, and those of King John III and his wife Catherine, preserved at Lisbon. After this he returned to Madrid, where he painted the portrait of Maximilian of Bohemia; he was in Rome again in 1552. It has been gravely suggested, but on insufficient evidence, that one of the masterpieces of the Prado gallery, the portrait of the unknown young Cardinal, hitherto attributed to Rafael, and regarded as one of his noblest works, should be credited to Mor. From Rome, he went to Genoa, and thence to Madrid. In 1553 he was sent to England, where he painted the portrait of Mary Tudor, perhaps one of his very noblest works; and in all probability the portraits of Sir Henry Sidney, and of Ambassador Simon Renard. That of Renard's wife was not painted until three years later. To this period should be attributed the miniature of Mary Tudor in the Duke of Buccleuch's collection, two portraits of Elizabeth at the age of twenty-one, one of which once belonged to Dr. Propert, and another even more notable, of Roger Ascham, now in the collection of Mr. Pierpont Morgan. This

was at one time the property of Ascham's college, and later, of the Marquess of Hastings.

At about this time Mor married, but we know little of his wife, save that her name was Metgen, and she is supposed to have been a widow. He became a man of large means, acquired property, and was known as Moro van Dashorst when residing in Utrecht. He had one son, Philip, afterwards a canon, and two daughters. At the end of 1554, he was back in Holland, where he painted a portrait of William of Orange, and other notable works. A little later he executed his own portrait, now in the Uffizi Gallery, one of his wife, now in the Prado, a portrait of a knight of St. James at Budapest, one of Alexander Farnese at Parma, the portrait of an unknown man in Verona, and a very extraordinary religious picture of the Resurrection, now at Nimwegen in a private collection. His portrait of Jean Le Cocq [Gallus], one of his wife, and that called Don Carlos, in the gallery at Cassel, those of the Duchess de Feria (?), and of a widow, in the Prado, of himself in Lord Spencer's collection, and of Campaña, the Brussels painter, in the Basle gallery, are of a subsequent period. Several very important works, executed towards the close of his life are, Elizabeth Queen of Spain, in the Bischoffsheim collection (London), Jacopo da Trezzo and three other fine portraits, in the Stuers gallery (Paris), and the famous portrait of his own master, Jan van Scorel, belonging to the Society of Antiquaries (London). Other noted works are those representing a Professor of the University of Oxford in the Brunswick Gallery, and the very famous portraits of Sir Thomas and Lady Gresham, at one time at Strawberry Hill, now in the Hermitage collection (St. Petersburg). After the disgrace of Cardinal Granvelle, Mor remained in Spain for a while, and the following portraits belong to this period of his life: The Jeweller, in the gallery of The Hague, Sir Henry Lee, in Lord Dillon's collection, Antonio del Rio, his sons, and his wife, in the Louvre, the Duke of Alba, at Brussels, Ferdinand of Toledo, at Vienna, and several others of unknown people. His last portrait appears to be that of "Goltzius", in the Brussels Gallery.

Antonis Mor, commonly known as Sir Anthony More

The Emperor Maximilian II
Antonis Mor, The Prado, Madrid

The Empress Maria, Wife of Maximilian II
Antonis Mor, The Prado, Madrid

The last document that refers to him was one issued at Antwerp, in 1573, and we obtain the date of his death from certain documents still extant in the church of Notre Dame in that city. The many references to him and the numerous essays on his career, have been summed up by Henri Hymans in his memoir of Mor (Brussels, 1910), and to this invaluable work all students must now be referred.

Hymans, *Antonio Moro, son œuvre et son temps* (Brussels, 1910).

George Charles Williamson.

Morales, Ambrosio, Spanish historian, b. at Cordova, 1513; d. in 1591. After his studies at the University of Salamanca and Alcalá, he took Holy orders. Soon he was elected to the chair of Belles-Lettres at Alcalá. In 1574 he was appointed chronicler of Castile and commissioned to continue Florián de Ocampo's "Crónica General de España". This he brought down, after ten years of labour on it, to the date of the union of Castile and Leon under Ferdinand I. His pupil Sandoval continued it down to 1079. While he exhibits more talent and a better training than his predecessor Ocampo, Morales still proves to be on the whole an old-time chronicler, and manifests little tendency to react upon his facts, correlate cause and effect, or philosophize in any way. His style is rather wearisome. See the "Crónica general de España, prosiguiendo adelante los cinco libros que el Maestro Florian Docampo, Coronista del Emperador D. Carlos V dexó escritos" (Alcalá, 1574, 3 vols., and see also the ed. of Madrid, 1791–2). Other writings of Morales are "De las antigüedades de las ciudades de España"; and the "Viaje por orden del Rey D. Felipe II etc."

Memorias de la Academia Española, VIII, 285 sqq.

J. D. M. Ford.

Morales, Juan Bautista, missionary, b. about 1597 at Ecija in Andalusia, Spain; d. at Fu-ning, China, 17 Sept., 1664. He entered the Order of St. Dominic at a very early age, and, after devoting some years to missionary work in the Philippine Islands, accompanied in 1633 a band of Dominican missionaries to China, taking up their work in the province of Fu-kien. Here he took an active part in the controversy between the Jesuits on the one side and the Dominicans and Franciscans on the other, regarding Chinese customs (see China). The latter maintained that the Jesuits, to win over more easily the people to the religion of Christ, tolerated to a certain extent the cult of Confucius and of ancestors; and, seeing in this alleged condescension to heathen customs, a jeopardy to the purity of the faith, they despatched Morales to Rome in 1643, and on 12 Sept., 1645, obtained from Innocent

X a decision condemning the methods of the Jesuits. The latter also appealed to Rome, and obtained from Alexander VII a contradictory decree. In 1661 Morales again called the attention of the Holy See to the matter, and in 1669, five years after the death of Morales, Clement IX issued a new decree deciding against the Jesuits. About the same time the Dominicans discovered an enemy in their own ranks in the person of the Chinese friar, Gregory Lopez, Bishop of Basilea, who sent to the Holy See a memorandum favourable to the Jesuits. Among the works of Morales the following are the most important: (1) "Quæsta xvii a Fr. J. B. de Moralez, missionum sinarum procuratore, proposita Romæ 1643 S. Congreg. de Prop. Fide" (Rome, 1645); (2) "Tractatus ad explicandas et elucidandas opiniones et controversias inter Patres Societatis Jesu et religiosos S. Ord. Præd."; (3) "Commentarium super Litanias B. Virginis lingua sinica"; (4) "Tractatus ad Dei amorem in voluntate excitandum, lingua sinica."

QUÉTIF-ECHARD, *Script. Ord. Præd.*, II, 611; TOURON, *Hommes illust. de l'ordre S. Dominique*, V, 627, 628, 630; HUC, *Le Christianisme en Chine*, III (Paris, 1857), 11–19.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

Morales, LUIS DE, Spanish painter, b. at Badajoz in Estremadura about 1509; d. at Badajoz, 1586. His life was spent in painting devotional subjects for churches and oratories. Painting was for him not merely a means of charming the sense of vision: he strove by his brush to express the religious enthusiasm which characterized his age. Critics have detected two styles in the long artistic career of Morales. In his earlier style, the influence of the Florentine school is more marked: he executed various studies and exercises after works of Michelangelo; notably, he copied at Evora a picture representing Christ on the Cross, with the Blessed Virgin and St. John. To this, not easily definable, period is referred a "Circumcision", now in the Prado Museum at Madrid, and six panels for the high altar of the church of La Higuera of Fregenal. In his second style Morales lessens the number of figures in his compositions, which seldom contain more than two or three, often in bust or in half-length. His favourite themes, frequently reproduced without any change, are "Ecce Homo", "Christ at the Column", and "The Blessed Virgin holding the Dead Christ". The drawing is clean and firm, the anatomy correct, the figures, which recall primitive German and Flemish work by their slenderness, are not wanting in grace, and at times are characterized by a certain air of melancholy. The colouring is delicate and as brilliant as enamel. Morales excels in the faculty of making his modelling stand out by the skilfully graduated employment of half-tones; like the early Northern painters, he exercises minute care in the reproduction of the beard and hair, and makes a point of rendering faithfully the drops of blood falling from the thorn-crowned brow of Christ, and the tears flowing from the eyes of the afflicted Mother.

No artist of his time knew better than he how to appeal to the ardent faith of his countrymen, because no one else in that day knew so well how to impart to his sacred characters so intense and infectious emotion. As an example of this we may take the "Christ at the Column" in the Church of San Isidro el Real at Madrid; here the painter pathetically places the disciple who has denied Him face to face with the Divine Master at the flagellation. The resignation of Jesus, His loving look directed towards Peter and fraught with forgiveness, the deep penitence of the Apostle, are so vividly rendered that one shares the enthusiasm of Morales's countrymen, and can understand why they called him *El Divino*. Naturally, his reputation spread rapidly through Spain; Philip II, however, whose preference was for the Italian painters, does not seem to have shared the general enthusiasm: he gave Morales but one commission, for the "Christ going up to Calvary", which he presented to the Jeronymite church at Madrid. The king afterwards, in 1581, granted a pension to the artist, who had become destitute in his old age. Many imitators of Morales exaggerated his style into mannerism and caricature. His son Cristóbal accomplished little beyond mediocre reproductions of his works, but one of his pupils, Juan Labrador, became distinguished as a painter of still life. To the works of Morales already mentioned we may add: at Badajoz (Church of the Conception), "Virgin and Child playing with a bird", "Christ carrying the Cross", "St. Joachim and St. Anne"; at Madrid, "Ecce Homo", "Our Lady of Sorrows", "Mary caressing the Divine Child", "The Presentation in the Temple", a "Head of Christ" (Prado Museum), "Ecce Homo" (Church of San Felipe), "Virgin with the Dead Christ" (Academy of San Fernando); at Seville (in the chalice-room of the cathedral), "Ecce Homo", with the "Blessed Virgin and St. John" on the panels; at Toledo (in the Provincial Museum), a "Head of Christ", "Our Lady of Solitude"; at Basle (in the Museum), "Christ carrying the Cross", "Our Lady and St. John"; at Dresden (in the Museum), "Christ carrying the Cross", "Ecce Homo"; at Dublin (in the National Gallery), "St. Jerome in the Desert", at New York (in the Historical Society), "Ecce Homo"; at Paris (in the Louvre), "Christ carrying the Cross"; at St. Petersburg (in the Hermitage), "Our Lady of Sorrows"; at Stuttgart (in the Museum), "Ecce Homo".

STIRLING, *Annals of the Artists of Spain*, (London, 1868), 224; BLANC, *Hist. des peintres de toutes les Ecoles* (Paris, 1865): *Ecole espagnole;* LEFORT, *La peinture espagnole*, (Paris, 1893), 74–6.

GASTON SORTAIS.

Moralities (or MORAL PLAYS) are a development or an offshoot of the Miracle Plays and together with these form the greater part of Medieval drama. They were popular in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries and existed side by side with the Miracle Plays of that date. A Morality has been defined by Dr. Ward as "a play enforcing a moral truth or lesson by means of the speech and action of characters which are personified abstractions—figures representing vices and virtues, qualities of the human mind, or abstract conceptions in general", and, on the whole, that definition comprehends the main features of the Morality proper in its most characteristic form. Miracle Plays and Moralities existed throughout Europe, especially in France, and had various features in common while the manner of their presentation, at least in the early stages of the Morality, differed hardly at all—the performance being out of doors upon movable scaffolds with all the usual "properties". The aim of both was religious. In the Miracle Play the subject-matter is concerned with Bible narrative, Lives of Saints, the Apocryphal Gospels, and pious legends, a certain historical or traditional foundation underlies the plot, and the object was to teach and enforce truths of the Catholic faith. In the Morality the matter was allegorical rather than historical, and its object was ethical; the cultivation of Christian character. The intention of both Miracle Plays and Moralities, as we have said, was religious; in the one it aimed at faith, the teaching of dogma, in the other morals, the application of Christian doctrine to conduct. In the one medieval morality at all well known to the general public, that of "Everyman", this is clearly illustrated—a human life is brought face to face with the imperative facts of the Christian faith. It is not difficult, therefore, to see that the Morality is not only a development from the Miracle play but also its complement.

It is the custom with many dramatic and literary historians to decry the Moralities, especially in comparison with the Miracle plays, as unutterably dull, and to place them in the lowest rank of dramatic art;

yet that does not seem to have been contemporary opinion, for the multitude of extant printed editions of Moralities is stated by Mantzius to exceed by far that of the Miracles and farces. Mr. Pollard is, moreover, of the opinion that in its earlier days the Morality was not wholly unworthy to be ranked with the Miracle Play. It is, of course, clear that the substitution in the moralities of abstract ideas (Love, Friendship, etc.) in place of the human personalities of the Bible or legendary narrative, would tend to produce a less real effect if acted carelessly, or if the audience did not thoroughly comprehend, or was out of sympathy with, the meaning of the play (and this is practically the position of the modern reader, especially if non-Catholic). But the abstract ideas, after all, were represented as human beings (though typical human beings) on the stage, and if we put ourselves even slightly into the Catholic, religious, and moral atmosphere of the medieval audience (to which the ethical bearing of the play was not naturally dull but vivid, because of the tremendous human issues it was concerned with), we should be able to understand why the Moralities were popular not only in the Middle Ages but on into the time of the Renaissance. Besides this, in many Moralities the characters were not all abstract qualities—there were angels and devils, priests, doctors, and, especially in English plays, the fool, under various names, chiefly that of the "Vice". The versification of the Moralities was, too, on the whole, more varied than that of the Miracle Plays. One of the latest and most thorough of English writers upon this stage of the drama points out that four main plots can be distinguished in the earlier Moralities, sometimes occurring alone and sometimes in combination: the Debate of the Heavenly Graces; the Coming of Death; the Conflict of Vices and Virtues; and the Debate of the Soul and the Body.

In England, however, we have not extant examples of all the four, though the Morality Play is well represented in our literature. The earliest English Morality of which we hear is a play of the "Lord's Prayer" of the latter half of the fourteenth century "in which all manner of vices and sins were held up to scorn and the virtues held up to praise". This play is lost, but it must have been much thought of, for a Guild was formed in York (where it was played) with the special object of maintaining it. Also lost is another early and highly interesting Morality of the "Creed". The earliest complete Moral play extant, leaving out the still earlier fragment of the "Pride of Life" (ed. Waterhouse, see below), is the "Castell of Perseverance", 3650 lines long, and written perhaps in the early fifteenth century. This "traces (to quote Mr. Pollard's skilful summary) the spiritual history of *Humanum Genus* [Mankind or the typical man] from the day of his birth to his appearance at the Judgment Seat of God, personifying the foes by whom his pathway is beset, the Guardian Angel by whose help he resists them, and the ordinances of Confession and Penance by which he is strengthened in his conflict". Dramatic power is shown in this Morality; the plot forms a unity, and is developed in logical sequence. It must have been a thrilling moment for the audience when *Humanum Genus* after hearing the persuasive arguments of his Good and his Bad Angels, hesitates which to follow:—

"Whom to folowe, wetyn I ne may;
I stonde in stodye, and gynne to rave;
I wolde be ryche in gret aray,
And fayn I wolde my sowle save
As wynde in water I wave.
Thou (*to Bad Angel*) woldyst to the world I me toke;
And *he* wold that I it forsoke.
Now so God me helpe, and the holy boke
I not (*know not*) wyche I may have."

Other early Moralities approaching the same type are "Mind, Will, and Understanding"; "Mankind" (these, with the "Castell of Perseverance", included in one MS. and named in modern times after a former owner, the "Macro Moralities", ed. Pollard and Furnivall, see below); "Everyman" (London, 1902), a translation from a Dutch original; the "World and the Child" (*Mundus et Infans;* ed. Manly, see below). All the above plays are lengthy and belong almost certainly to the fifteenth century. About the same date we may place two plays which though not pure Moralities are yet much influenced by the Moralities, "St. Mary Magdalene" (ed. Furnivall, see below), and what is known as the Croxton Play of the "Sacrament" (ed. Waterhouse, see below).

About the end of the fifteenth century a new kind of Morality play appeared. In the earlier Moralities of which we have been speaking, time was not an object, nor was there need to limit the number of actors, but little by little, as performances began to take place indoors, in the hall of a king or a noble, and as they passed into the hands of professional actors, compression began to be necessary both in time and in the number of personages introduced. The aim of the play, also, became gradually more secular. The result was a modified and shortened Morality known as an Interlude. The meaning of this term is not yet clearly defined. Its primary meaning according to Mr. Chambers is that of a play in dialogue between two or more performers, but its secondary meaning, that of a dramatic diversion in the pause or interlude between the parts of a banquet or other entertainment, which has been generally given to it, may still stand. The nature of the Moral Interlude and its close connexion with the earlier Morality proper is, however, clear. It deals with portions only of a man's life; and the ethical teaching, in some Interludes, is mainly limited to warnings against certain sins (especially those of youth) and in others to exhortations to learning and study. "Hick Scorner" (ed. Manly, see below) and the Interlude of the "Four Elements" (Hazlitt, "Dodsley's Old Plays", London, 1874) are early examples. This type of play was often used as a means of asserting Protestantism against Catholicism. Among the writers of this later type of Morality we find John Skelton in his "Magnyfycence" (ed. Ramsay, see below), and John Heywood, the dramatist, who was especially noted for his Interludes, some of which, however, are more like plays proper having a satirical rather than a definite moral aim, and leading to another development of the drama. Some of the Interludes are lively enough, but in others there appears something of the dramatic lifelessness which has been, perhaps rashly, attributed to Moralities in general. When we find an Interlude on the subject of Love, in which the characters are named "Loving not Loved", "Loved not Loving", "Both Loving and Loved", "Neither Loved nor Loving", it is plain that this type of work is reaching its end, or if it is to continue must take on a more living character. John Heywood's work, however, on the whole, brings us, in Interludes such as "The Four P's" and "The Pardner and the Frere" (both plays to be found in Hazlitt's "Dodsley"), to the threshold of real drama. Allegory has passed away, together with the recognized Moral plot, and the characters are drawn from contemporary life. This "transformed morality takes its place as one of the threads which went to make up the wondrous web of the Elizabethan drama".

Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage* (Oxford, 1903); Pollard, *English Miracle Plays* (Oxford, 1909); Ramsay, *Preface to Skelton's Magnyfycence* in *Early Eng. Text. Socy. Publications* (London, 1906); Pollard and Furnivall, *Preface to Macro Plays* in *Early Eng. Text Socy. Publications* (London, 1904); Waterhouse, *Preface to Non-Cycle Mystery Plays* in *Early Eng. Text Socy. Publications* (London, 1909); Furnivall, *Preface to Digby Mysteries* in *Early Eng. Text Socy. Publications* (London, 1882); Ten-Brink, *English Literature*, II (London, 1893); Ward, *English Dramatic Literature*, I (London, 1899); Courthope, *History of Eng. Poetry*, I (London, 1895); Furnivall and Munro, *Shakspere: Life and Work*, Ch. xii (London, 1908); Mantzius, *History of Theatrical*

Art, tr. Gossel, II (London, 1903); Gayley, *Representative English Comedies* (New York, 1903); Idem, *Plays of Our Forefathers* (London and New York, 1908); Manly, *Specimens of Pre-Shaksperian Drama* (Boston and London, 1897).

K. M. Warren.

Morality.—It is necessary at the outset of this article to distinguish between morality and ethics, terms not seldom employed synonymously. Morality is antecedent to ethics: it denotes those concrete activities of which ethics is the science. It may be defined as human conduct in so far as it is freely subordinated to the ideal of what is right and fitting. This ideal governing our free actions is common to the race. Though there is wide divergence as to theories of ethics, there is a fundamental agreement among men regarding the general lines of conduct desirable in public and private life. Thus Mr. Hobhouse has well said: "The comparative study of ethics, which is apt in its earlier stages to impress the student with a bewildering sense of the diversity of moral judgments, ends rather by impressing them with a more fundamental and far-reaching uniformity. Through the greatest extent of time and space over which we have records, we find a recurrence of the common features of ordinary morality, which to my mind at least is not less impressive than the variations which also appear" (Morals in Evolution, I, i, n. 11). Plainly this uniformity regards principles rather than their application. The actual rules of conduct differ widely. While reverence to parents may be universally acknowledged as obligatory, certain savage tribes believe that filial piety requires them to despatch their parents when the infirmities of old age appear. Yet making allowance for all such diversities, it may be said that the common voice of the race proclaims it to be right for a man to reverence his parents; to care and provide for his children; to be master of his lower appetites; to be honest and just in his dealings, even to his own damage; to show benevolence to his fellows in time of distress; to bear pain and misfortune with fortitude. And only within comparatively recent years has anyone been found to deny that beyond this a man is bound to honour God and to prefer his country's interests to his own. Thus, indeed, the advance of morality lies not so much in the discovery of new principles as in the better application of those already accepted, in the recognition of their true basis and their ultimate sanction, in the widening of the area within which they are held to bind, and in the removal of corruptions inconsistent with their observance.

The relation of morality to religion has been a subject of keen debate during the past century. In much recent ethical philosophy it is strenuously maintained that right moral action is altogether independent of religion. Such is the teaching alike of the Evolutionary, Positivist, and Idealist schools. And an active propaganda is being carried on with a view to the general substitution of this independent morality for morality based on the beliefs of Theism. On the other hand, the Church has ever affirmed that the two are essentially connected, and that apart from religion the observance of the moral law is impossible. This, indeed, follows as a necessary consequence from the Church's teaching as to the nature of morality. She admits that the moral law is knowable to reason: for the due regulation of our free actions, in which morality consists, is simply their right ordering with a view to the perfecting of our rational nature. But she insists that the law has its ultimate obligation in the will of the Creator by whom our nature was fashioned, and who imposes on us its right ordering as a duty; and that its ultimate sanction is the loss of God which its violation must entail. Further, among the duties which the moral law prescribes are some which are directly concerned with God Himself, and as such are of supreme importance. Where morality is divorced from religion, reason will, it is true, enable a man to recognize to a large extent the ideal to which his nature points. But much will be wanting. He will disregard some of his most essential duties. He will, further, be destitute of the strong motives for obedience to the law afforded by the sense of obligation to God and the knowledge of the tremendous sanction attached to its neglect—motives which experience has proved to be necessary as a safeguard against the influence of the passions. And, finally, his actions even if in accordance with the moral law, will be based not on the obligation imposed by the Divine will, but on considerations of human dignity and on the good of human society. Such motives, however, cannot present themselves as, strictly speaking, obligatory. But where the motive of obligation is wanting, action lacks an element essential to true morality. Moreover, in this connexion the Church insists upon the doctrine of original sin. She teaches that in our present state there is a certain obscurity in reason's vision of the moral law, together with a morbid craving for independence impelling us to transgress it, and a lack of complete control over the passions; and that by reason of this inherited taint, man, unless supported by Divine aid, is unable to observe the moral law for any length of time. Newman has admirably described from the psychological point of view this weakness in our grasp of the moral law: "The sense of right and wrong . . . is so delicate, so fitful, so easily puzzled, obscured, perverted, so subtle in its argumentative methods, so impressionable by education, so biassed by pride and passion, so unsteady in its course, that in the struggle for existence amid the various exercises and triumphs of the human intellect, the sense is at once the highest of all teachers yet the least luminous" (Newman, "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk", in section on conscience).

In dealing with this subject, however, it is further necessary to take account of the historical argument. Various facts are adduced, which, it is alleged, show that morality is, in point of fact, capable of dissociation from religion. It is urged (1) that the most primitive peoples do not connect their religious beliefs with such moral code as they possess; and (2) that even where the moral consciousness and the religious system have reached a high degree of development, the spheres of religion and morality are sometimes regarded as separate. Thus the Greeks of classical times were in moral questions influenced rather by non-religious conceptions such as that of αἰδώς (natural shame) than by fear of the gods; while one great religious system, namely Buddhism, explicitly taught the entire independence of the moral code from any belief in God. To these arguments we reply, first: that the savages of to-day are not primitives, but degenerates. It is the merest superstition to suppose that these degraded races can enlighten us as to what were the beliefs of man in his primitive state. It is among civilized races, where man has developed normally, that we must seek for knowledge as to what is natural to man. The evidence gathered from them is overwhelmingly in favour of the contention that human reason proclaims the essential dependence of morality on religious belief. In regard to the contrary instances alleged, it must be denied that the morality of the Greeks was unconnected with religion. Though they may not have realized that the laws prescribed by natural shame were derived from a divine command, they most certainly believed that their violation would be punished by the gods. As to Buddhist belief, a distinction must be drawn between the metaphysical teaching of the Buddha or of some of his disciples, and the practical interpretation of that teaching as expressed in the lives of the great mass of the adherents of the creed. It is only the Buddhist monks who have really followed the speculative teaching of their master on this point and have dissociated the moral law from belief in God. The mass of adherents never did

so. Yet even the monks, while denying the existence of a personal God, regarded as a heretic any who disputed the existence of heaven and hell. Thus they too help to bear witness to the universal consensus that the moral law is based on supernatural sanctions. We may, however, readily admit that where the religious conceptions and the moral code were alike immature and inadequate, the relation between them was less clearly grasped in thought, and less intimate in practice, than it became when man found himself in possession of a fuller truth regarding them. A Greek or a Buddhist community may have preserved a certain healthiness of moral tone even though the religious obligation of the moral law was but obscurely felt, while ancestral precept and civic obligation were viewed as the preponderating motives. A broad distinction must be made between such cases and that of those nations which having once accepted the Christian faith with its clear profession of the connexion between moral obligation and a Divine law, have subsequently repudiated this belief in favour of a purely natural morality. There is no parity between "Fore-Christians" and "After-Christians". The evidence at our command seems to establish as certain that it is impossible for these latter to return to the inadequate grounds of obligation which may sometimes suffice for nations still in the immaturity of their knowledge; and that for them the rejection of the religious sanction is invariably followed by a moral decay, leading rapidly to the corruptions of the most degraded periods of our history. We may see this wherever the great revolt from Christianity, which began in the eighteenth century, and which is so potent a factor to-day, has spread. It is naturally in France, where the revolt began, that the movement has attained its fullest development. There its effects are not disputed. The birth-rate has shrunk until the population, were it not for the immigration of Flemings and Italians, would be a diminishing quantity; Christian family life is disappearing; the number of divorces and of suicides multiplies annually; while one of the most ominous of all symptoms is the alarming increase of juvenile crime. But these effects are not peculiar to France. The movement away from Christianity has spread to certain sections of the population in the United States, in England, in Germany, in Australia, countries providing in other respects a wide variety of circumstances. Wherever it is found, there in varying degrees the same results have followed, so that the unprejudiced observer can draw but one conclusion, namely: that for a nation which has attained maturity, morality is essentially dependent on the religious sanction, and that when this is rejected, morality will soon decay.

Granting religion to be the essential basis of moral action, we may further inquire what are the chief conditions requisite for the growth and development of morality in the individual and in the community. Three such may be singled out as of primary moment, namely: (1) a right education of the young, (2) a healthy public opinion, (3) sound legislation. It will be unnecessary for us to do more than touch in the briefest manner on these points. (1) Under education we include the early training of the home as well as the subsequent years of school life. The family is the true school of morality, a school which nothing can replace. There the child is taught obedience, truthfulness, self-restraint, and the other primary virtues. The obligation to practise them is impressed upon him by those whose claim on him he at once recognizes, and whose word he does not dream of doubting; while the observance of the precept is made easy by the affection which unites him with those who impose it. It is, therefore, with reason that the Church has ever declared divorce to be fatal to the truest interests of a nation. Where divorce is frequent, family life in its higher form disappears, and with it perishes the foundation of a nation's morality. Similarly the Church maintains, that during the years of school life, the moral and religious atmosphere is of vital importance, and that apart from this the possession of intellectual culture is a danger rather than a safeguard. (2) It is hardly necessary to do more than call attention to the necessity of a sound public opinion. The great mass of men have neither opportunity nor leisure to determine a standard of morals for themselves. They accept that which prevails around them. If it is high, they will not question it. If it is low, they will aim no higher. When the nations were Catholic, public opinion was predominantly swayed by the teaching of the Church. In these days it is largely formed by the press; and since the press as a whole views morality apart from religion, the standard proposed is inevitably very different from what the Church would desiderate. Hence the immense importance of a Catholic press, which even in a non-Catholic environment will keep a true view before the minds of those who recognize the Church's authority. But public opinion is also largely influenced by voluntary associations of one form or another; and of recent years immense work has been done by Catholics in organizing associations with this purpose, the most notable instance being the German *Volksverein*. (3) It may be said with truth that the greater part of a nation's legislation affects its morality in some way or other. This is of course manifestly the case with all laws connected with the family or with education; and with those, which like the laws regarding the drink traffic and the restriction of bad literature, have the public morals for their immediate object. But it is also true of all legislation which deals with the circumstances of the lives of the people. Laws, for instance, determining the conditions of labour and protecting the poor from the hands of the usurer, promote morality, for they save men from that degradation and despair in which moral life is practically impossible. It is thus evident how necessary it is, that in all such questions the Church should in every country have a definitely formed opinion and should make her voice heard. (See ETHICS; LAW.)

CATHREIN, *Religion und Moral* (Freiburg, 1900); FOX, *Religion and Morality* (New York, 1899); DEVAS, *Key to the World's Progress* (London, 1906); IDEM, *Studies of Family Life* (London, 1886); BALFOUR, *Foundations of Belief* (London, 1895), Part I, i; *Catholic Truth Society's Lectures on the History of Religions* (London, 1910).

G. H. JOYCE.

Moral Philosophy. See ETHICS.

Moral Theology. See THEOLOGY.

Moran, PATRICK FRANCIS. See SYDNEY, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

Moratín, LEANDRO FERNANDEZ DE, Spanish poet and playwright, b. at Madrid, 10 March, 1760; d. at Paris, 21 June, 1828. He is usually known as the younger Moratín, and was the son of Nicolás Fernández de Moratín (1737–80), a lawyer and professor of poetry at the Imperial College, also a playwright. The elder Moratín had devoted himself to attempting to reform the Spanish drama and had written several plays after the style of Racine and Corneille. In 1762 he had published his "Desengaño al Teatro Español" in which he criticized the old drama and especially the "Auto Sacramental" which still flourished. So successful was this work, that three years later the exhibition of "Autos" was forbidden by royal edict. Among his works were "La Petimetra", "Guzmán el Bueno" and, probably the best known, "Hormesinda", a tragedy. Knowing by his own experience how precarious was literature as a means of livelihood, the elder Moratín apprenticed his son to a jeweller, thinking in this way to develop his son's artistic skill. While serving as apprentice, young Leandro won two prizes offered by the Academy, one in 1779 with an epic ballad entitled "La toma de Granada", and the

other in 1782 with "La lección poética", a satire upon the popular poets of the day. These brought him to the notice of the statesman and author Jovellanos, through whose influence Moratín was appointed secretary to Count Cabarrus upon the latter's special mission to France in 1787. During the year that he spent in Paris he improved the opportunity to study the French drama and formed friendships with men of letters, both of which circumstances aided materially in the artistic development of the young poet. Returning to Spain in 1789, Moratín set out to continue the work begun by his father of reforming the Spanish drama upon the French classical model. He secured the patronage of Manuel Godoy, prime minister and favourite of Charles IV, through whose influence he was able in 1790 to stage the first of his plays, "El Viejo y la Niña", a comedy in three acts and in verse. This was followed in 1792 by "La Comedia nueva" or "El Café" in two acts and in prose. In the same year Godoy gave him the means for foreign travel and his journey through France, England, the Low Countries, Germany, and Italy completed his education. His next play "El Barón" was produced in 1803, followed in 1804 by "La Mojigata" (The female hypocrite), a weak imitation of Molière's "Tartuffe". An unsuccessful attempt was made to suppress this last piece on religious grounds by means of the Inquisition. Moratín's crowning triumph came in 1806 when the second of his prose comedies and his best work "El Sí de las Niñas" was produced. Performed before crowded houses night after night, it ran through several editions in one year, and was translated into several foreign languages. In 1808, upon the fall of his friend Godoy, Moratín was compelled to flee from Spain, but returned shortly afterward to accept from Joseph Bonaparte the post of royal librarian, a lack of patriotism which lost him the friendship of loyal Spaniards, so that when the Spaniards returned to power, Moratín was compelled to pass the rest of his days in exile, principally in Paris where he died. In addition to the works mentioned, Moratín made a rather poor translation of Hamlet, and translated and adapted to the Spanish stage Molière's "Ecole des Maris" and "Le Médecin Malgré Lui" under the titles respectively of "La Escuela de los Maridos" and "El Médico á Palos". During his exile he wrote a history of the Spanish drama entitled "Origines del Teatro Español". In his work, Moratín shows originality, he skilfully describes the manners of his time and is clever in his dialogue. He adheres to the French unities, but introduces certain peculiarities of the Spanish stage, dividing his plays into three acts and using the short romance verse. He was unquestionably the best dramatic writer Spain had produced since the famous ones of the *Siglo de oro*. The "Biblioteca de Autores Españoles", Vol. II, contains the plays of both the elder and the younger Moratín.

TICKNOR, *History of Spanish Literature* (Boston, 1866); FITZMAURICE-KELLY, *A History of Spanish Literature* (New York, 1906); FEDERICO, *Historia de la literatura y del arte dramático en España*, tr. from German of MEIER (Madrid, 1885–87).

VENTURA FUENTES.

Moravia (German MÄHREN), Austrian crown land east of Bohemia. In the century before the Christian era the Germanic Quadi (a tribe closely related to the Marcomanni, who had just driven the Celtic Boii from Bohemia) took possession of the modern Moravia. Of these two tribes settled in Bohemia and Moravia we know nothing beyond their collisions with the Romans—e. g., their wars with Marcus Aurelius in A. D. 165 and 181 and with Valentinian I (364–75). The invasion of the Huns under Attila drove the majority of the Marcomanni and Quadi from their settlements. In the fifth century the deserted territory was occupied by Slav tribes. About the middle of the sixth century, these were conquered by the Atars, who advanced as far as Thuringia. The Slavs were delivered from the Avar yoke temporarily (622–58) by Samo, who was perhaps of Frankish parentage, and finally by Charlemagne, whose defeat of the Avars in 796 enabled the Moravians to recover the territory extending from Mannhartsberg to the mouth of the Gran. During this period a uniform principality had developed on Moravian soil, and received the name of the Kingdom of the Moimorides from the founder of the dynasty, Moimir. Moravia stood towards the Frankish Empire in relations of dependence; at least, the "Mahararer" brought presents to Emperor Louis at the Diet of Ratisbon in 822. When Moimir sought to assert his independence of the empire, he was deposed by the Germans and his nephew Wratislaw appointed prince. The latter's struggle for complete freedom ended in his betrayal into the hands of Louis the German by his nephew Swatopluk, who then attained to power under German protection.

In the ecclesiastical domain Wratislaw had also desired independence of the German Empire. Christianity had already been preached in Moravia, but had failed to reach the great mass of the people, as the German and Italian missionaries were ignorant of the vernacular speech. In 863 Wratislaw asked the Greek emperor to send new apostles acquainted with the Slav tongue. This monarch dispatched the brothers Constantine (afterwards called Cyril) and Methodius in 864. Having only minor orders, the missionaries confined themselves to the training of the youth and the translation of a portion of the Bible into the Slav language, for which purpose they invented special Slav characters. In 867 they set out for Rome to seek papal permission to conduct the Divine Service in the vulgar tongue. Pope Adrian II, who consecrated both brothers bishops, is said to have acceded to their petition. While Constantine, having a presentiment of his approaching end (869), remained in Rome, Methodius returned to Moravia and there resumed his work of evangelization, in opposition to the German clergy. After the fall of Wratislaw, Methodius had to submit to the German spiritual authorities, was confined for two and a half years in a German monastery, and was freed only at the strict command of the pope in 873. His activity was, however, even now narrowly restricted by the Bavarian bishops, although the use of the Slav Liturgy was expressly recognized by the pope in 880.

The understanding between Swatopluk and the Frankish Empire was of short duration. From 882 Swatopluk was engaged in fierce conflict with Arnulf, who administered Carinthia and Pannonia. In 885, however, a complete reconciliation took place, and the Moravian prince lent Arnulf his zealous support until the latter successfully established his claim to the German Crown. But the energetic Arnulf was not likely to tolerate any longer the growth of Swatopluk's power, so dangerous to his empire. In 892 war again broke out, and Swatopluk died in 895 before any decisive result had been reached. Subsequently the Moravian Kingdom was rent asunder by the struggle of various claimants for the throne, and in the first decade of the tenth century succumbed to the attack of Hungary at the battle of Presburg. The country remained in the hands of Hungary until the battle of Lechfeld in 955, when it was united with Bohemia by the Bohemian Duke Boleslaw of the Přemysl family, the confederate of Emperor Otto I. Towards the end of the tenth century Moravia was conquered by the Polish duke, Boleslaw Chrobry (992–1025), but, when domestic disturbances broke out in Poland after his death, Duke Udalrich of Bohemia, with the assistance of his son Břetislaw, recovered Moravia from the Poles. Břetislaw administered the land as Duke of Moravia, and established his residence at Olmütz. With the booty from his campaigns against the Poles, he founded the first Moravian monastery, that of Raigern near Brünn (1048). The strife, caused by

the law establishing in Bohemia the right of succession by seniority (1054), extended also to Moravia (which would have been divided to provide petty principalities for the younger sons of the ducal house), especially to the principalities of Brünn, Olmütz, and Znaim. The suzerainty of the Bohemian duke was however maintained. In 1063 Duke Wratislaw (1061–92) gave the land its own ecclesiastical centre by establishing the Diocese of Olmütz, which was placed under Mainz.

The Moravian petty princes repeatedly rebelled against the sovereignty of the Bohemian duke; thus when, on the death of Wratislaw II, Břetislaw II appointed his brother his successor in contravention of the law regulating succession by seniority, long wars were waged against him by the rightful heir, Duke Udalrich of Brünn (1101, 1105, and 1107). These wars reached their climax in 1125, when Prince Otto of Olmütz rose against Duke Sobeslaw, the youngest son of Wratislaw II, and was supported by Lothair of Supplinburg. Lothair led an army in person for his confederate Otto, but was defeated in a decisive battle near Kulm (1126). Sobeslaw (1125–40) and his nephew and successor, Wladislaw II, energetically maintained the Bohemian supremacy over Moravia; during the reign of the latter the Moravian branch of the Přemysl family became extinct, whereupon Prince Conrad Otto of Znaim, who probably belonged to the collateral line of the Bohemian Přemysls, united the three divisions of the Moravian kingdom (1174). On his attempting also to annex Bohemia (from which, on the death of Wladislaw, his son Frederick had been expelled by his barons), Barbarossa, to whom Frederick had fled, summoned both the Přemysl nobles to appear before his tribunal at Ratisbon, and decided (29 Sept., 1182) that Frederick should rule in Bohemia, but that thenceforth Conrad Otto should hold Moravia as an immediate margraviate, independent of Bohemia. After Conrad Otto's death in Sicily (1191), a new war of succession broke out between the brothers Ottokar and Henry Wladislaw: to avoid bloodshed, the latter renounced in 1197 his claims to Bohemia, accepting Moravia as a margraviate feudatory to the Bohemian crown. Thenceforth, this was the political condition of Moravia.

Market and City Hall, Brünn, Moravia

The German colonization of Moravia, begun under Henry Wladislaw, greatly increased under his successors Henry Wladislaw II and Přemysl, as the invasions of the Mongols in 1241 and the Cumans in 1252 had swept away numbers of the inhabitants into captivity. This immigration of Germans led to the formation of German townships, the development of which was encouraged by the Přemysl family, especially by Ottakar II. The privileges, accorded to these towns, were based generally on those of Magdeburg and Nuremberg. After Ottakar had fallen in the battle of Marchfeld fighting against Rudolf of Hapsburg (1278), Moravia remained for five years as a pledge in Rudolf's hands, but was then under Ottakar's successor, Wenceslaus II, reunited with Bohemia, though its area was somewhat reduced. With Wenceslaus III the ruling line of the Přemysls became extinct in 1306. Moravia at first fell with Bohemia to Albert I of Hapsburg; then on Albert's death in 1307 to Henry of Carinthia, and in 1309 to John of Luxemburg, son of Emperor Henry VII. In the Privilege of 1311 John granted the country important liberties, which formed the foundation of the subsequently augmented rights of the estates. Under the provincial governor Henry of Lipa and Margrave Charles (1333), later Emperor Charles IV, a new period of prosperity began. In 1349 Charles enfeoffed his brother John in the margraviate. In 1371 John divided the country among his three sons, Jobst (Jodocus) receiving the title of Ancient Margrave and Overlord; his two younger sons were also given the title of Margrave, but they were to hold their lands in fief from Jobst. This partition and the great Western Schism, which evoked two ecclesiastical parties in Moravia as elsewhere, gave rise to much discord and disturbances between 1380 and 1405. On the death of the childless Jobst, Moravia, as a vacant fief, reverted to the Bohemian Crown, and its administration was entrusted to certain district governors by Wenceslaus IV.

As in Bohemia, where similar political and ecclesiastical conditions prevailed, Hussitism made rapid and great progress in Moravia under the feeble rule of Wenceslaus, especially among the nobility and peasantry; the Bishop of Olmütz and almost all the imperial cities inhabited by Germans, however, remained true to the Catholic cause. On Wenceslaus's death his brother, Emperor Sigismund, was recognized in Moravia as margrave, although the Bohemians refused to recognize him as king. Against the Hussites, who, under the leadership of two apostate priests, had established a fortified camp in the neighbourhood of Ungarisch-Hradisch (Neu Tabor), the emperor received vigorous support from Duke Albert of Austria. In 1423 Albert received for these services the Margraviate of Moravia in fief. After the chief power of the fanatical Hussites in Bohemia had been crushed in the battle near Lipau (1434), a treaty of peace was also arranged in Moravia, according to which the Hussites were allowed to receive Communion under both species, these *Compactata*, as they were called, being published at the Diet of Iglau (1436). Under Albert's son, Wladislaw Posthumus (1449), began the first attempts to stem Utraquism and to restore to the Catholic Church its earlier dominant position. Especially efficacious towards this end was the missionary activity of St. John Capistran, whose ignorance of the native speech, however, prevented him from attaining complete success. George of Podiebrand, who became King of Bohemia on Wladislaw's death in 1457, had to resort to arms to secure recognition in Moravia from the German and Catholic towns. In 1464 he promised the Moravian Estates that the margraviate should never be separated from the Crown of Bohemia by sale, exchange, or mortgage. After his death, however, the strife between Matthias Corvinus and Wladislaw of Poland for the Bohemian Crown resulted in the peace of 1478, according to which Corvinus received Moravia for life and Wladislaw Bohemia. On the death of Corvinus, Moravia also fell under the sway of Wladislaw (1490). Thanks to the excellent

administration of the governor Ctibor of Cymburg (1469–94), who, although a Utraquist, enjoyed the confidence of both princes, Wladislaw was able to leave to his son Louis II in 1516, considering the troubled era, a splendidly ordered land. Louis was slain in the Battle of Mohács against the Turks (1526). As he was childless, Ferdinand of Hapsburg, husband of Anna Jagellon, the sister of Louis, claimed Moravia with Bohemia and Hungary. His claim was admitted by the assembly of the Moravian Estates, who did homage to Ferdinand at Brünn and Olmütz in 1527.

Turning to ecclesiastical affairs, there was in Moravia in the fifteenth century, besides the Catholics and Utraquists, a third confession, the so-called "Brethren's Union". This body had spread widely, thanks mainly to the patronage of certain influential nobles, who could defy all decrees of banishment. Luther's teaching thus found a favourable soil in Moravia, and spread rapidly, especially in the cities of Olmütz, Znaim, and Iglau. From 1526 Moravia was also the refuge and new home of the Anabaptists, the adherents of Hubmaier, the Gabrielists, and the Moravian Brethren, who later emigrated to Russia and thence to the United States. The friendly attitude of Emperor Maximilian II (1564–76) towards Protestantism favoured the growth of all these non-Catholic movements. With the foundation of the Jesuit Colleges of Brünn and Olmütz (1574) the Catholic Counter-Reformation set in, its direction being undertaken by Franz von Dietrichstein, Bishop of Olmütz (1599–1636). The Bohemian rising against the emperor in 1618 extended for a short time to Moravia, and on 19 August, 1619, the opposition party of the Moravian Estates voted in common with the Bohemian Estates at Prague for the deposition of Ferdinand and the election of Frederick of the Palatinate as King of Bohemia. In Feb., 1620, the latter succeeded in making his entry into Brünn as Margrave of Moravia, but the Battle of the White Mountain gave victory to the cause of the emperor and Catholicism, and the imperial generals occupied the land. Sharp punishment was meted out to the leaders of the rebellion and the revolting cities; in 1622 the Anabaptists were compelled to leave the land, and in 1623–8 the Brethren's Union.

An imperial edict of 9 March, 1628, ordered the return to the Catholic Church, and compelled all recusants to emigrate. The Protestant religion, however, continued under the surface, especially in the German townships. From 1642 Moravia was the theatre of the devastating wars between the imperial forces and the Swedes, who maintained a foothold in the land until the Peace of 1648 (in Olmütz until 1650). Sixty-three castles, twenty-two large towns, and three hundred and thirty villages were destroyed, and the plague swept away thousands of the inhabitants whom the war had spared. On the conclusion of the Thirty Years' War the Catholic restoration was actively resumed. From Olmütz, Brünn, Iglau, Znaim, and Hradisch outwards, the Jesuits displayed a fruitful activity by holding missions far and wide, while the Piarists performed valuable service by establishing schools in numerous places. The lack of secular clergy, however, continued for a long time an obstacle to complete Catholicization. Under Leopold I, Joseph I, and Charles VI, Moravia enjoyed as a rule peaceful conditions, although in 1633 the Turks and Tatars penetrated as far as Olmütz and Brünn, devastating the land. The wars begun by Frederick II of Prussia for the possession of Silesia reduced Moravia to a piteous state, especially northern Moravia and Olmütz. Maria Theresa and Joseph II introduced extensive alterations in almost all branches of the administrative system. The administration was greatly centralized, the autonomy of the estates and the Diet was abolished, and in 1782 Moravia was united with Silesia for purposes of administration. In favour of the Protestants a patent of tolerance was issued, while on the other hand thirteen monasteries for men and six for women were suppressed. The University of Olmütz, deserted after the suppression of the Jesuit Order, was transferred in 1778 to Brünn, where a bishopric had been founded in 1777, Olmütz being simultaneously raised to an archdiocese. Emperor Leopold restored to the estates a certain independence.

The Napoleonic era did not pass by without leaving a landmark in Moravia, for at Austerlitz, in the centre of the land, was fought the decisive battle of the Third Coalition War, and the subsequent contest between Austria and Napoleon took place partly in Moravia (Battle of Znaim). The Restoration was followed by many years of peace. The Austrian Revolution of 1848 gave Moravia and the other crown lands of Austria a constitution, substantially unaltered to-day, and admitted the co-operation of the people in the making of laws. In 1866 Moravia was the scene of the latest war between Austria and Prussia, which was decided at the Battle of Königgrätz, and a Moravian town, Nikolsburg, witnessed the preliminary negotiations which resulted in the Peace of Prague. In the subsequent era of peace Moravia made great strides in cultural and economical development. The national quarrels between the Germans and Czechs, which even to-day (1910) convulse Austria and especially the portion of Bohemia bordering on Moravia, found a friendly settlement in Moravia in 1905. The electoral conditions were altered so as to include —in addition to the three electoral classes of the landed interests, the cities, and the rural districts—a fourth general electoral class consisting of every qualified voter; separate German and Czech electoral districts were established according to the national land registers, and curiæ of the separate nationalities were instituted to settle all disputes involving the question of nationality. The question of language in the case of the autonomous national and district authorities has been settled on a bilingual basis, and the division of the school board according to nationality accomplished. Although, by the acceptance of this franchise reform, the Germans lost their previous majority in the Diet, they gave their consent to the change in the interests of public peace.

Politically speaking the Margraviate of Moravia is an Austrian crown land, the highest administrative authority being vested in the governor at Brünn. The Diet consists of 149 deputies: 2 members with individual vote, the Archbishop of Olmütz and the Bishop of Brünn; 30 members of the landed interests (10 German, 20 Czech); 3 deputies from the Chamber of Commerce of Olmütz and from that of Brünn; 40 representatives of the towns (20 German, 20 Czech); 51 representatives of the rural communes (14 German); 20 deputies from the electoral curiæ (6 German). In the Imperial Diet of the Austrian Crownlands Moravia is represented by 49 deputies. Ecclesiastically, the land is divided into the dioceses of Olmütz and Brünn, which are treated in separate articles. The Protestants have 1 *Superintendentur*, 14 *Seniorate*, and 45 parishes; the Jews 50 cultural districts. The area of Moravia is 8573 square miles. According to the census of 1900 the population of Moravia was 2,437,706 inhabitants, including 2,325,574 Catholics, 185 Uniats, 66,365 Protestants, 44,255 Jews; and, according to nationality, 695,492 Germans and 1,727,270 Czechs. At the beginning of 1909 the population was estimated at 2,591,980.

PITTER, *Monasticon histor. diplomat. omnium Moraviæ monasteriorum* (11 vols., 1760); *Codex diplomat. et epist. Moraviæ* (15 vols., Olmütz and Brünn, 1836–1903); ERBEN AND EMLER, *Regesta diplomat. necnon epist. Bohemiæ et Moraviæ* (19 vols., Prague, 1855); A. WOLNY, *Die Markgrafschaft Mähren* (6 vols., Brünn, 1835); G. WOLNY, *Kirchl. Topographie von Mähren* (8 vols., Brünn, 1855); DUDIK, *Mährens allg. Gesch.* (12 vols. and index, Brünn, 1860–88); WEINBRENNER, *Mähren u. das Bistum Brünn* (Vienna, 1877); BRETHOLZ, *Gesch. Mährens* (2 vols., Brünn, 1893–5); TRAUTENBERGER, *Chronik der Landeshauptstadt Brünn* (5 vols.,

Brünn, 1892–8); *Die österreich. Monarchie in Wort u. Bild*, XVII: *Mähren u. Schlesien* (Vienna, 1897); PROKOP, *Mähren in kunstgeschichtl. Beziehung* (4 vols., Brünn, 1904); DVORAK, *Gesch. der Markgrafschaft Mähren* (Brünn, 1906); *Zeitschr. des deutschen Ver. für Gesch. Mährens u. Schlesiens* (1897).

JOSEPH LINS.

Moravian Brethren. See BOHEMIAN BRETHREN.

Morazzone, IL. See MAZZUCHELLI, PIETRO FRANCESCO.

Morcelli, STEFANO ANTONIO, an Italian Jesuit and learned epigraphist; b. 17 January, 1737, at Chiari near Brescia; d. there 1 January, 1822. He studied at the Jesuit College of Brescia and was admitted into the Society of Jesus, 3 Nov., 1753. He successively taught grammar at Fermo, humanities at Ragusa, and oratory at the Roman College where he established an academy of archæology at the Kircher Museum. After the suppression of the Society of Jesus (1773) he became librarian to Cardinal Albani and in 1791 was appointed to a provostship in his native town. He declined the offer of the Archbishopric of Ragusa and died a member of the restored Society of Jesus. He owes his fame not only to his extensive knowledge of ancient inscriptions, but also to his classical Latinity. Among his numerous works the following may be mentioned: (1) "De stilo inscriptionum latinarum" (Rome, 1781); (2) "Inscriptiones commentariis subjectis" (Rome, 1783) —to a second edition of these two works was added the "Parergon Inscriptionum novissimarum" (Padua, 1818–22); (3) "Μηνολόγιον τῶν Εὐαγγελίων ἑορταστικῶν sive Kalendarium Ecclesiæ Constantinopolitanæ" etc. (Rome, 1788); (4) "Africa Christiana" (Brescia, 1816–7); (5) "Opuscoli Ascetici" (Brescia, 1819 or 1820).

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la C. de Jésus*, V, 1290–1305 (Paris, 1894).

N. A. WEBER.

More, HELEN (DAME GERTRUDE), Benedictine nun of the English Congregation; b. at Low Leyton, Essex, England, 25 March, 1606; d. at Cambrai, France, 17 August, 1633. Her father, Cresacre More, was great-grandson of Blessed Thomas More; her mother, Elizabeth Gage, was sister of Sir John Gage, Baronet, of Firle, Sussex, lord chamberlain to Queen Mary. Her mother dying at an early age, Helen's care and education now devolved upon her father. By persuasion of Dom Benet Jones, O.S.B., she joined his projected foundation at Cambrai, and was first among nine postulants admitted to the order, 31 Dec., 1623, but vacillation of mind so disquieted her novitiate, that only with the greatest hesitation she pronounced her vows on 1 January, 1625; nor was she even then quite free from scruples and temptations, until she had availed herself of Dom Augustine Baker's prudent guidance. A year or two later, having now become Dame Gertrude, learning from him the use of affective prayer, a complete change was wrought in her; rapidly advancing in the interior life, she became a source of edification to the infant community, and, in 1629, when a choice of abbess must be made, her name, conjointly with that of Catharine Gascoigne, was sent to Rome for a dispensation on point of age. Catharine was eventually chosen, but Gertrude was always honoured as chief foundress. Supporting her abbess by lifelong devotion, promoting peace and good observance, she was universally beloved. None suffered more nor with more edifying fortitude than Dame Gertrude, under a heavy trial to which the community was subjected through interference of the vicar, Dom F. Hull, with Father Baker's teachings. Later, doubts arising as to her mode of prayer, formal inquiry was made, resulting in approval at the General Chapter in 1633, during the sessions of which, however, Gertrude was attacked by small-pox and died a peaceful death.

Some papers found after her death and arranged by Father Baker, were afterwards published in two separate works: one entitled "The Holy Practices of a Divine Lover, or the Sainctly Ideot's Devotions" (Paris, 1657); the other, "Confessiones Amantis", or "Spiritual Exercises", or "Ideot's Devotions", to which was prefixed her "Apology" for herself and for her spiritual guide (Paris, 1658), both recently republished.

BAKER, *Life and Death of Dame Gertrude More* (MS., written soon after her death—very rare); WELD-BLUNDELL, *Inner Life and Writings of D. Gertrude More* (2 vols., London, 1910); SWEENEY, *Life and Spirit of Father Baker* (London, 1861); WELDON, *Chronological Notes* (Stanbrook, 1881); LANE-FOX, introduction to his edition of *The Holy Practices of a Divine Lover* (Fort-Augustus, 1908).

E. B. WELD-BLUNDELL.

More, HENRY, great-grandson of the martyred English chancellor; b., 1586; d. at Watten in 1661. Having studied at St. Omer and Valladolid, he entered the Society of Jesus, and after his profession, and fulfilling various subordinate posts in the colleges, he was sent on the English Mission where he was twice arrested and imprisoned (1632, 1640), while acting as chaplain to John, the first Lord Petre. He became provincial in 1635, and in that capacity had a good deal to do with the negotiations of Panzani, Conn, and Rossetti, the papal agents at the court of Queen Henrietta Maria. He was rector of St. Omer in 1649–1652, and again in 1657–1660. During these latter years he wrote his important history of the English Jesuits: "Historia Missionis Anglicanæ, ab anno MDLXXX ad MDCXXXV" (St. Omer, 1660, fol.). Besides translating Jerome Platus's "Happiness of the Religious State" (1632), and the "Manual of Meditations" by Thomas de Villa Castin (1618), he wrote "Vita et Doctrina Christi Domini in meditationes quotidianas per annum digesta" (Antwerp, 1649), followed by an English version, entitled, "Life and Doctrines of our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Ghent, 1656, in two parts; London, 1880).

FÓLEY, *Records of the English Province S. J.*, VII, 518; MORRIS, *Life of Father John Gerard* (London, 1881).

J. H. POLLEN.

More, SIR THOMAS. See THOMAS MORE, BLESSED.

Morel, GALL, a poet, scholar, æsthete, and educationist, b. at St. Fiden, Switzerland, on 24 March, 1803; d. at the Abbey of Einsiedeln on 16 December, 1872. His baptismal name was Benedict, but in the monastery he took the name of Gall. In 1814, he entered the gymnasium at St. Gall. A pilgrimage to Einsiedeln in 1817 influenced him deeply, and soon afterwards he entered the monastery school as a novice. In 1820 he took the final vows, and after several years spent in theological and philosophical studies, was ordained priest in 1826, being appointed forthwith instructor in the monastery school. From this period his life presents a picture of extraordinary activity. From 1826 to 1832 he was professor of rhetoric, and until 1835 he lectured on philosophy. In this latter year he became librarian of the abbey, and retained this office to the end of his life, while also fulfilling the offices of choral director (1835–40), prefect (1836), and rector (1848) of the abbey school, archivist of the abbey (1839–45), counsellor of education of the Canton Schwyz (1843–5), and subprior of the abbey (1846–52).

In spite of the many demands upon his time and strength, the industrious monk exhibited a many-sided literary activity. He is best known as a poet, ten volumes of lyric, didactic, and dramatic verse testifying to his prolific poetical talent. Endowed by nature in so many directions, it has been said that in his poems, "he shows himself now as a childlike pious monk, now as a good-natured humorist, now as a man fully conversant with worldly affairs, and often as a keen satirist, forceful and epigrammatic in ex-

pression." Though Morel may not rank among the princes of verse, still his modest muse produced many a poem of enduring worth. But Morel also proved himself a scholar of great versatility. Under his care the library of Einsiedeln was enriched in thirty-seven years by more than 26,000 volumes; many of these are most valuable, especially the manuscripts, which include a tenth-century MS. of Horace, rescued by Morel from the bindings of books, and named after him "Codex Morellianus". Drawing on these literary treasures, Morel published the "Lateinische Hymnen des Mittelalters", "Offenbarungen der Schwester Mechtild von Magdeburg", and other works. Another publication was the "Regesten der Archive der schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft"; and he also compiled the Regesta of the Benedictine Abbey of Einsiedeln. Morel's compilations and catalogues are models of accuracy and arrangement. He was associate founder of the Swiss Society for Historical Research (1840), and wrote many valuable contributions for its "Archiv". He likewise assisted in the formation of "Verein der fünf alten Orte", and was a contributor to its organ, the "Geschichtsfreund".

In æsthetics, Morel became an authority by painstaking study and repeated art journeys to Munich, Vienna, Venice, Milan, Rome, and Paris. His conception of æsthetics was concisely expressed in the words that he considers it the prime object of æsthetics to reconstruct creation: the Divine ideas by the understanding in philosophy, the Divinely picturesque by our fancy in art, and God's creation by our will in our lives. An accomplished violinist, Morel critically treated music as an important branch of æsthetics. Morel's services as an educationist for nearly fifty years are easier to estimate than to describe. His energy and his quickening influence over teachers and scholars raised the humble *Klosterschule* to a high rank among institutions of learning. In this connexion special mention must be made of his efforts to foster school drama, including the publication of two volumes entitled "Jugend- und Schultheater". In the apt words of Bishop Greith of St. Gall, "Father Gall Morel was a living vindication of the monastic and cloistered life against the attacks of misunderstanding and prejudice."

KÜHNE, *P. Gall Morel, ein Mönchsleben aus dem 19 Jahrh.* (Einsiedeln, 1875); *Hist.-pol. Blätter*, LXXXI, 559 sqq.; LEIMBACH, *Die deutsche Dichtung der Neuzeit und der Gegenwart*, VI (Leipzig, 1896), 394 sqq.

N. SCHEID.

Morell, JULIANA, Dominican nun, b. at Barcelona, Spain, 16 February, 1594; d. at the convent of the Dominican nuns at Avignon, France, 26 June, 1653. The accounts of the learning of this celebrated Spanish lady seem to border on the miraculous. In a laudatory poem Lope de Vega speaks of her "as the fourth of the Graces and the tenth Muse", and says "that she was an angel who publicly taught all the sciences from the professorial chairs and in schools". The apparently extravagant praise of the poet is confirmed by the reports of contemporaries. Left motherless when very young, Juliana's first training was received from the Dominican nuns at Barcelona. At the age of four she began Latin, Greek, and Hebrew at home under competent teachers, and, when not yet seven years old, wrote a pretty Latin letter to her father who was away. Accused of taking part in a murder, the father fled to Lyons with his daughter, then eight years old. At Lyons Juliana continued her studies, devoting nine hours daily to rhetoric, dialectics, ethics, and music. At the age of twelve she defended in public her theses in ethics and dialectics "summa cum laude". She then applied herself to physics, metaphysics, and canon and civil law. Her father, who had meanwhile settled at Avignon, wanted his daughter to obtain a doctorate in the last-named faculty. This was gained in 1608, when she publicly maintained her law theses at the papal palace of the vice-legate before a distinguished audience, among whom was the Princesse de Condé. Disregarding wealth and a desirable marriage, she entered during the same year the convent of Sainte-Praxède at Avignon. In 1609 she received the habit of the order, and on 20 June, 1610, took the vows. Just as she had distinguished herself in secular life by her learning, so in the order she excelled all others in piety, humility, and faithful observance of the rules, being on three occasions, notwithstanding her reluctance, named prioress. In this manner the pious nun spent the remainder of her life in the order, well-pleasing to God and beloved by the sisters. For two years before her end she was in great bodily suffering and her death agony lasted five days. She left a number of religious writings: (1) a translation of the "Vita Spiritualis" of St. Vincent Ferrer, with comments and notes to the various chapters (Lyons, 1617; Paris, 1619); (2) "Exercices spirituels sur l'éternité" (Avignon, 1637); (3) French translation of the Rule of St. Augustine, with addition of various explanations and observations for the purpose of instruction (Avignon, 1680); (4) History of the reform of the convent of St. Praxedis, with lives of some pious sisters, in manuscript; (5) Latin and French poems, some printed and some in manuscript.

QUÉTIF AND ECHARD, *Script. Ord. Præd.*, II (1721), 845 sqq.; BARONIUS, *Apologeticus*, V, 326; ANTONIO, *Bibliotheca hispana*, II (1672), 344–5.

N. SCHEID.

Morelos, JOSÉ MARÍA, Mexican patriot, b. at Valladolid (now called Morelia in his honour), Mexico, on 30 September, 1765; shot at San Cristóbal Ecatepec on 22 December, 1815. His father died while he was still a youth, and, being left destitute, he worked for some time as a muleteer, until he succeeded in obtaining admission, as an extern, to the College of San Nicolas at Valladolid, the rector of which institution was at that time the reverend Don Miguel Hidalgo. Having been ordained priest, he was appointed parish priest of Carácuaro and Nucupétaro in Michoacan. When Hidalgo left Valladolid for Mexico City, after uttering his *Grito de Dolores*, Morelos offered himself to him at Charo, and Hidalgo commissioned him to raise troops for the cause of Independence on the southern coast, and to get possession of the port of Acapulco. Returning to his parish, he collected a few ill-armed men, marched towards Zacatula, and, following the coast, reached Acapulco with some 3000 men whom he had recruited on the way and supplied with arms taken from the royalists. After defeating Paris, who had come from Oaxaca with the object of relieving Acapulco, he left part of his forces to continue the siege and made for Chilpancingo. Forming a junction there with the brothers Galiana and Bravo, he marched to Chilapa and captured that town. As the viceroy, Venegas, was keeping all the colonial troops occupied with the siege of Zitacuaro, Morelos, who had been joined at Jantetelco by his fellow-priest Mariano Matamoros—thenceforward his right hand in almost every enterprise—organized four armies, which he distributed in various parts of Mexico. But the easy surrender of Zitacuaro to Calleja, and the approach of that commander with all his forces, placed Morelos, with some 4000 men, in the situation of being besieged at Cuautla by 8000 of the best troops of the viceroyalty. With indomitable courage, fighting day after day, Morelos held out for seventy-three days, until at last he succeeded in breaking away with all that remained of his army. He then passed over to Huajuapan, from thence to Orizaba and so on to Oaxaca, capturing all those places, and defeating every body of troops that encountered him.

On 14 September, 1813, the first Independent

Congress assembled at Chilpancingo and there passed the decree: "That dependence upon the Spanish Throne has ceased forever and been dissolved. That the said Congress neither professes nor recognizes any religion but the Catholic, nor will it permit or tolerate the practice, public or private, of any other; that it will protect with all its power, and will watch over, the purity of the Faith and its dogmas and the maintenance of the regular bodies". From Chilpancingo he turned towards his native Valladolid, which was then held by the royalist leaders Iturbide and Llano; driven back there he moved on Chupio. At Puruarán his brave companion Matamoros was captured, and was shot at Valladolid, 3 February, 1814. These reverses were followed by the recapture of Oaxaca by the royalist troops. The independent Congress of Chilpancingo had removed to Apatzingan, where it promulgated the Constitution of 22 October, 1814. Then it determined to remove again from Apatzingan to Tehuacán, Morelos accompanied it to protect it, and engaged in the Battle of Tesmalaca, where he was made prisoner.

Having been taken to Mexico City, on 22 November, 1815, proceedings were instituted against him by both the military and the ecclesiastical tribunal, and an advocate was appointed for him. The principal charges against him were: (1) Having committed the crime of treason, failing in his fealty to the king, by promoting independence and causing it to be proclaimed in the Congress assembled at Chilpancingo. Morelos answered to this that, as there was no king in Spain (Ferdinand VII having been taken to France, a prisoner), he could not have been false to the king; and that, as to the declaration of independence, of the said Congress, he had concurred in it by his vote because he believed that the king would not return from France and that, even if he should return, he had rendered himself unworthy of fealty by handing over Spain and its colonies to France like a flock of sheep. (2) Having ordered a number of prisoners to be shot. He declared that he had done this in obedience to orders sent first by the Junta at Zitacuaro and then by the Congress at Chilpancingo, by way of reprisals, moreover, because the viceregal Government had not accepted the exchange of prisoners proposed instead of General Matamoros. (3) Having ignored the excommunication fulminated against him and the Independents by the bishops and the Inquisition. He declared that he had not considered these excommunications valid, believing that they could not be imposed upon an independent nation, such as the insurgents must be considered to constitute, so long as they (the sentences) were not those of a pope or an œcumenical council. (4) Having celebrated Mass during the time of the Revolution. He denied this, since he had regarded himself as under irregularity from the time when blood began to be shed in the territory under his command.

The case having been concluded in the military tribunal that court requested of the ecclesiastical tribunal the degradation and surrender of the condemned priest, in accordance with the formalities prescribed by the canons; the ecclesiastical tribunal granted both requests, and communicated its decision to the viceroy. It was at this point that the tribunal of the Inquisition intervened, requesting the viceroy, Calleja (who had succeeded Venegas) to delay execution of the sentence four days, and citing Morelos to a public *auto de fe* on 27 November. On that occasion, with all the formalities proper to such proceedings, twenty-three charges were preferred against him: the Inquisitors added to the charges brought at the former trial others which they believed themselves competent to try, as implying, according to them, suspicions of heresy. These were: (1) Having received Communion in spite of the excommunications which he had incurred. Morelos answered that he had communicated because he did not believe the excommunications valid. (2) Not reciting the Divine Office while he was in prison. He declared that he could not recite it in the dungeon for want of light. (3) Having been lax in his conduct. This he granted, but denied that scandal had been given, since it was not publicly known that he had begotten children. (4) Having sent his son to the United States to be educated in Protestant principles. He declared that, so far from wishing the son whom he had sent to the United States—as he could not place him in any institution within the kingdom—to be brought up in the doctrines of the Reformation, he had directed him to be placed in a college where he would not run that risk. In spite of these arguments, the tribunal decided: "that the priest Don José Morelos was a formal negative heretic, a favourer of heretics, a persecutor and disturber of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, a profaner of the holy sacraments, a traitor to God, the king, and the pope, and as such was declared forever irregular, deposed from all offices and benefices, and condemned to be present at his *auto* in the garb of a penitent, with collarless cassock and a green candle, to make a general confession and a spiritual retreat; and that, in the unexpected and very remote case of his life being spared, he was condemned for the remainder of it to confinement in Africa at the disposition of the inquisitor general, with the obligation of reciting every Friday in the year the penitential psalms and the rosary of the Blessed Virgin, and to have his sambenito (penitential inscription) placed in the cathedral church of Mexico as that of a reconciled formal heretic".

It was one of the decrees of the Inquisition which have done most to damage the reputation of that tribunal in New Spain. The proceedings lacked the legality and judicial correctness which should have marked them. Morelos was out of the jurisdiction of the Inquisition both as an Indian and as having been already tried and condemned by another, competent, tribunal; nor was there any reason in condemning him for charges to which he had made satisfactory replies. It may be that the tribunal, re-established in New Spain only a little more than one year before this, and carried away by an indiscreet zeal, was unwilling to miss the opportunity presented by so famous a case to ingratiate itself with the Government and call attention to its activity.

Morelos, degraded in pursuance of his sentence, according to the ritual provided by the Church in such cases, was transferred from the prison of the Inquisition to the citadel of Mexico and put in irons. On 22 December he was taken from the city to San Cristóbal Ecatepec, where he was shot. As a guerilla leader, Morelos must occupy a prominent place among those who struggled and died for Mexican independence. He appeared at the moment when the first great army of the Independents had been routed at the Bridge of Calderón, and when its first leaders were being executed at Chihuahua, and he achieved his first successes in the rugged mountains of the south. He began his campaigns without materials of war of any kind, expecting to take what he needed from the enemy, and no one ever used the resources of war better than he did, for the extension of the national territory. Profoundly astute and reserved, he confided his plans not even to those of his lieutenants for whom he felt the most affectionate regard. The stamp of genius is discernible in the astonishing sagacity with which he handled the most difficult problems of government, and in multiplied instances of his rapid and unerring insight into actual conditions. When, after the ill-starred campaign of Valladolid, the hour of adversity came upon him, he faced disaster as serenely as he had previously accepted good fortune, and, in that famous retreat upon Tehuacan, deliberately gave his own life to save the lives of his associates in the Independent Government.

México á través de los siglos, III (Barcelona); ALAMÁN, *Historia de México*, I, II, III, IV (Mexico, 1851); ZAMACOIS, *Historia de México*, VIII, IX (Mexico, 1879); VERDIA, *Compendio de la Historia de México* (Mexico, 1906); LEÓN, *Compendio de la Historia de México* (Mexico, 1902).

CAMILLUS CRIVELLI.

Moréri, LOUIS, encyclopædist, b. at Bargemont, in the Diocese of Fréjus, France, 25 March, 1643; d. at Paris, 10 July, 1680. His grandfather, Joseph Chatranet, a native of Dijon, had settled in Provence under Charles IX and taken the name of the village of Moréri, the seigniory of which he had acquired through marriage. Young Moréri studied humanities at Draguignan, rhetoric at the Jesuit College of Aix and theology at Lyons. During his stay in this city, he published several works, among them "Pratique de la perfection chrétienne et religieuse" (1667), a translation from the Spanish of Alphonso Rodriguez's work. After his ordination, he preached in Lyons for five years with great success. It was about that time that he formed the design of publishing a dictionary that would contain all the interesting data of history and mythology. In 1673 he was appointed chaplain to Gaillard de Longjumeau, Bishop of Apt, to whom he dedicated the first edition of his encyclopædia. In 1675 he accompanied that prelate to Paris where he became acquainted with de Pomponne, who gave him employment in his offices. After the downfall of that minister in 1678, he returned to his studies, but overwork had undermined his constitution and he died of consumption in 1680.

Moréri was a man of great erudition but lacked taste and judgment. His name is connected with a work that can hardly be considered as his own after all the changes which it has undergone. Bayle, who intended to make up the deficiencies of Moréri's dictionary, said of it: "I share the opinion of Horace on those who lead the way. The first compilers of dictionaries made many errors; but they deserve a glory of which their successors ought never to deprive them. Moréri has given himself a great deal of trouble, has been useful to everybody, and has given sufficient information to many." Moréri's encyclopædia appeared for the first time in Lyons in 1674, under the title: "Le grand Dictionnaire historique, ou mélange curieux de l'histoire sacrée et profane." It was defective in many respects and was greatly improved in later editions which appeared in Paris or Amsterdam. The best edition is the twentieth and last, published at Paris, in 1759.

P. J. MARIQUE.

Moreto y Cabaña, AUGUSTÍN, Spanish dramatist; b. at Madrid, 9 April, 1618; d. at Toledo, 28 October, 1669. He received what little academic training he had at the University of Alcalá de Henares and graduated Licentiate in Arts in 1639. From a very early age he began to write for the stage, and it is known that from 1640, probably through his friendship with Calderón, his plays began to be produced. The Spanish drama had reached the height of its success during Moreto's boyhood, and a gradual decline had set in. The clergy began to preach against plays as they were then given, and in 1644 the Royal Council instituted radical reforms by reducing the number of dramatic companies, modifying stage costumes, and establishing a strict censorship. It was furthermore ordered that thenceforth no comedies were to be played but those of an historical nature, or those dealing with the lives of the saints. This accounts for the fact that, for a time, Moreto devoted himself to this kind of drama. Like many famous writers of his time, Moreto received Holy orders toward the end of his life, though it is not known exactly when he did so. He entered the household of the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, Don Baltasar de Moscoso, and in 1659 joined the Brotherhood of St. Peter.

In 1654 twelve of his plays were published in one volume under the title of "First Part of the Comedies of Moreto". Among them may be mentioned "El lindo Don Diego", "Los jueces de Castilla" dealing with the life of Peter the Cruel, "San Franco de Sena", and "Trampa Adelante".

As a writer, Moreto lacked the creative genius of some of his contemporaries, but he excelled them all in knowledge of stagecraft, in the power of coming quickly to the point in evolving his plots. He also excelled in the variety of his characters and in depicting human passions, while at character drawing he was a master surpassed by none. He handles a humorous situation with great delicacy of touch, and is at his best in comedies of the lighter and gayer sort. His best play "El desdén con el desdén" (Disdain met with Disdain), published at Valencia in 1676, is borrowed from Lope de Vega's "Milagros del desprecio" (Scorn works Wonders), and is generally conceded to be better than the original. Molière, in his "Princesse d'Elide", tried to repeat Moreto's success, but fell far short of his model. The "Biblioteca de Autores Españoles", XXXIX (Madrid, 1856), contains a collection of Moreto's plays with a biography of the author by Luis Fernández Guerra.

Consult, besides the above-mentioned life by GUERRA, TICKNOR, *History of Spanish Lit.* (Boston, 1866); FITZMAURICE-KELLY, *History of Spanish Lit.* (New York, 1906).

VENTURA FUENTES.

Moretto da Brescia, IL. See BONVICINO, ALESSANDRO.

Morgagni, GIOVANNI BATTISTA, called by Virchow, the "Father of Modern Pathology", a distinguished Italian physician and investigator in medicine; b. at Forlì, 25 February, 1682; d. at Bologna, 6 December, 1771. His father died when Morgagni was very young, but his mother, a woman of uncommon good sense and understanding, devoted her life to the education of her gifted son. At sixteen he went to the University of Bologna for his higher studies, where before his graduation he attracted attention by his powers of observation. His two great teachers, Albertini and Valsalva, became deeply interested in him, and Valsalva picked him out as his special assistant in anatomy. In the year following his graduation as Doctor of Medicine and Philosophy, though not yet twenty-two, he was sometimes allowed to take Valsalva's classes during his master's absence. He became a leader in thought among the young men and founded a society called the "Academia Inquietorum" (the Academy of the Restless), a title indicating that the members were not satisfied with previous knowledge but wanted to get at science for themselves by direct observation and experiment. After several years of graduate work at Bologna, Morgagni spent a year in special medical investigations at the Universities of Pisa and Padua. His incessant work impaired his sight and he returned to his native town to recuperate. At the age of 24 he

went to Bologna to lecture on anatomy, and there published a series of notes called "Adversaria Anatomica" (1706). These gained him such a reputation that he was called to the University of Padua, and later became second professor of anatomy at Bologna.

He studied particularly the throat, and the sinus and hydatid of Morgagni in this region perpetuate his name. After a few years he succeeded to the first professorship of anatomy, the most important post in the medical school, for anatomy was to medicine at that time what pathology is now. Here Morgagni wrote his great book, "De sedibus et causis morborum per anatomen indigatis"—"On the Seats and Causes of Disease"—(Venice, 1771, trans. French, English, and German) which laid the foundation of modern pathology. Benjamin Ward Richardson said (Disciples of Æsculapius): "To this day no medical scholar can help being delighted and instructed by this wonderful book." Morgagni's studies in aneurisms and in certain phases of pulmonary disease were especially valuable. He thought tuberculosis contagious and refused to make autopsies on tuberculous subjects. As a consequence of his teaching laws were introduced at the end of the seventeenth century in Rome and Naples, declaring tuberculosis contagious and requiring upon the death of the patients that their rooms be disinfected and their clothing burned. Venesection was one of the fads of his time, but Morgagni refused to credit its power for good and would not allow it to be performed on himself. He studied the pulse, and especially palpitation of the heart apart from organic cardiac affection, thus anticipating most of our modern teaching. With regard to cancer, Morgagni insisted that though it was the custon to try many remedies, the knife was the only remedy that gave fruitful results.

Morgagni was most happy in his private life. He lived with such simplicity that he was blamed for parsimony, but his secret charities, revealed after his death, disprove this charge. Of his fifteen children there were three sons, one of whom died in childhood, another became a Jesuit and did some striking scientific work after the suppression of the Society, while the third followed his father's profession but died young. All of Morgagni's daughters who grew to womanhood, eight in number, became nuns. The estimation in which he was generally held can be judged from the fact that twice, when invading armies laid siege to Bologna, their commanders gave strict orders that no harm was to come to Morgagni. He was one of the most profoundly learned men of his time not only in science, but in the literature of science. The Royal Society of England elected him a fellow in 1724, the Academy of Sciences of Paris made him a member in 1731, the Imperial Academy of St. Petersburg in 1735, and the Academy of Berlin in 1754. He was in correspondence with most of the great scientists of his time, among them such men as Ruysch, Boerhaave, Sir Richard Meade, Haller, and Meckel. Cooke, his English biographer, declares "that the learned and great who came into his neighbourhood did not depart without a visit to Morgagni". The patricians of Venice counted him a personal friend. King Emanuel III of Sardinia often turned to him for advice. The five popes of the second half of his life consulted him on educational and medical matters. Benedict XIV (De Beatificatione) mentions him in special terms of commendation. Clement XIII lodged him at the papal palace on his visits to Rome. He was probably the most respected man of his time and even more beloved than respected.

COOKE, *Sketch of Morgagni* in *Seats and Causes of Disease* (London, 1822); VIRCHOW, *Morgagni and Anatomical Thought* in *Brit. Med. Journal*, I (1894), 725; RICHARDSON, *Disciples of Æsculapius* (London, 1901); WALSH, *Makers of Modern Medicine* (Fordham University Press, New York, 1907); NICHOLS, *Morgagni, Father of Modern Pathology* in *Montreal Medical Journal* (1903).

JAMES J. WALSH.

Morgan, EDWARD, VENERABLE, Welsh priest, martyr, b. at Bettisfield, Hanmer, Flintshire, executed at Tyburn, London, 26 April, 1642. His father's Christian name was William. Of his mother we know nothing except that one of her kindred was Lieutenant of the Tower of London. From the fact that the martyr was known at St. Omer as John Singleton, Mr. Gillow thinks that she was one of the Singletons of Steyning Hall, near Blackpool, in Lancashire. Of his reported education at Douai, no evidence appears; but he certainly was a scholar at St. Omer, and at the English colleges at Rome, Valladolid, and Madrid. For a brief period in 1609 he was a Jesuit novice, having been one of the numerous converts of Father John Bennett, S.J. Ordained priest at Salamanca, he was sent on the English Mission in 1621. He seems to have laboured in his fatherland, and in April, 1629, was in prison in Flintshire, for refusing the oath of allegiance. Later about 1632 he was condemned in the Star Chamber to have his ears nailed to the pillory for having accused certain judges of treason. Immediately afterwards he was committed to the Fleet Prison in London, where he remained until a few days before his death. He was condemned at the Old Bailey for being a priest under the provisions of 27 Eliz., c. 2 on St. George's Day, 23 April, 1642. At the same time was condemned John Francis Quashet, a Scots Minim, who subsequently died in Newgate Prison. The last scene of the martyrdom is fully given (apparently by an eye witness) in Father Pollen's work cited below.

CHALLONER, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*, II (Manchester, 1803), 110; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*, s. v.; POLLEN, *Acts of English Martyrs* (London, 1891), 343; *Calendar State Papers Domestic 1628–29; 1631–33* (London, 1859–1862), *passim.*

JOHN B. WAINEWRIGHT.

Morganatic Marriage. See MARRIAGE.

Morghen, RAFFAELLO, an Italian engraver, b. at Portici, 19 June, 1758 (1761?); d. at Florence, 8 April, 1833. His father, Filippo, came of a family of German engravers, his mother was the daughter of Liani, court painter to Charles III. Raffaello's first teachers were his father and his uncle Jean, and before he was twelve he had achieved a good plate. When only twenty he produced seven noteworthy plates illustrating the carnival of 1778, and later went to study in Rome, under Volpato, whose daughter he married. Impressed with Sanzio's pictures in the Vatican, Morghen engraved his "Poetry" and "Theology". In 1787 he finished one of his principal works, Guido's "Aurora" from the fresco in the garden-house of the Rospigliosi Palace, his art and his time being far better suited to this style than to translating the work of greater masters. When he visited Naples in 1790, the court offered him a salary of six hundred ducats, which he declined, but later accepted (1793) the invitation of Ferdinand of Tuscany to live in Florence. Here he received only four hundred scudi, but he was free to found a school of engraving, to engrave what he chose, and own all the prints from his plates. His next

RAFFAELLO MORGHEN

important plate, Raphael's "Transfiguration", was begun in 1795, but so many were his commissions that it was not finished until 1812. While somewhat lacking in tone and aerial perspective, this engraving exhibits brilliant technique and immense dexterity. The first edition brought him one hundred and forty thousand francs. The dedication of this plate to Napoleon I resulted in a summons to Paris, where he was urged to establish a school of engraving; but the French protested that this would be detrimental to their own artists and the plan was never carried out. Morghen engraved a portrait of Napoleon, poor in resemblance and weak in execution.

The most celebrated work of the Volpato School and Morghen's *chef-d'œuvre* was his engraving from da Vinci's "Last Supper", begun in 1794 and published in 1800. It was immensely successful despite the fact that it is flat and the figures resemble Sanzio's more than da Vinci's. This flatness, however, is not a serious fault, since the original is practically in one plane. Morghen's greatest artistic success is the equestrian portrait of François de Moncade (Van Dyck), wherein he shows more of sentiment, temperament, and vigour than in any of his two hundred and fifty-four engravings. His plates are pleasing, quiet, harmonious, typifying the graver's art at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and mark the revival of classical line engraving in Italy. Great paintings were to him more themes for technical skill than models to be rigorously followed; hence his reproductions of the Masters are all much alike. His prolific burin "flew over the plate" to witness his mastery of hatch, dot, and flick. Morghen began many of his plates by etching the salient lines and was probably the first engraver to dry-point the flesh-tints of his portraits. He etched some very spirited and delicate coppers and produced many vignettes. He was professor in the Florence Academy, engraver to the Grand Duke of Tuscany and associate of the *Institut de France* (1803). Louis XVIII gave him the *Cordon de St. Michel*, and made him a member of the *Légion d'Honneur*. When he died Italy resounded with sonnets to "the imperishable glory of the illustrious engraver of the Last Supper". Among his works should be noted the "Miracle of Bolsena" (Raphael Sanzio), "Charity" (Correggio), and "Shepherds in Arcady" (Poussin).

De Chennevières, *Hist. de Cent Ans de Gravure* in *L'Art* (1889); Lippman, *Engraving and Etching* (New York, 1906); Beradi, *Graveurs du XIX^e Siècle* (Paris, 1890); *Le Cabinet de l'Amateur* (Paris, 1842) (after Palmieri's catalogue).

Leigh Hunt.

Moriarty, David, bishop and pulpit orator, b. in Ardfert, Co. Kerry, in 1812; d. 1 October, 1877. He received his early education in a classical school of his native diocese, and later was sent to Boulogne-sur-Mer, France. From there he passed to Maynooth, and after a distinguished course in theology was elected to the Dunboyne establishment, where he spent two years. While yet a young priest he was chosen by the episcopal management of the Irish College in Paris, as vice-president of that institution; which position he occupied for about four years. So satisfactory was his work that, on the death of Father Hand, he was appointed President of All Hallows missionary college, Dublin; and for years guided, fashioned, and made effective the discipline and teaching of that well known institution. It was during this time he gave evidence of the noble oratory, so chaste, so elevated, so various, and so convincing, that has come to be associated with his name. In 1854 he was appointed coadjutor, with the right of succession, to the See of Kerry, under the title of Bishop of Antigonia; and two years later succeeded to that see. His work as bishop is testified to by several churches and schools, a diocesan college, and many conventual establishments. He found time to conduct retreats for priests, and his addresses which have come down to us under the title "Allocutions to the Clergy" are characterized by profound thought, expressed in an elevated and oratorical style. In his political views he ran counter to much of the popular feeling of the time, and was a notable opponent of the Fenian organization, which he denounced strongly. Still, he was a patriot of the type of O'Connell, for whom he had a great admiration. His principal works are: "Allocutions to the Clergy" and two volumes of sermons.

P. A. Beecher.

Morigi (Caravaggio), Michelangelo, Milanese painter, b. at Caravaggio in 1569; d. at Porto d'Ercole in 1609. His family name was Morigi, but he assumed that of his birthplace, and was known by that almost exclusively. He was the son of a mason, and as a boy worked at preparing the plaster for the fresco painters of Milan, acquiring from them a great desire to become an artist. He received no instruction as a youth, but trained himself by copying natural objects, doing the work with such rigid accuracy that in later life he was seldom able to rid himself of a habit of slavish and almost mechanical imitation. After five years of strenuous work he found his way to Venice, where he carefully studied the works of Giorgione, and received instruction from an unknown painter. Thence he went to Rome, and on account of his poverty engaged himself to Cesare d'Arpino, who employed him to execute the floral and ornamental parts of his pictures. He soon, however, acquired a reputation for his own work, and his accurate imitations of natural objects were attractive. The artist's hot temper, however, led him into trouble, and in a fit of anger he killed one of his friends and had to leave Rome in haste. For a while he was at Naples, and then in Malta, where twice he painted the portrait of the Grand Master of the Knights of Malta, but he quarrelled with one of the Order, who threw him into prison, and it was with difficulty that he escaped, fled to Syracuse and returned to Naples. There he obtained a pardon for the manslaughter of his companion, set out again for Rome, was taken prisoner on the way by some Spaniards who mistook him for another person, and when set at liberty found that he had lost his boat and all that it contained. At Porto d'Ercole he fell ill and died of a violent fever.

Michelangelo Morigi
By himself

His paintings are to be found at Rome, Berlin, Dresden, Paris, St. Petersburg, Malta, Copenhagen, Munich, and in the National Gallery, London. His colouring is vigorous, extraordinary, and daring; in design he is often careless, in drawing frequently inaccurate, but his flesh tints are exceedingly good, and his skill in lighting, although inaccurate and full of tricks, is very attractive. His pictures are distinguished by startling contrasts in light and shadow and by extraordinary effects of light on half-length figures, giving the desired appearance of high relief, the general effect of the remainder of the picture being over sombre.

BALDINUCCI, *Notizie de' Professori del disegno*, II (1688); LANZI, *Storia Pittorica*, I (1809).

GEORGE CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Morimond, ABBEY OF, fourth daughter of Cîteaux, situated in Champagne, Diocese of Langres, France; was founded in 1115 by Odelric d'Aigremont and his wife, Adeline de Choiseul. Arnold, its first abbot, a member of one of the noblest families of Germany, was for many years considered as one of the columns of the Cistercian Order. Thanks to his zeal and influence, Morimond took on a rapid growth; numerous colonies therefrom established themselves in France, Germany, Poland, Bohemia, Spain, and the Island of Cyprus. Amongst the most celebrated foundations were Ebrach (1126) the most flourishing in Germany; Holy Cross (1134), the glory of the Order in Austria; Aiguebelle (1137), in France, which the Reformed Cistercians have now resuscitated from its ruins. This extension was so prodigious that toward the end of the eighteenth century Morimond counted amongst its filiations nearly seven hundred monasteries for both sexes. Briefs from various popes placed the principal Military Orders of Spain under the spiritual jurisdiction of the Abbot of Morimond: the Order of Calatrava (1187); of Alcantara (1214); the Militia of Christ, in Portugal (1319), and later on those of St. Maurice and St. Lazarus, in Savoy. The vast wealth that gradually accumulated, and the continual wars wherefrom Morimond had particularly to suffer, on account of its geographical position, became the cause of decadence. Various attempts at reform were made, but the constant political disorders paralyzed the efforts of the reformers. In 1791 the religious were dispersed, and Morimond ceased to exist.

Morimond had sheltered a great number of religious, renowned both for sanctity and science. The abbatial chair was often filled by abbots whose names are yet celebrated, to whom kings and emperors had confided tasks of the most delicate importance, and whom the popes had honoured with their confidence. A large number of bishops and several cardinals were given to the Church by Morimond; and Benedict XII, before his election, was a monk of affiliation of this abbey. Of the magnificent buildings that formed the abbey and its church, so remarkable for architectural beauty and the richness of ornamentation, nothing now remains but ruins; nevertheless the organ, one of the most wonderful in France, and the choir-stalls now beautify the cathedral of Langres.

Gallia Christiana; MARTÈNE AND DURAND, *Voyage Littéraire de deux Bénédictins* (1717); DUBOIS, *Histoire de l'Abbaye de Morimond* (Dijon, 1852); MANRIQUE, *Annales Cisterciences* (Lyons, 1642); JANAUSCHEK, *Originum Cisterciensium*, I (Vienna, 1877); JONGUELINUS, *Notitia Abbatiarum O. Cist.* (Cologne, 1640); LE NAIN, *Essai de l'histoire de l'ordre de Cîteaux* (Paris, 1696).

EDMOND M. OBRECHT.

Morin, JEAN, a French priest of the Oratory, b. at Blois, in 1591; d. at Paris, 28 Feb., 1659. According to Dupin, whose judgment posterity has confirmed, he was the most learned Catholic author of the seventeenth century. Born a Calvinist, he was converted by Cardinal Duperron, and in 1618 joined the Oratory at Paris. At first he was superior in houses of his congregation at Orléans and Angers; in 1625 he was in attendance on Queen Henrietta of France in England; in 1628 he returned to Paris, where he remained until his death, with the exception of a sojourn of a few months in Rome, whither he had been called by Urban VIII in 1640 to aid in bringing about the union of the Greeks and Latins. An order from Richelieu recalled him to Paris, where he continued the publishing of his learned works, at the same time labouring to convert heretics and Jews, many of whom he brought to the true Faith. The General Assemblies of the French clergy often appealed to his great erudition, and entrusted him with various tasks. He kept up a correspondence and was often in controversy with the noted savants of the day, such as Muis, Buxtorf, etc.

His chief works are: "Histoire de la déliverance de l'Eglise chrétienne par l'empereur Constantin et de la grandeur et souveraineté temporelle donnée à l'Eglise romaine par les rois de France" (Paris, 1630); "Exercitationes ecclesiasticæ in utrumque Samaritanorum Pentateuchum" (Paris, 1631), in which he maintained that the Samaritan text and the Septuagint should be preferred to the Hebrew text, a position he upheld again in the following work: "Exercitationes biblicæ de Hebræi Græcique textus sinceritate . . ." (Paris, 1663, 1669, 1686); "Commentarius historicus de disciplina in administratione sacramenti Pœnitentiæ XIII primus sæculis" (Paris, 1651); "Commentarius de sacris Ecclesiæ ordinationibus" (Paris, 1655; Antwerp, 1695; Rome, 1751). The two preceding works are very important for the history of the sacraments. Morin also published: "Biblia græca sive Vetus testamentum secundum Septuaginta" (Paris, 1628); and in Lejay's "Polyglotte", vol. V (1645), "Pentateuchus hebræo-samaritanus" and "Pentateuchus samaritanus". He left several manuscript works.

CONSTANTIN, *Sciagraphia vitæ J. Morini* (Paris, 1660); NICÉRON, *Mémoires*, IX, 90; SIMON, *Vita Morini* taken from *Antiquitates ecclesiæ . . . dissertationibus epistolicis enucleatæ* (London, 1682): a satire rather than a life; BATTEREL, *Mémoires domestiques*, II, 435; GODIN, *Notice sur Morin* (Blois, 1840); RAESS, *Die Convertiten*, IV, 447; INGOLD, *Essai de bibliographie oratorienne*, 112.

A. M. P. INGOLD.

Mormons, or the CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS.—This religious body had its origin during the early part of the nineteenth century. Joseph Smith, the founder and first president of the sect, was the son of a Vermont farmer, and was born in Sharon township, Windsor County, in that state, on 23 December, 1805. In the spring of 1820, while living with his parents at Manchester, Ontario (now Wayne) County, New York, he became deeply concerned upon the subject of his salvation, a condition partly induced by a religious revival which proselytized a few of his relatives to the Presbyterian Faith. Joseph himself was inclined toward Methodism: to satisfy his mind as to which one of the existing sects he should join, he sought Divine guidance, and claimed to have received in answer to prayer a visitation from two glorious beings, who told him not to connect himself with any of these Churches, but to bide the coming of the Church of Christ, which was about to be re-established. According to his own statement, there appeared to him on the night of 21 September, 1823, a heavenly messenger, who gave his name as Moroni, and revealed the existence of an ancient record containing the fullness of the Gospel of Christ as taught by the Saviour after His Resurrection to the Nephites, a branch of the House of Israel which inhabited the American continent ages prior to its discovery by Columbus. Moroni in mortal life had been a Nephite prophet, the son of another prophet named Mormon, who was the compiler of the record buried in a hill anciently called Cumorah, situated about two miles from the modern village of Manchester. Joseph Smith states that he received the record from the Angel Moroni in September, 1827. It was, he alleges, engraved upon metallic plates having the appearance of gold and each a little thinner than ordinary tin, the whole forming a book about eight inches long, six inches wide, and six inches thick, bound together by rings. The characters engraved upon the plates were in a language styled the Reformed Egyptian, and with the book were interpreters—Urim and Thummim—by means of which these characters were to be translated into English. The result was the "Book of Mormon", published at Palmyra, New York, in March, 1830; in the preface eleven witnesses, exclusive of Joseph Smith, the translator, claim to have seen the plates from which it was taken. On renouncing Mormonism subsequently, Cowdery, Whitmer, and Harris, the three principal witnesses, declared this testimony false.

The "Book of Mormon" purports to be an abridged account of God's dealings with the two great races of prehistoric Americans—the Jaredites, who were led from the Tower of Babel at the time of the confusion of tongues, and the Nephites, who came from Jerusalem just prior to the Babylonian captivity (600 B. C.). According to this book, America is the "Land of Zion", where the New Jerusalem will be built by a gathering of scattered Israel before the second coming of the Messiah. The labours of such men as Columbus, the Pilgrim Fathers, and the patriots of the Revolution, are pointed out as preparatory to that consummation. The work of Joseph Smith is also prophetically indicated, he being represented as a lineal descendant of the Joseph of old, commissioned to begin the gathering of Israel foretold by Isaias (xi, 10–16) and other ancient prophets. In another part of his narrative Joseph Smith affirms that, while translating the "Book of Mormon", he and his scribe, Oliver Cowdery, were visited by an angel, who declared himself to be John the Baptist and ordained them to the Aaronic priesthood; and that subsequently they were ordained to the priesthood of Melchisedech by the Apostles Peter, James, and John. According to Smith and Cowdery, the Aaronic priesthood gave them authority to preach faith and repentance, to baptize by immersion for the remission of sins, and to administer the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; the priesthood of Melchisedech empowered them to lay on hands and bestow the Holy Ghost. The "Book of Mormon" being published, its peculiar doctrines, including those just set forth, were preached in western New York and northern Pennsylvania. Those who accepted them were termed "Mormons", but they called themselves "Latter-Day Saints", in contradistinction to the saints of former times. The "Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints" was organized on 6 April, 1830, at Fayette, Seneca County, New York; Joseph Smith was accepted as first elder, and subsequently as prophet, seer, and revelator. The articles of faith formulated by him are as follows:

"(1) We believe in God, the Eternal Father, and in His Son, Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Ghost.

"(2) We believe that men will be punished for their own sins, and not for Adam's transgression.

"(3) We believe that through the atonement of Christ all men may be saved, by obedience to the laws and ordinances of the Gospel.

"(4) We believe that these ordinances are: First, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; second, repentance; third, baptism by immersion for the remission of sins; fourth, laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost.

"(5) We believe that a man must be called of God by prophecy, and by the laying on of hands by those who are in authority, to preach the Gospel and administer the ordinances thereof.

"(6) We believe in the same organization that existed in the primitive church, viz. apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, evangelists, etc.

"(7) We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, healing, interpretation of tongues, etc.

"(8) We believe the Bible to be the word of God, as far as it is translated correctly; we also believe the 'Book of Mormon' to be the word of God.

"(9) We believe all that God has revealed, all that He does now reveal, and we believe that He will yet reveal many great and important things pertaining to the Kingdom of God.

"(10) We believe in the literal gathering of Israel and in the restoration of the Ten Tribes. That Zion will be built upon this continent. That Christ will reign personally upon the earth, and that the earth will be renewed and receive its paradisaic glory.

"(11) We claim the privilege of worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of our conscience, and allow all men the same privilege; let them worship how, where, or what they may.

"(12) We believe in being subject to kings, presidents, rulers and magistrates, in obeying, honouring and sustaining that law.

"(13) We believe in being honest, true, chaste, benevolent, virtuous, and in doing good to all men; indeed, we may say that we follow the admonition of Paul, 'We believe all things, we hope all things', we have endured many things, and hope to be able to endure all things. If there is anything virtuous, lovely or of good report, or praiseworthy, we seek after these things."

Six months after its inception, the Mormon Church sent its first mission to the American Indians—called in the "Book of Mormon" the *Lamanites*, the degenerate remnants of the Nephite nation. Oliver Cowdery was placed at the head of this mission, which also included Parley P. Pratt, a former preacher of the Reformed Baptists, or Campbellites. The missionaries proceeded to northern Ohio, then almost a wilderness, where Elder Pratt presented to his former pastor, Sidney Rigdon, a copy of the "Book of Mormon", published several months before. Up to that time Rigdon had never seen the book, which he was accused of helping Smith to write. The Mormons are equally emphatic in their denial of the identity of the "Book of Mormon" with Spaulding's "Manuscript Story", now in Oberlin College; they quote in this connexion James H. Fairchild, president of that institution, who, in a communication to the "New York Observer" (5 February, 1885), states that Mr. L. L. Rice and he, after comparing the "Book of Mormon" and the Spaulding romance, "could detect no resemblance between the two, in general or detail". Elder Cowdery and his companions, after baptizing about one hundred persons in Ohio, went to western Missouri, and, thence crossing over at Independence into what is now the State of Kansas, laboured for a time among the Indians there. Meanwhile the Mormons of the East, to escape the opposition awakened by their extraordinary claims, and to be nearer their proposed ultimate destination, moved their headquarters to Kirtland, Ohio, from which place, in the summer of 1831, departed its first colony into Missouri, Jackson County in that state having been designated as the site of the New Jerusalem. Both at Kirtland and at Independence efforts were made to establish "The United Order", a communal system of an industrial character, designed to make the church members equal in things spiritual and temporal. The prophet taught that such a system had sanctified the City of Enoch, whose people were called "Zion, because they were of one heart and one mind, and dwelt in righteousness," with "no poor among them". He also declared that the ancient Apostles had endeavoured to establish such an order at Jerusalem (Acts, iv, 32–37), and that, according to the "Book of Mormon", it had prevailed among the Nephites for two centuries after Christ. In the latter part of 1833 trouble arose between the Mormons and the Missourians, based largely, say Mormon writers, upon a feeling of apprehension concerning the aims and motives of the new settlers. Coming from the north and the east, they were suspected of being abolitionists, which was sufficient of itself to make them unpopular in Missouri. It was also charged that they intended to unite with the Indians and drive the older settlers from the land. The Mormons asserted their innocence of these and other charges, but their denial did not avail. Armed mobs came upon them, and the whole colony—twelve hundred men, women, and children—were driven from Jackson County, and forbidden on pain of death to return.

In Ohio the Mormons prospered, though even there they had their vicissitudes. At Kirtland a temple was built, and a more complete organization of the priesthood effected. Mormonism's first foreign mission was opened in the summer of 1837, when Heber C. Kimball and Orson Hyde, two of the "twelve apostles of the Church", were sent with other elders to England for that purpose. While this work of proselytizing was in progress, disaffection was rife at Kirtland, and the ill-feeling grew and intensified until the "prophet" was compelled to flee for his life. It is of importance to bear in mind that the opposition to the Mormons in the localities where they settled is, from the contradictory and divergent statements made by the Latter-Day Saints and the neighbours not of their belief, difficult of explanation. It is safe to assume that there was provocation on both sides. The main body of the Mormons, following their leader to Missouri, settled in and around Far West, Caldwell County, which now became the chief gathering-place. The sect had been organized by six men, and a year later it was said to number about two thousand souls. In Missouri it increased to twelve thousand. A brief season of peace was followed by a series of calamities, occasioned by religious and political differences. The trouble began in August, 1838, and during the strife considerable blood was shed and much property destroyed, the final act in the drama being the mid-winter expulsion of the entire Mormon community from the state.

In Illinois, where they were kindly received, they built around the small village of Commerce, in Hancock County, the city of Nauvoo, gathering in that vicinity to the number of twenty thousand. Another temple was erected, several towns founded, and the surrounding country occupied. Up to this time there had been no Mormon recruiting from abroad, all the converts to the new sect coming from various states in the Union and from Canada. In 1840–1 Brigham Young and other emissaries visited Great Britain, preaching in all the principal cities and towns. Here they baptized a number of people, published a new edition of the "Book of Mormon", founded a periodical called the "Millennial Star", and established a permanent emigration agency. The first Mormon emigrants from a foreign land—a small company of British converts—reached Nauvoo, by way of New York, in the summer of 1840. Subsequently the emigration came via New Orleans. The Legislature of Illinois granted a liberal charter to Nauvoo, and, as a protection against mob violence and further drivings and spoliations, the Mormons were permitted to organize the "Nauvoo Legion", an all but independent military body, though part of the state militia, commanded by Joseph Smith as lieutenant-general. Moreover, a municipal court was instituted, having jurisdiction in civil cases, as a bar to legal proceedings of a persecuting or vexatious character. Similar causes to those which had resulted in the exodus of the Mormons from Missouri brought about their expulsion from Illinois, prior to which a tragic event robbed them of their prophet, Joseph Smith, and their patriarch, Hyrum Smith, who were killed by a mob in Carthage jail on 27 June, 1844. The immediate cause of the murder of the two brothers was the destruction of the press of the Nauvoo "Expositor", a paper established by seceders from Mormonism to give voice to the wide indignation caused by the promulgation of Smith's revelation of 12 July, 1843, establishing polygamy, which had been practised personally by the prophet for several years. Another avowed purpose of this paper was to secure the repeal of the Nauvoo Charter, which the Mormons looked upon as the bulwark of their liberties. The "Expositor" issued but once, when it was condemned as a public nuisance by order of the city council, its printing-office being destroyed and its editor, Foster, expelled. This summary act unified anti-Mormon sentiment, and, on Smith's preparing to resist by force the warrant procured by Foster for his arrest, the militia were called out and armed mobs began to threaten Nauvoo. At Carthage was a large body of militia, mustered under Governor Thomas Ford to compel the surrender of Nauvoo. Smith submitted and repaired to Carthage, where he and his brother Hyrum, with others, were placed in jail. Fearful of a bloody collision, the governor disbanded most of his force, and with the remainder marched to Nauvoo, where the Mormons laid down their arms. During the governor's absence, a portion of the disbanded militia returned to Carthage and assaulted the jail in which the Mormon leaders were imprisoned, shooting Joseph and Hyrum Smith, and all but fatally wounding John Taylor; Willard Richards, their fellow-prisoner, escaped unhurt.

In the exodus that ensued, Brigham Young led the people westward. Passing over the frozen Mississippi (February, 1846), the main body made their way across the prairies of Iowa, reaching the Missouri River about the middle of June. A Mormon colony, sailing from New York, rounded Cape Horn, and landed at Yerba Buena (San Francisco) in July, 1846. Prior to that time only a few thousand Americans had settled on the Pacific Coast, mostly in Oregon, which was then claimed both by Great Britain and the United States. So far as known, no American had then made a permanent home in what was called "The Great Basin". The desert region, now known as Salt Lake Valley, was then a part of the Mexican province of California, but was uninhabited save by Indians and a few wandering trappers and hunters. The Mormon pioneers, marching from the Missouri River in April, 1847, arrived in Salt Lake Valley on 24 July. This company, numbering 143 men, 3 women, and 2 children, was led by Brigham Young. Most of the exiles from Nauvoo remained in temporary shelters on the frontier, where they entered into winter quarters in what is now Nebraska. Well armed and disciplined, they accomplished the journey of over a thousand miles to Salt Lake Valley without one fatality. A few days after their arrival they laid out Salt Lake City. The people left upon the Missouri migrated in the autumn of 1848, and after them came yearly to the Rocky Mountains, generally in Church wagons sent to the frontier to meet them, Mormon emigrants from the states, from Europe, and from other lands to which missionaries continued to be sent. Most of the converts were drawn from the middle and working classes, but some professional people were among them.

While awaiting the time for the establishment of a civic government, the Mormons were under ecclesiastical rule. Secular officers were appointed, however, to preserve the peace, administer justice, and carry on public improvements. These officers were often selected at church meetings, and civil and religious functions were frequently united in the same person. But this state of affairs did not continue long. As soon as a civic government was organized, many of the forms of political procedure already in use in American commonwealths were introduced, and remained in force till statehood was secured for Utah. In March, 1849, thirteen months after the signing of the treaty by which Mexico ceded this region to the United States, the settlers in Salt Lake Valley founded the provisional Government of the State of Deseret, pending action by the American Congress upon their petition for admission into the Union. Deseret is a word taken from the "Book of Mormon", and signifies honey-bee. Brigham Young was elected governor, and a legislature, with a full set of executive officers, was also chosen. Congress denied the petition for

statehood, and organized the Territory of Utah, naming it after a local tribe of Indians. Brigham Young was appointed governor by President Millard Fillmore (September, 1850) and four years later was reappointed by President Franklin Pierce. The period between 1850 and 1858, during which the Mormons defied the authority of the Federal Government, is one of the least creditable chapters of their history.

One reason given for the persistent hostility to the Mormons was the dislike caused by the acrimonious controversy over polygamy or plural marriage. Joseph Smith, the founder of Mormonism, claimed to have received a revelation and a command ordering him to re-introduce plural marriage and restore the polygamous condition tolerated among the pre-Judæic tribes. Polygamy now became a principle of the creed of the Latter-Day Saints, and, though not enforced by the laws of the Mormon hierarchy, was preached by the elders and practised by the chiefs of the cult and by many of the people. The violation by the Mormons of the monogamous law of Christianity and of the United States was brought to the attention of Congress, which prohibited under penalty of fine and imprisonment the perpetuation of the anti-Christian practice, refusing, however, to make the prohibition retroactive. The Mormons appealed to the Supreme Court, which sustained the action of Congress, and established the constitutionality of the anti-polygamy statutes. The Latter-Day Saints, strangely enough, submitted to the decrees of Congress, unwittingly admitting by their submission that the revelation of their founder and prophet, Joseph Smith, could not have come from God. If the command to restore polygamy to the modern world was from on High, then, by submitting to the decision of the Supreme Court, the Mormon hierarchy reversed the apostolic proclamation and acknowledged it was better "to obey man than to obey God".

So long as Utah remained a territory there was much bitterness between her Mormon and non-Mormon citizens, the latter termed "Gentiles". The Mormons submitted, however, and their president, Wilford Woodruff, issued a "Manifesto", which, being accepted by the Latter-Day Saints in General Conference, withdrew the sanction of the Church from the further solemnization of any marriages forbidden by the law of the land. One of the results of this action was the admission of Utah into the Union of States on 6 January, 1896.

Instances of the violation of the anti-polygamy laws subsequent to the date of the "Manifesto" having been brought to light, the present head of the Church, President Joseph F. Smith, in April, 1904, made the following statement to the General Conference assembled at Salt Lake City, and it was endorsed by resolution and adopted by unanimous vote:

"OFFICIAL STATEMENT.

"Inasmuch as there are numerous reports in circulation, that plural marriages have been entered into, contrary to the official declaration of President Woodruff, of September 24th, 1890, commonly called the 'Manifesto', which was issued by President Woodruff and adopted by the Church at its General Conference October 6th, 1890, which forbade any marriages violative of the law of the land; I, Joseph F. Smith, President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, hereby affirm and declare that no such marriages have been solemnized with the sanction, consent, or knowledge of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; and

"I hereby announce that all such marriages are prohibited, and if any officer or member of the Church shall assume to solemnize or enter into any such marriage, he will be deemed in transgression against the Church, and will be liable to be dealt with according to the rules and regulations thereof, and excommunicated therefrom.

Joseph F. Smith,

President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints."

In an "Address to the World", adopted at the General Conference of April, 1907, President Smith and his counsellors, John R. Winder and Anthon H. Lund, in behalf of the Church, reaffirmed its attitude of obedience to the laws of Congress. The practice of plural marriage is indeed fast becoming a thing of the past.

Mormonism announces as one of its principal aims the preparation of a people for the coming of the Lord; a people who will build the New Jerusalem, and there await His coming. The United Order, the means of preparation, is at present in abeyance, but the preliminary work of gathering Israel goes on, not to Zion proper (Jackson County, Missouri), but to the Stakes of Zion, now numbering sixty-one, most of them in Utah; the others are in Idaho, Arizona, Wyoming, Colorado, Oregon, Canada, and Mexico. A stake is a division of the Mormon Church, organized in such a way as to constitute almost a "church" in itself; in each stake are subdivisions called wards, also fully organized. The area of a stake is usually that of a county, though the extent of territory differs according to population or other conditions. Each stake is presided over by three high-priests, who, with twelve high councilors, constitute a tribunal for the adjudication of differences among church members within their jurisdiction. Each ward has a bishopric of three, a lower tribunal, from whose decisions appeals may be taken to the high council. The extreme penalty inflicted by the church courts is excommunication. In each stake are quorums of high-priests, seventies, and elders, officers and callings in the Melchisedech priesthood: and in each ward, quorums of priests, teachers, and deacons, who officiate in the Aaronic priesthood. This lesser authority ministers in temporal things, while the higher priesthood ministers in things spiritual, which include the temporal.

Presiding over the entire Church is a supreme council of three high-priests, called the First Presidency, otherwise known as the president and his counsellors. Next to these are the twelve apostles, equal in authority to the First Presidency, though subject to and acting under their direction. Whenever the First Presidency is dissolved, which occurs at the death of the president, the apostles take the government and reorganize the supreme council—always, however, with the consent of the Church, whose members are called to vote for or against this or any other proposition submitted to them. The manner of voting is with the uplifted right hand, women voting as well as men. Besides the general conferences held semi-annually and the usual Sabbath meetings, there are stake and ward conferences, in which the consent of the people is obtained before any important action is taken. The special function of the apostles is to preach the Gospel, or have it preached, in all nations, and to set in order, whenever necessary, the affairs of the entire Mormon Church. Among the general authorities there is also a presiding patriarch, who, with his subordinates in the various stakes, gives blessings to the people and comforts them with sacred ministrations. The first council of the Seventies, seven in number, assist the twelve apostles, and preside over all the quorums of seventies. Upon a presiding bishopric of three devolves the duty of receiving and disbursing the revenues of the Church, and otherwise managing its business, under the general direction of the first presidency.

The Mormon Church is supported by the tithes and

offerings of its members, most of whom reside in the Stakes of Zion, though a good number remain in the several missions, scattered in various countries of the globe. About two thousand missionaries are kept in the field; while they consider themselves under the Divine injunction to "preach the Gospel to every creature", they have special instructions to baptize no married woman without the consent of her husband, and no child under age without the consent of its parents. The tithes are used for the building of temples and other places of worship, the work of the ministry, the furtherance of education, the support of the sick and indigent, and for charitable and philanthropic purposes in general. Nearly every male member of the Church holds some office in the priesthood, but only those who devote their entire time to its service receive support. In every stake are institutions known as auxiliaries, such as relief societies, sabbath schools, young men's and young ladies' mutual improvement associations, primary associations, and religious classes. The Relief Society is a woman's organization, having a special mission for the relief of the destitute and the care of the sick. An "Old Folks Committee" is appointed to care for the aged. The Church school system comprises the Brigham Young University at Provo, the Brigham Young College at Logan, and the Latter-Day Saints University at Salt Lake City. There are also nearly a score of stake academies. There are four Mormon temples in Utah, the principal one being at Salt Lake City. It was begun in April, 1853, and completed in April, 1893, costing, it is said, about $4,000,000. In these temples ordinances are administered both for the living and the dead. It is held that vicarious work of this character, such as baptisms, endowments etc., will be effectual in saving souls, once mortal, who believe and repent in the spirit state. The Mormons claim a total membership of 584,000. According to the United States Census Report of 21 May, 1910, there are 256,647 Mormons within the Federal Union.

ROBERTS, *Joseph Smith: Hist. of the Church, personal narrative, with introduction and notes*, 5 vols. already issued (Salt Lake City, 1902–9); PRATT, *Autobiog.* (S. L. City, 1874); FORD, *Hist. of Illinois* (Chicago, 1854); KANE, *The Mormons, a Lecture before the Hist. Soc. of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1850); GUNNISON, *The Mormons, their Hist. and Relig.* (Philadelphia, 1852); STANSBURY, *U. S. A. Expedition* (Philadelphia, 1852); GREELY, *Overland Journey* (New York, 1860); BURTON, *City of the Saints* (New York, 1862); TULLIDGE, *Life of Joseph the Prophet* (S. L. City, 1878); IDEM, *Life of B. Young, or, Utah and her Founders* (S. L. City, 1877); IDEM, *The Women of Mormondom* (S. L. City, 1877); IDEM, *Hist. of S. L. City* (S. L. City, 1886); ROBINSON, *Sinners and Saints* (Boston, 1883); BANCROFT, *Hist. of Utah* (San Francisco, 1890); CANNON, *Life of J. Smith the Prophet* (S. L. City, 1888); WHITNEY, *Hist. of Utah* (4 vols., S. L. City, 1892–1904); IDEM, *Life of H. C. Kimball* (S. L. City, 1888); IDEM, *Making of a State* (S. L. City, 1908); ROBERTS, *Life of John Taylor* (S. L. City, 1892); IDEM, *Hist. of the M. Church* in *Americana*, IV–VI (New York, 1909–10); IDEM, *Outlines of Ecclesiastical Hist.* (S. L. City, 1893); STENHOUSE, *The Rocky Mountain Saints* (New York, 1873); COWLEY, *Life and Labors of Wilford Woodruff* (S. L. City, 1909); JENSON, *Historical Record* (S. L. City, 1889); IDEM, *Latter-Day Saints, Biogr. Encycl.* (S. L. City, 1901).

W. R. HARRIS.

Morocco, PREFECTURE APOSTOLIC OF.—The country known as Morocco (from Marrakesh, the name of one of its chief cities) forms the northwest corner of the Continent of Africa, being separated from French Algeria by an imaginary line, about 217 miles in length, running from Nemours to Tenish es Sassi. It is the Gatulia or Mauretania Tingitana (from *Tingos*=Tangier) of the ancient Romans. The natives call it *Gharb* (*West*), or *Magreb el Aksa* (Extreme West). The total area is a little more than 308,000 square miles; the population, about 10,000,000. Excepting Abyssinia, it is now the only independent native state in Africa, and is one of the most difficult countries for Europeans to penetrate. Though Morocco is often spoken of as an empire, the authority of the sovereign is a mere fiction throughout the greater part of its territory, which is, on this account, divided, more or less precisely, into the *Bled el Maksen*, or "country subject to taxes", and the *Bled es Siba*, or "unsubdued country". Physically, the surface is broken up into three parallel mountain-chains: the most important of these, the Great Atlas, forms a plateau, forty to fifty miles in width, from which rise peaks, often snow-clad, 10,000 to 13,000 feet high. Facing the Mediterranean are the mountains of the Riff, below which stretches the well-watered and fertile range of the Tell. On the other side, to the extreme south lies the arid Sahara, broken only by a few oases. Between the Mediterranean littoral and the Sahara, the Atlas Plateau, broken by ravines and valleys, rivers and smaller streams, contains many tracts of marvellously fertile country. The sea-coast of Morocco is for the most part dangerous, and offers few advantages for commerce. The best harbours are those of Tangier, Mogador, and Agadir. El Araïds, or Larache, and Tangier are the maritime outlets for Fez, which is one of the three capitals of Morocco, the other two being Marrakesh and Meknes. Owing to the high mountains, the sea breezes and the openness of the country, the climate is healthy, temperate, and equable. The temperature is much higher in the south than in the north, the heat, in certain districts, becoming at times insufferable. The soil is adapted to every kind of crop, and sometimes yields three harvests in a year. Cattle-breeding is also carried on. There is very little industry, and commerce is chiefly in the hands of Europeans and Jews.

From the earliest period known to history, Morocco has been inhabited by the Berbers (whence the name *Barbary*). These people were known to the Romans as *Numidæ*, but to the Phœnicians as *Mahurin* (Westerners); from the Phœnician name the Greeks, and, after them, Latin writers, made *Mauri*, whence the English *Moors*. These Moors, Numidians, or Berbers, were subjugated by the Romans, then by the Vandals, the Byzantines, the Visigoths, and, lastly, the Arabs, whose political and religious conquest began in 681. Arabs and Berbers together crossed over into Spain, and thence into France, where their progress was stopped at Poitiers (732) by Charles Martel. Not until 1492, when Granada fell, were the Christians of the Iberian Peninsula definitively rid of the Moors on European soil, and able to carry the war against them into Africa. Portugal no longer retains any of her possessions in Morocco; but Spain still holds eight ports, known as the *presidios*, one on the Atlantic Coast and seven on the Mediterranean. Besides the Berbers, the population of Morocco includes Jews, who in all the cities are confined to separate quarters (*mellah*), Sudanese negroes, mostly slaves, and Europeans engaged in commerce on the coast, chiefly at Tangier and Mogador. For two hundred years Morocco has been ruled by a dynasty of Arab sherifs, who claim descent from Ali, the uncle and son-in-law of Mohammed. The sherif, or sultan, is theoretically supreme in both temporal and spiritual affairs, his wishes being carried out by viziers, or secretaries, in the various branches of the administration (*maghzen*). As a matter of fact, the normal condition of the country is revolution and anarchy. In 1906 the International Conference of Algeciras provided for a combined French and Spanish system of police, but the Morocco question is still (1910) unsettled.

With the exception of the European residents, the segregated Jews mentioned above, and a body of aborigines (Berbers), living in the Atlas, who have proved refractory to Islam, the whole population of Morocco is Mohammedan, and is inaccessible to Christian propaganda. The first Catholic mission to this country was organized in 1234, when Father Angelo, a Franciscan friar and papal legate, was appointed Bishop of Morocco. The succession lasted until 1566, when the see was suppressed, and its juris-

diction given to the Archbishop of Seville. In 1631 the Prefecture Apostolic of Morocco was founded; its first incumbent, Blessed Giovanni da Prado, O.F.M., was martyred at Marrakesh in that year, and his feast is kept by the Franciscan Order on 29 May. Other missionaries continued to exercise their ministry through trials and persecutions of every kind until 1859, when the prefecture was reorganized on its present basis. It is administered by the Franciscans of the College of Compostela. There are in Morocco about 10,000 Catholics, nearly all Europeans; 24 missionaries, 8 stations (in the leading ports), 16 schools, with 1200 children, and a hospital at Tangier, where the prefect Apostolic resides.

Statesman's Year Book (London, 1910); *Missiones Catholicæ* (Rome, 1907), 372.

A. Le Roy.

Morone, Giovanni, Cardinal, Bishop of Modena, b. at Milan 25 Jan., 1509; d. at Rome, 1 Dec., 1580. He belonged to a distinguished Milanese family, raised to the nobility in the twelfth century. His father held the dignity of chancellor of Milan, and it was probably to bind the father to his interest that Clement VII in 1529 named his son Giovanni, then only twenty years of age, to the See of Modena. By this appointment great offence was given to Cardinal Ippolito d'Este, who on the pretext that the See of Modena had previously been promised to himself, invoked the aid of Duke Alfonso of Ferrara and took forcible possession of the see, appropriating all its revenues. The dispute was not settled until 1532, when Morone at last bought off the opposition of d'Este by agreeing to pay him an annual pension of 400 ducats. Even as early as 1529, the young bishop-elect, whose talents had already attracted attention at the University of Padua, was chosen by Clement VII for a diplomatic mission to France. Under Paul III Morone's gifts as a negotiator placed him at once in the very front rank of ecclesiastical politicians. He was sent as papal envoy to Duke Sforza of Milan in 1535, and in the following year accepted, not altogether without reluctance, the important mission of nuncio at the court of Ferdinand, King of the Romans. His instructions were to press on the affair of the council in Hungary and Bohemia. He was to obtain from Ferdinand a safe-conduct for those who intended to take part in it, and to insist upon Mantua or some other Italian city as the place of meeting.

With the exception of an interval from September, 1538 to July, 1539, and another in 1541, Morone remained at his post in Germany for nearly six years, and he was present at the diets of Hagenau in 1540 and Ratisbon in 1541, while at the important meeting of Spiers in 1542 he appeared as the pope's special representative, and played a leading part, though even his great tact and resolution were able to do little in the complicated tangle of German religious affairs. During these early years in Germany, and indeed throughout his life, Morone remained a conspicuous member of a little group of moderate and intellectual men who saw that in the deadly struggle with Lutheranism, the faults were not all on one side. When Cardinal Sadoleto in 1537 for addressing a courteously worded appeal to Melanchthon was denounced by many of his own side as little better than a traitor and a heretic, Morone wrote the cardinal a letter of sympathy. "There are in these parts", he said, "many reputed defenders of the Catholic faith who think that our religion consists in nothing but hatred of the Lutherans . . . . and they are so wedded to this point of view that, without ever looking into the matter itself, they take in bad part not only all negotiations with the Lutherans, but every single word spoken about them which is not abusive". Morone further advises Sadoleto to treat his critics with silent contempt, and states his own conviction that to show charity to heretics was a better way than to overwhelm them with abusive language, adding: "if only this course had been adopted from the first, there would probably be less difficulty than there is in bringing about the union of the Church" (see the letter in "Archiv f. Reformationsgeschichte", 1904, I, 80–81).

On 22 May, 1542, Paul III published his Bull, which had been drafted by Sadoleto, summoning the council to meet at Trent, on 1 Nov., of the same year. On 2 June, Morone was created a cardinal, and on 16 Oct., he and Cardinals Parisio and Pole were named legates to preside over the assembly as the pope's representatives. But this first attempt to launch the long-desired council was a failure. Morone went to Trent and waited until the handful of representatives, who never met in public session, gradually dispersed, the council being formally prorogued 6 July, 1543. Before the assembly was again convened Morone was named legate (practically papal governor) at Bologna, and he had nothing to do with the sessions of the council which took place at Trent between December, 1545 and June, 1546, though after the council had been ostensibly transferred to Bologna, he was named by Julius III as one of the commissioners to arrange for its return to Trent. In 1555 he was sent to the Diet of Augsburg, but the death of Julius necessitated his recall and under the Pontificate of Paul IV Morone, who owing to his wide and liberal views had the misfortune to awaken the pope's suspicions when the latter presided over the Roman Inquisition, was arrested by the pontiff's order, confined in the Castle of Saint Angelo (31 May, 1557), and made the object of a formal prosecution for heresy, in which his views on justification, the invocation of saints, the veneration of relics and other matters were incriminated and submitted to rigid inquiry.

The cardinal strenuously repudiated these charges, but he was kept in confinement until the death of Paul IV. In 1560 his successor Pius IV authorized a revision of the process against Morone, and as a result the imprisonment of the cardinal and the whole procedure against him were declared to be entirely without justification; the judgment also recorded in the most formal terms that not the least suspicion rested upon his orthodoxy. A few years later when the cardinal legates Gonzaga and Seripandi died at Trent, Morone and Cardinal Navagero were appointed to succeed them, and the former eventually presided over the concluding sessions of the council with conspicuous tact and dignity. He was also placed upon the commission appointed to see that the conciliar decrees were duly carried into execution. Under the succeeding pontiffs his credit was in no way impaired. He was sent on a mission to Genoa in 1575, and in 1576 was appointed to attend the Diet of Ratisbon as papal legate. As Cardinal Protector of England, Morone in 1578–1579 had much to do with the administration of the English College (see Catholic Record Society, "Miscellanea", II, London, 1906); and when he died he had been for some time Cardinal Bishop of Ostia. Few ecclesiastics in that century were so successful in retaining the esteem of men of all parties and all creeds as this large-minded and eminently able and honest churchman. His reports as nuncio, recently published of late years in the German series of "Nuntiaturberichten", throw a flood of light upon the religious conditions of the empire, and it is interesting to note that the "Claudius internuntius" whose letters were so often turned to good account by Raynaldi proves to be no other than Morone himself (see Ehses in "Römische Quartalschrift", 1903). It may be mentioned in conclusion that Morone had much to do with the founding of the important Collegium Germanicum in Rome,

a work in which he was closely associated with St. Ignatius Loyola.

CANTÙ, *Gli Eretici d'Italia*, II, (Turin, 1865); CANTÙ, *Il Cardinale Giovanni Morone* in *Atti dell' Instituto Lombardo* (Turin, 1866); BERNABEI, *Vita del Cardinale Morone* (Modena, 1885). The most interesting and satisfactory materials for Morone's life are to be found in his own despatches and in the prefaces contributed by his editors: see FRIEDENSBURG, *Nuntiaturberichten aus Deutschland*, part I, II (Gotha, 1892); DITTRICH, *Quellen und Forschungen auf d. Gebiete der Geschichte*, I (Paderborn, 1892); IDEM in *Historisches Jahrbuch*, IV (Bonn, 1883); LÄMMER, *Monumenta Vaticana* (Freiburg, 1901); MERKLE, *Concil. Trident. Diaria* (Freiburg, 1901); EHSES, *Concilium Tridentinum*, IV (Freiburg, 1904); STEINHUBER, *Gesch. d. Collegium Germ.* (Freiburg, 1906); TACCHI VENTURI, *La Vita Religiosa in Italia*, I (Rome, 1910), in the appendix, pp. 534–49, is printed Father Salmeron's evidence before the Inquisition given in Morone's trial. PASTOR, *Geschichte der Päpste*, V (Freiburg, 1909); this last work is particularly valuable for an account of Morone's early missions.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Moroni, GAETANO, author of the well-known "Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica", b. at Rome, 17 October, 1802; d. there, 3 Novenber, 1883. He received his early education from the Brothers of the Christian School at Rome. Apprenticed later to a barber, his duties frequently took him to the Camaldolese convent of San Gregorio on the Cœlian Hill; there the abbot, Mauro Cappellari, and several of the fathers recognized his exceptional gifts, and made use of him in a quasi-secretarial capacity. When Cappellari became a cardinal, he made Moroni his *cameriere:* and when he became pope, as Gregory XVI, he took Moroni for *primo aiutante di camera*, employing him also as private secretary, in which capacity Moroni wrote over 100,000 letters. Moroni also served Pius IX as *aiutante di camera*. Among the books of the Camaldolese convent and of the cardinal, as well as from conversation with learned people, Moroni acquired a vast store of information. He also gradually collected a considerable private library bearing on ecclesiastical questions, while he made notes from the daily papers and from other publications for his own instruction. The subsequent arrangement of these notes in order suggested to him the idea of turning his labours to the benefit of the public, an idea which he realized in the "Dizionario" (Venice, 1840–61; index, 1878–9), a mine of interesting data and authoritative in matters concerning the Pontifical Court, the organization of the Curia and the Church, and the administration of the Pontifical States. In matters of history, it depends on the writers whom its author consulted. It is, however, not a well-ordered or homogeneous work; but these defects may be readily forgiven in view of the fact that its author did his work alone, without real collaboration, and wrote at times sixteen hours a day. He was also the author of official articles on papal ceremonies, the journeys of the popes, etc. During the conclaves of 1829 and 1831, he wrote the "Giornale storico-politico-ceremoniale della sede vacante e il conclave per l'elezione di Pio VIII e Gregorio XVI", which, like others of his writings, remained unpublished. As a member of the household of Gregory XVI, Moroni was the object of much sectarian hatred. He was a friend of many cardinals, including Wiseman, and of other illustrious men. In the index of the "Dizionario" (s. v., Moroni), he indicates the various passages of the work in which he speaks of himself, and which thus constitute a kind of autobiography.

U. BENIGNI.

"THE TAILOR"
GIOVANNI BATTISTA MORONI,
NATIONAL GALLERY, LONDON

Moroni, GIOVANNI BATTISTA, painter, b. at Bondo, near Albino, in the territory of Bergamo, between 1520 and 1525; d. at Bergamo, in 1578. He was the pupil of Alessandro Bonvicino, called Moretto da Brescia (about 1498–1555), and one of the best imitators of his style. Moroni's work was done chiefly at Bergamo and in the vicinity. He was remarkable as a portrait painter, and as such was not inferior to his master. He has the same sincerity and nobility, but more originality. His portraits are among the most vigorous of the Renaissance; of these we may mention a "Scholar with an open book before him" and a "Man in Black" at the Uffizi (Florence); at the Gallery of Bergamo a "Young Man" and a "Woman", of excellent workmanship; at the Brera (Milan) the portrait of Antonio Navagiero, podestà of Bergamo; at the Ambrosiana Library in Milan, a "Man of sickly appearance"; at the National Gallery (London), portrait of a member of the Fenaroli family, "The Tailor", and Canon Lodovico Terzi of Bergamo; at the Louvre "An Old man seated holding a book", "of large, firm workmanship, somewhat heavy as in some of Tintoretto's portraits" (E. Müntz); in the Dublin Museum, "A Gentleman and his two children"; in the Museum of Madrid a "Venetian Captain"; in the Dresden Gallery, portrait of a man; in the Gallery of Vienna, two portraits of men. In religious pictures, on the other hand, Moroni is inferior to Moretto, especially in drawing and inventiveness, but his colouring, of a clear grayish tone, is not disagreeable. "It is only in his last works that the grey tone becomes monotonous and soft, together with a rather hard reddish colouring" (J. Burckhardt and Bode). Worthy of note are the "Coronation of the Virgin", painted for the church of the Trinity at Bergamo; the "Last Judgment" for the parish church of Gorlago, near Bergamo; "Virgin and Saints" and "St. Jerome" at the Carrara Academy of Bergamo; the "Assumption of the Virgin", the "Virgin surrounded by Saints" (two pictures) at the Brera of Milan; "The Jesuit" (portrait of Ercole Tasso), at Stafford House, the London residence of the Duke of Sutherland.

BLANC, *Hist. des peintres de toutes les écoles* (Paris, 1865–77): *Ecole vénitienne;* LÜBKE, *Gesch. der italienischen Malerei*, II (Stuttgart, 1878), 621; DENISON, CHAMPLIN AND PERKINS, *Cyclop. of Painters and Paintings*, III (London and New York, 1888); BURCKHARDT AND BODE, *Le Cicerone*, II, 753; French tr. GÉRARD (Paris, 1892); MÜNTZ, *Hist. de l'art pendant la Renaissance*, III (Paris, 1895), 690; BRYAN, *Dict. of Painters and Engravers*, III (London, 1904), s. v.

GASTON SORTAIS.

Morris, JOHN, canon, afterwards Jesuit, F.S.A., b. in India, 4 July, 1826; d. at Wimbledon, 22 Oct., 1893, son of John Carnac Morris, F.R.S. He was educated

partly in India, partly at Harrow, partly in reading for Cambridge with Dean Alford, the New Testament scholar. Under him a great change passed over Morris's ideas. Giving up the thought of taking the law as his profession, he became enthusiastic for ecclesiastical antiquities, took a deep interest in the Tractarian movement, and resolved to become an Anglican clergyman. Going up to Trinity College, Cambridge, in October, 1845, he became the friend, and then the pupil of F. A. Paley, grandson of the well-known divine, and already one of the leading Greek scholars of the university. The conversion of Newman, followed by the receptions of so many others, deeply impressed him, and he was reconciled by Bishop Wareing, 20 May, 1846. A storm followed, beginning in the "Times", which made itself felt even in Parliament. Paley had to leave Cambridge (which led to his subsequently joining the Church), while Morris was practically cast off by his family. He then went to the English College, Rome, under Dr. Grant (q. v.), and was there during the revolution of 1848. Soon after the restoration of the English Hierarchy in 1850, he was made Canon of Northampton, and then returned as vice-rector to Rome (1853–1856). He now became *postulator* for the English Martyrs (q. v.), whose cause owes perhaps more to him than to any other person. Returning to England, he took part in the third Synod of Westminster, became secretary to Cardinal Wiseman (q. v.), whom he affectionately nursed on his death-bed, and served under Archbishop Manning (q. v.), until he became a Jesuit in 1867. He taught Church History from 1873–1874; he was Rector of St. Ignatius' College, Malta, from 1877–78; master of novices in 1879; and director of the writers of the English Province in 1888. Always remarkable for his ardent affectionate nature, his untiring energy and earnest holiness of life, he was also an excellent scholar, an eloquent speaker, and a high-principled leader of souls. His death befitted his life; for he expired in the pulpit, uttering the words, "Render to God the things that are God's." His principal works are: "The Life and Martyrdom of St. Thomas Becket" (London, 1859 and 1885); "The Life of Father John Gerard" (London, 1881), translated into French, German, Spanish, and Polish; "Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers" (3 vols., London, 1872–1877); "Letter-books of Sir Amias Poulet" (London, 1874); and many contributions to "The Month", "The Dublin Review", "Archæologia", and other periodicals.

POLLEN, *Life and Letters of Father John Morris* (London, 1896); MORRIS, *Journals kept during Times of Retreat* (London, 1895); SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la C. de Jésus*, V, p. v–viii; IX, 692.

J. H. POLLEN.

Morris, JOHN B. See LITTLE ROCK, DIOCESE OF.

Morris, JOHN BRANDE, b. at Brentford, Middlesex, 4 September, 1812; d. at Hammersmith, London, 9 April, 1880; he studied at Baliol College, Oxford, graduating in 1834 (B.A. honours) and 1837 (M.A.). He was at once elected Petrean Fellow of Exeter College, and lectured on Hebrew. His favourite field of study was Eastern and patristic theology. While at Oxford he wrote an "Essay towards the Conversion of learned and Philosophical Hindus" (1843); a poem entitled "Nature: a Parable" (1842); and translated "Select Homilies from St. Ephraem" from the Syriac (1846), likewise St. Chrysostom's "Homilies on the Romans" (1841) for the "Library of the Fathers". Having joined the Tractarian Movement, he was received into the Church, 16 January, 1846, resigning his Oxford fellowship a few days later. He was ordained at Oscott in 1851 and in the same year was appointed professor at Prior Park, near Bath. He soon began parish work and for the next nineteen years ministered in Plymouth, Shortwood (Somersetshire), and other parts of England. He was for a time chaplain to Sir John Acton and Coventry Patmore. In 1870 he became spiritual director of the Sœurs de Miséricorde, Hammersmith, which post he occupied till his death. After his conversion he contributed to the "Dublin Review", the "Lamp" and other Catholic periodicals; and wrote "Jesus the Son of Mary" (1851), a treatise on the Incarnation and devotion to Our Lady; "Taleetha Koomee" (1858), a metrical religious drama; and "Eucharist on Calvary", an essay on the first Mass and the Passion.

Tablet (17 April, 1880); *Times* (12 April, 1880); GILLOW, *Dict. Biog. of Eng. Cath.*, s. v.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

Morris, MARTIN FERDINAND, lawyer and jurist, b. 3 December, 1834, at Washington, D. C.; d. 12 September, 1909, at Washington, D. C. Descended from an Irish Catholic family, he was educated at Georgetown University, from which he was graduated in 1854. On leaving Georgetown he entered the Jesuit Novitiate, at Frederick, Md., to prepare himself for the priesthood, to which high calling his inclinations from early youth had impelled him, and for which, by reason of his studious habit, scholarly tastes, and high moral standards, he was in every way fitted. His ambition, however, could not be realized, as the death of his father left him the sole support of his mother and sisters. In 1863 he began the practice of law in Baltimore, Maryland, and in 1867 removed to Washington to enter into partnership with the late Richard T. Merrick. He continued a member of the firm of Merrick and Morris until the death of Mr. Merrick (1885) when he formed a partnership with George E. Hamilton, and continued actively to practise his profession, being connected with important litigation both in the local courts and in the Supreme Court, until appointed by President Cleveland an Associate Justice of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia upon the establishment of that Court in 1893. Modest, unassuming, almost diffident in manner, he was best adapted to office practice, and yet, when occasion required it, was forceful and successful in the trial of cases. A skilled lawyer, standing high in his profession, judicial labours did not prevent him from taking an active interest in civic and social conditions, or from broadening the scope of his researches into the fields of science, of literature, and of art. Actively interested in his Alma Mater, and in the growth and development of Catholic education, he was one of the founders of Georgetown Law School (1871), then under the direction of the late P. F. Healey, S.J., to-day one of the largest and most successfully conducted law schools in this country. In 1877 he received from Georgetown, in recognition of his nobility of character, his broad scholarship, and achievements as lawyer and judge, the degree of LL.D. He wrote "Lectures on the History of the Development of Constitutional and Civil Liberty" (1898); also numerous monographs and addresses.

GEORGE E. HAMILTON.

Morse (Lat. *morsus*), also called the MONILE, FIBULA, FIRMALE, PECTORALE, originally the rectangular ornamented piece of material attached to the two front edges of the cope near the breast to prevent the vestment from slipping from the shoulders. Morses were provided with hook and eye, and were often richly ornamented with embroidery or precious stones. The name was also applied to metal clasps used instead of such pieces of woven fabric. As early as the eleventh century such metal clasps are found represented in miniatures and mentioned in inventories. These clasps, however, gradually lost their practical use and became mere ornaments, which were sometimes sewn firmly to the flaps that served to fasten the cope, sometimes only attached to the flaps by hooks, so that, after the vestment had been worn, the clasps could be removed and cared for separately. This latter was especially the case when, as frequently happened at least in the later Middle Ages, the clasp was very heavy or very valuable. As

early as the thirteenth century inventories mention clasps which formed distinct ornaments in themselves. Many churches had a large number of such morses. They were generally made of silver covered with gold, and were ornamented with pearls, precious stones, enamel, niello-work, architectural designs, small figures of saints, ornamental work in flowers and vines, and similar designs. Such clasps were frequently the finest products of the goldsmith's art; they were generally either round, square, quatrefoil, or like a rosette in form; yet there were also more elaborate and at times peculiar shapes. Abundant proof of the desire for costly clasps for the cope is shown by the old inventories and by the numerous medieval morses preserved (especially in Germany) in churches and museums. According to present Roman usage the morse is reserved to cardinals and bishops ("Cær. epïsc.", I, c. vii, n. 1; S. R. C., 15 September, 1753).

Bock, *Gesch. der liturg. Gewänder des M. A.*, II (Bonn, 1866), 304 sq.; Braun, *Die liturg. Gewandung im Occident u. Orient* (Freiburg, 1907), 321 sqq.

Joseph Braun.

Morse, Henry, Venerable, martyr; b. 1595 in Norfolk; d. at Tyburn, 1 February, 1644. He was received into the Church at Douai, 5 June, 1614, after various journeys was ordained at Rome, and left for the mission, 19 June, 1624. He was admitted to the Society of Jesus at Heaton; then he was arrested, and imprisoned for three years in York Castle, where he made his novitiate under his fellow-prisoner Father John Robinson, S.J., and took simple vows. Afterwards he was a missionary to the English regiments in the Low Countries. Returning to England at the end of 1633 he laboured in London, and in 1636 he is reported to have received about ninety Protestant families into the Church. He himself contracted the plague but recovered. Arrested 27 February, 1636, he was imprisoned in Newgate. On 22 April he was brought to the bar charged with being a priest and with having withdrawn the king's subjects from their faith and allegiance. He was found guilty on the first count, not guilty on the second, and sentence was deferred. On 23 April he made his solemn profession of the three vows to Fr. Edward Lusher. He was released on bail for 10,000 florins, 20 June, 1637, at the instance of Queen Henrietta Maria. In order to free his sureties he voluntarily went into exile when the royal proclamation was issued ordering all priests to leave the country before 7 April, 1641, and became chaplain to Gage's English regiment in the service of Spain. In 1643 he returned to England; arrested after about a year and a half, he was imprisoned at Durham and Newcastle, and sent by sea to London. On 30 January he was again brought to the bar and condemned on his previous conviction. On the day of his execution his hurdle was drawn by four horses, and the French Ambassador attended with all his suite, as also did the Count of Egmont and the Portuguese Ambassador. The martyr was allowed to hang until he was dead. At the quartering the footmen of the French Ambassador and of the Count of Egmont dipped their handkerchiefs in the martyr's blood. In 1647 many persons possessed by evil spirits were relieved through the application of his relics.

Foley, *Records of the English Province S. J.* (London, 1877–1883), I, 566–611; VI, 288–9; VII, 528, 658, 1198, 1200; Challoner, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*, II (Manchester, 1803), 151–5; Tanner, *Societas Jesu* (Prague, 1675), 126–131; Hamilton, *Calendar State Papers Domestic 1640–1* (London, 1882), 292.

John B. Wainewright.

Mortification, one of the methods which Christian asceticism employs in training the soul to virtuous and holy living. The term originated with St. Paul, who traces an instructive analogy between Christ dying to a mortal and rising to an immortal life, and His followers who renounce their past life of sin and rise through grace to a new life of holiness. "If you live after the flesh", says the apostle, "you shall die, but if through the spirit you *mortify* the deeds of the flesh, you shall live" (Rom., viii, 13; cf. also Col., iii, 5, and Gal., v, 24). From this original use of the term we see that mortification, though under one aspect it is a law of death, under another and more fundamental aspect it is a law of life, and so does not destroy but elevates nature. What it slays is the disease of the soul, and by slaying this it restores and invigorates the soul's true life.

Of the diseases it sets itself to slay, sin, the one mortal disease of the soul, holds the first place. Sin committed it destroys, by impelling to true penitence and to the use of those means of forgiveness and restoration which our Lord has confided to His Church. Temptations to sin it overcomes by inducing the will to accept hardships, however grave, rather than yield to the temptations. To this extent, mortification is obligatory on all, but those who wish to be more thorough in the service of Christ, carry it further, and strive with its aid to subdue, so far as is possible in this life, that "rebellion" of the flesh against the spirit which is the internal incentive to sin. What is needed to achieve this victory is that the passions and sensual concupiscences, which when freely indulged exercise so pernicious an influence on human conduct, should be trained by judicious repression to subordinate and conform their desires to the rule of reason and faith, as discerned by the mind. But for this training to be effectual it is not sufficient to restrain these desires of the flesh only when their demands are unlawful. They represent a twist in the nature, and must be treated as one treats a twisted wire when endeavouring to straighten it, namely, by twisting it the opposite way. Thus in the various departments of ascetic observance, earnest Catholics are constantly found denying themselves even in matters which in themselves are confessedly lawful.

Mortification, viewed thus as a means of curing bad habits and implanting good ones, has its recognized place in the methods even of those who are engaged in pursuing purely natural ends. What is peculiar to Christian mortification is, that it relies for the attainment of its spiritual objects, not merely on this natural efficacy of its methods, but still more on the aids of divine grace, for which, by its earnestness in self-discipline and the Christian motive which inspires it, it can plead so powerfully with God. And here, as further contributing to increase its spiritual efficacy, another motive for which it is practised comes in. It is practised likewise as an expiation for past sins and shortcomings, for it is the belief of the Catholic Church that, although only the Atonement of Christ can offer adequate expiation for the sins of men, men ought not to make that an excuse for doing nothing themselves, but should rather take it as an incentive to add their own expiations to the extent of their power, and should regard such personal expiations as very pleasing to God. This explains why many of the mortifications practised by devout persons are not directly curative of evil propensities, but take the form of painful exercises or privations self-inflicted because they are painful, e. g., fastings, hard beds, abstention from lawful pleasures, etc. Not that these external mortifications are of themselves available, for spiritual writers never tire of insisting that the internal mortification of pride and self-love in their various forms are essential, but that external penances are good only so far as they spring from this internal spirit, and react by promoting it (see Asceticism).

Alvarez de Paz, *De mortificatione virium animæ* in *Opera*, t. III (Paris, 1875), l. II; Baker, *Holy Wisdom*, ed. Sweeny (London, 1905); Rodriguez, *Christian and Religious Perfection*; Le Gaudier, *De perfectione vitæ spiritualis* (Paris, 1856); Scaramelli, *Directorium Asceticum* (London, 1897); Maturin, *Self-knowledge and Self-discipline* (London, 1905); Chabot, *La mortification chrétienne et la vie* in *Science et Religion* series (Paris, 1903).

Sydney F. Smith.

Mortmain (Old Fr., *morte meyn*), dead-hand, or "such a state of possession of land as makes it inalienable" (Wharton, "Law Lexicon", 10th ed., London, 1902, s. v.), is "the possession of land or tenements by any corporation" (Bouvier, "Law Dictionary", Boston, 1897, s. v.), or "where the use came *ad manum mortuam*, which was when it came to some corporation" (Lord Bacon, "Reading on the Statute of Uses"), alienation of lands or tenements to a corporation being termed alienation in mortmain (Stephen, "New Commentaries on the Laws of England", 15th ed., London, 1908, I, 296). The alienation was formerly expressed by the now obsolete words *amortization* and *amortizement*, the person so alienating being said to *amortize* (Murray, "New English Dictionary", Oxford and New York, 1888), a verb used by Chaucer in connexion with good works "amortised by sinne following" (The Persones Tale). In Old French *amortissement* was used in connexion with licences termed *chartes d'amortissement*, validating an alienation, *amortir* being defined *éteindre en tout ou en partie les droits de la seigneurie féodale* ("La Grande Encyclopédie", Paris, s. d.; "Century Dictionary", New York, s. d., s. v. amortization; cf. the same use of the English word in statute 15 Richard II, c. 5).

Corporate ownership, recognized by the Roman Law, did not become obsolete under feudalism (q. v.). Throughout the Middle Ages there were numerous associations having, by their titles of association, "a perpetual body" or "a perpetual commonalty". Such were the mayors, bailiffs, and commons of cities, or of boroughs and towns, and such, too, were various guilds and fraternities.

These associations "of many individuals united into one body, under a special denomination having perpetual succession under an artificial form" (Shelford, "A practical treatise on the Law of Mortmain, &c.", Philadelphia, 1842, 22) had become established for purposes which, in respect to any property they were allowed to acquire or to retain, implied an ownership free from the vicissitudes and limited duration of ownership by natural persons.

The Catholic Church, having been recognized "since the time of the Emperor Constantine" in the countries which adopted the feudal system "as possessing a legal personality and the capacity to take and acquire property" (Ponce vs. Roman Catholic Church, 210 United States Supreme Court Reports, 311), feudalism recognized not only the Church, but its religious communities, as spiritual corporations. Such a community has been thought to be appropriately described to be *gens æterna eadem perpetuo permanens quasi in ea nemo unquam moritur* (an everlasting body continuing perpetually the same as if in it no one may ever die). The communities might consist of men, each of whom was deemed, because of his vows, civilly dead. But to the communities themselves, *viri religiosi*, "people of religion", *gens de main morte*, the law attributed a perpetual existence and perpetual ownership of property.

English Law, admitting the corporate existence of associations, which were corporations aggregate, and also allowing of such an artificial existence in an official individual, considered not only the king, but each bishop, parson, and vicar as a corporation sole. And such might be a chantry (q. v.) priest, to whom land had been given by its owner, subject to a perpetual service *a chaunter pur ly e pur ces heyrs a tou jours* (see Year Books of the reign of King Edward the First, Years XX–XXI, London, 1866, 265).

Corporate ownership of land, however, by subjects of the realm was repugnant to feudal theory. According to this theory all land of subjects was deemed to have been acquired, immediately or mediately, by grant of the king. Of land directly acquired from the king, the person to whom the grant or feoffment was made, the feoffee, held as tenant *in capite* of the Crown. If the tenant *in capite* made a feoffment, he became immediate lord of his feoffee, and as to the king a mediate lord. And thus from successive feoffments there might result a long succession of lords, mediate and immediate, the king being ultimate lord of all land in the kingdom which was held by feudal tenure. A freeman who became a landowner was bound in many instances to render military service to his immediate lord, and liable to forfeit the land for crime. Should he die without a proper heir, the land escheated. If he left a male heir under age, the lord was entitled to his guardianship (q. v.). In the case of a female heir, the lord was entitled to her disposal in marriage (Stephen, op. cit., I, 103–140).

The Magna Carta of King Henry III (9 Henry III, c. 32; 1224), afterwards repealed as to this provision by implication (Shelford, op. cit., 15), prohibited the giving or selling by a freeman of so much of his land as that the unsold residue should be insufficient to render to the lord of the fee the services due to him.

Feudal theory, therefore, favoured ownership of land by some natural person liable to death and capable of committing crime, or according to the Norman expression, *homme vivant, mourant et confiscant* (Thornton vs. Robin, I, Moore's Privy Council Reports, 452). An artificial being, existing in contemplation of law, not competent to render military service, incapable of crime, and not subject to death, was thus not possessed of the attributes which, according to feudal polity, became a landowner.

In France a custom arose of the *gens de main morte* supplying a knight to fulfil the services of a feudal vassal. As early, however, as 1159 this custom began to be superseded by *chartes d'amortissement*, and these licences became, in the course of time, an important fiscal resource of the Crown. Of the conferring of relief from feudal obligations a notable instance was the exemption given in 1156 by Frederick Barbarossa to the Dukes of Austria from all service, except almost nominal military service. Land held by individuals free from feudal liabilities was designated as allodial (Fr. *alleu*), or a *fief de Dieu*, or in Germany as *Sonnenlehn*.

A third of the value of property is said to have heen sometimes the price of its *amortissement* (Littré, "Dictionnaire de la langue française", Paris, 1889, s. v.).

William the Conqueror sought to promote in England holding of land by feudal tenure. That allodial holdings were known in England at the time of the Conquest seems quite possible (see "La Grande Encyclopédie", s. v. Alleu). And many of the holders would doubtless consent to change to the feudal tenure, which implied feudal protection.

But there appears to have arisen a somewhat widespread repugnance on the part of landowners to hold land subject to the faith and homage which accorded with the law doctrines of the Norman feudists. A method of escape was resorted to, which the Magna Carta of King Henry III indicates. Owners availed themselves of the property rights of the religious communities in order to hold land under these communities. For to contrivances of this kind the Charter evidently alludes, prohibiting the same land being given to and taken again from any religious house, and forbidding any house of religion to take land under an agreement of returning it to its former owner, *terram alicujus sic accipere quod tradat illam ei a quo ipsam recepit tenendam* (see c. 36).

This early statute of mortmain applies only to action by religious houses in the way of enabling lay owners to hold their lands. The statute does not seem directed against the holding by the houses of land in their own possession. The correctness of Sir William Blackstone's surmise that even before the Conquest licences in mortmain had become necessary "among the Saxons" (Commentaries, B. 11, c. 18, 269) does not appear to be confirmed by this Magna Carta,

nor, in any general sense, by the fact that the allusion in the Constitutions of Clarendon (1164) to mortmain was confined to advowsons (ibid.).

The mortmain statute of Edward I, known as "Statutum de viris religiosis", 7 Edward I, enacted in 1279, and so often referred to by writers on English real property law, recites that religious men have entered into their own fees as well as into the fees of other men, and that those services due "and which at the beginning were provided for the defence of the Realm" are wrongfully withdrawn and the escheats lost to the chief lords (Duke, "The Law of Charitable Uses", London, 1805, 193).

The statute thereupon ordains that "no person, religious or other", *nullus religiosus aut alius quicumque*, shall buy or sell lands or tenements or receive them, or appropriate them (under pain of forfeiture) so as to cause the land to come into mortmain, *per quod ad manum mortuam terræ et tenementa hujusmodi deveniant quoquo modo.*

A violation of the statute renders lawful to the king "and other chief lords of the fee immediate", *nobis et aliis immediatis capitalibus dominis fædi*, to enter and hold the land. The chief lord immediate is afforded a year to enter, the next chief lord immediate the half-year next ensuing, and so every lord immediate may enter into such land, if the next lord be negligent in entering. If all the chief lords who are "of full age, within the four seas and out of prison be negligent or slack", "we", the king, namely, "shall take such lands and tenements into our own hands", *capiemus in manum nostram.*

The term *manus mortua* is not applied to the sovereign, yet land so taken "in manum nostram" is not to be retained. Such a retaining would be in mortmain. And the king promises to convey the land to other persons subject to services from which ownership by the "religious men" or others had withdrawn it, services for the defence of the realm, *alios inde feoffabimus per certa servitia nobis inde ad defensionem regni nostri facienda*, saving to the lords "their wards and escheats and other services". A statute of 1290 permits any freeman to part with his land, the feoffee to hold of the same lord and by the same services as his feoffor held. But the statute cautiously adds that in no wise are the lands to come into mortmain against the statute (see 18 Edward I, c. I, c. II, c. III).

Where churches stood "the ground itself was hallowed" (see Ponce vs. Roman Catholic Church, 210 United States Supreme Court Reports, 312). And a statute of Richard II (15 Richard II, c. V; 1391) recites that "some religious persons, parsons, vicars and other spiritual persons have entered in divers lands and tenements, which be adjoining to their churches and of the same by sufferance and assent of the tenants, have made churchyards and by bulls of the bishop of Rome [(sic)—the French and more authoritative text reads: *par bulles del appostoill*] have dedicated and hallowed the same" and in these make "parochial burying". Therefore all persons possessed of land "to the use of religious people or other spiritual persons", of which these latter take the profits, are required upon pain of forfeiture to procure licence of amortization within a time limited, or to "sell and aliene" to some other use.

This statute does not confine its operation to "spiritual persons" and churchyards, but enacts that the statute of 1279 shall "be observed of all lands, tenements, fees, advowsons, and other possessions purchased or to be purchased to the use of guilds and fraternities" and "Mayors, Bailiffs and Commons of Cities, Boroughs and other towns that have a perpetual commonalty", all of whom are forbidden to purchase.

Licences allowing, in particular instances, transfers into mortmain, notwithstanding the statute, were issued from time to time. The text of a licence of Edward I himself has been preserved, permitting a certain person to give a parcel of land to a certain prior and convent to be held *sibi et successoribus suis in perpetuum*, but subject to the due and accustomed services to the *capitalibus dominis fædi illius* (Year Books of the reign of King Edward I, years XXXII–XXXIII, London, 1864, 499). This licence recites that it is given *ob affectionem et benevolentiam* towards the religious order. Nor do licences in mortmain seem to have ever become in England, as in France, recognized sources of royal revenue.

Legal devices, too, as in the times before the Magna Carta of Henry III, were resorted to for the purpose of escaping the operation of the statute, such as purchases alluded to in the statute of Richard II "to the use" of persons other than those to whom the legal title was transferred. These devices have produced far-reaching and enduring influence on the development of English jurisprudence. Concerning English aggregate ecclesiastical bodies of former times, Sir Edward Coke observes in language which we might imagine to be applied to modern "trusts" and combinations of capital, that those bodies "in this were to be commended, that they ever had of their counsel the best learned men that they could get" (Blackstone, "Commentaries", B. 11, c. 18, 270).

Before the coming of the Conqueror and his feudal lawyers much land in England had been acquired to be held by the spiritual tenure of frankalmoign, a tenure subjecting the holders to what was termed the *trinoda necessitas* (or threefold obligation) of repairing highways, building castles, and repelling invasions, but otherwise to no service other than praying for the souls of the donor and his heirs, dead or alive (Stephen, op. cit., I, 139, 140). To such pious foundations already established none of the mortmain legislation applied.

When Henry VIII commenced his ecclesiastical alterations, the general body of the parochial clergy holding, in a corporate way, their lands by this tenure (ibid.) "acknowledged", to quote Sir Edward Coke (1 Reports, 24, a), "King Henry VIII to be supreme head of the church of England", and thus continued to hold their lands by the Saxon tenure, by which "the parochial clergy and very many ecclesiastical and eleemosynary foundations", observes Sergeant Stephen, "hold them at this day" (op. cit., I, 139).

Land held in mortmain by some of the religious corporations were confiscated by the statute 27 Henry VIII, c. 28 (1535), and thus, according to Lord Bacon (Reading on the Statute of Uses), "The possessions that had been in mortmain began to stir abroad", a "stir" extended by the statute 37 Henry VIII, c. 4 (1545), to other religious houses and to chantries, this statute transferring their lands to the sovereign's possession in consideration of His Majesty's great costs and charges in his then wars with France and Scotland.

During the brief period of reaction after the death of King Edward VI, the statutes of mortmain, in so far as they applied to future conveyances to spiritual corporations, were suspended (1554) for twenty years (1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8, sec. LI).

The expressions quoted from Lord Bacon, and an allusion of his to "plenty and purchasing", suggest the view that holding of land in mortmain, being opposed to land stirring abroad and its ready purchase, was in the nature of a public inconvenience or mischief. Similar views had not actuated the English kings and barons previous to Henry VIII, who (to quote Barrington, "Observations on the more ancient Statutes", London, 1796, 113), "had no notion of an inconvenience or mischief to the public from a stagnation of property", realizing, however, that, "as the land was given to God, the king and the barons lost all the usual profits of what was held under them" (ibid.).

But opposition to mortmain holdings as being per-

petuities appears in a statute of Henry VIII, which preceded the confiscating statutes. This is the statute 23 Henry VIII, c. X (1531), directed against holding of lands, "to the use of parish churches, chapels, churchwardens, guilds, fraternities, commonalties, companies, or brotherhoods", purposes previously acknowledged as charitable and religious.

Excluding from its operation cities and towns corporate, having, by their ancient customs, power to "devise into mortmain", the statute alluded to declares trusts or assurances to the uses just mentioned "erected and made of devotions or by common assent of the people without any corporation", or "to the uses and intents to have obites perpetual or a continual service of a priest forever", or for sixty or eighty years, to be within the mischiefs of alienation "into mortmain", and as to future gifts void except for terms not exceeding twenty years (cf. 1 Edward VI, c. XIV).

Sir Edward Coke explains this statute to have been directed against some purposes which were thenceforth to be condemned as superstitious, although formerly approved as charitable, "such superstitious uses", he points out, "as to pray for souls supposed to be in purgatory, and the like". Not long before the date of the statute, Coke observes "by the light of God's word", "diverse superstitions and errors in the Christian religion which had a pretence and semblance of charity and devotion were discovered". With true charity, he claims, the statute was not intended to interfere. For, he observes, "no time was so barbarous as to abolish learning and knowledge nor so uncharitable as to prohibit relieving the poor" (op. cit., 24 a). And he allows us to infer such to be the fact, even though the charity might constitute a perpetuity.

Dispositions for charity, which the law would specially commend, a statute of Queen Elizabeth mentions (43 Elizabeth, c. IV, 1601). Dispositions in aid of "superstitions" were not to be deemed charitable, and these the courts were to ascertain and condemn, in the varying light of English Statutes, as evils like to alienations in mortmain.

An authority on the law of charitable uses (Duke, op. cit., 125) states that "religion being variable, according to the pleasure of succeeding princes, that which at one time is held for orthodoxy may at another be accounted superstitious". And accordingly the English courts even condemned as superstitious the charge on land of an annual sum for education of Scotchmen to propagate in Scotland the doctrines of the Church of England. For, by statute, presbyteries had been settled in that portion of the United Kingdom [Methodist Church vs. Remington, 1 Watts (Pa.), Reports, p. 224].

The manner of establishing a charity was in the course of time restricted by "the statute of mortmain commonly so called", remarks the Master of the Rolls in Corbyn vs. French, 4 Vesey's Reports, 427, "but", he adds, "very improperly, for it does not prevent the alienation of land in mortmain, nor was that the object of the Act".

Reciting that gifts of lands in mortmain are restrained by Magna Carta, and other laws as against the public utility, but that "nevertheless this public mischief has of late greatly increased by many large and improvident alienations or dispositions to uses called charitable uses", this statute (9 George II, c. XXXVI, 1736) provides that thenceforth such dispositions shall be "null and void", unless executed with certain prescribed solemnities, and not less than twelve months before the death of the donor.

The statutes 23 Henry VIII and this statute of George II, in their effect on the dispositions of land, which they prohibit, differ from the old mortmain acts. The statutes referred to render such dispositions void, that is, of no effect whatsoever. But alienations in mortmain properly so termed were not mere nullities, but were effectual to transfer ownership of land to a corporation, by which the land might be retained until its forfeiture.

Enforcement of a forfeiture and the declaring void a charge on, or use of, land are in their nature and result very different.

Notwithstanding the statement in the case cited from Vesey's Reports that devises for charitable uses are not in themselves alienations in mortmain, the latter word's meaning has yet been claimed to embrace any perpetual holding of land "in a dead or unserviceable hand". And such, it is claimed, "is the characteristic of alienations to charitable uses". Land dedicated to the service of charity and religion is said to be "practically inalienable", because any disposition of it, which is incompatible with the carrying out or continuity of the benevolent purposes of the conveyance, will be restrained by Courts of Equity (Lewis, "A practical treatise on the Law of Perpetuity", Philadelphia, 1846, 689), in England the Court of Chancery.

For, notwithstanding mortmain statutes, and as if to protect the sovereign from the reproach which, according to Coke, he might otherwise have incurred, the lord chancellors seem, from a period long previous to that of King Henry VIII, to have protected and guarded trusts or uses in favour of charity. The chancellors seem to have administered this duty in their capacity as guardians of the king's conscience, and by force of an assumed, if not expressed, delegation of the royal prerogative and sovereign will.

We cannot here consider the subject of royal prerogative, nor how the modern differs from the ancient theory concerning it. Whether modern legislation against perpetual holdings of land is to be deemed to prohibit by implication trusts for charity, because they imply perpetual ownership, has been the subject of extensive legal discussion and of discordant judicial decisions.

But according to the existing law of England we learn from Sergeant Stephen (op. cit., III, 174) that "there is now practically no restraint whatsoever on gifts of land by will for charitable purposes. Pure personal estate", he adds, "may, of course, be freely bequeathed for these purposes". All corporations, however, are yet precluded by English law from purchasing land "except by licence in mortmain from the Crown" (ibid., 26).

As to what dispositions of property which otherwise would be charitable are to be deemed legally superstitious, the modern law of England is less narrow and rigid than the law was formerly interpreted to be (ibid., 180).

The statutes of mortmain themselves were not extended to the colonies. And respecting the United States Chancellor Kent observes, "We have not in this country re-enacted the Statutes of Mortmain or generally assumed them to be in force; and the only legal check to the acquisition of lands by corporations consists in those special restrictions contained in the acts by which they are incorporated . . . . and in the force to be given to the exception of corporations out of the Statute of Wills" (Commentaries on American law, 14th ed., Boston, 1896, II, 282). The commentator states, by way of exception, that the statutes of mortmain are in force in the State of Pennsylvania. The supreme court of that State, in 1832, stated that these statutes had been extended to the State "only so far as they prohibit dedications of property to superstitious uses and grants to corporations without a statutory licence" (1 Watts Reports, 224). The court had in mind, but seemed reluctant to follow, the "Report of the Judges" made in 1808, and which is to be found in 3 Binney's Reports. The "Report" almost follows the statute of Henry VIII, in declaring all conveyances "void made either to an individual or to any number of persons associated, but not incorporated, if the said conveyances are for

uses or purposes of a superstitious nature, and not calculated to promote objects of charity or utility".

Notwithstanding this early declaration, no such doctrine as that of the English courts on the subject of superstitious uses or trusts can well have a place in the jurisprudence of the United States, where "all religious beliefs, doctrines and forms of worship are free" (Holland vs. Alcock, 108 New York Court of Appeals Reports, 329).

The people of the States make known their sovereign will by enactments of the State legislatures, to which bodies the prerogatives of sovereignty have been delegated. And, therefore, the validity of dispositions of land in favour of charity is controlled by the law of the State where the land is situated, and without any implied delegation of prerogative to any judicial officer. And the same remark applies to the general power of corporations to acquire and to hold land in the several States. (See PROPERTY, ECCLESIASTICAL.)

PICKERING, *The Statutes at Large* (Cambridge, 1800); STUBBS, *Select Charters and other illustrations of English Constitutional History* (5th ed., Oxford, 1884); BURGE, *Commentaries on Colonial and Foreign Laws generally* (London, 1838), II, 456, 458; *Vidal vs. Girard's Executors, 2 Howard, United States Supreme Court Reports*, V, 194, 195; *Fountain v. Ravenel, 17 do.*, V, 384, 385, 389; DILLON, *Bequests for Masses for the Souls of deceased persons* (Chicago, 1896); *Holmes vs. Mead, 52 New York Court of Appeals Reports*, 332; *Allen vs. Stevens, 161 do.*, 122; THOMPSON, *Commentaries on the law of Private Corporations* (Indianapolis, 1909), sections 2365–2400; HALSBURY, *The Laws of England* (London, 1909), s. v. *Corporations*.

CHARLES W. SLOANE.

Morton, JOHN, Cardinal, Archbishop of Canterbury, b. in Dorsetshire about 1420; d. at Knowle, Kent, 15 Sept., 1500. He was educated at Oxford (Balliol College) where he graduated D.C.L. Being ordained priest he practised in London as an ecclesiastical lawyer. The patronage of Cardinal Bourchier obtained for him much preferment and he became privy councillor, Chancellor of the Duchy of Cornwall, master in Chancery, subdean of Lincoln (1450), principal of Peckwater Inn, Oxford (1453), and prebendary of Salisbury and Lincoln (1458). During the Civil War he joined the Lancastrians, was attainted by the Yorkists and lost all his offices. During the reign of Edward IV his attainder was reversed on his submission, and he was made Master of the Rolls (16 March, 1472–3), Archdeacon of Winchester and Chester (1474), and was elected Bishop of Ely on 31 Jan., 1478–9. During the reign of Richard III he was imprisoned but escaped to Flanders, returning to England when Henry VII became king in 1485. He was much trusted by the king and was all-powerful in the government. He was elected Archbishop of Canterbury, 8 Oct., 1486, and in the following March became Lord Chancellor of England. In 1493 Alexander VI created him Cardinal of St. Anastasia. He was made Chancellor of Oxford in 1495. It is probable that he was the author of the "History of Richard III", usually ascribed to Blessed Thomas More, who as a boy was a page in his household and who subsequently translated it into English.

HOOK, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury* (London, 1860–84); WILLIAMS, *Lives of the English Cardinals* (London, 1877); ARCHBOLD in *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, with list of contemporary references.

EDWIN BURTON.

Morton, ROBERT, VENERABLE, English priest and martyr, b. at Bawtry, Yorks, about 1548; executed in Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, Wednesday, 28 August, 1588 (the catalogue probably compiled by Fr. John Gerard, S.J., and printed by Fr. Pollen, S.J., in "Cath. Rec. Soc. Publ.", V, 288–293, gives the date of the deaths of the Venerabiles Morton, Moor, Holford, Claxton, and Felton as 30 August, but this seems to be an error). He was the son of Robert Morton, and nephew of Dr. Nicholas Morton, was ordained deacon at Rome and priest at Reims in 1587, and condemned at Newgate 26 August merely for being a priest contrary to 27 Eliz., c. 2. At the same time and place suffered Hugh Moor, a layman, aged 25, of Grantham, Lincolnshire, and Gray's Inn, London, for having been reconciled to the Church by Fr. Thomas Stephenson, S.J. On the same day suffered (1) at Mile End, William Dean, a priest (q. v.); and Henry Webley, a layman, born in the city of Gloucester; (2) near the Theatre, William Gunter, a priest, born at Raglan, Monmouthshire, educated at Reims; (3) at Clerkenwell, Thomas Holford, a priest, born at Aston, in Acton, Cheshire, educated at Reims, who was hanged only; and (4) between Brentford and Hounslow, Middlesex, James Claxton or Clarkson, a priest, born in Yorkshire and educated at Reims; and Thomas Felton, born at Bermondsey Abbey in 1567, son of B. John Felton, tonsured 1583 and about to be professed a Minim, who had suffered terrible tortures in prison. According to one account there also suffered on the same day at Holywell, London, one Richard Williams, a Welsh priest of Queen Mary's reign. Another, however, puts his death in 1592 or 1593. Fr. Pollen thinks his name occurs in this year in mistake for that of John Harrison, *alias* Symonds, a letter carrier, who was it seems executed at Tyburn, 5 October, 1588.

POLLEN, *English Martyrs 1584–1603* in *Cath. Rec. Soc. Publ.*, V (privately printed, London, 1908); IDEM, *Acts of English Martyrs* (London, 1891); CHALLONER, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*, I (Manchester, 1802).

J. B. WAINEWRIGHT.

Mosaic Legislation, the body of juridical, moral, and ceremonial institutions, laws, and decisions comprised in the last four books of the Pentateuch, and ascribed by Christian and Hebrew tradition to Moses.

Name.—As early as the Davidic era, the name תורה, *tôrāh* was popularly used to designate this compilation, which, however, might not then have embraced all the enactments it now contains. After the captivity, the term became synonymous with the Pentateuch, and this usage has obtained ever since. Side by side with these meanings are others less comprehensive and more ancient. If, as is generally admitted, *yārāh* (to cast) be the root, there would be a peculiar historic interest attaching to the word, because of the implication that the first *tôrôth*, or decisions, of whatever kind, were arrived at chiefly, or at least in important cases, by the casting of lots. The deity would then be regarded as the author of them. More developed than these are the first available historic *tôrôth*, such as were pronounced in cases of private litigation at Raphidim (Ex., xviii, 13 sq.) by Moses, relying for his direction on the analogies of precedent or custom. On the lips of the priests and prophets *tôrāh* was sometimes referred to the moral and religious prescriptions of the Law alone, or again, to the ceremonial part of it, whether in theory or practice; in short, to any direction, written or oral, given in Jehovah's name by one enjoying an official capacity.

Quite naturally, when the period of formal codification set in, each new code was styled a *tôrāh*, and these separate *tôrôth* were the stepping-stones to, and afterwards the constituent parts of, the "Torah" or Corpus, which has always been identified with the name of Moses.—More restricted in their signification are the following Biblical terms: פקודים, *pīqqûdîm*, precepts; מצוה, *mīçwāh*, commandment; עדות, *'ed(w)ôth*, testimonies, i. e. expressions of God's will to man, chiefly in moral and religious matters; משפט, *mīshpāt*, a judgment, usually though not exclusively relating to civil or criminal law, and, eventually, implying an obligatory force arising from the nature of moral rectitude, which is enhanced, not obscured, by the notion of theocratic economy; and חק, חקה, *hōq*, *hūqqāh* (root, to engrave), statute, or thing engraved (e. g. on stone), thereby becoming fixed, so to speak, as an ordinance. From this varied terminology, however indiscriminate

the use made of it may have been as time went on, it seems right to conclude that its originators had more than a faint perception of the distinction between the different classes of law, and of their respective binding force. If, in given cases, equal penalties were meted out for delinquencies from the moral and ceremonial laws, it was because the nearness of the latter to the national God by reason of their universal character, seemed to give offences against them a peculiar heinousness, not found in other crimes. The legislators understood well that when monotheistic ceremonies declined, polytheistic institutions would supplant them, and then there would be no morality left to guard.

Origin.—The Torah, as a whole, was neither miraculously communicated from heaven, nor was it laboriously thought out and put together by Moses independently of external influences. It is sometimes hazardously asserted that it antedated Moses by a thousand years or more, since much that is in the Torah is found also in the Code of Hammurabi. Indeed, certain decrees in the Babylonian code are more excellent than their Mosaic parallels; in more important ones, however, the Torah takes precedence. It was the primitive condition of Hebrew society that dictated Israel's first laws, by leading to the establishment of family and tribal customs. Yet it would be wrong to maintain with too much assurance that the same or a similar collection of laws would have resulted spontaneously and independently from the same natural conditions in any other period or clime. There had been precedents of just such customs and practices as Israel adopted, among other races with which the founders of Israel's laws had come in contact, and it seems an irresistible conclusion that, since Israel borrowed its language from its neighbours and could be so easily won over to heathen rites as to defy the vigilance of judges, priests, and prophets, it could not but be influenced by the social and political life of the neighbouring peoples.

The possibilities then, are the following: the migration of Abraham from Chaldea would be responsible for the nucleus of Mosaic Legislation, which is peculiarly Semitic. The sojourn of the patriarchs among the Canaanites, coupled with their relations with the Pharaohs, would impart a foreign colouring, with a slight strengthening of the original stock during Jacob's retreat to Mesopotamia. The Egyptian oppression would certainly elicit some well-defined views regarding justice and right. The education of Moses by Pharaoh's daughter would prepare a master-mind for tribal unification, while his experiences among the Semitic Midianites would teach him the necessity of certain institutions peculiar to desert life, with a due respect for established usages, such as must be taken into account even to-day in dealing with the Sinaitic tribes. Any real influence from the Code of Hammurabi would have to operate, as it likely did, through one or other of these channels. The direct result of these antecedents would be a transmission of principles through the knowledge of concrete examples illustrating them, the primitive mind not being capable of grasping or forming bare abstractions. What these traditionary laws were, and how they were reduced to practice in domestic and political life, is set forth at large in the article on Biblical Antiquities.

No matter how much, or how little can be explained in this way, room must always be left for direct, external, and Divine intervention, that is for an historic revelation made by God of Himself to the chosen people, in such a way as to guarantee them a special Providence and direction in working out their high destiny. Since such direction could be secured to future generations only through the Law by which they would be governed, the Sinaitic manifestations must be explained as placing a Divine seal upon existing laws, which they did not abrogate, and upon any normal development of them in the future which would be calculated to carry out the designs of Jehovah more efficiently. Then, too, there must have been something settled and fixed on the spot, as a norm to which subsequent prophets might appeal in their judgments of future laws and contingencies. It would be strange if some such remote preparation had not been made for a stupendous event like the Incarnation. Hence it is that the more reflecting among Christian critics, whatever be their views as to the literary composition of the Pentateuch, are at one in asserting that the Pentateuchal laws, even those of a ceremonial character, are traceable back to Moses as their founder; hence, too, the peculiar psychological phenomenon all through Israel's history, that observance of the law or any of its parts was superior to (non-compulsory) sacrifice, because it was a homage of obedience paid directly to the nation's God.

Codification.—In its present form the Mosaic Legislation appears without logical order, and interspersed with historical reminiscences. It is largely casuistic, as might be expected from the manner of its early transmission. (1) The Decalogue, with its two versions (Ex., xx, 2–17; Deut., v, 6–21) is basic, setting forth, as it does, the sovereignty and spirituality of God, together with the sacredness of His and the neighbour's rights. (2) The "Book of the Covenant", so called in Ex., xxiv, 7, embraces Ex., xxi–xxiii, 19 (or xx, 20–xxiii, 33), and contains judicial, moral, and religious regulations for people living in primitive agricultural conditions. It is remarkable for its humanitarian character. (3) The Deuteronomic code amplifies the preceding and adapts it to new conditions. (4) The "Law of Holiness" as contained in Lev., xvii–xxvi has reference chiefly to holiness of a moral and ceremonial nature. It forms a small part of what is now critically styled the (5) "Priest's Code". This last group abounds in ceremonial enactments, and comprises nearly all Leviticus and Numbers, with a few chapters of Exodus. In the light of criticism there is no need of abandoning the traditional belief that Moses compiled, under the influence of inspiration, any or all of these codes as they stood originally, or in that stage of development they had attained in his time. The literary peculiarities of the Pentateuch merely entitle us to assert that these various divisions were by later writers revised, enlarged, and brought up to date, while the changes in Israel's life, from a nomadic to a sedentary state, from a dispersed to a king-ruled nation, explain full well the appearance, as time went on, of a limited amount of new legislation quite consonant with the soul and spirit of the old. Common Law, as it were, grew and developed, but the statutory enactments remained inviolable.

Contents.—Abstracting from the distinction of codes, the Torah exhibits a dogmatic system that is rigorously monotheistic. A moral standard issues from this, having as its peculiar feature the identification of civil, social, and religious observance, with service performed directly and immediately for Jahweh, and at His bidding. A ceremonial characterized by its picturesqueness and wealth of detail follows, the evident purpose of which was to keep the people constantly in mind of the Covenant into which they or their ancestors had entered, and to assure them of God's fidelity to His promises, if only they would do their part. The civil and criminal enactments are sufficiently well explained elsewhere. The article on Biblical Antiquities dispenses us from treating in detail any of these topics save the ceremonial. Even that is largely dealt with in the paragraph on *Sacred Antiquities* (loc. cit.) and the articles Atonement, Dedication, Jubilee, Pasch, Pentecost, Purim, Sabbath, Tabernacles, Trumpets.

The Tabernacle was the centre of public worship. This was a portable tent measuring fifty-two by seventeen feet, and divided by a veil into two unequal parts, the Holy Place and the smaller Holy of Holies. The latter contained only the Ark of the Covenant, and might be entered by no one but Moses and the high priests. Any priest might enter the Holy Place. This was furnished with a table for the Loaves of Proposition, a seven-branched golden candlestick, and the Altar of Incense. Outside, in the surrounding court, were the Altar of Holocausts and the brazen laver for priestly ablutions. The tribe of Levi furnished the ministers, the descendants of Aaron being priests, and the remaining majority, Levites properly so-called. The priests were consecrated, wore special vestments, offered sacrifice, attended to the Holy Place, and acted as judges and teachers. For the peculiar distinction of highpriesthood, see the article AARON (section II). The Levites were the priests' assistants. They carried the Tabernacle whenever it was moved. Bloody and unbloody sacrifices were prescribed. The former class embraced the Holocaust, in which the entire victim was consumed on the altar by fire and the Expiatory and Pacific sacrifices, when only the fat was burned on the altar. The rest was either burned elsewhere or given to the priest as in the first instance, but divided between priest and offerer as in the second, and followed by a sacrificial meal. The Unbloody sacrifices included first-fruits, tithes, meat and drink offerings, and incense. Both oblations and sacrifices were seasoned with salt.

The most striking feature of the ceremonial legislation is the distinction between legal cleanness and uncleanness, with its concomitant provision for numerous external purifications. The faithful Hebrew had always to abstain from blood. He might not use for food any quadruped that did not divide the hoof and chew the cud, nor any fish that did not have both fins and scales, nor birds of prey, nor water fowl, nor reptiles, nor insects, the locust excepted. To do so would make him unclean. The use of marriage, childbirth, and leprosy also induced uncleanness. It is true that this legislation is largely hygienic, but the Hebrews did not commonly conceive it in that light. As diseases were regarded as direct from Jahweh, precautions against them were designed primarily to avert them by appeasing the sender. Those, therefore, who failed to take such precautions, either necessarily or otherwise, were displeasing to Jahweh, and legal defilement was the result. How effectually the *Torah* prepared the Hebrews for the acceptance of the New Law is attested by the work of Christ, who came not to destroy but to perfect it. It was only those who, while sitting in the chair of Moses, preferred for their personal guidance the traditions of men, who proved inimical to our Saviour's work.

GIGOT, *Outlines of Jewish History* (New York, 1897); HOTTINGER, *Goodwini Moses et Aaron, seu Civiles et Ecclesiastici Ritus* (Frankfort, 1716); EWALD, *Antiquities of Israel*, tr. SOLLY (London, 1876); SAYCE, *Early History of the Hebrews* (New York, 1897). Invaluable for thoroughness and concentrated form are tables XXIX–XXXIX and XLII–LVI in *Concordantiarum U. S. S. Thesaurus, Auctoribus P. P., S. J.* (Paris, 1897), sect. I.

THOS. Á K. REILLY.



FIG. 2—COLUMNS DECORATED WITH GLASS MOSAIC
From Pompeii, now in National Museum, Naples

Mosaics, as a term, according to the usual authorities is derived through generations of gradual change from the Greek *μουσεῖον*, "appertaining to the Muses." In the later Latin there are the terms *opus musivum*, "mosaic work," *musivarius*, "mosaic worker"; but probably the English word "mosaic" is derived immediately from the French *mosaique*, which with its earlier form *mousaique* can only be borrowed from the Italian or Provençal, and cannot be the descendant of the earlier French form *musike*. It is, however, questionable if these terms were applied to all the different species of work which may now be classed as "mosaic", and it is probable that they were only properly applied to the products of the worker in *opus tessellatum* or *vermiculatum*, formed of small cubes of glass, marble or other material. If we define mosaic as a collocation of pieces of marble, glass, ceramic material, or precious stone embedded in some species of cement so as to form an ornamental entity, we should have to include the *opus Alexandrinum*, and other ordinary pavings such as were used for the less dignified portions of Roman houses. The term mosaic would also be made to apply to the *opus sectile* (Vitruvius, VII, i) made of pieces of marble and glass forming geometrical or foliated patterns, each piece being ground exactly to fit into the design, or in the case of pictures, ground to make the shapes necessary for the completion of the subject. We also apply the term to the pavement work of later date, like that in St. Mary Major's in Rome, and that in Canterbury Cathedral and in the sanctuary of Westminster Abbey in England, as well as to mosaics of a miniature species used for jewellery and small pictures—such as the Head of Our Lord which was presented by Pope Sixtus IV to Philip de Croy in 1475 and is now in the Treasury of Sts. Peter and Paul's, Chimay. This latter tradition of work still exists, and every visitor to Rome or southern Italy is acquainted with the cheap but wonderfully executed mosaic jewellery which is sold in most of the shops, and even in the streets of Rome. There is little doubt but that mosaic in jewellery is of considerable antiquity.

History.—In passing these various species in historical review, the earliest to be mentioned is that in Exodus, a pavement (xxiv, 10), "a work of sapphire stones", and the pavement of Ahasuerus at Susa "paved with porphyry and white marble, and embellished with painting of wonderful variety", which here, probably, means varied inlaid colour, since surface painting would be out of place on a pavement. And we may well believe that the Persians knew of tessellated work when we consider the enamelled bricks, which may be called a large kind

Typogravure Goupil of Paris (France).

FIG. 1—BATTLE OF ISSUS (333 B.C.)

FROM THE CASA DEL FAUNO, POMPEII, NOW IN THE NATIONAL MUSEUM, NAPLES

of "tessellatum," now in the Louvre from this same palace at Susa. This is the only record earlier than the existing examples in the Roman pavements of the Republic and Empire such as remain in the Regia, the Temple of Castor, the House of Livia, Pompeii, etc. Suetonius says that Cæsar was accustomed to carry in his campaign both tessellated and sectile pavements. It appears according to Pliny (XXXVI, i) that in the theatres and basilicas, as well as in certain palaces of noble Romans, the pavements were in tessellated work or in marble sectile, and the walls decorated with marble or glass subjects and patterns. Here is the passage from Holland's quaint translation: "Scaurus when he was Edile, caused a wonderfull piece of worke to be made, and exceeding all that had ever been knoune wrought by man's hand . . . and a theatre it was: the stage had three lofts one above another . . . the base or nethermost part of the stage was all of marble, the middle of glass, an excessive superfluitie never heard of before or after." Signor Luigi Visconti informed Herr von Minutoli (Ueber die Anfertigung und die neu-Anwendung der färbigen Gläser bei den Alten", p. 13, Berlin, 1836) that the walls of a chamber in a palace between the gate of St. Sebastian and that of St. Paul at Rome were found covered up to five or six feet from the pavement with beautiful marbles and above that with coloured glass plaques and patterns. Some existing examples appear to have been of curious structure, the pieces of coloured glass were laid upon a flat surface and a sheet of glass laid over these and melted to a sufficient heat to join them together.

Concerning the method called "tessellatum" we have existing remains to prove the perfection to which the art was carried by the Romans in the pavements, and in remains of wall glass mosaic at Pompeii. One of the finest examples of pavements is the representation of the "Battle of Issus" from the Casa del Fauno at Pompeii [Fig. 1], now in the Naples Museum. Many of the pictures and mosaics in

Fig. 3—Specimen of Roman pavement
Found at Silchester, England

Pompeii are supposed to be traditional copies of celebrated antique paintings; and it is suggested that this "Battle" is a traditional copy of a celebrated picture by Helen, a daughter of Timon, of the Egyptian Hellenic school. From Pompeii came further the very beautiful columns in glass mosaic now in the Naples Museum [Fig. 2]. Pompeii, as we know, was destroyed on 24 August, A. D. 79, so that these works precede the Christian Era. Their perfection argues a development of considerable antiquity, the genesis of which is at present unknown. Of the subsidiary work in mosaic of Roman pavements, mention has already been made—it consists of patterns in black and white, plain floors with orna-

Fig. 4—Specimen of Carthaginian pavement
Now in the British Museum, London

mental borders; groups of still life, festoons of flowers, and other designs. These exist in sufficient quantity to show how general was their use. That mosaic pavements continued in use during the Christian era is proved by the numerous examples that have been discovered, apparently of Roman origin, at places as distant from one another as Carthage, Dalmatia, Germany, France, and England. In England a great variety have been found in London and in all parts of the country dominated by the Romans; an example from Silchester is given in Figure 3. The British Museum contains many mosaic fragments; amongst these is the fine specimen of work from Carthage [Fig. 4]. Some of the earlier Carthaginian pavements have glass tesseræ; the later ones are of marble or ceramic cubes.

Entirely different in method from the work formed of cubes was the *opus sectile*, where, as already described, the ornament or picture was formed of pieces of marble, stone, or glass of different colours cut to a required shape, in the same way that a painted glass window is now made. The manufacture of the necessary opaque glass was carried to a very great perfection by the Romans, as is testified by the multitude of fragments that have been found in mounds of rubbish or in the Tiber. *Opus sectile* as a wall decoration seems to have been very subject to decay, the pieces of glass becoming detached by their own weight, on the wall becoming damp, decayed, or shaken. There are some very fine specimens in the Naples Museum; others have been found in the church of St. Andrea in Catabarbara, Rome, which is supposed to have been originally the basilica of the house of the Bassi on the Esquiline, dating from about A. D. 317. From this house comes the spirited work [Fig. 5] of the "Tiger and Heifer," now preserved in the church of St. Antonio Abbate. The background and stripes of the tiger are in green porphyry, the rest of the tiger's skin of *giallo antico*; the heifer is pale fawn marble, and its eyes of mother-of-pearl. Other decorations of the same house showed that the walls had *opus sectile* in glass ornament and figures, much in the manner described in the quota-

tion from Pliny, already given. Sectile work in glass is found in some examples of Christian art, but marble is more common, although the tessellated work in the same buildings may be of glass. This use of marble probably arose from the decay in the manufacture of the special glass and the difficulty of cutting and

Fig. 5—Mosaic of "The Tiger and Heifer" (a. d. 317)
Preserved in S. Antonio Abbate, Rome

grinding it exactly to the forms. Sectile in marbles is found in Santa Sabina, Rome (425–450); in the baptistery of the cathedral, Ravenna; in San Vitale, Ravenna (sixth century); at Parenzo (sixth century); in Sancta Sophia at Constantinople and at Thessalonica, (sixth century); its use thus has been continuous ever since, and was an especial feature of the Renaissance.

The portion of this theme of the greatest importance in the present article is that concerned with the glass mosaic of Christian churches. The initial steps by which it gradually emerged from Pagan art are in a measure lost, for it rises suddenly like a phœnix from the ashes, complete, entire in its manipulation, whilst the character of the subjects and designs represented bespeak the traditions adopted by the artists of the catacombs. Mosaic, as far as one can at present ascertain, became a vehicle of Christian art in the fourth century. The earliest examples, such as those of the first basilica of St. Peter and St. Paul, are all destroyed. In the church of St. Costanza on the Via Nomentana there still remains interesting work. We have also preserved in the Chigi Library some mosaic from the catacomb of Cyriacus. A mosaic of St. Agnes in the catacomb of St. Callistus was, however, so decayed, that the existing picture was painted over it in the sixth century. Other mosaics have been found on sarcophagi in the catacombs. The most interesting early work is, however, that now existing in the apse of the church of St. Pudentiana (398) [Fig. 7]. It has been much restored in parts and was added to in 1588, but the design remains. Of the same period is the mosaic in the baptistery at Naples. It is uncertain whether the apse of St. Rufinus's is of the fourth or fifth century, but it is interesting as early work.

A great impetus to the art occurred when Constantine, in establishing himself on the throne of Byzantium, commenced to give his capital an imperial appearance as far as art was concerned. He gathered together artists from all celebrated centres, and gave to them special legal and civil or civic favours. Of the works carried out by them, the mosaics of the church of St. George at Thessalonica in many cases yet occupy their original position. The nave of St. Mary Major's in Rome still retains some of the fine mosaics placed there in the fifth century (430–440) and the churches of St. Sabina (422–433), of St. Paul without the walls, and of St. John Lateran were also so decorated in the same era (446–462). St. Paul's, destroyed by fire in 1823, has since been restored and little of the original remains. What remains of the original mosaics of St. John Lateran's dates from 432–440. The mosaics of the church of Saints Cosmas and Damian (526–530) were restored in 1660. At Ravenna the mosaic work in the various churches is the finest of its period. That in the baptistery of the cathedral dedicated to St. John the Baptist [Fig. 6] is an especially good example, the church being originally built at the end of the fourth century but burnt in 434. The mosaics of the Mausoleum of Galla Placidia (450) are also of excellent design and workmanship. Unfortunately some of these have been restored with painted stucco. Those in the chapel of the archiepiscopal palace and of the church of St. John the Evangelist are too of this period. The mosaics of the cathedrals of Novara and Aosta and the chapel of St. Satira in St. Ambrose's, Milan, are also of the fifth century. In France at Nantes, Clermont, and Toulouse historians record the placing of mosaics which no longer remain.

The greatest works of the sixth century, and perhaps the greatest of all mosaic works in extent, were those carried out under the Emperor Justinian in Sancta Sophia, Constantinople. In 533, a fire destroyed what then existed, but in a quarter of a century the restoration was commenced under Anthemios and Isidore, who, it is recorded, employed ten thousand builders, craftsmen, and artists. The colour is subdued, and the design and execution good of its period. Justinian also caused the church of Sancta Sophia at Thessalonica to be built, and decorated with mosaic. Further great works were executed at Ravenna at the same period. After the conquest by Belisarius in 539, it became the residence of the exarchs in 552, and S. Apollinare Nuovo [Fig. 8], S. Maria in Cosmedin (553–566), S. Vitale (524–534) [Fig. 9], and S. Apollinare-in-Classe (534–549) were built and filled with mosaics. It will be observed that these churches were commenced under the Ostrogoths and finished under Justinian, who probably had the mosaics executed by local artists.



Fig. 6—Fourth-century Mosaic
From Baptistery of Cathedral, Ravenna, Italy

The names of Euserius, Paulus, Statius, Stephano, etc. are recorded. Greeks may have worked with them. The design of the work in St. Apollinare Nuovo is new to western art and consists of two processions of figures, all very similar, which extend along the whole of the nave over the arches. It is curious that in the mosaics of the Adoration of the Magi, the Magi wear the same Persian costume we find

worn by Persians in the Pompeiian mosaic of the "Battle of Issus" [Fig. 1] which is not unlike that in the painting of the three children in the furnace, in the catacomb of St. Priscilla, and that in the mosaic of the prophet Daniel at Daphne. The mosaic from S. Michele-in-affrisco at Ravenna was taken to Berlin in 1847 and Pope Adrian I permitted Charlemagne to take what he chose of marble and mosaic for his cathedral at Aachen. In Rome the church of Saints Cosmas and Damian (526–530) has mosaics of an entirely different character from those at Ravenna and of a ruder type. In Rome also the basilica of St. Lawrence was decorated with mosaic (577–590). These have been restored. In Paris the church of the Apostles which occupied the site where the Panthéon now is was decorated with mosaic about this period.



Fig. 7—Fourth-century Mosaic
From apse of St. Pudentiana's, Rome

Notwithstanding the deplorable condition of Rome in the seventh century, the arts were still kept alive and Pope Honorius decorated the tribune of the apse of St. Agnes's with a beautifully designed mosaic which still remains. The composition represents in the centre St. Agnes, above her the Divine Hand blessing, and the popes Honorius and Symmachus on each side. The work appears to be Greek. In the chapel of St. Venantius at St. John Lateran's, and at St. Stephen's on the Cœlian Hill some mosaics were placed by John IV; other works were done at St. Peter's and at St. Costanza's on the Via Nomentana. Mosaics were also executed for Autun and Auxerre in France. Animmense and very fine pavement of this period was found by M. Renan in ancient Tyre, but it is not Christian art. Of the eighth century very little mosaic remains. Considerable work was done in the old basilica of St. Peter, of which only a fragment, which came from one of the chapels, exists. It is in S. Maria in Cosmedin, and represents part of the "Adoration of the Wise Men" and strikingly resembles the design of same subject in enamel on the "Chasse de Huy". The mosaic was commissioned by John VII in 705–8. In the apse of St. Theodore's, restored in the last quarter of the eighth century, there is a "majesty": Christ is seated on an orb, with Sts. Peter, Paul, and Theodore. The triclinium of the Lateran Palace was ornamented with a mosaic of Christ appearing to the Apostles. On the sides were the groups of Christ and St. Sylvester, Constantine, Copronicus, and St. Peter with Leo III and Charlemagne—all these mosaics, never of high class, were injured by removal and restoration in the eighteenth century. The cathedral of Aachen executed from the orders of Charlemagne at this period was injured by fire in 1650, and utterly destroyed soon afterwards. Certain mosaics are known to have existed in Picardy, and were eventually destroyed by fire in the twelfth century. Some good fragments of interesting mosaic of the early ninth century remain at Germingy-des-Prés, Loiret, France.

In the ninth century, although the decadence in mosaic work was complete, there was, however, an attempt at a slight revival. In Rome mosaics were placed in the churches of Sts. Nereus and Achilles (795–816), S. Maria (817–824), S. Prassede, S. Cecilia, St. Mark, Sts. Sylvester and Martin (844–847), and portions of St. Peter's and of S. Maria in Trastevere (885–888). Mosaic was placed in S. Margaretta in Venice (837), in St. Ambrose's, Milan, and in Sancta Sophia at Constantinople, and some subjects were inserted in the cathedrals of Capua and Padua. Probably the most interesting of the period are those in S. Prassede, where that in the apse appears to be an adaptation of an older design in Saints Cosmas and Damian's. In the tenth and eleventh centuries some mosaics were placed in St. Mark's, Venice, one subject representing Christ, with the Blessed Virgin and St. John on each side, and in 1071–1084 the Doge Domenico Selvo had other mosaics executed, notably in the grand dome, and portions of the pavement. It is likely that the *smalti* were made by the Greeks, who were also probably the designers and executants.

Fig. 8—Sixth-century Mosaic
From S. Apollinare Nuovo, Ravenna, Italy

A comparison of the western works of this period with those in the east is very unfavourable to the former. The art had been degenerating in the West, and in certain instances, such as that of Sancta Maria Antiqua, painting on the wall had taken its place. Evidence of this decay, both in design and practice is shown in the fact that when Abbot Desiderius, formerly legate at Constantinople and who became pope as Victor III, wished to decorate the monastery of

Monte Cassino with mosaics, he brought artists and workmen from Constantinople in 1066 for that purpose. These mosaics are lost or decayed, but it is not unlikely that the artists so engaged, designed and worked on the wall paintings of Sant' Angelo-*in-formis*, a subsidiary church of the monastery near

Fig. 9—Sixth-century Mosaic
From roof of San Vitale, Ravenna, Italy

Capua. These most interesting paintings are still in a fair state of preservation. It is probable that this action of Desiderius had a far-reaching influence in importing fresh energy, especially when he came to occupy the papal chair. The schools of Paulus Laurentius and Rainerius were founded, which were ultimately influenced by the Cosmos, and all the work of this character was at one time erroneously called *cosmati* work. The generation of these schools is of considerable interest in the history of mosaic, and is given by Mr. A. L. Frothingham, in the "American Journal of Archæology", I, 182. The main features of the decorative mosaic of the Roman School were derived from southern Italy, indirectly from Byzantium, in the eleventh century. The mosaics of the twelfth century are remarkable both for their number and the development of design in Christian art. A new period was inaugurated in Rome under Innocent II. In Italy, in Greece, in Arabia, as well as in Germany and France, important examples are preserved. In Rome, S. Maria in Trastevere (where the design and execution of the mosaic in the apse is extremely grand), S. Crisogono, S. Maria, and S. Francesca Romana were also so decorated.

The Roman artists exerted great influence in Umbria, and the Abruzzi, including the Marches. These men were at times both architects, mural painters, and mosaic workers. From the Roman centre their work went west to considerable distances. Other great works in Italy of this period are in the cathedral of Torcello, in the chapel of St. Zeno, and in the apse of St. Mark's at Venice, 1159; in the Palatine chapel, in S. Maria Martorana or S. Maria dell' Ammiraglio in Palermo, in other Sicilian churches both of Monreale and of Cefalù [Fig. 10] (1140)—in the Palatine chapel Arab workmen assisting the Greeks both in the design and execution. The Mohammedans themselves, notwithstanding the order of the prophet, had occasionally figure design in the mosaic of their mosques; that of Abd-el-Melik at Jerusalem has figures of prophets in the porch, and on the walls inside an *Inferno* and a Mohammedan *Paradiso*. The mosaic ornamentation in the mosques of Seville, Cordova, and Granada are well known to travellers. In Greece there still remain most interesting mosaics of the churches of Daphne, and of St. Luke of Stiris in Phocis [Fig. 11]. In Syria, there remain the celebrated series of mosaics in the church of the Nativity, Bethlehem; those in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and the Mosque of Omar. The mosaics of this period in the churches of Mount Athos are all lost excepting a few figures at Vatopedi. In France, Abbot Suger had mosaics executed for the church of Saint Denis, and there are records of such work at Lyons and Troyes.

The great period of Christian mosaic was probably in the thirteenth century. Rome, Florence, Pisa, Venice, Parenzo, and Spoleto still possess great works of this era, and the names of Cimabue, Giotto, P. Cavallini, Gaddo Gaddi, Jacobus Torriti, Tafi, Apollonio, and others are connected with the craft. Torriti did important work in St. Mary Major's and St. John Lateran's; Pietro Cavallini designed the subjects under the apse of S. Maria in Trastevere; important mosaics were done in St. Peter's, St. Clement's, and other churches. In 1298 the great Giotto was called to Rome to design the "navicella" for the Porch of S. Peter's; that now *in situ* is a restoration. In Florence the mosaics of the baptistery commenced in 1225 by Jacobus, a Franciscan, were continued at the end of the century by Andrea Tafi, Gaddo Gaddi, Apollonio, and afterwards by Agnolo Gaddi. Gaddo Gaddi also did the beautiful "Madonna" at Santa Maria del Fiore, and the "majesty" at San Miniato is also attributed to him, but it is so much restored that it is difficult to pass judgment upon it. At the end of the century (1298–1301) there was executed the celebrated "majesty" in the apse of the cathedral at Pisa. This has generally been attributed to Cimabue and the side figures to Vicino. To this opinion Venturi adheres with strong evidence (Storia dell' Arte Italiana, V, 239–240). Gerspach, however, will not have Cimabue amongst the mosaicists (La Mosaique, 127). At Cività Cas-



Fig. 10—Twelfth-century Mosaic
From apse of Cathedral of Cefalù, Sicily

tellana there is considerable work by the Cosmati, who possessed a school of architects, artists, and mosaicists. They not only did mosaic pictures or subjects, but enriched the altars, pulpits, columns, pavements, and other portions of the architecture with geometrical mosaic patterns.

The earliest Christian mosaics in England are of this century, when the beautiful pavement placed be-

fore the shrine of St. Thomas in Canterbury cathedral, and that of the sanctuary of Westminster Abbey was laid, and the shrine of St. Edward the Confessor, with its inlaid mosaic, was executed. Concerning this last, Robert de Ware was sent by the king to Rome in 1267 to procure workmen for the ornamentation of Westminster Abbey and to erect a new monument to St. Edward the Confessor, that made in 1241 not being good enough. The abbot brought back with him one "Petrus", who laid the mosaic pavement before the high altar and executed the tomb for the golden shrine of St. Edward. That this Petrus was an eminent person is without doubt. There are

Fig. 11—Specimen of Greek mosaic-work
From St. Luke's monastery, Stiris, Phocis

recorded many artists of this name, but he who, in the opinion of Mr. Frothingham (American Journal of Archæology, 1889, 186), did the work in St. Edward's Chapel was Petrus Orderisi, son of Andreas. Horace Walpole (History of Painting in England, I, 17) considers that the artist so called was Pietro Cavallini; both these artists may be termed *Cosmateschi*. A portion of the inscription reads: HOC OPUS EST FACTUM QUOD PETRUS DUXIT IN ACTUM ROMANUS CIVIS.

The work of the fourteenth century in Rome and in Italy generally was a continuation of that of the thirteenth, the design towards the end of the era becoming influenced by the rising art of the more western styles. In St. Mary Major's the "Coronation of The Blessed Virgin" was commenced at the conclusion of the thirteenth and completed early in the fourteenth century; it is signed by the celebrated artist and mosaicist, Jacobus Torriti. Gaddo Gaddi designed the smaller subjects underneath, soon afterwards. The same artist is said to have completed the work in St. Peter's left by Torriti. He was then called to Arezzo to do the vault of the cathedral, which fell away before the end of the century. Torriti also did the apse of St. John Lateran's; Filippo Rusuti designed the "majesty", and Gaddo Gaddi the lower subject of the façade of St. Mary Major's, Rome. A mosaic by Munio de Zamaro, a Dominican who died in 1300, is on the floor of St. Sabina's. At the beginning of the century the work in St. Mark's, Venice, was continued. A mosaicist, Solferino, did the dome at Spoleto; and the apse at Parenzo was filled with moasic. Perhaps the most important developments of the art are shown in the subjects decorating the lower part of the apse of S. Maria in Trastevere [Fig. 12]; in 1291 these subjects were commenced by Pietro Cavallini, who is said by Vasari to have been a pupil of Giotto, although this is questioned by modern critics on fairly substantial evidence. He was the most celebrated Roman artist of his time and his designs, while adhering more to the Byzantine than those of Giotto did, show a tendency to what may be called Gothic development. His accessories show his cosmatesque affinity; this is very noticeable in the throne of the Blessed Virgin in S. Crisogono.

Mosaic work of the period remains at Salerno, Naples and Ravello; at Feranio there are mosaics by Deodato Cosmos (1332); at Orvieto by two religious, Ceco Vanni and Francesco; at Pisa (in 1321) by Vicino, who finished that commenced by Cimabue from the designs of Gaddo Gaddi. Andrea di Mino and Michele worked in the cathedral of Sienna, and Deodato Cosmos worked at Teramo. Charles IV called Italian mosaicists to Prague; they also worked at Marienweide and Marienburg, but the art did not apparently thrive in Germany. Mosaic was, however, being rapidly superseded by fresco, which as a primary art giving the sentiment and character of the artists immediately, was of course much more esteemed by persons of discrimination than a mere copy in tesseræ, or slabs of opaque glass. Hence in the fifteenth century the cessation of mosaic work in Italy generally was very notable, except in the case of churches in which it had been commenced. Some little was done in St. Peter's, and the work in St. Mark's, Venice, was continued in 1430, when in the chapel of the Mascoli the "Life of the Blessed Virgin" was designed and executed by Grambono. Mosaicists named Petrus, Lazarus, Sylvester, and Antonius also worked there. In Florence, Alessandro Baldovinetti (1425–1450) did a mosaic for St. John's and restored that in San Miniato; he studied the making of *smalti*, etc. from a German and wrote a work on the technique of the art. He was the master of Domenico Ghirlandajo, who not only did the mosaic of the "Assumption" over a porch of the cathedral and those unfinished in the chapel of St. Zenobius, but also designed some of the painted windows in S. Maria Nuova, and whose brother David also followed the same vocation and in 1497 worked at Orvieto and Siena. A specimen of David's work is in the Musée de Cluny. Ridolfo Ghirlandajo, son of Domenico and a friend of Raphael, has certain later mosaics attributed to him.

In the sixteenth century the work of St. Mark's was still carried on and a great many artists of reputation were engaged on the designs. The mosaics executed in this cathedral, commencing in 1530, are far too numerous to recapitulate here, and are perhaps less fitted to the building than any hitherto placed; in fact, that greatest of painters, Titian, when rendered in mosaic, becomes coarse, heavy, and, on occasions, grotesque. Other works were designed by Tintoretto, Salviati, and the best Venetian artists of the day, and rendered in mosaic by Zuccati, Rizo, Mariano, and

others. Unfortunately many of the earlier mosaics were destroyed by the senate, it is said, on the advice of Titian, to make room for the new work. The condition of many of them was bad. Amongst his many other works, Raphael designed for mosaic. The "Creation of the World" in the Chigi Chapel, Santa Maria del Popolo, Rome, from his design, is very fine. It was done in mosaic by Luigi di Pace, who came from Venice for the purpose. Baldassare Peruzzi also designed mosaic for Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, and F. Zucchio executed a mosaic in Santa Maria Scala-Cæli, whilst the work in St. Peter's was commenced under Muziano da Brescia. That the mosaic art had degenerated altogether and lost its vitality is evi-

FIG. 12—MOSAIC OF "ANNUNCIATION" (1291) BY PIETRO CAVALLINI
From apse of S. Maria in Trastevere, Rome

denced by the work done in St. Peter's, Rome, from the seventeenth century under this same Muziano da Brescia (1528–1592) and other artists.

The establishment of the pontifical works commenced in 1727 when the Cristoferi were appointed superintendents by order of Benedict XIII. After occupying various localities these mosaic works were finally settled in a *cortile* of the Vatican in 1825. In the first half of the seventeenth century the paintings and frescoes of the basilica began to be imitated in mosaic. The quality of the work errs on the side of excessive smoothness, as much as some modern work errs on that of excessive and affected roughness. Other works of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries and great restorations kept the art alive, notably those of St. John Lateran's and St. Mark's, Venice, by the Italian mosaicists. The "Last Judgment" on the façade of St. Mark's was designed by Latanzio Querano in 1836. In 1839 a school of mosaicists arose in Russia, its primary object being the restoration of the mosaics of Sancta Sophia in Kieff, and eventually Pius IX allowed certain of the pontifical mosaicists in 1850 to go to St. Petersburg and join the Russian mosaicists. An example of their work was shown in the international exhibition held in Hyde Park, London. The mosaics of the Russian church, London, are not, however, very successful.

Numerous mosaics have been executed in England during the last half century, notably the figures of great painters in the Museum of South-Kensington. The earliest of these were done by Venetians, but some of the more recent figures were executed at the works of South-Kensington itself. Many mosaics were done in St. Paul's cathedral, London; those in the choir were designed by Sir W. B. Richmond, and under the dome some strong figures were designed by Mr. Watts, R.A. The mausoleum at Frogmore is also elaborately decorated with mosaic, as is the monument of Prince Albert in Hyde Park, both designed by John Clayton, who is also responsible for the Brampton chapel in Westminster cathedral. Mr. W. C. Symons designed the mosaics for the chapel of the Holy Souls of Westminster cathedral in which mosaic work is still being inserted in the various chapels. The writer of the present article designed a mosaic of the "Last Judgment" for the church of the Annunciation, Chiselhurst; a figure of Blessed Giacomo di Ulma for South-Kensington, and an "Epiphany" for the frontal of an altar at the Assumption Church, Warwick Street, with other works elsewhere.

In Aachen the mosaic of the dome of Charlemagne was restored, or rather redone, in 1869. In France, various mosaics of fair excellence have been executed, but unfortunately the grand style of the early centuries, so exceptionally suitable to the art, has not been attempted. The modern French mosaic appears to have been initiated by Signor Bellini, one of the Vatican mosaicists, at the close of the eighteenth century, who became the principal of the "manufacture royale"—one of its productions is in the Salle de Melpomène in the Louvre; the design was by Baron Gérard and M. Baudry Garnier, and the mosaic by Curzon Facchino. The mosaics at the Opéra are of Italian execution. In 1876 a national school of mosaic was formed, when M. Gerspach was sent to Rome and obtained, with the consent of the pope, the services of Signor Poggesi of the Vatican works. The execution of the apse of the Panthéon from designs of M. Herbert was the principal work that followed, but the design is moderate, although considered good in its time. This national school soon became extinct, and the mosaics since done have been by private enterprise. Amongst these is that in the apse of the Madeleine and that over the grand staircase of the Louvre. M. Ravoli has designed some mosaics for the new cathedral of Marseilles.

Technique.—The making of a mosaic picture has differed in various periods and under various manufacturers, and the cements into which the tesseræ were fixed have been the subject of discussion and, in some medieval examples, of secrecy. Historically no cement has effected a permanent mosaic, as nearly every ancient example not destroyed is partially restored. The following interesting account is from the personal examination by Messrs. Schultz and Barnsley of the old work at St. Luke's of Stiris:

"The method of fixing the mosaic was as follows:—Over the structural brickwork of the surfaces to be covered, a coat of plaster was spread; this, like the first coat of plaster in ordinary wall coverings, was roughened on the face in order to make a second coat of finer stuff adhere. On the surface of this second coat, which was evidently of a very slow-setting nature, the main lines of the mosaic figure or composition were sketched on in tone with a brush, and the mosaic cubes were then pressed into this from the face, forcing up the stuff between the cubes in order to act as a key. We are inclined to think that, at any rate in the case of the single figures, the first cubes put in position were the double or treble row of gold tesseræ which enclosed the subject; we have found in many cases that these do not correspond with the lines of the figures as executed, odd spaces between the lines and the final outline of the figure having been filled up with further gold cubes after the mosaics of figure had been finished in position. The backgrounds are universally formed of gold tesseræ, while the figures of subjects are composed of cubes of many colours and gradations of tone. The principal coloured cubes are cut out of sheets of opaque coloured glass, while the lighter ones, such as the flesh tints, etc., are of marble. The gold mosaics are formed in the usual manner; a piece of gold leaf,

MOSAIC MAP OF CHRISTIAN PALESTINE AND EGYPT

FORMING THE GREATER PORTION OF THE FLOOR OF A FIFTH- OR SIXTH-CENTURY CHURCH AT MEDABA (MEDEBA)—DISCOVERED IN 1896

having been laid on glass, a thin transparent film was then spread over the same, and the whole afterwards annealed to a solid mass. The cubes do not vary greatly in size, the average being about three-eighths of an inch. They are, however, slightly larger in the main outlines of the draperies, etc., and smaller in the delicate gradations of the face and hands. The main portion of the gold background is laid fairly regularly in horizontal lines up to the rows enclosing the subjects" (Schultz and Barnsley, "The Monastery of St. Luke in Stiris", 43).

ANTONIADES, *S. Sophia, Constantinople* (Athens, 1907); BONI, *Il Duomo di Parenzo* (Rome, 1894); BROCKHAUS, *Die Kunst in den Athos Klostern* (Leipzig, 1891); BRONSELLE, *Les Mosaïques de S. Apollinaire Neuf* (Paris, 1903); BULINGERUS, *De Pictura plastica et statuaria* (2 vols., Lyons, 1627); CARON, *Bulletin Monumentale* (———, 1886); CIAMPINI, *Vetera Monumenta Romæ*, I (Rome, 1747); CROWE AND CAVALCASELLE, *History of Painting . . . in Italy* (2 vols., London, 1910); D'AGINCOURT, *History of Art by its Monuments*, II and III (London, 1847); DE MARZO, *Delle Bell' Arti in Sicilia; Delhi, The Glass Mosaics of*, pub. by the Government of India; DIEHL, *Mosaïques Byzantines de Nicée* (1892); FOWLER, *Mosaic Pavements* (London, ——); IDEM, *Mosaics in England, of the Roman period:* there is a large series of coloured plates in the Library of the Society of Antiquaries, London; FROTHINGHAM, *Grotta Ferrata* in *Gazette Archéologique* (1883); FURIETTI, *De Musivis* (Rome, 1752); GARRUCCI, *Outlines of early Mosaics* in *Storia dell' Arte Christiana* (Prato, 1873–81); GERSPACH, *La Mosaïque* (Paris, 1885); GRAVINA, *Il Duomo di Monreale* (Palermo, 1859); KONDAKOV, *Die Mosaiken der Kahrie-Djami*, pub. by the Archæological Institute of Constantinople; IDEM, *Handbook Russian Iconography*, Vol. I, in Russian (1905); KRAUS, *Geschichte der Christlichen Kunst* (Freiburg, 1896–1900); KUGLER, *Italian Painting* (2 vols., London, 1887); KURTH, *Die Mosaiken der Christlichen Aera* (Leipzig, 1902); LEVAL in *Bulletin Monumentale* (1886); MELANI, *Pavimenti Artistici d'Italia* in *Emporium*, XXIII, 428 (Bergamo, 1906); MILLET, *Le Monastère de Daphni* (Paris, 1899); MÜNTZ, *Les Mosaïques Byzantines* in *Bulletin Monumentale* (1886); IDEM, *La Mosaïque chrétienne* (Paris, 1893); IDEM, *Lost Mosaics of Rome* in *American Journal of Archæology*, VI (Boston); ONGANIA, *La Basilica di San Marco* (Venice, 1881–1888); PAULOUSKIJ, *Iconographie de la Chapelle Palatine* in *Revue Archéologique*, 3rd series, XXV (1895); POHL, *Die Altchristliche Fresco und Mosaic Malerei* (Leipzig, 1888); REYNARD, *Observations sur l'Art de la Mosaïque chez les Byzantins et les Arabes* in *Revue Archéologique*, new series (1862); DE ROSSI, *Musaici Cristiani di Roma* (Rome, 1876–1894); SCHMITT, *Kahrie-Djami* in Russian, published by Archæological Institute of Constantinople (1906); SCHULTZ AND BARNSLEY, *The Monastery of St. Luke in Stiris* (London, 1908); SACCARDO, *Les Mosaïques di S. Marco, Venise* (Venice, 1897); TEXIER AND PULLAN, *St. George's, Thessalonica* (London); TIKKANEN in *Act. Soc. Fennicæ*, XIII (Helsingfors); TILLY, *Glass Mosaics of Burma*, published by Burmese Government (1901); VENTURI, *Storia dell' Arte Italiana*, II and III (Milan, 1902); MELCHIOR DE VOGÜÉ, *Les Eglises de la Terre Sainte* (Paris, 1860); WOLTMANN AND WOERMANN, *History of Painting* (London, 1887, New York, 1880); WOERMANN, *Geschichte der Kunst aller Zeiten und Völker* (Leipzig, 1905); WYATT, *Mosaic Pavements* (London); WINCKELMAN, *Storia delle Arte*, 2 vols.; see also various articles in *Archæologia*, published by the Society of Antiquaries, London, and various works in course of publication by Society of Byzantine Research (London, 1910).

N. H. J. WESTLAKE.

Moschus (ὁ τοῦ Μόσχου, son of Moschus), JOHANNES, a monk and ascetical writer, b. about 550 probably at Damascus; d. at Rome, 619. He was surnamed The Abstemious (ὁ εὐκρατᾶς). He lived successively with the monks at the monastery of St. Theodosius (now Deir Dosi) in Jerusalem, among the hermits in the Jordan valley, and in the New Laura of St. Sabas south-east of Bethlehem. About the year 578 he went to Egypt with Sophronius (afterwards Patriarch of Jerusalem) and came as far as the Great Oasis. After 583 he came to Mt. Sinai and spent about ten years in the Laura of Æliatæ; he then visited the monasteries near Jerusalem and the Dead Sea. In 604 he went to Antioch but returned to Egypt in 607. Later he came to Cyprus and in 614–615 to Rome. On his deathbed he requested Sophronius to bury him, if possible, on Mt. Sinai or else at the monastery of St. Theodosius in Jerusalem. Mt. Sinai being then invaded by the Arabs, Sophronius buried him in the monastery of St. Theodosius. He is the author of one of the earliest hagiological works entitled "Λειμών" (Pratum spirituale, Spiritual Meadow). In it he narrates his personal experiences with many great ascetics whom he met during his extensive travels, and repeats the edifying stories which these ascetics related to him. Though the work is devoid of critical discrimination and teems with miracles and ecstatic visions, it gives a clear insight into the practices of Eastern monasticism, contains important data on the religious cult and ceremonies, and acquaints us with the numerous heresies that threatened to disrupt the Church in the East. It was first edited by Fronton du Duc in "Auctarium biblioth. patrum", II (Paris, 1624),1057–1159. A better edition was brought out by Cotelier in "Ecclesiæ Græcæ Monumenta", II (Paris, 1681), which is reprinted in Migne, P. G., LXXXVII, III, 2851–3112. A Latin translation by Bl. Ambrose Traversari, is printed in Migne, P. L., LXXIV, 121–240, and an Italian version made from the Latin of Traversari (Venice, 1475; Vicenzo, 1479). Conjointly with Sophronius, Moschus wrote a life of John the Almoner, a fragment of which is preserved in the first chapter of the "Vita S. Joanni Eleemosynarii" by Leontius, under the name of "Simeon Metaphrastes" (P. G., CXIV, 895–966).

BARDENHEWER, *Patrologie*, tr. SHAHAN, *Patrology* (Freiburg im Br. and St. Louis, 1908), 559–61; HOLE in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, III, 406–8; VAILHÉ, *St. Jean Mosch* in *Echos d'Orient*, V (Paris, 1901), 107–16 and 356–87; IDEM, *Sophrone le sophiste et Sophrone le patriarche* in *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, VII (Paris, 1902), 360–385; VIII (1903), 32–69. A Latin translation of an old life, originally in Greek, is printed in *P.L.*, LXXIV, 119–22, and in USENER, *Der hl. Tychon* (Leipzig, 1907), 91–3.

MICHAEL OTT.

Moscow (Russian MOSKVA), the ancient capital of Russia and the chief city of the government (province) of Moscow, situated in almost the centre of European Russia. It lies on both sides of the River Moskva, from which it derives its name; another small stream called the Yauza, flows through the eastern part of the city. Moscow was the fourth capital of Russia—the earlier ones being Novgorod, Kieff, and Vladimir—and was the residence of the Tsars from 1340 until the time of Peter the Great in 1711. It is the holy city of Russia, almost surpassing in that respect the city of Kieff, and is celebrated in song and story under its poetic name *Bielokamennaya*, the "White-Walled". The population, according to the latest (1907) available statistics, is 1,335,104, and it is the greatest commercial and industrial city of Russia. It is the see of a Russian Orthodox metropolitan with three auxiliary or vicar bishops, and has 440 churches, 24 convents, over 500 schools (with high schools, professional schools, and the university besides), some 502 establishments of charity, mercy, and hospital service, and 23 cemeteries. The population is composed of 1,242,090 Orthodox, 26,320 Old Ritualists, 25,540 Catholics, 26,650 Protestants, 8905 Jews, and 5336 Mohammedans, together with a small scattering of other denominations.

Historically, the city of Moscow, which has grown up gradually around the Kremlin, is divided into five principal parts or concentric divisions, separated from one another by walls, some of which have already disappeared and their places been taken by broad boulevards. These chief divisions are the Kremlin, Kitaigorod (Chinese town), Bielygorod (white town), Zemlianoigorod (earthwork town), and Miestchanskygorod (the bourgeois town). The actual municipal division of the city is into seventeen *chasti* or wards, each of which has a set of local officials and separate police sections. The city hall or *Duma* is situated on Ascension Square near the Kremlin. The Kremlin itself is a walled acropolis and is the most ancient part of Moscow, the place where the city originated; it is situated in the very center of the present city, some 140 feet above the level of the River Moska. The Kitaigorod, or Chinese town, is situated to the north-east and outside of the Kremlin, and is in turn surrounded by a wall with several gates. It is irregularly built up, contains the Stock Exchange, the *Gostinny Dvor* (bazaars), the *Riady* (great glass en-

closed arcades), and the printing office of the Holy Synod. Just why it was called the *Chinese* town is not known, for no Chinese have ever settled there. The allusion may be to the Tatars, who besieged and took Moscow several times, camping outside the Kremlin.

The Kremlin and Kitaigorod are considered together and known as the "City" (*gorod*), much as the same word is applied to a part of London. The enormous walls surrounding them were originally whitewashed and of white stone, and are even yet white in places, thus giving rise to the poetic name.

MOSCOW: LOOKING NORTHWARD, TO THE

Just outside of it lies the Bielygorod, or white town, extending in a semicircle from the Moskva on the one side until it reaches the Moskva again. The Bielygorod is now the most elegant and fashionable part of the city of Moscow. Containing as it does, beautiful and imposing palaces, many fine public monuments and magnificent shops, theaters, and public buildings, it presents a splendid appearance worthy of its ancient history. Around this, in a still wider semicircle, is the Zemlianygorod, or earthwork town, so called because of the earthen ramparts which were constructed there by Tsar Michael Feodorovich in 1620 to protect the growing city in the Polish wars. They have been levelled and replaced by the magnificent boulevards known as the *Sadovaya* (Garden Avenues).

The wealthy merchants and well-to-do inhabitants dwell here, and fine buildings are seen on every side. The remainder of the city is given over to the industrial and poor classes, railway stations, and factories of all kinds. In addition, there is that part of the city which lies on the south side of the Moskva, the so-called *Zamoskvarechie* (quarter beyond the Moskva) where the Tatars dwelt for a long time after they had been driven from Moscow proper. Now it is the Old Russian quarter, where old-fashioned merchants dwell in state and keep up the manners and customs of their fathers. The famous Tretiakoff art galleries are situated here. There are six bridges across the River Moskva connecting both parts of the city.

The name Moscow is mentioned in Russian chronicles for the first time in 1147. In March of that year Yuri Dolgoruki (George the Long-armed), Grand Duke of Kieff and son of Vladimir Monomachus, is said to have met and entertained his kinsmen there at the village on the Moskva. So pleased was he with the reception which he had received and so impressed by the commanding location of the situation that he built a fortified place on the hill where the meeting took place, just where the present Kremlin is situated. The word Kremlin (Russian *Kreml*) seems to be of Tatar origin, and means a fortified place overlooking the surrounding country. Many other Russian cities dating from Tatar times have kremlins also, such as Nizhni-Novgorod, Vladimir, Kazan, and Samara.

In the beginning of its early history Moscow was nothing but a cluster of wooden houses surrounded by palisades; in 1237 the Tatar Khan laid siege to it, and his successors for several centuries were alternately victors and vanquished before it. In 1293 Moscow was besieged and burned by the Mongols and Tatars, but under the rule of Daniel, son of Alexander Nevsky, its fame increased and it became of importance. He conquered and annexed several neighbouring territories and enlarged his dominions to the entire length of the River Moskva.

In 1300 the Kremlin was enclosed by a strong wall of earth and wooden palisades, and it then received its appellation. In 1316 the Metropolitan of Kieff changed his see from that city to Vladimir, and in 1322 thence to Moscow. The first cathedral of Moscow was built in 1327. The example of the metropolitan was followed in 1328 by Grand Duke Ivan Danilovich, who left Vladimir and made Moscow his capital. In 1333 he was recognized by the Khan of Kazan as the chief prince of Russia, and he extended the fortifications of Moscow. In 1367 stone walls were built to enclose the Kremlin. Notwithstanding this, the city was again plundered by the Tatars two years later. During the rule of Dimitri Donskoi in 1382 the city was burned and almost entirely destroyed. Vasili II was the first Russian prince to be crowned at Moscow (1425).

KREMLIN, ACROSS THE RIVER MOSKVA

The city, although still the greatest in Russia, began to decline until the reign of Ivan III (1462–1505). He was the first to call himself "Ruler of all the Russias" (*Hospodar vseya Rossii*), and made Moscow pre-eminently the capital and centre of Russia, besides constructing many beautiful monuments and buildings.

His wife, who was Sophia Palæologus, was a Greek princess from Constantinople, whose marriage to him was arranged through the pope, and who brought with her Greek and Italian artists and architects to beautify the city. But even after that the Tatars were often at the gates of Moscow, although they only once succeeded in taking it. Under Ivan IV, surnamed the Terrible (Ivan Grozny), the development of the city was continued. He made Novgorod and Pskoff tributary to it, and subdued Kazan and Astrakhan. He was the first prince of Russia to call himself *Tsar*, the Slavonic name for king or ruler found in the church liturgy, and that name has survived to the present time, although Peter the Great again changed the title and assumed the Latin name *Imperator* (Emperor). This latter name is the one now commonly used and inscribed on public monuments and buildings in Russia. Moscow was almost completely destroyed by fire in 1547; in 1571 it was besieged and taken by Devlet-Ghirei, Khan of the Crimean Tatars, and again in 1591 the Tatars and Mongols under Kara-Ghirei for the last time entered and plundered the city, but did not succeed in taking the Kremlin. During the reign of Ivan the Terrible the adventurer Yermak crossed the Ural Mountains, explored and claimed Siberia for Russia; the first code of Russian laws, the *Stoglav* (hundred chapters), was also issued under this emperor, and the first printing-office set up at Moscow. Ivan was succeeded by Feodor I, the last of the Rurik dynasty, during whose reign (1584–98) serfdom was introduced and the Patriarchate of Moscow established. During the latter part of the reign of Ivan the Terrible, Boris Godunoff, a man of high ambitions who had risen from the ranks of the Tatars, attained to great power, which was augmented by the marriage of his sister to Feodor. To ensure his brother-in-law's succession to the throne, he is said to have caused the murder of Ivan's infant son, Demetrius, at Uglich in 1582. When Feodor I died, Boris Godunoff was made Tsar, and ruled fairly well until 1605. The year before his death the "False Demetrius" (*Lzhedimitri*) appeared. He was said to have gone under the name of Gregory Otrepieff, a monk of the Chudoff monastery (Monastery of the Miracles) in the Kremlin, who fell into disgrace, escaped to Poland, gave himself

out as Demetrius, the son of Ivan the Terrible, who had in some way escaped Boris Godunoff, another child having been murdered. King Sigismund of Poland espoused his claims, furnished him an army, with which and its Russian accessions the pretender fought his way back to Moscow, proclaiming himself the rightful heir to the throne. All who looked on Boris Godunoff as a usurper flocked to his standard, the widow of Ivan, then a nun, recognized him as her son, and he was crowned in the Kremlin as the Tsar of the Russias. For ten months he ruled, but, as he was too favourable to the Poles and even allowed Catholics to come to Moscow and worship, the tide then turned against him, and in 1606 he was assassinated at his palace in the Kremlin by the *Streltsi* or sharpshooters who formed the guard of the Tsars of Russia.

After seven years of civil war and anarchy Michael Romanoff, the founder of the present dynasty, was elected Tsar in 1613. But Moscow never regained its earlier pre-eminence, although it became a wealthy commercial city, until the first part of the reign of Peter the Great (1689–1725). He sent persons abroad, and, having observed the advancement and progress of Western Europe, determined to improve his realm radically by introducing the forms of western civilization. All the earlier part of his life was spent in war with the Swedish invaders and the Polish kings. In 1700 he abolished the Patriarchate of Moscow, left the see vacant, and established the Holy Synod. These acts set Moscow, the old Russians and the clergy against him, so that in 1712 he changed the imperial residence and capital from Moscow to St. Petersburg, which he had caused to be constructed for the new capital on the banks of the Neva. After the departure of the Tsars from Moscow, it diminished in political importance, but was always regarded as the seat and centre of Russian patriotism. In 1755 the University of Moscow was founded. In 1812 during the invasion of Russia by Napoleon, the Russians determined after the Battle of Borodino to evacuate Moscow before the victorious French, and on 14 September, 1812, the Russian troops deserted the city, followed by the greater part of the inhabitants. Shortly afterwards the French entered, and Napoleon found that he had no submissive citizens to view his triumphal entry, but that the inhabitants were actually burning up their entire city which was even then built largely of wood. He revenged himself by desecrating churches and destroying monuments. The Russian winter begins in October, and, with a city in smoking ruins and without supplies or provisions, Napoleon was compelled on 19–22 October, to evacuate Moscow and retreat from Russia. Cold and privation were the most effective allies of the Russians. The reconstruction of the city commenced the following year, and from that time hardly any wooden buildings were allowed. In May, 1896, at the coronation of Nicholas II, over 2000 persons were crushed and wounded in a panic just outside the city. In 1905 the Grand Duke Sergius was assassinated in the Kremlin and revolutionary riots occurred throughout the city. Although Moscow is no longer the capital, it has steadily grown in wealth and commercial importance, and, while second in population to St. Petersburg, it is the latter's close rival in commerce and industry, and is first above all in the heart of every Russian.

In the religious development of Russia Moscow has held perhaps the foremost place. In 1240 Kieff was taken by the Tatars, who in 1299 pillaged and destroyed much of that mother city of Christian Russia. Peter, Metropolitan of Kieff, who was then in union with Rome, in 1316 changed his see from that city to the city of Vladimir upon the Kliazma, now about midway between Moscow and Nizhni-Novgorod, for Vladimir was then the capital of Great Russia. In 1322 he again changed it to Moscow. After his death in 1328 Theognostus, a monk from Constantinople, was consecrated Metropolitan at Moscow under the title "Metropolitan of Kieff and Exarch of all Russia", and strove to make Great Russia of the north ecclesiastically superior to Little Russia of the south. In 1371 the South Russians petitioned the Patriarch of Constantinople: "Give us another metropolitan for Kieff, Smolensk, and Tver, and for Little Russia." In 1379 Pimen took at Moscow the title of "Metropolitan of Kieff and Great Russia", and in 1408 Photius, a Greek from Constantinople, was made "Metropolitan of all Russia" at Moscow. Shortly afterwards an assembly of South Russian bishops was held at Novogrodek, and, determined to become independent of Moscow, sent to the Patriarch of Constantinople for a local metropolitan to rule over them. In 1416 Gregory I was made "Metropolitan of Kieff and Lithuania", independently of Photius who ruled at Moscow. But at the death of Gregory no successor was appointed for his see. Gerasim (1431–5) was the successor of Photius at Moscow, and had correspondence with Pope Eugene IV as to the reunion of the Eastern and Western Churches. The next Metropolitan of Moscow was the famous Greek monk, Isidore, consecrated under the title of "Metropolitan of Kieff and Moscow". When the Council of Florence for the reunion of the East and the West was held, he left Moscow in company with Bishop Abraham of Suzdal and a large company of Russian prelates and theologians, attended the council, and signed the act of union in 1439. Returning to Russia, he arrived at Moscow in the spring of 1441, and celebrated a grand pontifical liturgy at the cathedral of the Assumption in the Kremlin in the presence of Grand Duke Vasili II and the Russian clergy and nobility. At its close his chief deacon read aloud the decree of the union of the churches. None of the Russian bishops or clergy raised their voices in opposition, but the grand duke loudly upbraided Isidore for turning the Russian people over to the Latins, and shortly afterwards the Russian bishops assembled at Moscow followed their royal master's command and condemned the union and the action of Isidore. He was imprisoned, but eventually escaped to Lithuania and Kieff, and after many adventures reached Rome.

From this time the two portions of Russia were entirely distinct, the prelates of Moscow bearing the title "Metropolitan of Moscow and all Russia" and those of Kieff, "Metropolitan of Kieff, Halich, and all Russia". This division and both titles were sanctioned by Pope Pius II. But Kieff continued Catholic and in communion with the Holy See for nearly a century, while Moscow rejected the union and remained in schism. After Isidore the Muscovites would have no more metropolitans sent to them from Constantinople, and the grand duke thereupon selected the metropolitan. Every effort was then made to have the metropolitans of Moscow independent of the Patriarch of Constantinople. After the Turks had captured Constantinople, the power of its patriarch dwindled still more. When the Bishop of Novgorod declared in 1470 for union with Rome, Philip I, Metropolitan of Moscow, frustrated it, declaring that, for signing the union with Rome at Florence, Constantinople had been punished by the Turks. This hatred of Rome was fomented to such a point that, rather than have one who favoured Rome, a Jew named Zozimas was made Metropolitan of Moscow (1490–4); as, however, he openly supported his brethren, he was finally deposed as an unbeliever. Yet in 1525 the metropolitan Daniel had a correspondence with Pope Clement VII in regard to the Florentine Union, and in 1581 the Jesuit Possevin visited Ivan the Terrible and sought to have him accept the principles of the Union. In 1586, after

the death of Ivan, the archimandrite Job was chosen Metropolitan of Moscow by Tsar Feodor under the advice of Boris Godunoff. Just at that time Jeremias II, Patriarch of Constantinople, who was fleeing from Turkish oppression, visited Russia and was received with all the dignity due to his rank. In 1589 he arrived at Moscow and was fittingly received by Boris Godunoff, who promised to take his part against the Turks if possible, and who requested him to create a patriarch for Moscow and Russia, so that the orthodox Church might once more count its five patriarchs as it had done before the break with Rome. Jeremias consented to consecrate Job as the Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, and actually made him rank as the third patriarch of the Eastern Church, preceding those of Antioch and Jerusalem. This patriarchate was in fact a royal creation dependent upon the Tsar, its only independence consisting of freedom from the sovereignty of Constantinople.

In 1653 the Patriarch Nikon corrected the Slavonic liturgical books of the Eastern Rite by a comparison with the Greek originals, but many of the Russians refused to follow his reforms, thus beginning the schism of the Old Believers or Old Ritualists, who still use the uncorrected books and ancient practices. The Patriarchate of Moscow lasted until the reign of Peter the Great (that is 110 years), there being ten patriarchs in all. When Patriarch Adrian died, in 1700, Peter abolished the office at once, and allowed the see to remain vacant for twenty years. He then nominally went back to the old order of things, and appointed Stephen Yavorski "Metropolitan of Moscow", but made him merely a servant of the Holy Synod. To emphasize the new order of things more strongly, it is related that Peter himself sat on the patriarch's throne saying in grim jest: "I am the patriarch". Not until 1748 was the Eparchy or Metropolitanate of Moscow canonically established by the Holy Synod under the new order of things. In 1721 Peter published the "Ecclesiastical Regulations" (*Dukhovny Reglament*), providing for the entire remodelling of the Russian Church and for its government by a departmental bureau called the Holy Governing Synod. This body, usually known as the Holy Synod, has existed ever since. Its members are required to swear fidelity to the Tsar by an oath which contains these words: "I confess moreover by oath that the supreme judge of this ecclesiastical assembly is the Monarch himself of all the Russias, our most gracious Sovereign" (*Reglament, Prisiaga*, on p. 4, Tondini's edition). The Holy Governing Synod is composed of the Metropolitans of St. Petersburg, Moscow, and Kieff, several other bishops, and certain priests, but its active affairs are carried on by lay government officials (the bishops act rather as consultors or advisors), and the Chief Procurator, a layman, directs its operations, while none of its acts are valid without the approval (*Soizvoleniya*) of the Tsar. No church council or deliberative church organization has been held in Russia since the establishment of the Holy Synod.

The chief and most historic buildings in Moscow are situated in the Kremlin, which is a triangular enclosure upon a hill or eminence on the north bank of the Moskva. It is surrounded by a high wall of brick and stone, provided with high towers at intervals, and has five gates, one (for pedestrians only) in the wall on the riverside and two in each of the other walls of the triangle. The most celebrated gate is the *Spassakaya Vorota*, or Gate of the Saviour, opening out upon the Red Square. It contains a venerated image or icon of Christ, and all persons passing through the gate must remove their hats in reverence. Inside the Kremlin are churches, palaces, convents, a parade ground, a memorial to Alexander II, also the Senate (or law courts building), the arsenal, and the great Armoury. Directly inside the Gate of the Saviour is the convent of the Ascension for women, founded in 1389 by Eudoxia, wife of Dimitri Donskoi. The present stone convent building was erected in 1737. Just beyond it stands the Chudoff monastery, founded in 1358 by the Metropolitan Alexis, and here in 1667 the last Russian church council was held. The present building dates from 1771. Next to it is the Nicholas or Minor Palace built by Catherine II and restored by Nicholas I. In front of this and across the parade ground near the river wall of the Kremlin is the memorial of Alexander II, very much in the style of the Albert Memorial in London. A covered gallery surrounds the monument on three sides, and on it are mosaics of all the rulers of Russia. To the west of the Minor Palace is the church and tower of Ivan Veliky (great St. John) with its massive bells. At the foot of the tower is the famous *Tsar Kolokol* (king of bells), the largest bell in the world. It was cast in 1734, and weighs 22 tons, is 20 feet high and nearly 21 feet in diameter. A triangular piece nearly six feet high was broken out of it when it fell from its place in 1737 during a fire. Towards the north of the great bell in front of the barracks at the other end of the street, is the Great Cannon, cast in 1586, which has a calibre one yard in diameter, but has never been discharged. Behind Ivan Veliky stands the Cathedral of the Assumption, the place of coronation of all the emperors of Russia, and the place where all the patriarchs of Moscow are entombed. The present cathedral was restored and rebuilt in part after Napoleon's invasion. Across a small square is the Cathedral of the Archangel Michael. Here lie buried all the Tsars of the Rurik and Romanoff dynasties down to Peter the Great. He and his successors lie entombed in the cathedral in the Fortress of Sts. Peter and Paul in St. Petersburg. To the west lies the Cathedral of the Annunciation, in which all the Tsars before Peter were baptized and married, still used for royal baptisms and marriages.

Towards the westerly end of the Kremlin is the Great Palace in which all the history of Moscow was focussed until after the time of Peter the Great. It is the union and combination of all the ancient palaces, and contains the magnificent halls of St. George and St. Alexander and also the ancient *Terem* or women's palace, which is now completely modernized. In the centre of the courtyard of the palace stands the church of Our Saviour in the Woods (*Spass na Boru*). It was originally built here at the beginning of the thirteenth century, when the Kremlin was but a hill still covered with forest trees, and hence its name. Ivan I, in 1330, tore down the primitive wooden church and replaced it by a church of stone. Outside the Great Palace is the Armoury, one of the finest museums of its kind in Europe, being particularly rich in collections of Russian weapons and armour. The building towards the north of the palace, known as the Synod, was the residence of the patriarchs of Moscow and the first abiding-place of the Holy Synod. To the east of the Kremlin, outside the gates of the Saviour and of St. Nicholas, is the well-known Red Square, where much of the history of Moscow has been enacted. At the end of it towards the river stands the bizarre church of St. Basil the Blessed, of which Napoleon is said to have ordered: "Burn that mosque!" The Historical Museum is at the other end. At the east side of the Red Square is the *Lobnoe Miesto* or Calvary, to which the patriarchs made the Palm Sunday processions, and where proclamations of death were usually read in olden times. Behind it are the magnificent Riady or glass-covered arcades for fine wares, while at the northern entrance of the square behind the Museum is the chapel of the Iberian Madonna (*Iverskay a Bogoroditza*), the most celebrated icon in all Russia. It was sent to Moscow in 1648 from the Iberian monastery on Mount Athos.

One of the most celebrated modern churches in

Moscow is the Temple of Our Saviour and Redeemer, built as a memorial and thanks offering in commemoration of the retreat of the French from Moscow. It was consecrated in 1883, is probably the most beautiful church in Russia and is filled with modern art adapted to the requirements of the Greek Rite. There are two Arches of Triumph in Moscow—one celebrating 1812, near the Warsaw station, and the other called the Red Gate, commemorating Empress Elizabeth. At Sergievo, about forty miles to the east of Moscow, is the celebrated Trinity Monastery (*Troitsa-Sergievskaya Lavra*), which is intimately bound up with the history of Moscow, and is one of the greatest monasteries and most celebrated places of pilgrimage in Russia; it played a great part in the freeing of Russia from the Tatar yoke. There are three Roman Catholic churches in Moscow: the large church of St. Louis on the Malaya Lubianka, the church and school of Sts. Peter and Paul in the Milutinsky Pereulok, and another small chapel. There is also a Greek Catholic chapel recently founded by a priest converted from the Old Believers with a handful of worshippers.

GERRARE, *Story of Moscow* (London, 1903); MORFILL, *Hist. of Russia* (New York, 1902); MEAKIN, *Russia* (Philadelphia, 1906); LEROY-BEAULIEU, *Empire of the Tsars*, I (New York, 1902); FABRICIUS, *Le Kremlin de Moscou* (Moscow, 1883); ZABEL, *Moskau* (Leipzig, 1902); BRUGGEN, *Das heutige Russland* (Leipzig, 1902); PELESZ, *Gesch. der Union* (Vienna, 1880); SEMENOV, *Rossiya* (St. Petersburg, 1900); GOLUBINSKI, *Istoriya Russkoi Tserkvi* (Moscow, 1904); *Raspredeleniya naseleniya Imperii* (St. Petersburg, 1901); URBAN, *Statystyka Katolicyzmu w Panstwie Rosyjskiem* in the *Przeglad Powszechny* (Cracow, Aug. and Sept., 1906).

ANDREW J. SHIPMAN.

Moses, Hebrew liberator, leader, lawgiver, prophet, and historian, lived in the thirteenth and early part of the twelfth century B. C.

NAME.—משה *Mosheh* (M. T.), Μωϋσῆς, Μωσῆς. In Ex., ii, 10, a derivation from the Hebrew *Māshāh* (to draw) is implied. Josephus and the Fathers assign the Coptic *mo* (water) and *uses* (saved) as the constituent parts of the name. Nowadays the view of Lepsius, tracing the name back to the Egyptian *mesh* (child), is widely patronized by Egyptologists, but nothing decisive can be established.

SOURCES.—To deny with Winckler and Cheyne, or to doubt, as do Renan and Stade, the historic personality of Moses, is to undermine and render unintelligible the subsequent history of the Israelites. Rabbinical literature teems with legends touching every event of his marvellous career: taken singly, these popular tales are purely imaginative, yet, considered in their cumulative force, they vouch for the reality of a grand and illustrious personage, of strong character, high purpose, and noble achievement, so deep, true, and efficient in his religious convictions as to thrill and subdue the minds of an entire race for centuries after his death. The Bible furnishes the chief authentic account of this luminous life.

BIRTH TO VOCATION (Ex., ii, 1–22).—Of Levitic extraction, and born at a time when by kingly edict had been decreed the drowning of every new male offspring among the Israelites, the "goodly child" Moses, after three months' concealment, was exposed in a basket on the banks of the Nile. An elder brother (Ex., vii, 7) and sister (Ex., ii, 4), Aaron and Mary (AV and RV, *Miriam*), had already graced the union of Jochabed and Amram. The second of these kept watch by the river, and was instrumental in inducing Pharaoh's daughter, who rescued the child, to entrust him to a Hebrew nurse. The one she designedly summoned for the charge was Jochabed, who, when her "son had grown up", delivered him to the princess. In his new surroundings, he was schooled "in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (Acts, vii, 22). Moses next appears in the bloom of sturdy manhood, resolute with sympathies for his degraded brethren. Dauntlessly he hews down an Egyptian assailing one of them, and on the morrow tries to appease the wrath of two compatriots who were quarrelling. He is misunderstood, however, and, when upbraided with the murder of the previous day, he fears his life is in jeopardy. Pharaoh has heard the news and seeks to kill him. Moses flees to Madian. An act of rustic gallantry there secures for him a home with Raguel, the priest. Sephora, one of Raguel's seven daughters, eventually becomes his wife and Gersam his first-born. His second son, Eliezer, is named in commemoration of his successful flight from Pharaoh.

VOCATION AND MISSION (Ex., ii, 23–xii, 33).—After forty years of shepherd life, Moses speaks with God. To Horeb (Jebel Sherbal?) in the heart of the mountainous Sinaitic peninsula, he drives the flocks of Raguel for the last time. A bush there flaming unburned attracts him, but a miraculous voice forbids his approach and declares the ground so holy that to approach he must remove his shoes. The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob designates him to deliver the Hebrews from the Egyptian yoke, and to conduct them into the "land of milk and honey", the region long since promised to the seed of Abraham, the Palestine of later years. Next, God reveals to him His name under a special form Yahweh (see art. JEHOVAH), as a "memorial unto all generations". He performs two miracles to convince his timorous listener, appoints Aaron as Moses's "prophet", and Moses, so to speak, as Aaron's God (Ex., iv, 16). Diffidence at once gives way to faith and magnanimity. Moses bids adieu to Jethro (Raguel), and, with his family, starts for Egypt. He carries in his hand the "rod of God", a symbol of the fearlessness with which he is to act in performing signs and wonders in the presence of a hardened, threatening monarch. His confidence waxes strong, but he is uncircumcised, and God meets him on the way and fain would kill him. Sephora saves her "bloody spouse", and appeases God by circumcising a son. Aaron joins the party at Horeb. The first interview of the brothers with their compatriots is most encouraging, but not so with the despotic sovereign. Asked to allow the Hebrews three days' respite for sacrifices in the wilderness, the angry monarch not only refuses, but he ridicules their God, and then effectually embitters the Hebrews' minds against their new chiefs as well as against himself, by denying them the necessary straw for exorbitant daily exactions in brickmaking. A rupture is about to ensue with the two strange brothers, when, in a vision, Moses is divinely constituted "Pharaoh's God", and is commanded to use his newly imparted powers. He has now attained his eightieth year. The episode of Aaron's rod is a prelude to the plagues. Either personally or through Aaron, sometimes after warning Pharaoh or again quite suddenly, Moses causes a series of Divine manifestations described as ten in number in which he humiliates the sun and river gods, afflicts man and beast, and displays such unwonted control over the earth and heavens that even the magicians are forced to recognize in his prodigies "the finger of God". Pharaoh softens at times but never sufficiently to meet the demands of Moses without restrictions. He treasures too highly the Hebrew labour for his public works. A crisis arrives with the last plague. The Hebrews, forewarned by Moses, celebrate the first Pasch or Phase with their loins girt, their shoes on their feet, and staves in their hands, ready for rapid escape. Then God carries out his dreadful threat to pass through the land and kill every first-born of man and beast, thereby executing judgment on all the gods of Egypt. Pharaoh can resist no longer. He joins the stricken populace in begging the Hebrews to depart.

EXODUS AND THE FORTY YEARS (passim after Ex., xii, 34).—At the head of 600,000 men, besides women and children, and heavily laden with the spoils of the Egyptians, Moses follows a way through the









MICHELANGELO
S. PIETRO IN VINCOLI, ROME

PINTURICCHIO
SISTINE CHAPEL, ROME

MOSES

PHILIPPE DE CHAMPAGNE
ST. PETERSBURG

CARLO DOLCI
PITTI PALACE, FLORENCE

desert, indicated by an advancing pillar of alternating cloud and fire, and gains the Peninsula of Sinai by crossing the Red Sea. A dry passage, miraculously opened by him for this purpose at a point to-day unknown, afterwards proves a fatal trap for a body of Egyptian pursuers, organized by Pharaoh and possibly under his leadership. The event furnishes the theme of the thrilling canticle of Moses. For upwards of two months the long procession, much retarded by the flocks, the herds, and the difficulties inseparable from desert travel, wends its way towards Sinai. To move directly on Chanaan would be too hazardous because of the warlike Philistines, whose territory would have to be crossed; whereas, on the south-east, the less formidable Amalacites are the only inimical tribes and are easily overcome thanks to the intercession of Moses. For the line of march and topographical identifications along the route, see ISRAELITES, subsection *The Exodus and the Wanderings*. The miraculous water obtained from the rock Horeb, and the supply of the quails and manna, bespeak the marvellous faith of the great leader. The meeting with Jethro ends in an alliance with Madian, and the appointment of a corps of judges subordinate to Moses, to attend to minor decisions. At Sinai the Ten Commandments are promulgated, Moses is made mediator between God and the people, and, during two periods of forty days each, he remains in concealment on the mount, receiving from God the multifarious enactments, by the observance of which Israel is to be moulded into a theocratic nation (cf. MOSAIC LEGISLATION). On his first descent, he exhibits an all-consuming zeal for the purity of Divine worship, by causing to perish those who had indulged in the idolatrous orgies about the Golden Calf; on his second, he inspires the deepest awe because his face is emblazoned with luminous horns.

After instituting the priesthood and erecting the Tabernacle, Moses orders a census which shows an army of 603,550 fighting men. These with the Levites, women, and children, duly celebrate the first anniversary of the Pasch, and, carrying the Ark of the Covenant, shortly enter on the second stage of their migration. They are accompanied by Hobab, Jethro's son, who acts as guide. Two instances of general discontent follow, of which the first is punished by fire, which ceases as Moses prays, and the second by plague. When the manna is complained of, quails are provided as in the previous year. Seventy elders—a conjectural origin of the Sanhedrin—are then appointed to assist Moses. Next Aaron and Mary envy their brother, but God vindicates him and afflicts Mary temporarily with leprosy. From the desert of Pharan Moses sends spies into Chanaan, who, with the exceptions of Josue and Caleb, bring back startling reports which throw the people into consternation and rebellion. The great leader prays and God intervenes, but only to condemn the present generation to die in the wilderness. The subsequent uprising of Core, Dathan, Abiron, and their adherents suggests that, during the thirty-eight years spent in the Badiet et-Tih, habitual discontent, so characteristic of nomads, continued. It is during this period that tradition places the composition of a large part of the Pentateuch (q. v.). Towards its close, Moses is doomed never to enter the Promised Land, presumably because of a momentary lack of trust in God at the Water of Contradiction. When the old generation, including Mary, the prophet's sister, is no more, Moses inaugurates the onward march around Edom and Moab to the Arnon. After the death of Aaron and the victory over Arad, "fiery serpents" appear in the camp, a chastisement for renewed murmurings. Moses sets up the brazen serpent, "which when they that were bitten looked upon, they were healed". The victories over Sehon and Og, and the feeling of security animating the army even in the territory of the hostile Balac, lead to presumptuous and scandalous intercourse with the idolatrous Moabites which results, at Moses's command, in the slaughter of 24,000 offenders. The census, however, shows that the army still numbers 601,730, excluding 23,000 Levites. Of these Moses allows the Reubenites, Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasses to settle in the east-Jordan district, without, however, releasing them from service in the west-Jordan conquest.

DEATH AND POSTHUMOUS GLORY.—As a worthy legacy to the people for whom he has endured unparalleled hardships, Moses in his last days pronounces the three memorable discourses preserved in Deuteronomy. His chief utterance relates to a future Prophet, like to himself, whom the people are to receive. He then bursts forth into a sublime song of praise to Jahweh and adds prophetic blessings for each of the twelve tribes. From Mount Nebo—on "the top of Phasga"—Moses views for the last time the Promised Land, and then dies at the age of 120 years. He is buried in "the valley of Moab over against Phogor", but no man "knows his sepulchre". His memory has ever been one of "isolated grandeur". He is the type of Hebrew holiness, so far outshining other models that twelve centuries after his death, the Christ Whom he foreshadowed seemed eclipsed by him in the minds of the learned. It was, humanly speaking, an indispensable providence that represented him in the Transfiguration, side by side with Elias, and quite inferior to the incomparable Antitype whose coming he had predicted.

Consult histories mentioned under articles AARON and ISAAC, commentaries under PENTATEUCH, Introductions to Old Testament (long list under INTRODUCTION BIBLICAL), and biblical dictionaries. BENNETT in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v., may be recommended for an exposition of the documentary hypothesis, and LAUTERBACH in the *Jewish Encycl.* for a summary of Rabbinical traditions. In VIGOUROUX, *Dict. de la Bible*, MANGENOT dovetails historical and Rabbinical data. See also VIGOUROUX, *La Bible et les découvertes modernes* (6th ed., Paris, 1896).

THOMAS Á K. REILLY.

Moses, ASSUMPTION OF. See APOCRYPHA, subtitle I.

Moses Bar Cephas, Syriac bishop and writer, b. at Balad about 813; d. 12 Feb., 903. He is known through a biography by an anonymous Syriac writer, and from references in the writings of Bar Hebræus. He embraced early the monastic life, and was later bishop over a territory including Beit-Ramman, Beit-Kiyonaya, and Mossul. On his elevation to the episcopate he received the name Severus. For ten years he also performed the duties of overseer of the neighbouring Diocese of Tagrita. He belonged to the Jacobitic branch of the Monophysites, and he was in his day the most voluminous writer of his sect. His works comprise a complete commentary on the Old and New Testaments, frequently quoted by Bar Hebræus in his "Auçár Râzê" (Storehouse of Mysteries). Of this nothing has come down to us save fragments pertaining to Genesis, the Gospels, and the Pauline Epistles. He also wrote a treatise in four books on predestination and free will, of which a manuscript copy is preserved in the British Museum. Through a citation in Bar Hebræus (Chron. eccl., ii, 215) we learn that Bar Cephas composed an otherwise unknown commentary on Aristotle's "Dialectica". A manuscript copy of his "Hexameron", or treatise on the six days of creation in five books with a curious geographical drawing, is one of the treasures in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Other works of his are a treatise on paradise, of which there exists a Latin translation published by Masius in 1569; a treatise on the soul in forty chapters with a supplement on the utility of offerings for the dead; a book of controversy against heretics; homilies for the feasts of the liturgical year; a commentary on the works of Gregory Nazianzen; sermons on various subjects; and a history of the Church.

DUVAL, *La Littérature Syriaque* (Paris, 1899), 78, 252, 259, 283, 391.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

Moses of Chorene (MOSES CHORENENSIS), perhaps the best known writer of Armenia, called by his countrymen "the father of history" and the "father of scholars", and celebrated as a poet, or hymn writer, and a grammarian. A native of Choren or Chorni in the province of Darou, when young, he was sent by Mesrop, the founder of Armenian literature, to study in Edessa, Constantinople, Alexandria, Athens, and Rome. Upon his return, he is said to have assisted Mesrop (407–433), in the translation of the Bible into Armenian. The date of his birth is unknown, but the above fact would indicate that he was born towards the end of the fourth century, and his death is generally placed about the end of the fifth. The following works are attributed to him: "Treatise on Rhetoric"; "Treatise on Geography"; "Letter on Assumption of B. V. M."; "Homily on Christ's Transfiguration"; "Oration on Hripsinia, an Armenian Virgin and Martyr"; "Hymns used in Armenian Church Worship"; "Commentaries on the Armenian Grammarians"; and "Explanations of Armenian Church Offices". The most celebrated work, however, is the "History of Armenia Major", practically the only work preserving the early history and traditions of pre-Christian Armenia, but like other histories of this kind, abounding in legendary and fictitious narratives, historical inaccuracies, etc. It is divided into three parts: (1) "Genealogy of Armenia Major", embracing the history of Armenia from the beginning down to the foundation of the Arsacide dynasty (149 B. C.); (2) "History of the middle period of our ancestors", extending from 149 B. C. to the death of St. Gregory the Illuminator and the reign of King Terdat (A. D. 149–332); (3) the third part brings the history down to the overthrow of the Arsacide dynasty (A. D. 428); a fourth part was added to the work by another and later writer who brought the history down to the time of the Emperor Zeno (474–491). Recent researches, however, have shown that this famous "History of Armenia" is not the work of Moses of Chorene.

The reasons for discarding the traditionally received attribution have been ably summarized by Dr. Bardenhewer as follows. The author of the "History of Armenia Major" calls himself Moses of Chorene and pretends to belong to the fifth century, to be a disciple of Saint Mesrop, and to have composed his work at the request of Isaac (Sahak), the Bagratunid prince who fell in battle in 482. These personal statements are shown to be untrustworthy for internal and external reasons. In his account of his own life the author contradicts such fifth-century writers as Koriun and Lazarus of Pharp. Carrière has shown recently that he makes use of historical sources posterior to the sixth and even the seventh century, e. g. Armenian versions of the "Vita St. Silvestri" and the "Church History" of Socrates. Only since the ninth century have traces of his work been found in Armenian literature. This, however, does not dispose of the historical personality of Moses of Chorene, who is one of the venerable fathers of the Armenian Church, and who really lived in the fifth century. Lazarus of Pharp bears witness to the existence in the fifth century of an Armenian bishop named Moses and a distinguished writer. We do not know the reason why this eighth- or ninth-century writer assumed the name of Moses of Chorene. He makes it clear that he intends to glorify the Bagratunid dynasty which from the end of the seventh century surpassed in splendour all the other noble houses of Armenia. In 885 Aschot I, a descendant of that house, was recognized by the Caliph as King of Armenia. Vetter conjectures that the secret aim of the pseudo-Moses of Chorene was to prepare the way for the accession of this house. In spite of its really late date, the author's narrative is generally speaking, trustworthy. He draws largely on ancient authorities, though occasionally modifying them in a capricious way, and embodies his own ideas in their context; but it cannot be maintained, as some have done, that he invented these authorities. His witnesses for the ancient history of Armenia, even as late as the second or third century after Christ, were principally legends and folk-song, and it is precisely this legendary element that lends to the work its special charm and value. The "Geography" and "Rhetoric" mentioned above are of course no more genuine works of Moses of Chorene than the "History". All three works are by the same author, as is evident both from the testimony of the manuscripts and from intrinsic criteria. The author's own statement leads us to believe that the "Geography" is an extract from the description of the world by Pappus, an Alexandrine author of the fourth century of our era. The "Rhetoric" is entitled "Chria" in the Greek manuscripts, and follows such Greek models as Aphthonius and Theon. The minor writings mentioned above await a more thorough examination into their genuineness (Patrology, Shahan, 1908, pp. 595–6). The first edition of the "History of Armenia" was published at Amsterdam, 1695; the second at London, with a Latin translation, 1736; the third at Venice, 1752; it was translated into French (Venice, 1841), and Italian (ibid.). The best translation is that made by Langlois in his "Historiens Anciens de l'Armenie" (Paris, 1867), II, 47, 175. The Armenian Mechitarist Fathers of Venice have issued several editions of the work in 1827, 1843–64, etc.

SMITH AND WACE, *Dictionary of Christian Biography;* VETTER in *Kirchenlex.*, VIII, 1955–63; CHEVALIER, *Répertoire des sources historiques du Moyen Age* (Paris, 1907), s. v.

GABRIEL OUSSANI.

Mossul, the seat of a Chaldean archdiocese, a Syrian diocese, and an Apostolic Mission. The origin of the town is unknown. It is not the Mosel of Ezechiel, xxvii, 19, which is but a mistranslation of Uzzal, a town in the north of Arabia. It is probable that there always has been on the right bank of the Tigris a small town named Mossul, which grew in importance as Nineveh on the left bank decayed and finally disappeared. In Arabic Mossul is called El-Mosil, the junction. Perhaps the name was originally Motsal, a cotton or muslin thread. Near Mossul at the gates of Nineveh took place in 627 the great battle in which Heraclius finally broke the power of the Persians. Then the town passed into possession of the Arab caliphs, afterwards to the Hamdanids, the Beni-Okaïl (991), the Beni-Mervan (1102), and eventually to the Seljuk Turks. Melek-Shah, known also as Djelal-Eddin, built schools and academies there. His successors fought against the Franks of the First Crusade, and Kerboga was conquered 28 June, 1098, with an army of 200,000 men, under the walls of Antioch. Five years later (1103) Baldwin, Count of Edessa, was defeated and led prisoner to Mossul. In December, 1144, the famous Zenki took possession of Edessa; his son Nour ed-Din continued his conquests, and built many fine edifices at Mossul. On his death in 1174, Saladin was driven from Mossul, but it soon after yielded to him. In the middle of the thirteenth century, when the Mongolian Houlagou took the town, the Sultan Loulou, of the Zenki family and famous for his generosity and justice, was living there. Subsequently Mossul was taken and sacked by Timur (Tamerlane), the Turkomans, the Shah of Persia Ismail, and the Turkish Sultan Selim I (1516). Idris, the historiographer of this Sultan, was afterwards charged with the reorganization of the province. The Persians under Nadir Shah vainly attempted to recapture the town in 1733; but they were driven back, as tradition says, by the Blessed Virgin, and in consequence the Turks allowed the Chaldeans and Syrians to build in her honour two churches which are still

standing. It was once a busy and prosperous town, trading in woollen goods and morocco leather, but during the nineteenth century, owing to lack of communications with the outside world and also to the opening of the Suez canal which changed the caravan route, it has decayed. At the present time it is the capital of a vilayet and has 70,000 inhabitants. Its girdle of wall more than six miles in circumference, has become too large for it. The town has sulphur springs and many very fine mosques and churches. Among its more famous citizens were Baha ed-Din, Ibn el-Athir, and Ibn Khallikan, Mussulmans; Thomas of Marga, Isaac of Nineveh, Hanna of Adiabene, etc. Christians.

In 410, at the council of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, the Metropolitan of Adiabene had the united titles of Arbela, Hazza, Assyria, and Mossul (Chabot, "Synodicon orientale", 265, 619). This is the earliest mention of the See of Mossul. It continued under the same style up to the seventh century. Soon after the Arab invasion the title of Adiabene was replaced by that of Assyria and Mossul. Le Quien (Oriens christ., II, 1215–1220) gives a long list of titulars from the seventh to the sixteenth century. Many of the Nestorian patriarchs of Mossul became converts and resided there, beginning with Elias Denham in 1751. As there was already a Catholic Chaldean patriarch at Diarbekir, Rome in 1828 and especially in 1830 brought about the union of the two Churches and Mar Elias, also known as John VIII, was recognized as the only patriarch. He transferred the residence of the see to Bagdad, and since that time the Chaldean patriarchs have again taken up their residence at Mossul. The Chaldean archdiocese numbers 20,000 souls; 45 secular priests; 12 parishes; and 13 churches. In the neighbourhood of Alkosh is the convent of Rabban Hormuz, the home of the Antonian Congregation of St. Hormisdas of the Chaldean rite, who have two other convents in the diocese. The congregation numbers in all 63 religious of whom 30 are priests. The Jacobites took up their residence at Mossul at an early date, especially at the Convent of Mar Mattaï, the principal centre of their activity. There also since 1089 dwells the "Maphrian" or delegate of the patriarch for the ecclesiastical provinces in Persia, a title or office now purely honorary. The Monophysites are very numerous in the city and the diocese. The Syrian Catholic diocese numbers 6,000 souls; 20 priests; 7 parishes; and 10 churches. Le Quien (Oriens christ., II, 1559–1564) gives a list of Jacobite titularies of Mossul.

The Apostolic Mission of Mossul was founded in 1750 by Benedict XIV as a Prefecture Apostolic and entrusted to the Italian Dominicans who had repeatedly laboured in the province from the thirteenth century onwards. Thanks to them, a Syrian Catholic diocese was erected at Mossul in that same year. In 1780, the Nestorian patriarch Mar Yohannan, who resided at Alkosh, 25 miles north-east of Mossul, became a Catholic together with five bishops of his nation, the greater part of the inhabitants of his town, and of six villages in the vicinity. The French monks who replaced the Italians were able in 1856, thanks to M. Boré, and to the French Consul, the Assyriologist Botta, to open boys' and girls' schools, and to found a printing press for Arabic and Syriac works, and finally a college at Mossul. The Apostolic Mission at the present day is bounded by three other French Missions, those of the Capuchins at Mardin, the Carmelites at Bagdad, and the Lazarists in Persia. It includes the south-east of Mesopotamia, Kurdistan, and the north-east of Armenia Major, a stretch of territory covering the vilayets of Mossul, Bitlis, Van, and a part of Diarbekir. Besides the Arabs, Kurds, and Mussulman Turks (about 3,000,000), and the Yezidis or Devil-worshippers (about 30,000), the Mission numbers 300,000 schismatic Armenians; 70,000 Jacobites; 30,000 Nestorians; 5000 Protestants; and 10,000 Jews. The Catholics of all the rites scattered through the territory amount to 80,000. The Mission has 23 Latin priests, all Dominicans, and 15 native priests who assist them in teaching. There are 9 Latin churches, 5 residential stations (Mossul, founded in 1750; Mar-Yakoub in 1847; Van in 1881; Seert in 1882; Djezireh in 1884), and 98 secondary stations visited by the missionaries. In 1910 a station was founded in the heart of the Nestorian patriarchate. The Syro-Chaldean Seminary, founded at Mossul in 1882, has educated more than 60 priests; it has between 50 and 60 students. There are 50 parochial schools for boys; 8 for girls; 1 Normal School for Chaldean Catholic teachers at Mar-Yakoub; 3 colleges for boys; 4 boarding schools for girls; 4 orphanages opened in consequence of the massacres of 1895. The Dominicanesses of the Presentation have houses at Mossul, Seert, and Van.

CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie*, II (Paris, 1892), 818–827; PIOLET, *Les Missions*, I (Paris), 256–271; *Missiones Cath.* (Rome, 1907), 162, 806–8.

S. VAILHÉ.

Mostar and Markana-Trebinje, DIOCESES OF (MANDATRIENSIS, MARCANENSIS ET TRIBUNENSIS).— When at the Berlin Congress (1878) Austria-Hungary was allowed to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina, the religious situation was at once regulated. The religious hatred existing until then between the Orthodox (673,000, 43 per cent), Mohammedans (549,000, 35 per cent), Catholics (330,000, 21 per cent), and Jews (8000, 0.5 per cent), was moderated. In 1881 the Emperor Francis Joseph formed the ecclesiastical province of Sarajevo (Bosna-Serai; Sarahimur) with the three sees of Banjaluka (Banialucus), Mostar, and Markana-Trebinje as suffragans. The Bishop of Mostar, through his pro-vicar, administers Markana-Trebinje, in which there are only eight secular priests and 20,000 Catholics.

Mostar is the capital of Herzegovina, and numbers 15,000 inhabitants, among whom there are 3500 Catholics. Herzegovina, which lies east of southern Dalmatia, received its name from the title of *Herzog* (duke) conferred by the Emperor Frederick IV (1448) on the Grand Waywode Stephan Vukčić. In 1463 Stephan Tomašević, the last King of Bosnia, was made a prisoner by the Turks and beheaded, in defiance of a promise to spare him. Twenty years later Herzegovina came under the rule of Turkey. With Bosnia it received Christianity from the Romans. In the first half of the seventh century the Slavs took possession. In the eleventh century the Eastern Schism and the sect of the Bogomili did the Catholic Church great and unrepaired harm. National writers trace this sect to a Bulgarian priest, Jeremias, who was also called Bogomil. His followers were called Patarenes; they rejected matrimony, allowed no intercourse with those of other religions, unconditionally forbade war and taking of oaths, and wished to yield obedience to no authority but God. In 1483, during the Turkish occupation of the country, the majority of the Bogomili, those of the upper classes, went over to Mohammedanism. Those who remained faithful to Christianity became outlaws (*Kajaks*). After the siege of Vienna and the retreat of the Turks in 1683, the poor peasants repeatedly took up arms, but only made their condition worse. During this unhappy time the Franciscans, unaided and with great difficulty, preserved the life of the Catholic Church in the country. Not seldom they celebrated Divine service amid the cold and snow in the open air. They lived in the most wretched poverty, and many became martyrs.

The Franciscans deserved that one of their order should be chosen Bishop of Mostar and Markana-Trebinje in 1881. The order maintains two schools and six classes for the education of the rising genera-

tion. There are 12 secular priests and 64 Franciscans in the diocese, and the number of Catholics is estimated at 130,000.

STRAUSS, *Bosnien, Land und Leute* (2 vols., Vienna, 1882, 1884); KLAIĆ, *Geschichte Bosniens* (Leipzig, 1885); NIKASCHINOWITSCH, *Bosnien und die Herzegowina* (Berlin, 1901); SCHMID, *Kulturmission Oesterreichs in Bosnien und in der Herzegowina* in *An Ehren und Siegen reich* (Vienna, 1908), 351–355 sq.

C. WOLFSGRUBER.

Most Pure Heart of Mary, FEAST OF THE.—In its principal object this feast is identical with the feast of the "Inner Life of Mary", celebrated by the Sulpitians on 19 October. It commemorates the joys and sorrows of the Mother of God, her virtues and perfections, her love for God and her Divine Son, and her compassionate love for mankind. In a subordinate manner, its object is also the physical Heart of Mary, which, being part of her sinless and virginal body, is the symbol and sensible object representing the sentiments and virtues of Mary (see HEART OF MARY, DEVOTION TO THE). The feast originated with Blessed John Eudes as the patronal feast of his congregations of priests and nuns, and was, since 1644, kept at the seminary of Caen on 20 October. The office, which is very beautiful, was composed by Blessed John Eudes in 1641, but its text was not definitely fixed before 1672. In 1647 the date of the feast was changed to 8 February, the feast being solemnized publicly for the first time, with the permission of Bishop Ragny, at the cathedral of Autun on 8 February, 1648. In 1668 Cardinal Vendôme approved the office, and the feast was adopted the same year by the French Franciscans, the Benedictine Nuns of the Perpetual Adoration, and later by a number of dioceses and religious communities, contrary to decrees of the Congregation of Rites prohibiting the feast of the Heart of Mary. The bishops of the Church in France claimed at this period the right to institute new feasts, and to compose offices and new breviaries without consulting the Roman authorities. In 1672 Blessed John Eudes could state that the feast had spread over nearly all France. It was mostly kept on 8 February, but at the Hôtel-Dieu of Quebec (since 1690) on 3 July, and at Saint-Maclou, Rouen, on the Sunday after 22 August (Office pr. 1765; triple of the first class).

The Nuns of Notre Dame de Corbeil (8 Feb., 1787) were the first to obtain papal sanction for the feast from Pius VI (kept on 22 August as a double of the first class with octave). The same pope later approved it for the Carmelites of Saint-Denys (8 Feb.), and for the Nuns of Fontevrault (Sunday after 2 July). On 22 March, 1799, it was granted to the city of Palermo (third Sunday after Pentecost); on 13 Aug., 1805, to the Clerics Regular of the Mother of God; in 1806 to Siena; in 1807 to the Discalced Carmelites; on 2 Sept., 1807, to the Capuchins and Hermits of St. Augustine for the Sunday after the Octave of the Assumption; on 19 Sept., 1807, to Tuscany. The city of Rome adopted the feast in 1879. In the Society of Jesus it is observed on the Sunday within the Octave of the Assumption. The feast has not yet been extended to the entire Church. It is kept as the patronal feast of the Republic of Ecuador, of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, of the Society of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, and of the Missionary Society of the Heart of Mary on the Sunday after 22 August. The feast is celebrated at Cosenza (Calabria) on 7 February (earthquake, 1783), by the English Benedictines on the first Sunday of May; in the ecclesiastical province of Lemberg on the last Saturday in May; at Bologna, Pescia, Volaterra etc., on the second Sunday in July; at Salerno on the last Sunday after Pentecost, etc. The office of Blessed John Eudes, universally used in France for over a hundred years, was finally approved for the Eudists (8 Feb.) in 1861. The office contained in the Appendix of the Roman Breviary was granted on 21 July, 1857; the dioceses of Palermo, Salerno, Catanzaro, etc., use that composed by Père Gallifet in 1726.

The feast of the Archconfraternity of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, refuge of sinners, is celebrated on the Sunday before Septuagesima at Paris, Chartres, Reims, Limoges, Vannes, Nantes, at Lucca in Toscana, in the ecclesiastical province of St. Louis, Missouri, etc.

Œuvres Complètes du B. Jean Eudes, XI (Vannes, 1910), 147 sqq.; NILLES, *De rationibus festorum utriusque Cordis* (Innsbruck, 1885); HOLWECK, *Fasti Mariani* (Freiburg, 1892).

FREDERICK G. HOLWECK.

Mostyn, FRANCIS. See MENEVIA, DIOCESE OF.

Mosynoupolis, titular see, suffragan of Trajanopolis in Rhodope. A single bishop is known, Paul, who assisted at the council of 878, which re-established Photius (Le Quien, "Oriens christ.", I, 1205). The see is mentioned in the "Notitia" of Leo the Wise, about 900 (Gelzer, Ungedruckte . . . Notitiæ episcopatuum, 558); in that for 940 (Gelzer, "Georgii Cyprii Descriptio orbis romani", 79); in that for 1170 under the name of Misinoupolis (Parthey, "Hierocles Synecdemus", 122). The monk Ephrem (Cæsares, V. 5695, in P. G., CXLIII, 216) says that the city was taken in 1190 by the Emperor Frederick of Swabia; and that Calojan, Tsar of the Bulgarians, ravaged it about 1206 (Cæsares, V. 7816). It is not known exactly where this town of Macedonia was situated nor what name it bears to-day.

S. VAILHÉ.

Motet.—A short piece of music set to Latin words, and sung instead of, or immediately after, the Offertorium, or as a detached number in extra-liturgical functions. The origin of the name is involved in some obscurity. The most generally accepted derivation is from the Latin *motus*, "movement"; but the French *mot*, "word", or "phrase", has also been suggested. The Italian *mottetto* was originally (in the thirteenth century) a profane polyphonic species of music, the air, or melody, being in the Tenor clef, taking the then acknowledged place of the *canto fermo*, or plainchant, theme. Philip de Vitry, who died Bishop of Meaux, wrote a work entitled "Ars compositionis de motetis", the date of which was probably 1320. This volume (now in the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale) contains our oldest specimens of sacred motets, and these continued in vogue for over two centuries. Gerbert prints some other motets of the first half of the fourteenth century, but they are not of any particular interest, and are mostly in two parts. It was not until the commencement of the following century, especially between the years 1390 and 1435, that a number of distinguished composers—e. g., Dunstable, Power, Dufay, Brasart, and Binchois—produced polyphonic motets that are still worthy of attention.

Dunstable's "Quam pulchra es" is a charming specimen of a three-part motet, the concluding Alleluia being far in advance of any similar work during the first quarter of the fifteenth century, betraying a genuinely artistic style. Equally beautiful are the motets of Lionel Power, the manuscripts of which are at Vienna, Bologna, and Modena. One of his happiest efforts is a four-part motet in which the treatment is peculiarly melodious and of an Irish flavour. Dufay, who was a Walloon, composed numerous motets, including "Salve Virgo", "Flos florum", "Alma Redemptoris", and "Ave Regina cœlorum"; and by his will he ordered the last named exquisite composition to be sung by the altar boys and choristers of Cambrai cathedral at his death-bed. Brasart, also a Walloon, whose name appears among the pontifical singers in 1431, composed motets, including a four-part "Fortis cum quevis actio" and a very pretty "Ave Maria". Binchois, another native of Flanders has left some motets in three parts, including "Beata Dei Genitrix", but the treatment is

archaic, and not at all comparable to the work of Power or Dufay. He died in 1460. Like Dufay, he was a priest and canon of Mons. From 1435 to 1480 the motet was treated by such masters as Caron, Okeghem, and Obrecht, and though the style is far in advance of similar compositions of the mid-fifteenth century, not many of the surviving specimens can compare with the best efforts of Power and Dufay. Okeghem was a priest, and was principal chaplain to Charles VII of France and to Louis XI, being subsequently made canon and treasurer of St. Martin's at Tours. His motet, "Alma Redemptoris", displays much contrapuntal ingenuity, and he also wrote a motet for thirty-six voices, probably performed by six choirs of six voices each.

But it is between the years 1480 and 1520 that the motet as an art-form progressed, favoured by the nascent devices of the modern school, with Josquin Després as leader. The outstanding feature of the motets of this period is the extraordinary skill displayed in weaving melodious counterpoint around a short phrase of plainchant or secular melody. Josquin (Canon of St-Quentin) stands head and shoulders over his fellows, and his motets were among the earliest printed by Petrucci, in 1502–05. In all, one hundred and fifty of his motets have been printed, the best known being the beautiful one, founded on the plainchant theme of "Requiem æternam", on the death of his master Okeghem, and the settings of the genealogies in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. His fellow-pupil, Pierre de la Rue, also composed some charming motets, of which twenty-five have been printed. One of the best known is founded on a theme from the Lamentations of Jeremias. Another famous motet-writer of this period was Eleazar Genet, better known as Carpentras (from the place of his birth), a priest and papal nuncio. His "Motetti della corona" were published by Petrucci, in 1514, but he is best known for his "Lamentations", which continued to be sung by the pontifical choir at Rome until 1587. A third motet-writer was Jean Mouton, canon of St-Quentin, whose "Quam pulchra es" has often been ascribed to Josquin. A fourth is Jacques Clément (Clemens non Papa), who issued seven books of motets, published by Phalèse (Louvain, 1559). Three typical specimens have been reprinted by Proske in his "Musica divina". Jacob Vaett composed a motet on this French composer's death in 1558. John Dygon, Prior of St. Augustine's, Canterbury, was a composer of motets, one of which was printed by Hawkins. Other English composers who cultivated this art-form in the sixteenth century were: Fayrfax, Tallis (who wrote one in forty parts), Whyto, Redford, Taverner, and Shepherd. Many of the Latin motets by these musicians were subsequently adapted to English words. Arcadelt, a pontifical singer, composed an eight-part Pater Noster; his better known Ave Maria is of doubtful authenticity. Willaert, *maestro di cappella* at St. Mark's, Venice, and "father of the madrigal", published three collections of motets for four, five, and six voices, not a few of which are extremely inventive and melodious though intricate.

The acme of motet composition was reached in the period from 1560 to 1620, when Orlandus Lassus (Roland de Lattre), Palestrina, Morales, Anerio, Marenzio, Byrd, de Rore, Suriano, Nanini, Gabrieli, Croce, and Monteverde flourished, not forgetting English Catholic composers like Bevin, Richard Dering, and Peter Philips. Palestrina, who has been aptly styled *Princeps Musicæ*, composed over 300 motets, some for twelve voices, but mostly for from four to eight voices, of which seven books were printed. One of his exquisite motets is, "Fratres, ego enim accepi", for eight voices, while another is the much simpler "Sicut cervus desiderat". Lassus composed 180 Magnificats, and 800 motets. The other masters quoted above have left us beautiful specimens. However, in the case of Monteverde (1567–1643), he broke away from the old traditions and helped to create the modern school of music, employing unprepared discords and other harmonic devices. Croce, who was a priest, published many beautiful motets, including "O sacrum convivium". In the mid-seventeenth century, owing to the conflict between the older and the newer schools, no appreciable advance was made in motet-writing. The only two composers who nobly upheld the true polyphonic school were Allegri and Casciolini. Allegri was a priest and a pontifical singer, and he is best known by his famous Miserere for nine voices in two choirs. A few of Cascolini's motets are still sung. From 1660 to 1670 the modern type of motet, with instrumental accompaniment, came into vogue, and the ancient ecclesiastical "modal" treatment was superseded by the prevalent scale-tonality. The masters of this epoch were Leo, Durante, Scarlatti, Pergolesi, Carissimi, Stradella, and Purcell. During the eighteenth century the motet received adequate treatment at the hands of Johann Sebastian Bach, Keiser, Graun, Hasse, Handel, and Bononcini. A further development, but on different lines, took place during the nineteenth century, specimens of which may be found in the published works of Mozart, Haydn, Cherubini, and Mendelssohn. However, the *motu proprio* of Pope Pius X has had the happy effect of reviving the polyphonic school of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, when the motet in its truest form was at the height of perfection.

EITNER, *Quellenlexikon* (Leipzig, 1900–04); GROVE, *Dict. of Music and Musicians* (new ed., London, 1904–10); WALKER, *Hist. of Music in England* (London, 1907); DUNSTAN, *A Cyclopædic Dict. of Music* (2nd ed., London, 1909).

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

Motive. See MORALITY.

Motolinia, TORIBIO DE BENAVENTE, Franciscan missionary, b. at Benavente, Spain, at the end of the fifteenth century; d. in the City of Mexico, 10 August, 1568. He was one of the first band of Franciscans who sailed for Mexico with Fray Martin de Valencia, and survived all his companions. Upon entering religion, he changed his name of Paredes for that of Benavente, following the then regular custom of the order. As he and his companions, on their way to the City of Mexico, passed through Tlaxcala, the Indians, seeing the humble aspect and ragged habits of the religious, kept repeating to each other the word *motolinia*. Fray Toribio, having asked the meaning of this word and learned that it was the Mexican for *poor*, said: "It is the first word I have learned in this language, and, that I may not forget it, it shall henceforth be my name." Bernal Diaz del Castillo, an eyewitness of the arrival of the first friars, singles Motolinia out from the others, saying of him: "Whatever was given him he gave to the Indians, and sometimes was left without food. He wore very torn clothing and went barefoot, and the Indians loved him much, because he was a holy person." When Motolinia and his companions arrived at the City of Mexico, Cortes went out to receive them, accompanied by all his captains and the chief men of the place. The religious carried wooden crosses in their hands; Cortes and those with him knelt and kissed their hands with the deepest respect, and then conducted them to the lodgings prepared for them. The Indians wondered much when they saw those whom they considered supernatural beings prostrate at the feet of these humble and apparently despicable men. Cortes seized the opportunity to address a discourse to the *caciques* (chiefs) and lords who accompanied him, recommending due veneration and respect, as he himself had shown, for those who had come to teach them the Christian religion.

When Cortes set out on the expedition to Las Hibueras, the influence of Motolinia over the Indians

was so great that the conqueror commissioned him to see that "no rising took place in Mexico or the other provinces" during his absence. Motolinia subsequently made a journey to Guatemala, where he made use of the faculties which he had to administer confirmation, and thence passed to Nicaragua. Returning to Mexico, he was guardian successively at Texcoco and Tlaxcala, and was chosen sixth provincial of the Province of Santo Evangelio. When Don Sebastian Ramirez de Fuenleal, president of the second *Audiencia*, decided to found the settlement of Puebla, Fray Toribio, who had joined in requesting this foundation, was one of the commissioners chosen to carry out the work, with the auditor Don Juan de Salmeron. In association with the guardians of Tlaxcala, Cholula, Huexotzingo, and Tepeaca, and employing a large number of Indian labourers, they built the city. Motolinia said the first Mass here on 16 April, 1530, and with his companions made the allotments of land, choosing for the convent the site upon which is still to be seen the beautiful church of San Francisco. He himself left in writing the total of baptisms performed by him, amounting to 400,000, "which," says Padre Torquemada, "I who write this have seen confirmed by his name." The Indians loved him tenderly for his virtues and, above all, for his ardent charity. He died in the convent of S. Francisco, in the City of Mexico, and the crowd at his burial had to be restrained from cutting in pieces the habit which his corpse wore, pieces of which they would have taken as relics of a saint.

Among the writings of Motolinia is his famous letter to Emperor Charles V, written on 2 January, 1555. It is a virulent attack upon Bishop Bartolomé de las Casas, intended to discredit him completely, calling him "a grievous man, restless, importunate, turbulent, injurious, and prejudicial", and moreover an apostate in that he had renounced the Bishopric of Chiapas. The monarch is even advised to have him shut up for safe keeping in a monastery. While it is impossible to save the memory of Motolinia from the blot which this letter has placed upon it, some explanation of his conduct can be given. He may have foreseen the extremely grave evils that would have resulted to the social system, as it was then established in New Spain, if the theories of Las Casas had become completely dominant. Indeed, when it is remembered that these theories jeopardized the fortunes of nearly all the colonists, not only in Mexico, but also throughout the New World—fortunes which they had perhaps amassed illegally, but, in many instances, in good faith and at the cost of incredible labours and perils—it may well be understood why so tremendous an animosity should have been felt against the man who not only had originated the theories, but had effected their triumph at Court; who was endeavouring with incredible tenacity of purpose to put them into practice, and who, in his directions to confessors, asserts that all the Spaniards of the Indies must despoil themselves of all their property, except what they have acquired by commerce, and no longer hold *encomiendas* or slaves. The theory of *encomiendas* was not in itself blameworthy; for the Indians, being like all other subjects bound to contribute towards the expenses of government, it made no difference to them whether they paid tribute direct to the government or to the holders of royal commissions (*encomiendas*). What made the system intolerable was the mass of horrible abuses committed under its shadow; had las Casas aimed his attack more surely against these abuses, he might perhaps have been more successful in benefiting the Indians. It is certain that the "New Laws", the greatest triumph of las Casas, remained virtually inoperative in Mexico; in Chiapas and Guatemala they led to serious disturbances, and in Peru they resulted in a civil war fraught with crimes and horrors, amidst which the aborigines suffered greatly. Such was the man whom Motolinia sought to oppose, and his attitude was shared by men of the most upright character, e. g. Bishop Marroquin, the viceroy, Don Antonio de Mendoza, and the *visitador* Tello. However pardonable the intention, it is impossible to forgive the aggressive and virulent tone of the aforesaid denunciation. He wrote some works which were of assistance to Mendieta and to Torquemada, one of the chief being his "Historia de los Indios de Nueva España".

BERISTAIN, *Biblioteca hispano-americana septentrional* (Amecameca, 1883); ICAZBALCETA, *Obras* (Mexico, 1905); ALAMAN, *Disertaciones* (Mexico, 1844); BERNAL DIAZ DEL CASTILLO, *Historia verdadera de la conquista de la Nueva España* (Mexico, 1904); BETANCOURT, *Menologio franciscano* (Mexico, 1871); CARRIÓN, *Hist. de Puebla* (Puebla, 1896); *México à través de los siglos*, II; MENDIETA, *Hist. eclés. indiana* (Mexico, 1870); *Colección de Documentos para la historia de México*, I (Mexico, 1898).

CAMILLUS CRIVELLI.

Motu Proprio, the name given to certain papal rescripts on account of the clause *motu proprio* (of his own accord) used in the document. The words signify that the provisions of the rescript were decided on by the pope personally, that is, not on the advice of the cardinals or others, but for reasons which he himself deemed sufficient. The document has generally the form of a decree: in style, it resembles a Brief rather than a Bull, but differs from both especially in not being sealed or countersigned. It issues from the Dataria Apostolica, and is usually written in Italian or Latin. It begins by stating the reason inducing the sovereign pontiff to act, after which is stated the law or regulation made, or the favour granted. It is signed personally by the pope, his name and the date being always in Latin. A Motu Proprio was first issued by Innocent VIII in 1484. It was always unpopular in France, where it was regarded as an infringement of Gallican liberties, for it implied that the sovereign pontiff had an immediate jurisdiction in the affairs of the French Church. The best-known recent example of a Motu Proprio is the instructions issued by Pius X on 22 November, 1903, for the reform of church music.

The phrase *motu proprio* is frequently employed in papal documents. One characteristic result of its use is that a rescript containing it is valid and produces its effect even in cases where fraud would ordinarily have vitiated the document, for the words signify that the pope in granting the favour does not rely on the reasons alleged. When the clause is used in dispensations, the latter are given a broad interpretation; a favour granted *motu proprio* is valid even when counter to ecclesiastical law, or the decisions of the pope himself. Consequently, canonists call the clause the "mother of repose": "sicut papaver gignit somnum et quietem, ita et hæc clausula habenti eam." (See RESCRIPTS.)

REBUF, *Tract. concordatorum: De forma mandati apostol.* (Paris, 1538), s. v.; RIGANTI, *Comment. in regul. cancellariæ apost.* (Rome, 1744), s. v. *Gratia motu proprio;* GIRAUD, *Bibl. sacra* (Milan, 1835), s. v.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

Mouchy, ANTOINE DE (called DEMOCHARES), theologian and canonist, b. 1494, at Ressons-sur-Matz, near Beauvais, in Picardy; d. 8 May, 1574, at Paris. In 1539 he was appointed rector of the University of Paris. He was also professor at the Sorbonne and canon *Pœnitentiarius* of Noyon. As *inquisitor fidei* he exerted his influence against the Calvinists. In 1562 he accompanied the Cardinal of Lorraine to the Council of Trent, and in 1564 was present at the Synod of Reims. Mouchy wrote a work in defence of the Mass (Paris, 1562), and edited the "Corpus juris canonici" (3 vols. fol., including the glossa, Paris, 1561; 4 vols. 8vo, without the glossa, Paris, 1547–50; 7 vols. 12mo, Lyons, 1554).

SCHERER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

LEO A. KELLY.

Moufang, Franz Christoph Ignaz, theologian, b. at Mainz, 17 Feb., 1817; d. there, 27 Feb., 1890. His early studies were made at Mainz. In 1834 he went to the University of Bonn, first taking up medicine, but soon turning to theology. Among his masters were Klee, Windischmann, and Walter. In 1837 he went to Munich, and the next year took the prescribed theological examinations at Giessen, after which he entered the ecclesiastical seminary at Mainz, where he was ordained priest 19 Dec., 1839. His first appointment was as curate in Seligenstadt on the Main, where his uncle, Adam Franz Lennig, later vicar-general and dean of the cathedral at Mainz, was pastor. Lennig stimulated in him a broad interest for the religious questions of the time. Moufang also taught at the pro-gymnasium at Seligenstadt. After brief charges of the parish of Bensheim, and that of St. Quentin in Mainz he was appointed in 1845 religious instructor at the Mainz gymnasium.

When Bishop von Ketteler re-established in 1851 the philosophical and theological school in connexion with the seminary at Mainz, he appointed Moufang regent of the seminary and professor of moral and pastoral theology. Moufang became a canon 6 Nov., 1854, and spiritual adviser and member of the diocesan court 2 December of the same year. On the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his priesthood the theological faculty of Würzburg bestowed the honorary degree of doctor of theology upon him. On the death of Lennig in 1866 the bishop wished Moufang to be his successor as dean of the cathedral and vicar-general. Moufang, however, declined, preferring to devote himself to the seminary. In November, 1868, he was summoned to Rome, for the preparatory work of the Vatican Council, and was placed on the committee for ecclesiastico-political matters under Cardinal Reisach. During the *Kulturkampf*, to Moufang's great sorrow, the theological school of the seminary was closed (1877) by hostile legislation. After the death of Bishop von Ketteler (13 July, 1877), the chapter elected Moufang administrator of the diocese. The hostile attitude of the Prussian Government made this office very difficult during the ten years' vacancy of the see. On 16 April, 1886, Leo XIII made him a domestic prelate. Under Bishop Haffner the theological school of the seminary was reopened on 25 October, 1887, and Moufang again directed the seminary as regent. But ill-health prevented him from remaining long at the work that was so dear to him.

Moufang rendered great and permanent services to the Archdiocese of Mainz as an educator of the clergy and in many other ways. He was soon prominent in the circle that centred about Lennig's strong, energetic personality, and he took an eager part in all efforts to improve religious and social conditions. He assisted in the formation of the "Piusverein", and as a member of the "St. Vincenz- und Elisabeth-Verein" did much to promote its prosperity. In the regeneration of Catholic Germany his name is inseparably linked with the history of the general conventions (Generalversammlungen) of the Catholics of Germany. Like his colleague, Heinrich, he was, for almost forty years, one of the leading personalities and most prominent speakers. For a number of years he was also active as a legislator. After 1863, as representative of the bishop, he had a seat in the upper chamber of the Hessian Landtag, and repeatedly took a prominent part in the debates on social and political questions, and questions of Church policy. In 1871 he entered the German Reichstag, where he was held in great esteem by the Centre for his political services and as an intermediary in harmonizing the differences between North and South Germany. The most prominent feature of his literary activity was his work in reorganizing and publishing the "Katholik", which in collaboration with Heinrich he edited from 1851 until his death.

His other literary work was mainly in the history of the older Catholic catechisms in Germany. His chief works on this subject are: "Die Mainzer Katechismen von Erfindung der Buchdruckerkunst bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts" (Mainz, 1878); "Katholische Katechismen des 16. Jahrhunderts in deutscher Sprache, herausgegeben und mit Anmerkungen versehen" (Mainz, 1881). Among his numerous shorter writings are: "Die barmherzigen Schwestern, eine Darstellung ihrer Gründung, Verbreitung, Einrichtung und Wirksamkeit" (Mainz, 1842); "Der Informativ-Prozess. Eine kirchenrechtliche Erörterung" (Mainz, 1850); "Die katholischen Pfarrschulen in der Stadt Mainz" (Mainz, 1863); "Das Verbot der Ehen zwischen nahen Verwandten. Beleuchtung der Gründe dieses Verbotes" (Mainz, 1863), I; "Die Handwerkerfrage" (Mainz, 1864), a speech delivered in the Upper Chamber of the Landtag at Darmstadt and published with notes; "Die Kirche und die Versammlung katholischer Gelehrten" (Mainz, 1864), a reply to Dr. Michelis's "Kirche oder Partei"; "Cardinal Wiseman und seine Verdienste um die Wissenschaft und die Kirche" (Mainz, 1865); "Der Kampf um Rom und seine Folgen für Italien und die Welt" (Mainz, 1868); "Carl August, Cardinal von Reisach", in "Katholik", 1870, I, 129–50; "Der besondere Schutz Gottes über Papst Pius IX" (Mainz, 1871); "Aktenstücke betreffend die Jesuiten in Deutschland, gesammelt und mit Erläuterungen versehen" (Mainz, 1872). Moufang also published a prayerbook, "Officium divinum", which is very widely used and has passed through numerous editions, the first appearing at Mainz, in 1851, the nineteenth in 1905.

Brück, *Dr. Christoph Moufang, Päpstlicher Hausprälat, Domcapitular und Regens des bischöflichen Seminars zu Mainz. Eine Lebensskizze* in *Katholik* (1890), I, pp. 481–93; II, pp. 1–25; *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, LII, 486–88.

Friedrich Lauchert.

Moulins, Diocese of (Molinensis), suffragan of Sens—comprises the entire department of Allier. Under the old regime Moulins did not even have a parish, the churches which served as parishes were succursal churches of two neighbouring country parishes, Yseure and St-Bonnet. In 1788 a see was created at Moulins; and des Gallois de la Tour, who exercised in that city the functions of vicar-general to the Bishop of Autun, was appointed bishop, but had not been preconized when the Revolution broke out in 1789. The See of Moulins was re-established by the Concordat of 1817, and had titulars from 1822. This new diocese was formed of dismembered parts of the Dioceses of Autun, Bourges, and Clermont-Ferrand. In this diocese the cantonal districts do not bear their geographical names, as in all other dioceses, but the name of a saint which becomes the patron of the deanery: the Vichy deanery, for instance, is called the deanery of St-Raphael. Joan of Arc came to Moulins in November, 1429, and from there wrote letters to all the important surrounding towns, asking for assistance. In 1604 Henry IV authorized the Jesuits to found a college at Moulins. The devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus was inaugurated in 1676 at the Visitation monastery of Moulins; St. Jane Frances de Chantal died in this convent in 1641. The monastery of Saint Lieu Sept Fons, in the present territory of the diocese, was founded in 1132 by monks of Cîteaux on a site where there were seven springs (*septem fontes*) and a sanctuary of the Blessed Virgin; it was reformed in 1663 by Dom Eustache de Beaufort, abbot from 1656 to 1709, a friend of de Rancé. In 1845 the monastery was restored by the Trappist Dom Stanislaus Lapierre. St. Benoît Labre passed two months there in 1769. The Benedictine monastery of Souvigny, founded in 916, had a fine Gothic church, where

even yet the tombs of many Seigneurs de Bourbon can be seen. Saint Mayeul (Majolus), second abbot of Cluny, died at Souvigny in 994, and St. Odilo, third abbot of Cluny, died there in 1049. The town of Gannat arose about an ancient abbey of Augustinians; the town of St. Pourçain owes its origin to the monastery founded in the sixth century by the slave St. Pourçain (Portianus) who put a stop to the devastations of Thierry, King of Austrasia, during his campaign against Auvergne. The preacher Jean de Lingendes (1595–1665) and the schismatic Abbé Chatel, founder of the "French Catholic Church" (1795–1857), were born in the territory of the present Diocese of Moulins.

The principal pilgrimages of the diocese are: Notre-Dame de St. Germain des Fossés; the body of the hermit St. Patroclus (sixth century) at Colombier; the relics of St. Mayeul at Souvigny; and the church of St. George at Bourbon l'Archambault, which possesses one of the largest known fragments of the Holy Cross, a relic given by St. Louis to his son Robert of Clermont. Before the application of the Associations Law of 1901 there were Benedictines, Jesuits, Marists, Lazarists, Redemptorists, Missionary Fathers of the Sacred Heart, and several orders of School Brothers in the Diocese of Moulins. At the beginning of the twentieth century the religious congregations of the diocese had charge of: 1 crèche, 15 day nurseries, 2 boys' orphanages, 10 girls' orphanages, 5 industrial rooms, 1 Magdalen hospital, 6 "houses of mercy" for the relief of the poor, 13 hospitals or asylums, 3 houses for the care of the sick in their own homes.

Lateral Façade, Cathedral, Moulins

In 1908 the Diocese of Moulins counted 390,812 inhabitants, 31 parishes, 281 succursal parishes, 55 vicariates.

Alary, *Histoire de l'établissement de l'évêché de Moulins* (Moulins, 1854); Fisquet, *France pontificale, évêchés de Troyes et Moulins* (Paris, 1867); Faure, *Histoire de Moulins* (2 vols., Moulins, 1900); Montégut, *En Bourbonnais et en Forez* (Paris, 1875); *Sept-Fons, études historiques sur l'abbaye de Notre Dame Saint Lieu Sept Fons*, by a monk of the abbey (Moulins, 1872); Chevalier, *Topobibl.*, 2028.

Georges Goyau.

Mount Calvary, Congregations of.—I. Daughters of Mount Calvary, founded in 1619 by Virginia Centurione (d. 1651), daughter of the Doge of Genoa and wife of Gasparo Grimaldi Bracelli (d. 1625), who during a time of famine gathered a number of abandoned children into a home, which she called Santa Maria del Refugio dei Tribolati in Monte Calvario. Under her inspiration those associated with her in the work decided to lead a common life, follow the rule of St. Francis, and pledge themselves to the service of the poor and sick. They bound themselves, however, by no vows, but by a solemn promise of perseverance. Among the prominent Genoese who promoted the work of the sisters was the Marquess Emmanuele Brignole, through whose munificence a second house was founded, in 1641, after which the sisters were often called "le suore Brignole". The congregation soon spread through northern Italy. In 1815 Pius VII invited the sisters to Rome, and in 1833 Gregory XVI assigned them a house on the Esquiline, near the church of St. Norbert, now the chief house of the institute.

II. Missionary Society of Mount Calvary, a congregation of secular priests, formed in 1633 by Hubert Charpentier to honour the Sacred Passion and to spread and maintain the Faith especially in regions under Huguenot control. The first houses were at Betharram in the Diocese of Lescar and at Notre-Dame de Ceraison in the Diocese of Auch. United with a similar association formed by the Capuchin, Père Hyacinthe, at the instance of Louis XIII, on Mont-Valérien near Paris, the congregation received royal confirmation in 1650. Later the pastors of Paris were admitted to membership, and during Holy Week pilgrimages were made from different parishes of Paris to Mount Valérien. The society did not survive the Revolution.

Centurione, *Vita di Virginia Centurione-Bracelli* (Genoa, 1873); Streber in *Kirchenlex.*; Morichini, *Degli istituti di pubblica carità* (Rome, 1835), 133 sqq.

Florence Rudge McGahan.

Mount Carmel, Feast of Our Lady of.—This feast was instituted by the Carmelites between 1376 and 1386 under the title "Commemoratio B. Mariæ Virg. duplex" to celebrate the victory of their order over its enemies in obtaining the approbation of its name and constitution from Honorius III on 30 Jan., 1226 (see Colvenerius, "Kal. Mar.", 30 Jan., "Summa Aurea", III, 737). The feast was assigned to 16 July, because on that date in 1251, according to the Carmelite traditions, the scapular was given by the Blessed Virgin to St. Simon Stock; it was first approved by Sixtus V in 1587. After Cardinal Bellarmine had examined the Carmelite traditions in 1609, it was declared the patronal feast of the order, and is now celebrated in the Carmelite calendar as a major double of the first class with a vigil and a privileged octave (like the octave of Epiphany, admitting only a double of the first class) under the title "Commemoratio solemnis B.M.V. de Monte Carmelo". By a privilege given by Clement X in 1672, some Carmelite monasteries keep the feast on the Sunday after 16 July, or on some other Sunday in July. In the seventeenth century the feast was adopted by several dioceses in the south of Italy, although its celebration, outside of Carmelite churches, was prohibited in 1628 by a decree *contra abusus*. On 21 Nov., 1674, however, it was first granted by Clement X to Spain and its colonies, in 1675 to Austria, in 1679 to Portugal and its colonies, and in 1725 to the Papal States of the Church, on 24 Sept., 1726, it was extended to the entire Latin Church by Benedict XIII. The lessons contain the legend of the scapular (q. v.); the promise of the Sabbatine privilege was inserted into the lessons by Paul V about 1614. The Greeks of southern Italy and the Catholic Chaldeans have adopted this feast of the "Vestment of the Bl. Virgin Mary" (Nilles, "Kal. Man.", II, 548, 665). The object of the feast is the special predilection of Mary for those who profess themselves her servants by wearing her scapular (see Carmelites).

Holweck, *Fasti Mariani* (Freiburg, 1892); Colvenerius,

Kalendarium Marianum (Douai, 1636); ALBERS, *Blüthenkränze*, IV (Paderborn, 1894), 191 sqq.

FREDERICK G. HOLWECK.

Mountford (MUMFORD), THOMAS. See DOWNES, THOMAS.

Mount of Olives. See OLIVET, MOUNT.

Mount St. Mary's College, the second oldest among the Catholic collegiate institutions in the United States, is located near Emmitsburg, Maryland, within the limits of the Archdiocese of Baltimore. Its situation on high ground at the foot of the Maryland range of the Blue Ridge Mountains is remarkable for beauty and healthfulness while it affords ample opportunity for physical exercise. Mount St. Mary's Theological Seminary has been maintained in connexion with the college since the foundation of the latter. The institution is directed by an association of secular clergymen who, with several lay professors, compose its faculty. Its material interests are controlled by a board of directors of which the Archbishop of Baltimore is, ex officio, the president. For the academic year 1909–10 the teaching corps included sixteen professors, besides assistant instructors in the various branches, with 298 students in the college and 54 in the seminary. Instruction is given in four departments: collegiate, academic, commercial, and modern languages. The degrees conferred are those of bachelor of arts and master of arts.

Mount St. Mary's College was founded in 1808 when the preparatory seminary established by the Sulpicians at Pigeon Hill, Pa., was transferred to Emmitsburg. Eight students formed the nucleus out of which the college developed. Its first president was Rev. John Dubois (q. v.) who had been labouring for some years in the neighbouring missions and had built a brick church on the slope above the present site of the college. He had been led to secure this site by Father (afterwards Bishop) Dubourg (q. v.), who directed Mother Seton also to Emmitsburg for the establishment of St. Joseph's Academy. Father Dubois had as his assistant Father Bruté (q. v.) who was consecrated first Bishop of Vincennes in 1834. Father Dubois himself became in 1826 Bishop of New York and was succeeded in the presidency by Rev. Michael de Burgo Egan (1826–28), Rev. J. F. McGerry (1828–29), and Rev. John B. Purcell (1830–33), later Archbishop of Cincinnati. In January, 1830, Father Purcell obtained from the General Assembly of Maryland a charter of incorporation for the college. This document prohibited the requiring of any religious test from students or professors, and limited the tenure of land to 1000 acres and the total value of the college property to $25,000: all gifts or revenues in excess of this amount, after the payment of necessary debts, were to be held for the use of the State of Maryland. After the brief (five months) incumbency of Rev. F. Jamison during the latter half of 1833, Rev. Thomas R. Butler was chosen president (1834–38). During his administration, a new charter, still in force, was granted on 4 April, 1836, wherein the college authorities are empowered to confer all collegiate honours and degrees except that of doctor of medicine. Father Butler's successor was Rev. John J. McCaffrey, a man of great energy and zeal, whose long term as president (1838–1872) was marked on one hand by the growth and prosperity of the college, on the other by reverses that threatened its very existence. He was the builder of the new church at Emmitsburg which was dedicated in June, 1842. The corner-stone of Bruté Hall, for which $12,000 had been appropriated, was laid on 2 May, 1843; and, in 1852, the foundation of McCaffrey Hall. On 25 June, 1857, Archbishop Purcell laid the corner-stone of the church which was to replace the structure on the hill. In 1858 the college celebrated its semi-centennial with appropriate exercises in which many distinguished alumni took part. The "Mountain" already counted among its graduates such men as John Hughes, later Archbishop of New York; William Quarter, first Bishop of Chicago; John McCloskey, afterwards Archbishop of New York and Cardinal; Willaim Henry Elder, Archbishop of Cincinnati; William George McCloskey, president of the American College, Rome, and later Bishop of Louisville; Francis S. Chatard, president of the American College, Rome, and later Bishop of Vincennes; Michael Augustine Corrigan, later Archbishop of New York; Richard N. Whelan, first Bishop of Wheeling; Francis X. Gartland, first Bishop of Savannah; Francis P. McFarland, third Bishop of Hartford.

Within three years after the celebration of its golden jubilee, the college was confronted by difficulties due to the outbreak of the war between the States. Though both North and South had strong partisans in the faculty as well as in the student body, the college as a whole remained neutral. But shortly after the beginning of hostilities, an exodus of students representing each section took place in such numbers that only seven were left for the graduating class of 1863, and only two for that of 1864. Moreover as parents were unable to meet tuition fees and other expenses of the pupils whom the college maintained during the four years of war, the financial standing of the institution was seriously compromised, and as a result the college at the end of the conflict was overwhelmed with debt. In June, 1872, Dr. J. J. McCaffrey, in consequence of failing health, withdrew from the presidency after thirty-four years of arduous and devoted service. Father John McCloskey was elected to the office with Rev. H. S. McMurdie as vice-president. Under their administration, the student body varied from 130 to 165. In 1877 Rev. John A. Watterson became president and retained the office until his promotion to the See of Columbus (1880). He introduced a thorough system of retrenchment in all departments; but the bulk of the debt remained. After his departure, Father John McCloskey once more took up the burden of the presidency, but only for a short time, as he died towards the close of 1880. In January, 1881, Rev. Wm. J. Hill, of Brooklyn, came to the college and petitioned to have a receiver appointed. The appointee was James McSherry, later Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals of Maryland. He turned over the affairs of the institution, in June, 1881, to Very Rev. William M. Byrne, Vicar-General of Boston, whose firmness, prudence, and wise economy restored prosperity to the college. His policy was continued by Rev. Edward P. Allen, who held office from 1884 until he became Bishop of Mobile in 1897. During his administration, McCaffrey Hall was completed (1894); and under his successor, Rev. Wm. L. O'Hara (1897–1905), Dubois Hall was completed, improvements were continued to accommodate the increasing number of students.

The presidency of his successor, Very Rev. Dennis J. Flynn (1905—), has been marked by the celebration, in October, 1908, of the centenary of the college. This occasion brought to the "Mountain" a large number of men prominent in ecclesiastical, professional, and public life who claim the college as their *Alma Mater* (for full account see "The Mountaineer", Oct. and Nov., 1908). It may indeed be said that the highest tribute to the college and the best proof of its efficiency is found in the careers of those whom it educated. Its service to the Church is shown by the fact that among its officers and graduates at least twenty-five have been bishops, including one cardinal and five archbishops—hence its well deserved title, "Mother of Bishops". But it has also given to the State and to every department of useful citizenship a large number of men distinguished by ability and integrity (see partial list in "The Mountaineer", Oct., 1908, 34–43). Among the causes which explain this success, the most

important is doubtless the united work of clergy and laity in building up the college, controlling its discipline, and conducting its courses. Scarcely less efficacious have been the relations between clerical and lay students which, continued beyond the years at college, have resulted in hearty cooperation for the highest civic, moral, and religious purposes, and have bound all the *alumni* in loyal devotion to the venerable institution which gave them their early training. This harmonious spirit found its latest expression at the dedication of the new college church on 12 Oct., 1910, which called together former graduates, both lay and clerical, from all parts of the United States (see "The Mountaineer", Nov., 1910).

BAILEY, *Memoirs of Bishop Bruté* (New York, 1865); *Jubilee of Mt. St. Mary's, 1858;* HERBERMANN in *U. S. Cath. Hist. Soc. Historical Studies and Records*, I (New York, 1900); *The Story of the Mountain* (Mt. St. Mary's, 1910).

ERNEST LAGARDE.

Movable Feast. See FEASTS, ECCLESIASTICAL.

Movers, FRANZ KARL, exegete and Orientalist, b. at Koesfeld, Westphalia, 17 July, 1806; d. at Breslau, 28 Sept., 1856. He attended the gymnasium of his native town, and from 1822 to 1825 the gymnasium at Münster. The next four years he studied at the academy of Münster, taking up philosophy, theology, and especially Oriental languages under Laurenz Reinke. In the autumn of 1829 he was ordained priest at Paderborn, and then continued his Oriental studies for a short time at the University of Bonn. After that he remained as tutor for several years with Baron von Geyr at Rath, near Deutz. In 1833 he became pastor at Berkum, near Bonn, in 1839 extraordinary professor of Old-Testament exegesis at the University of Breslau, and in 1842 ordinary professor at the same university.

In the field of exegesis Movers published the following works: "Kritische Untersuchungen über die biblische Chronik, ein Beitrag zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament" (Bonn, 1834); "De utriusque recensionis Vaticiniorum Jeremiæ, Græce Alexandrinæ et Hebraicæ masorethicæ, indole et origine Commentatio critica" (Hamburg, 1837); "Loci quidam historiæ canonis Veteris Testamenti illustrati, Commentatio critica" (Breslau, 1842); and various essays which appeared in theological magazines, especially in "Zeitschrift für Philosophie und katholische Theologie", published at Bonn. The first edition of the "Kirchenlexicon" contains a number of articles by him.

Movers showed great scholarship as an Orientalist and performed large and lasting services by his studies of the ancient Phœnicians. His chief work, "Die Phönizier", though never completed, is still an important contribution to the subject. It appeared in parts under separate titles, as follows: Vol. I, "Untersuchungen über die Religion und die Gottheiten der Phönizier, mit Rücksicht auf die verwandten Culte der Carthager, Syrer, Babylonier, Assyrer, der Hebräer und der Aegypter" (Bonn, 1841); vol. II, "Das phönizische Alterthum" in three parts, part I, "Politische Geschichte und Staatsverfassung" (Berlin, 1849); part II, "Geschichte der Colonien" (Berlin, 1850); part III, first half, "Handel und Schifffahrt" (Berlin, 1856). Movers gave a shorter compendium of the results of his researches in his article "Phönizien" in "Allgemeine Encyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste" (1848), section III, part XXIV, pp. 319–443. In addition to briefer essays appearing in magazines, Movers published "Phönizische Texte erklärt" (Breslau, 1845 and 1847), part I, "Die punischen Texte im Pœnulus des Plautus kritisch gewürdigt und erklärt"; part II, "Das Opferwesen der Carthager, Commentar zur Opfertafel von Marseille". Another work to be mentioned is "Denkschrift über den Zustand der katholisch-theologischen Facultät an der Universität zu Breslau seit der Vereinigung der Breslauer und Frankfurter Universität bis auf die Gegenwart" (Leipzig, 1845).

RASSMANN, *Nachrichten von dem Leben und den Schriften Münsterländischer Schriftsteller* (Münster, 1866), 223 sq.; REUSCH in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, XXII, 417 sq.; WERNER, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie* (Munich, 1866), 544–46; WERNER, *Geschichte der apologetischen und polemischen Literatur* (Schaffhausen, 1867), V, 442–52.

FRIEDRICH LAUCHERT.

Moxos Indians (MOYOS INDIANS).—According to one authority, they are named from Musu, their Quichua name; according to others, from the Moxos word, *muha*, erroneously thought by the Spaniards to be the tribal name. This collective designation is that of a group of tribes famous in the mission annals of South America, originally ranging through the forests and prairies of the upper Mamoré, extending east and west from the Guaporé (Itenes) to the Beni, and centring in the present Province of Mojos, Department of Beni, Bolivia. They numbered altogether at least 50,000 souls, in perhaps a hundred small tribes or subtribes, speaking at least thirteen distinct languages, each with dialects, viz., Moxo (spoken with dialectic variation by the Moxos proper, Baure, Ticomeri, and several small tribes), Paicone, Mopeciana, Icabicici, Mapiena, Movima, Cayubaba, Itonama, Sapibocona, Cheriba, Rocotona, Mure, Canichana. Of these, the Moxos and Paicone, with all their dialects, belong to the widespread Arawakan stock, which includes also the Maipure (q. v.) of the Orinoco; the Sapibocona belong to the Tacanan stock of Beni river; the Mure are an offshoot from the Mura of the great Tupian stock of eastern and central Brazil; the Movima, Cayubaba, Itonama, Canichana, and Rocotona (Ocorona) represent each a distinct stock; while the others remain unclassified. Besides all these, there were gathered in by the Jesuits some immigrant Chiquito, Siriono, and Chiriguano, each of different language, from the southern Bolivian missions. Of them all, the Moxos proper were the most important.

The mode of life of the Moxos, in their primitive condition, was determined by their peculiar environment. During the rainy season, lasting four months, nearly the whole country is inundated, excepting certain elevated places, where the scattered bands made their temporary villages. As the waters retreat the hot sun generates pestilence in the low grounds along the rivers, while the prevailing oppressive heat is varied by spells of piercingly cold winds from the mountains which prevent the ripening of corn. The natives therefore were generally without agriculture, but subsisted chiefly upon fish and roots during the greater part of the year, and upon the wild game of the mountains when driven from the low grounds by the floods. They were thus compelled to a wandering habit, at the same time that they were skilful fishers and river men. The constant shifting also brought the bands into collision, so that each tribe was constantly making war on its neighbours.

Their houses were low huts, occupied each by a single family, instead of being communal as in so many tribes. The larger villages had also well-built "town-houses" for the celebration of tribal functions. They slept upon mats upon the ground or in hammocks, with a smouldering fire close at hand to drive away the swarms of mosquitoes and other insects. They ate when they could find food, without regard to time, feasting equally upon putrid fish taken from stagnant pools, and upon human flesh of prisoners taken in war, for all or nearly all the tribes were cannibal. Of game, the monkey was their favourite food. They used dogs in hunting. They were greatly addicted to drunkenness, brought about by a fermented liquor of their own manufacture, and their frequent dance festivals always ended in general intoxication, frequently with bloody encounters in revenge for old injuries. Notwithstanding the generally rude culture, the Moxos proper and Baure excelled in hammock-weaving,

boat-making, pottery, and music, their favourite musical instrument being a sort of pan-pipes sometimes six feet in length. The Moxos had also a method of picture writing. This superiority may have been due in a measure to Peruvian influence, the Inca emperor Yupanqui having temporarily subdued the Moxos about 1460

In most of the tribes both men and women went entirely naked, but painted their faces in different colours, wore labrets, nose pendants, and necklaces—particularly of the teeth of slain enemies—and various decorations of feathers. One of their tribes, the Tiboi, had heads of pyramidal shape, produced by pressure upon the skull in infancy. Their hair was worn at full length in a queue. Their weapons were the bow, with poisoned arrows, and a javelin with which they could kill at one hundred paces. They were very cruel in war, being addicted to the torture of prisoners—a practice rare in South America—as well as to cannibalism. The Canichana even fattened prisoners for their cannibal feasts and afterwards fashioned their skulls into drinking cups. In some cases prisoners were held as slaves. Unlike the Iroquois, who exorcised the ghosts of their murdered victims, the Moxos moved away from the spot of the sacrifice to escape the vengeance of the dead. The savage Canichana in particular were so persistent in cannibalism that after coming into the missions they would sometimes steal children secretly for this purpose, even casting lots among themselves to decide who should give up a child, until the missionaries took steps to note each birth immediately upon delivery.

Marriages were arranged between the parents, usually without consulting the young people, and polygamy was permitted, although not common, but adultery was considered disgraceful. The wife was the mistress of the household and always chose the camping place. If the mother died the infant was buried alive with her, and if twins were born, one also was always buried. The woman who suffered miscarriage was killed by her own husband. The helpless aged were put to death by their children, and orphaned children also were sometimes killed by the elders. The authority of the village chiefs was absolute. Interment was in the ground and the property, instead of being destroyed as in most tribes, was divided among the relatives. In several tribes the bones were dug up after a time, reduced to powder and mixed with pounded corn to form a cake, which was given to friends to eat as the strongest bond and token of friendship. Some of this bread was thus partaken of by the first missionaries before they knew its composition.

Their religion was a pure nature worship, special reverence being paid to the River, the Thunder, and the Jaguar. Their tribal ceremonials and religious rituals were in the keeping of their priests, who were put through a severe course of training and initiation involving a year's abstention from all animal food, together with a battle with a jaguar—regarded as an embodied god—until wounded, and thus marked, by the divinity. Their principal festivals were regulated by the new moon, beginning with a day's fast and ending with a night dance and drinking orgy.



Map of the Moxos Mission Province
From Eder

The earlier attempts to missionize the tribes of central Bolivia met with no success. About the year 1673 the Moxos province was brought to the attention of the Jesuits of the college at Lima by José del Castillo, a lay brother, author of the valuable "Relación", who had accompanied some traders into that region and had been greatly impressed by the apparent docility of the natives. Father Cipriano Baraza, afterwards so noted as a missionary, at once asked and obtained the permission to undertake their conversion. In 1674, accompanied only by Brother Castillo and some Indian guides, he entered their country from Santa Cruz by way of a twelve-days' canoe voyage down the Mamoré river. In four years he had won their love and nearly mastered the language, when serious illness compelled his return to the healthier climate of Santa Cruz. He employed his convalescence in learning weaving, in order to induce them to clothe themselves, as a beginning in civilization. In the meantime, however, he was assigned to labour

among the Chiriguano, among whom he spent five years before he was permitted to return to his first choice, the Moxos. In 1686 he founded the first mission, Loreto, followed in rapid succession by Trinidad (1687), San Ignacio (1689), San Xavier (1690), San José (1691), San (Francisco de) Borja (1693), the six missions soon containing altogether nearly 20,000 Indians, Loreto alone in 1691 having 4000. Later missions were: San Pedro (the capital, 1698), Santa Ana, Exaltación, Magdalena (*alias* San Ramón), Concepción, San Simón, San Joaquín, San Martín, San Luis, San Pablo, San Juan, San Nicolas, Santos Reyes, San Judas, Santa Rosa I (del Itenes), San Miguel, Patrocinio, Santa Rosa II, Desposorios, Santa Cruz. Of these, the two missions of Santa Rosa del Itenes and San Miguel occupied chiefly by the Mure, Meque, and Rocotona tribes, were entirely broken up by the raids of the Portuguese slave-hunters (see GUARANÍ INDIANS; MAMELUCO) subsequent to 1742, and the survivors removed to other foundations. Wars, epidemics, and removals led to the abandonment also of San Luis, San José, San Pablo, Patrocinio, and San Juan. Santa Rosa II (1765), Desposorios, and Santa Cruz (de la Sierra) were the latest, and were occupied by Siriono, Chiriguano, and Chiquito, south of the Moxos province proper. The whole number of missions at one time was about twenty, containing in 1736 about 30,000 converts, increased to nearly 50,000 before the close of the Jesuit period, but again reduced to 20,345 souls in eleven missions in 1797, thirty years after the expulsion of the Jesuits.

MOXOS PRIEST IN CEREMONIAL PERFORMANCE
From Eder

Baraza himself was their great apostle and civilizer. Besides learning the principal languages and adapting himself to the Indian life so that he was able to penetrate every part of the province and thus make successful discovery of a shorter mountain passage to Peru, he introduced cattle, weaving, agriculture, carpentry, and brick-making. The mission churches reared by the Indians under his supervision rivalled those of Peru. At last after twenty-seven years of labour he was treacherously murdered at the age of sixty-one, on 16 September, 1702, among the then unconverted Baure, a tribe of considerably higher native culture than the others, living in palisaded villages on the eastern border of the province.

On the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spanish America in 1767 the Moxos missions were turned over to the Franciscans, under whom they continued into the modern period. The population has been greatly reduced, first by the slave raids and epidemic fevers in the earlier times, and more lately by the constant drain of the able-bodied men to the rubber forests of Brazil, whence few of them ever return, their superiority as boatmen rendering their services in demand as far as the Amazon. They are comfortably dressed in clothing made by themselves from bark fibre. In physique they are robust, and taller than most of the Bolivian tribes. "They are distinguished by a remarkably equable disposition, a frank and upright character, and great industry. They give up less time to merry-making than their southern kinsfolk, and are generally of more laborious habits, hence their industries are greatly developed, and although living far from the large towns and markets the Moxos excel all the other Indians as weavers, builders and wood carvers" (Reclus). They are zealous Catholics, entirely under the spiritual authority of their priests, and noted for their voluntary penances, as were their convert forefathers two centuries ago. Under the two principal names of Moxos and Baure, they number now about 30,000, not including several tribes—as the Canichana, Movima, etc.—included in the Moxos missions, but still retaining their distinct name and language.

For all that relates to the primitive condition and early mission history of the Moxos tribes, our principal authorities are the valuable writings of the Jesuits CASTILLO, EDER, and EGUILUZ. For the language of the Moxos and its cognate dialects, both grammar and vocabulary, our principal source is the *Arte* of the Jesuit MARBAN. BALLIVIAN, *Documentos para la Historia Geográfica de la República de Bolivia*, I, *Las Provincias de Moyos y Chiquitos* (La Paz, 1906); BRINTON, *The American Race* (New York, 1891); CASTILLO, *Relación de la Provincia de Mojos* in BALLIVIAN, *supra*; EDER, *Descriptio Provinciæ Moxitarum in Regno Peruano* (Buda, 1791); EGUILUZ, *Relación de la Misión de los Moxos* (1696); GIBBON, *Exploration of the Valley of the Amazon*, part II (Washington, 1854); smaller tribes, HEATH in *Kansas City Review of Science*, VI (Kansas City, 1883); HERVAS, *Catálogo de las Lenguas*, I (Madrid, 1800); *Lettres Edifiantes et Curieuses*, I–II (Paris, 1707), especially letter of ARLET on Canichana tribe and mission in vol. II; MARBAN, *Arte de la lengua moxa, con vocabulario y catecismo* (1701; reprinted, Leipzig, 1894); MARKHAM, *Tribes in the Valley of the Amazon* in *Jour. Anthrop. Institute*, XXIV (London, 1895), a brief notice; MORENO, *Biblioteca Boliviana; Catálogo del Archivo de Mojos y Chiquitos* (Santiago de Chile, 1888); D'ORBIGNY, *L'Homme Américain*, II (Paris, 1839); PAGE, *La Plata, the Argentine Confederation and Paraguay* (New York, 1859); RECLUS, *The Earth and its Inhabitants: South America*, I, *The Andes Regions* (New York, 1894); SOUTHEY, *History of Brazil*, III (London, 1819); *Sinópsis estadística y geográfica de la república de Bolivia* (La Paz, 1903); PORTER in *Bolivia*, published by the International Bureau of the American Republics (Washington, D. C., 1904).

JAMES MOONEY.

Moy de Sons, KARL ERNST, FREIHERR VON, jurist, b. 10 August, 1799, at Munich; d. 1 August, 1867, at Innsbruck (Tyrol). He belonged to an ancient noble family of Picardy, banished from France in 1789 and settled in Munich. After completing his studies in his native city, he became auditor in the war office; in 1827 privatdocent; 1830–33 attorney at law, in 1833 extraordinary professor of natural and political law at Würtzburg; finally in 1837 ordinary professor at Munich. Because of the address by the Senate of the university to King Ludwig II concerning the notorious dancer Lola Montes, he was deposed together with several other professors and appointed supernumerary counsellor of the Court of Appeals at Neuburg on the Danube. Obtaining leave of absence in 1848, he went to Innsbruck, where he devoted himself to literary work for the old Conservative party and in 1851, after his complete severance from the service of Bavaria, he accepted the chair of history of the German Empire and German law, in the university of that town. In 1863 he retired after having transferred the chair of German history to Ficker. In 1860–62 he was first vice-president and in 1864 president of the General Assembly of German Catholics. A tireless champion of Catholic ideas in speech and writing, on account of his peaceable disposition

he was never a leader in the struggle for the Catholic cause. In Austrian politics he soon abandoned his straightforward position and became reconciled to the modern trend, warmly defending the Concordat. Among his writings, in which he devoted the greatest attention to careful research and lucid arrangement, may be mentioned "Lehrbuch des bayerischen Staatsrechtes" (Ratisbon, 1840–46); "De impedimentis matrimonii" (Munich, 1827); "Die Ehe und die Stellung der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland rücksichtlich dieses Punktes ihrer Disciplin" (Landshut, 1830); "Das Eherecht der Christen in der morgenländischen und abendländischen Kirche bis zur Zeit Karls des Grossen nach den Quellen dargestell" (Ratisbon, 1833), by all means his best work; "Grundlinien einer Philosophie des Rechtes vom Katholischen Standpunkt" (2 vols., Vienna, 1854–57); "Die weltliche Herrschaft des Papstes und die rechtliche Ordnung in Europa" (Ratisbon, 1860). He did a great service to canon law through his foundation of the "Archiv für Katholisches Kirchenrecht mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Oesterreich", later "mit Rücksicht auch auf Deutschland" (Innsbruck, 1857), which he edited as far as the fifth volume.

Biographisches Lexicon des Kaiserthums Oesterreichs, XIX (1868), 165–167; *Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, XXII (1885), 420.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Moye, JOHN MARTIN, VENERABLE, priest of the Diocese of Metz, founder of the Sisters of Divine Providence (q. v.), missionary in China, b. at Cutting, Lorraine, 27 January, 1730; d. at Trier, 4 May, 1793. He was the sixth of the thirteen children of John Moye and Catharine Demange. His older brother, a seminarian, taught him the first rudiments of Latin, and he completed his classical studies at the College of Pont-à-Mousson. He then studied philosophy at the Jesuit College of Strasburg, and entered the theological Seminary of St-Simon, Metz, in the fall of 1751. Ordained a priest 9 March, 1754, he was appointed vicar in the episcopal city the same month. His great zeal for souls attracted attention; many pious ladies placed themselves under his firm and wise direction. This enabled him to find some select souls for the establishment of schools for country children whose education he had much at heart. He began the work in 1763; in 1767 in spite of the ill-will of many and the persecutions of a few, the Congregation of the Sisters of Divine Providence was founded. That same year he was appointed superior of the little seminary of St. Dié. Leaving the care of his sisterhood to two friends, Father Moye now determined to act upon his long delayed desire to become a missionary. In 1769 he joined the Séminaire des Missions Etrangères at Paris, and in 1773 he was at work in Oriental Su-tchuen, China. Nine years of hard labour, frequently interrupted by persecution and imprisonment, made him realize the necessity of native help. In 1782 he founded the "Christian Virgins", religious women following the rules of the Congregation of Providence at home, devoting themselves to the care of the sick and to the Christian instruction of pagan Chinese women and children in their own homes. After a hundred years of success, they are still active in the Chinese mission. Exhausted by labours and sickness, Father Moye returned to France in 1784. He resumed the direction of the Sisters of Divine Providence and evangelized Lorraine and Alsace by preaching missions. The Revolution of 1791 drove him into exile, and with his Sisters he retired to Trier. After the capture of the city by the French troops, typhoid fever broke out and, helped by his Sisters, he devoted himself to hospital work. He contracted the virulent disease and died, a martyr of Christian charity, 1793. The spot where he was buried is now a public square. Leo XIII declared John Martin Venerable and authorized the introduction of the cause of his beatification 14 January, 1891.

MARCHAL, *Vie de M. l'Abbé Moye* (Paris, 1872); WEILAND, *Une Ame d'Apôtre, le Vénérable Jean Martin Moye* (Metz, 1901); PUY-PENY, *Le Directoire des Sœurs de la Providence* (Portieux); ROHRBACHER, *Histoire de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1842–48, 9th ed., 1901); *Lettres édifiantes* (Paris).

CAMILLUS P. MAES.

Moylan, FRANCIS, Bishop of Cork, b. at Cork, 1739; d. in 1815. He was the son of a rich merchant. As the penal laws made it impossible for him to obtain a suitable education at home, he was sent to Paris, and educated there. His father desired that he should adopt a mercantile calling; but young Moylan's vocation being for a religious life he wished to join the Carthusians. Delicate health, however, stood in his way, and after finishing his course at the University of Toulouse, where he was graduated as doctor of theology, he was ordained priest in 1761 and for some years laboured in Paris. Returning to Cork he was appointed pastor of St. Finbarr's in the city, and remained there till 1775, when he became Bishop of Kerry. In 1787 he was transferred to the See of Cork and continued to rule that diocese till his death. Like Dr. Troy of Dublin, Dr. Moylan had no sympathy with violence as a means of redressing wrong, and therefore he condemned the Whiteboys; and, in 1796, he urged his flock to resist the French, when Hoche's fleet was in Bantry Bay. Dr. Moylan had a share in the establishment of Maynooth College and was one of its first trustees. He also supported the Union, and was one of the bishops who agreed to the "veto" in 1799. He regretted, however, having done this, for he found that he had been tricked by Pitt and Castlereagh, and when the veto question was revived (1814) he opposed it. During his time in Cork, the Christian Brothers were introduced and also the Ursuline and Presentation Nuns. He was indeed for many years the trusted friend and adviser of Nano Nagle.

HUTCH, *Life of Nano Nagle* (Dublin, 1875).

E. A. D'ALTON.

Moylan, STEPHEN, American patriot and merchant, b. in Ireland in 1734; d. at Philadelphia, 11 April, 1811. He received his education in Ireland, but resided for some time in England, and seems to have travelled considerably on the Continent before emigrating to the American Colonies where he settled in the city of Philadelphia. He gave his hearty support to the patriot cause on the eve of the Revolution, and, when war was finally declared, hurried to join the Continental Army before Boston in 1775. The readiness of his patriotic zeal, coupled with a belief in his business acumen, won him the recognition of John Dickinson, upon whose recommendation he was placed in the commissariat department. Attracted by his unusual dignity of bearing and military manner, Washington, in March, 1776, appointed him one of his aides-de-camp. Restless to exploit his energies in a field of wider activity, he was chosen by Congress, upon Washington's recommendation, in June of the same year to be Commissary General of the Continental Army. Restless again, seemingly, for a more direct participation in the conflict, he resigned this position in the following October, raising at once a troop of light dragoons, the First Pennsylvania regiment of cavalry, of which he was colonel. With this troop he served at Valley Forge, through the dismal winter of 1777–8, at the battle of Germantown, on the Hudson River, and in Connecticut, with Wayne in Pennsylvania, and rounded out the full measure of his service with General Greene in his southern campaign at the close of the war. In acknowledgment of his indefatigable energy and bravery, before the war closed, in 1782, he was brevetted brigadier-general. After the successful termination of the war he quietly

resumed his mercantile pursuits in Philadelphia In 1792 he was Register and Recorder of Chester County, Penn., and was Commissioner of Loans of Pennsylvania for a few years before his death. Duly allowing for the over excitability of the times, the eulogy of a fellow patriot quoted by Irving (Life of Washington, III, ch. 30) remains a no uncertain estimate of esteem: "'There is not in the whole range of my friends, acquaintance, and I might add, in the universe', exclaims Wilkinson, 'a man of more sublimated sentiment, or who combined with sound discretion a more punctilious sense of honour, than Colonel Moylan'." General Moylan was one of the organizers of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in Philadelphia in 1771, and was its first president. One of his brothers became Bishop of Cork, Ireland, and another, John, acted during the war as United States Clothier General.

MARQUIS DE CHASTELLUX, *Travels in America* (Paris, 1786); *American Monthly Magazine*, vol. VI, 14.

JARVIS KEILEY.

Mozambique (MOÇAMBIQUE), the former official and still usual name given to the Portuguese possessions on the eastern coast of Africa opposite the island of Madagascar. Portuguese East Africa extends from Cape Delgado (10° 41′ S. lat.) to the south of Delagoa Bay (25° 58′), that is about twelve hundred miles. It is bounded on the north by German East Africa; on the east by the Mozambique Channel; on the south by the Indian Ocean, and on the west by British South and Central Africa. It is the second largest Portuguese colony, its area approximating 293,000 square miles (that of Portuguese Angola is about 400,000); its population is between two and three millions. The coasts, in general low and marshy, are intersected here and there by rivers which terminate in almost every instance in muddy deltas or estuaries choked with sand. The low-lying tract between the Limpopo River and the delta of the Zambesi is barren, sprinkled with lagoons, malarial, and infested by the terrible tsee-tsee fly, which renders cattle-raising, the one industry otherwise suited to parts of this area, impossible. Between the Zambesi and the Rovuma the soil is very fertile, especially in the basin of the former river, where the land is fertilized by periodical inundations and produces abundant crops. The climate of the regions along the coast is torrid, unhealthy, and subject to sudden and great variations; the mean annual temperature is very high (76° at Beira). As one proceeds inland, the soil rises gradually, terrace over terrace, attaining a great altitude in the mountains which border on Lake Shirwa. In the interior both soil and climate are favourable to cultivation and European life; the chief crops are millet, maize, rice, wheat, sesame, earth-nuts, sugar-cane, cocoa, and tobacco. The large forests of the interior yield ebony, sandalwood, a number of other valuable timbers, and india-rubber. Besides an unusual variety of game, the fauna include the elephant, antelope, buffalo, lion, leopard, and, in certain districts, the rhinoceros and the hippopotamus. The mineral deposits, including coal, iron, and gold, are of exceptional importance, but not yet fully investigated.

Long before the arrival of the first European explorers, the Arabs, taking advantage of the regularity of the monsoons which greatly facilitated their voyages, carried on a brisk commerce with this portion of East Africa, and were in possession of the island of Mozambique when it was discovered by Vasco de Gama in 1498. Sofala had been already discovered by Covilham, another Portuguese, in 1489. The Portuguese had at first to contend with the fierce opposition of the Arabs who dominated all the adjacent country. In 1505 Albuquerque established at the mouth of the Sofala River the first European settlement. Vasco de Gama captured the island of Mozambique in 1506, and thanks to his exertions and those of other Portuguese captains (Saldanha, Almeida, and Tristão da Cunha) the neighbouring country was quickly brought under Portuguese rule. Although the Portuguese sent an expedition up the Zambesi about 1565 and occupied Tete in 1632, they seem to have paid scant attention to the interior. In 1607 and 1608 the Dutch made unsuccessful attempts on Mozambique, but in 1698 the resumed attacks of the Arabs, supported by the Sultan of Mascote, reduced the Portuguese territory to the country south of Cape Delgado. The waning political importance and power of Portugal rendered efficient colonization and control impossible. To the great feebleness of the authorities at home is due the late continuation of the slave trade between Mozambique and Madagascar, which was carried on surreptitiously until 1877. The discovery of gold in the interior of Africa about 1870 turned the tide of prosperity again in favour of Mozambique, as its ports were the natural outlets for the Transvaal and the more northern territories.

The explorations of Serpa Pinto in 1877 and subsequent years also led Portugal to take a keener interest in its possessions. In 1875 the dispute between England and Portugal for the possession of Delagoa Bay was decided by the arbitrator Marshal MacMahon, in favour of Portugal. The result of a subsequent collision between English and Portuguese claims was less favourable to Portugal. According to the modern theory of *hinterland*, Portugal claimed dominion over the territory situated between her possessions on the east and west coasts of Africa; but when in 1889 England proclaimed its protectorate over Matabeleland, Mashonaland, Nyassaland etc., Portugal, notwithstanding the immense indignation aroused by the occurrence at Lisbon, had to acquiesce. In 1891 lack of capital compelled the Portuguese government to lease with administrative authority a large portion of the colony to the Mozambique and Nyassa Companies; the former controls the Manica and Sofala regions, and the latter the territory enclosed between the Rovuma, Lake Nyassa, and the Lurio River. It is generally accepted that the Anglo-German Secret Treaty of 1898 dealt with the partition of Mozambique in the event that Portugal should be unable to extricate itself from its financial difficulties. The chief exports of Mozambique are rubber, sugar, various ores, wax, and ivory; it imports mainly cottons, hardware, spirits, beer, and wine. Lourenco Marques (9849 inhabitants), the capital of the colony, and Beira are thriving ports. The town of Mozambique (properly San Sebastian of Mozambique), situated on the island of the same name, has diminished greatly in importance since the abolition of the slave trade. The college built by the Jesuits in 1670, which was made the governor's residence after the suppression of the order, is one of the very few buildings of importance.

The early explorers were accompanied on their voyages by Franciscan fathers who founded under Alvarez of Coimbra the first mission in Mozambique in 1500. In 1560, after the arrival of the Jesuits, a glorious future seemed to await the mission, the King of Inhambane and the Emperor of Monomotapa being baptized with numbers of their subjects. The Dominicans also laboured for a period in this colony, their most illustrious representative being João dos Santos (d. 1622), whose work, "L'Ethiopia oriental e varia historia de cousas nataveis do Oriente", was long authoritative on the geography and ethnology of the country. The Jesuits returned in 1610 and were followed by the Carmelites. The work of evangelization was, however, attended with great difficulties owing to the fickleness of the natives, the opposition of the Mohammedans, the insalubrity of the climate, and the irregular communication with Europe. The powerlessness of Portugal to exercise a firm control and the demoralizing effects of the slave trade resulted in an equally low standard of morals in the case of

both the whites and the natives. In recent years the missionaries were still further hampered by the anti-Catholic policy of the Government. Ecclesiastically speaking, Mozambique is an exempt prelature belonging to the ecclesiastical province of Goa. The prelature formerly included all the territory as far as the Cape, but is now confined to the Portuguese possessions. In 1898 it was again entrusted to the Portuguese branch of the Friars Minor. According to the latest statistics it contains: 12 priests (4 Friars Minor), 13 Sisters, 3500 native Catholics, 11 churches and chapels, 10 stations.

João dos Santos, *L'Ethiopia oriental e varia historia de cousas nataveis do Oriente* (Évora, 1609), French tr. Charpy (Paris, 1684, 1688); Külb, *Missionereisen nach Afrika*, III (1862); Spillmann, *Rund um Afrika* (3rd. ed., 1897), 284 sqq.; Negreiros, *Le Mozambique* (Paris, 1904); Pinon, *La Colonie du Mozambique* in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, II, 5th period (Paris, 1901), 56–86. Concerning the natives see Bourquin, *Usos e costumes dos indigenas de Moçambique* in *Soc. de geog. de Lisboa* (Lisbon, 1909), 420 sqq.

Thomas Kennedy.

Mozarabic Rite.—This subject will be treated under the following heads: I. History and Origin; II. MSS. and Editions; III. The Liturgical Year; IV. The Divine Office; V. The Mass; VI. The Occasional Services.

I. History and Origin.—The name "Mozarabic Rite" is given to the rite used generally in Spain and in what afterwards became Portugal from the earliest times of which we have any information down to the latter part of the eleventh century, and still surviving in the Capilla Muzárabe in Toledo cathedral and in the chapel of San Salvador or Talavera, in the old cathedral of Salamanca. The name is not a good one. It originated in the fact that, after its abolition in Christian Spain, the rite continued to be used by the Christians in the Moorish dominions who were known as *Mozárabes* or *Muzárabes*. The form *Mostárabes* is also found. The derivation of the word is not quite certain, but the best theory seems to be that it is *musta'rab*, the participle of the tenth form of the verb *'araba*, and that it means a naturalized Arab or one who has adopted Arab customs or nationality, an Arabized person. Some, with less probability, have made it a Latin or Spanish compound, *Mixto-Arabic*. The meanings, which are not far apart, applied entirely to the persons who used the rite in its later period, and not to the rite itself, which has no sign of any Arab influence. The names *Gothic*, *Toledan*, *Isidorian*, have also been applied to the rite—the first referring to its development during the time of the Visigothic kingdom of Spain, the second to the metropolitan city which was its headquarters, and the third to the idea that it owed, if not its existence, at any rate a considerable revision to St. Isidore of Seville. Dom Férotin (Liber Ordinum) prefers *Rite Wisigothique*.

Its origin is still discussed, and the various theories have been already set forth under Ambrosian Rite (q. v.), Celtic Rite (q. v.), and Gallican Rite (q. v.). Suffice it to say that whatever theory applies to the Gallican Rite applies equally to the Mozarabic, which is so nearly identical with it in construction as to leave no doubt of a common origin. The theory of Pinius (op. cit. in bibliography) to the effect that the Goths brought with them from Constantinople and Asia Minor a Greek Liturgy, which, combined with the already existing Romano-Spanish Rite, formed the new rite of Spain, is not founded on more than conjecture. There is no definite information concerning the Spanish variety of the Hispano-Gallican Rite until the end of the sixth and beginning of the seventh century (that is to say, until the period of transition from Arianism to Catholicism in the Visigothic kingdom), and, since the whole of Spain, including the Suevic kingdom in Galicia which had been annexed by the Visigothic king Leovigild, was then under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Toledo, it may be presumed that the Toledo Rite was used throughout the whole peninsula. This had not been the case somewhat earlier. In 538 Profuturus, Bishop of Braga and Metropolitan of the Suevic kingdom, had consulted Pope Vigilius on liturgical matters. Vigilius sent him rather full information concerning the Roman usages in the Mass and in baptism. The Council of Braga (561), held at the time of the conversion of the Arian Suevi to Catholicism, decided (cc, iv, v) that the orders of Mass and baptism obtained from Rome by Profuturus should be exclusively used in the kingdom. This probably continued as long as the Suevi remained independent, and perhaps until the conversion of the Visigothic king Recared to Catholicism in 589. Though until this date the kings and the Teutonic ruling class were Arians, the native Spanish population was largely Catholic, and the rite—which was possibly revised and added to by St. Leander of Seville and the first Council of Toledo in 589, described and perhaps arranged by his brother and successor, St. Isidore (d. 636), and regulated by the Fourth Council of Toledo in 633—was no doubt that previously in use among the Spanish Catholics. This is confirmed by the scanty liturgical decrees of the various Spanish councils of the sixth century. What the Arians used we have no means of knowing, and there is no reason to suppose that, whatever it was, its influence continued after the conversion of Recared and the submission of the Arian bishops. But the rite described by St. Isidore, allowing of course for the modifications and variations of many centuries, is substantially that now known as the Mozarabic.

Dom Marius Férotin, O.S.B. (to whom the present writer is indebted for much help), in his edition of the Mozarabic "Liber Ordinum", dismisses the idea of any Oriental origin, and describes it as a purely Western rite, "the general framework and numerous ceremonies of which were imported from Italy (probably from Rome)", while the remainder (lessons, prayers, hymns, etc.) is the work of Spanish bishops and doctors, with additions from Africa and Gaul. Without accepting the Italian or Roman origin as more than a very reasonable conjecture, we may take this as an excellent generalization. There was a period of development during the seventh century under St. Isidore, who was the moving spirit of the Council of Toledo of 633, Eugenius III of Toledo (646-57), to whom the chant known as "Melodico" or "Eugeniano" is attributed, St. Ildefonsus of Toledo (657–67), to whom certain masses are attributed, and St. Julian (680–90), who, according to his biographer and successor, Felix, wrote a Mass-book "de toto circulo anni", and a book of collects, as a revision of the old books with additions of his own. But after the Moorish invasion, which began in 710, the Spanish Christians had little leisure for improving their liturgies, and, except for some prayers, hymns, and masses attributed to Abbot Salvus of Albelda (tenth century), nothing seems to have been added to the rite from the eighth to the eleventh century. In 870 Charles the Bald, King of the Franks, and afterwards emperor, wishing to see what the ancient Gallican Rite had been like, had priests sent from Spain to say the Toledan Mass before him. In the latter part of the eighth century, the Spanish Rite had fallen under some suspicion owing to quotations cited by Elipandus of Toledo in support of his Adoptionist theories, and the Council of Frankfort (794) spoke somewhat disparagingly of possible Moslem influence on it. Some of the passages still remain, in spite of Alcuin's suggestion that the original and proper readings must have been *assumptio* and *assumptus*, not *adoptio* and *adoptatus* (or *adoptivus*); but they all can bear an orthodox explanation. It was in consequence of this suspicion that in 924 John X sent a legate (Zanelo, Zannello, or Jannello) to Santiago to examine the Spanish Rite. He reported favourably upon it, and the pope gave it a new approbation, changing only, as

Sr. Moraleda y Estaban says (*El Rito Mozárabe*), the Words of Consecration to the Roman Use. This condition is still observed, but whether that has always been the case since 924 or not, there is no evidence to show. The old Spanish formula is given in the modern books—"ne antiquitas ignoretur", as Leslie says in his notes to the Mozarabic Missal—but the Roman is used in actual practice.

Of the existing manuscripts of the rite, though a very few may possibly be of the ninth century, almost all are of dates between the ratification by John X and the introduction of the Roman Rite in the second half of the eleventh century, during which period the old Spanish Rite held undisturbed possession of the whole of Spain, whether under Christian or Moorish rule. During these centuries the Christian kingdoms were gradually driving back the Moors. Besides Asturias and Navarre, which had never been quite conquered, Galicia, Leon, and Old Castile had been regained, and the Kingdom of Aragon had been formed. In 1064 Cardinal Hugo Candidus was sent from Rome by Alexander II to abolish the Spanish Rite, some vague attempts in that direction having been already made by his predecessor Nicholas II, who had also wished to abolish the Ambrosian Rite at Milan. The centralizing policy of the popes of that period included uniformity of liturgical practice. The Spanish kings and clergy were against the change then, and Bishops Munio, of Calahorra, Eximino of Oca, and Fortunio of Alava were sent to Italy with Spanish office-books, including a *Liber Ordinum* from Albelda, and a Breviary from Hirache, to defend the rite. The books were carefully examined by the Council of Mantua (1067), and were pronounced not only free from heresy but also worthy of praise. But in Aragon King Sancho Ramirez was in favour of the change, and on 22 March, 1071, the first Roman Mass was sung in the presence of Cardinal Hugo Candidus and the king in the Monastery of San Juan de la Peña (near Jaca, at the foot of the Pyrenees, and the burial place of the early kings of Aragon). The Roman Rite was introduced into Navarre on the accession of Sancho of Aragon to the throne in 1074, and into Cataluña a little later. Meanwhile Alfonso VI became King of Castile and Leon, and St. Gregory VII became pope. Alfonso, influenced by the pope, by St. Hugh of Cluny, and by his first wife Agnes, daughter of William, Duke of Gascony and Guienne and Count of Poitiers, introduced the Roman Rite into Castile and Leon in 1077. This was resisted by his subjects, and on Palm Sunday, 1077, according to the "Chronicon Burgense", occurred the incident of "El Juicio de Dios". Two knights—"one a Castilian and the other a Toledan", says the chronicle—were chosen to fight "pro lege Romana et Toletana". The champion of the Spanish Rite, Juan Ruiz de Matanzas, who was the victor, was certainly a Castilian, but it is improbable that the champion of the Roman Rite, whose name is not recorded, was a Toledan, and the Annals of Compostella say that one was a Castilian and the other of the king's party. The "Chronicon Malleacense", which alleges treachery, calls the latter "miles ex parte Francorum", and at the later ordeal by fire in 1090 the Roman Rite is called impartially "romano", "frances", or "gallicano". It is said that two bulls, one named "Roma" and the other "Toledo", were set to fight, and there also the victory was with Toledo.

But, in spite of the result of the trials by battle, Alfonso continued to support the Roman Rite, and a Council of Burgos (1080) decreed its use in Castile. In 1085 Toledo was taken and the question of rites arose again. The Mozarabic Christians, who had many churches in Toledo and no doubt in the country as well, resisted the change. This time another form of ordeal was tried. The two books were thrown into a fire. By the time the Roman book was consumed, the Toledan was little damaged. No one who has seen a Mozarabic manuscript, with its extraordinarily solid vellum, will adopt any hypothesis of Divine interposition here. But still the king, influenced now by his second wife Constance, daughter of Robert, Duke of Burgundy and son of King Robert the Pious of France, and by Bernard, the new Archbishop of Toledo, a Cistercian, insisted on the introduction of the Roman Rite, though this time with a compromise. All new churches were to use the Roman Rite, but in the six old churches, Sts. Justa and Ruffina, St. Eulalia, St. Sebastian, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Torquatus, the Mozárabes might continue to have their old rite, and might hand it on to their descendants. Flores mentions also the Ermita de S. Maria de Alficen, which is probably the church of St. Mary which Neale says "disappeared, we know not how, some centuries ago." But the rite still continued in the Moorish dominions, as well as in certain monasteries, apparently, according to Rodrigo Ximenes, Archbishop of Toledo (1210–49), even in the Christian kingdoms.

When King James of Aragon conquered Valencia in 1238, he found there Mozarabic Christians using the old rite, and the same apparently happened when Murcia and all Andalusia except Granada were conquered by Ferdinand III in 1235–51. When Ferdinand and Isabella took Granada in 1492, there were certainly some Mozarabic Christians there, as well as Christian merchants and prisoners from non-Moorish countries, but whether the Mozarabic Rite was used by them does not appear. With the discouragement which began with Alfonso VI came the period of decadence. The civil privileges (*fueros*) of the Toledo Mozárabes, which, though in 1147 Pope Eugene III had definitely put them under the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese, included a certain amount of independence, were confirmed by Alfonso VII in 1118, by Peter in 1350, by Henry II in 1379, and by Ferdinand and Isabella in 1480 (later also by Philip II in 1564, by Charles II in 1699, and by Philip V in 1740). But in spite of this the Roman Rite prevailed so much that it was introduced even into Mozarabic churches, which only used the old rite for certain special days, and that in a corrupted form from old and imperfectly understood MSS. This and the dying out of many Mozarabic families gradually brought the rite very low. There was a spasmodic attempt at a revival, when in 1436 Juan de Todesillas, Bishop of Segovia, founded the college of Aniago (originally a Benedictine house, a little to the south-west of Valladolid), where the priests were to use the Gothic Rite. The foundation lasted five years and then became Carthusian. Thus, when Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros became Archbishop of Toledo in 1495, he found the Mozarabic Rite in a fair way to become extinct. He employed the learned Alfonso Ortiz and three Mozarabic priests, Alfonso Martinez, parish priest of St. Eulalia, Antonio Rodriguez of Sts. Justa and Ruffina, and Jeronymo Guttierez of St. Luke, to prepare an edition of the Mozarabic Missal, which appeared in 1500, and of the Breviary, which appeared in 1502. He founded the Mozarabic Chapel in Toledo cathedral, with an endowment for thirteen chaplains, a sacristan and two *mozos sirvientes*, and with provision for a sung Mass and the Divine Office daily. Soon afterwards, in 1517, Rodrigo Arias Maldonado de Talavera founded the Capilla de San Salvador, or de Talavera, in the Old Cathedral of Salamanca, where fifty-five Mozarabic Masses were to be said yearly. They were later reduced to six, and now the rite is used there only once or twice a year.

When the church of St. Mary Magdalene at Valladolid was founded by Pedro de la Gasca in 1567, an arrangement was made for two Mozarabic Masses to be said there every month. This foundation was in existence when Florez wrote of it in 1748, but is now extinct. At that time also the offices of the titular

saints were said according to the Mozarabic Rite in the six Mozarabic churches of Toledo, and in that of Sts. Justa and Ruffina the Mozarabic feast of the Samaritan Woman (first Sunday in Lent) was also observed. Except for the Capilla Muzárabe in the cathedral, all else was Roman. In 1553 Pope Julius III regulated mixed marriages between Mozarabic and Roman Christians. The children were to follow the rite of the father, but, if the eldest daughter of a Mozarab married a Roman, she and her husband might choose the rite to which she and her children should belong, and if she became a widow she might return to the Mozarabic Rite, if she had left it at her marriage. These rules are still in force, and the writer is informed by Dom Férotin that the present Mozárabes are so proud of their distinctive rite, involving, as it does, pedigrees dating back to the eleventh century at least, that no Mozarabic heiress will ever consent to desert her own rite if she should marry a member of the Roman Rite. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the Mozarabic Rite attracted some attention among the liturgical scholars of the period, and certain dissertations were written and texts published, of which more will be said in the section on MSS. and editions. In 1842 all the Mozarabic parishes in Toledo except two, Sts. Justa and Ruffina and St. Mark, were suppressed, and their parishioners, something under a thousand in number, were added to those of the two surviving parishes. By the Concordat of 1851 the chaplains of the Capilla Muzárabe were reduced from thirteen to eight, but the continuance of the above two parishes was provided for, and at that time the parochial Mass in these was always Mozarabic. It has almost entirely ceased to be so now, and it is only in the Capilla Muzárabe in the cathedral and in the Capilla de Talavera at Salamanca that the rite can be seen at present—in the former daily (in a High Mass at nine a.m.), and in the latter once or twice a year. Only the Missal and Breviary were published by Ximenes, and only four manuscripts of the "Liber Ordinum" (which contains the services of the Ritual and Pontifical) are known to exist. Hence it is that in all the sacraments except the Eucharist, and in all the occasional offices the Mozárabes now follow the Roman Rite. One effect of the Mozarabic Rite yet remains in the cathedral services of the Roman Rite. According to Simonet (Historia de los Mozárabes de España), the *Canto Melódico* or *Eugeniano*, attributed to Eugenius II, Archbishop of Toledo (647–57), is still alternated with the Gregorian plain chant in all the Graduals of the Mass except on ferials, and certain hymns are still sung to the Eugenian melodies. When Jeronimo Romero, choirmaster of Toledo cathedral, wrote his note on the *Canto Melódico* in Lorenzana's edition of the Mozarabic Breviary of 1775, it seems to have been still more extensively used, but in the specimens which he gives (the beginning of the Gradual for Sts. Peter and Paul) the *textus* or *canto firmo* is only a variety of the ordinary plain chant, and the *glossa duplex* and *glossa simplex*, which he calls "Eugenian", seem rather too modern counterpoints for the seventh century.

II. MSS. AND EDITIONS.—Of the existing MSS. of the Mozarabic Rite many, as might be expected, are in the cathedral chapter library at Toledo, but until quite recent times the Benedictine Abbey of Silos, between thirty and forty miles to the south of Burgos, possessed nearly as many. Most of these are now elsewhere, some having been purchased in 1878 by the British Museum, and others by the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale. There are other MSS. in the Royal Library, in the Library of the Royal Academy of History, and in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid, in the Cathedral Library at Leon, in the University Library at Santiago de Compostela, and in the chapter library at Verona. It will be seen from the list which follows that nearly all the existing MSS. come either from Toledo or from the neighbourhood of Burgos. There is also an interesting collection of transcripts, made from 1752 to 1756 under the direction of the Jesuit Father, A. M. Burriel, from Toledo MSS. in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid. All the original MSS. are anterior to the conquest of Toledo in 1085, most of them being of the tenth or eleventh century. The arrangement of the books of that period was peculiar. The variable parts of the Mass and the Divine Office, whether sung by the choir or said by the celebrant or the deacon, were usually combined in one book, a sort of mixed sacramentary, antiphonary, and lectionary, usually with musical *neumes* to the sung portions. Most of the MSS. are very imperfect, and it is not quite clear under what name this composite book was known. Probably it was called "Antiphonarium" or "Antiphonale". But such books existed also as antiphoners with choir parts only and sacramentaries with the priest's part only, and the usual modern practice is to call the composite books by the descriptive name of "Offices and Masses". They contain under each day the variables of Vespers and Matins and of the Mass. Sometimes one Mass is made fuller by the addition of some of the invariables, as a model of a complete Mass. The *Missale Omnium Offerentium*, the separate book answering to the Ordinary of the Mass (see Section V, THE MASS), does not exist in any early MS., but there is a *Missa Omnimoda* in the principal Silos MS. of the "Liber Ordinum", which is a model Mass of the type found in that book. The book of "Offices and Masses" was supplemented for the Divine Office by the Psalter, which in its fullest form (as in the British Museum Add. MS. 30851) contained the whole book of Psalms, the Canticles, chiefly from the Old Testament, sixty-seven to a hundred in number, the Hymns for the year, and the "Horæ Canonicæ." For the Mass it would seem to require no supplement, but the Prophecies, Epistles, and Gospels are found also in a separate book known as "Liber Comitis", "Liber Comicus" or "Comes". The Prayers of Vespers and Matins and the Prayers which follow the *Gloria in Excelsis* at Mass are also found combined in the "Liber Orationum", and the Homilies read at Mass are collected in the "Homiliarum", though some are also given in the composite "Offices and Masses". The occasional services of the Ritual and Pontifical are found in the "Liber Ordinum", which contains also a number of Masses. There is one MS. (at Silos) which contains the Lessons of the now obsolete Nocturnal Office.

The following are the MSS. of the several books:

Offices and Masses.—(a) Toledo, Chapter Library, 35.4, eleventh century. Contains from Easter to the twenty-second Sunday after Pentecost. Belonged to the parish of St. Olalla (Eulalia) at Toledo. (b) 35.5, tenth or eleventh century, 194 ff. Contains from the first Sunday of Lent to the third day of Easter week. (c) 35.6, eleventh century, 199 ff. Contains from Easter to Pentecost and feasts as far as SS. Just and Pastor (6 Aug.). (d) Madrid, Royal Academy of History, F. 190, tenth or eleventh century, 230 ff. Belonged to the Monastery of San Millan (St. Æmilianus) de la Cogolla in the Rioja. (e) Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, formerly at Toledo (35.2), eleventh century, 121 ff. Contains the Lenten Offices up to Palm Sunday. Colophon "Finitur deo gratias hic liber per manus ferdinandi johannis presbiteri eglesie sanctarum juste et rufine civitatis Toleti in mense Aprilis." (f) Silos, eleventh century, paper octavo, 154 ff. (g) British Museum, Add. 30844, tenth century. Contains Offices and Masses for the Annunciation (18 Dec.), St. Thomas, Christmas, St. Stephen, St. Eugenia (27 Dec.), St. James the Less (28 Dec.), St. James the Great (30 Dec., but called St. John), St. Columba (31 Dec.), the Circumcision, Epiphany, St. Peter's Chair (22 Feb.), the

Ascension, and the Sunday after the Ascension. The Mass for the Annunciation is a model Mass with some of the invariable parts inserted. Homilies are inserted in some of the Masses, and the liturgical part is preceded by a collection of Homilies. Belonged to the Abbey of Silos. (h) British Museum, Add. 30845, tenth century. Contains Offices and Masses for the Feast of St. Quiriacus (4 or 20 May), and of Feasts from St. John Baptist (24 June) to St. Emilian (12 Nov.), thirty-seven in all, though not all in their proper order. Belonged to the Abbey of Silos. (i) British Museum, Add. 30846, tenth century. Contains Offices and Masses for Easter Week, followed by the Canticles for the same period, and the Hymns for Eastertide to Pentecost, including the Feasts of Sts. Engratia (16 April), Torquatus and Philip (1 May), and the Invention of the Cross (3 May).

Antiphoners.—There is one MS. which describes itself as "Antiphonarium de toto anni circulo, a festivitate S. Acisculi [17 Nov.] usque ad finem", containing the choir parts, but not the priest's part of the Offices and Masses. This is the book known, quite erroneously, as the "Antiphoner of King Wamba", preserved in the Cathedral Library at Leon. It is a vellum MS. of the eleventh century (Era 1107 = A. D. 1069), 200 ff., transcribed by one Arias, probably from a much older book, which perhaps did belong to King Wamba (672–80). Dom Férotin describes it as very complete.

Sacramentaries.—(a) Toledo Chapter Library, 35.3, late tenth century, 177 ff. Contains Masses for the year. In the initial of that for St. Peter's Chair (22 Feb.) are the words "Elenus Abbas Acsi indignus scripsit". It belonged to the parish of St. Olalla (Eulalia) at Toledo. Dom Férotin describes it as a Sacramentary, and says that it is complete. An edition by him will soon be published. (b) There is another MS. at Toledo mentioned but with no identifiable number by Burriel, Eguren, and Simonet, which is said by them to contain "Missas omnes tam de tempore quam de sanctis per totum anni circulum". There is a copy of it among the Burriel manuscripts at Madrid, and Eguren ascribes the original to the ninth century.

Psalters.—(a) Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, formerly at Toledo (35.1), tenth century, 174 ff. Contains the Psalter with antiphons, the Canticles, and the Hymnal. On f. 150 are the words "Abundantius presbyter librum mauro presbytero scriptor" (sic). The prologue of the Hymnal is an acrostic in verse which reads "Mavricvs obtante Veraniano edidyt". This MS. was used by Cardinal Lorenzana for the Psalter, Canticles, and Hymnal in his edition of the Mozarabic Breviary. There is a copy among the Burriel MSS. (b) British Museum, Add. 30851, eleventh century. Contains Psalter, Canticles, Hymnal, and "Horæ Canonicæ", the last (though imperfect) being much fuller than the printed Breviary and containing the now obsolete Night Offices, as well as the other Hours and a number of offices for special occasions. It has been edited by J. P. Gilson for the Henry Bradshaw Society. (c) Santiago de Compostela, University Library, Gabinete de Reservados No. 1, dated Era 1093 (= A. D. 1055), "Petrus erat scriptor, Frictosus denique pictor." Contains Psalter, 100 Canticles, and the Night Offices, but not the Hymnal. The Psalter is preceded by a poem addressed by Florus of Lyons to Hyldradus (here called Ysidorus Abbas), Abbot of Novalese near Susa in Piedmont (825–7). There is a full description of this MS. in Férotin's "Deux Manuscrits wisigothiques de la Bibliothèque de Ferdinand I". (d) Royal Library, Madrid, 2. J. 5, dated Era 1097 (= A. D 1059). Contains ninety-nine Canticles nearly agreeing with the Compostela Psalter. There is a formula of confession, in which the names of Queen Sancia and the Infanta Urraca appear, and which contain an extraordinary list of sins. The MS. belonged in the fourteenth century to the Benedictine monastery of St. Maria de Aniago near Simancas, which in 1436 became for a time a Mozarabic chapter (see Section I. History and Origin), then to the Colegio de Cuenca at Salamanca. It is fully described in Férotin's "Deux Manuscrits wisigothiques". (e) A Psalter and Canticles of the tenth century, 122 ff., sold at the Silos sale in 1878, present owner unknown.

Liber Orationum.—(a) British Museum, Add. 30852, tenth century. Contains the *Orationes* at Vespers and Matins and the Collects following the *Gloria in Excelsis* at Mass from Advent to St. John Baptist (24 June), the Temporale and Sanctorale being mixed. (b) Verona, Chapter Library, probably eleventh century. Similar contents to those of the above MS. but continuing to St. Martin (11 Nov.). Printed in Bianchini's edition of the works of Cardinal Tommasi (Rome, 1741). *Lectionary.*—Silos, 1059, 90 ff. Contains lessons for the Night Offices.

Liber Comicus, Liber Comitis, Comes, containing the Prophecies, Epistles, and Gospels used at Mass. (a) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouv. Acquis. Lat. 2171, eleventh century. Belonged to Silos from 1067, when it was given to the abbey by Sancho de Tabatiello to 1878. Edited by Dom Morin (Maredsous, 1893). (b) Toledo, Chapter Library, 35.8, ninth or tenth century. Imperfect, containing only from "Dominica post infantum" to the Saturday of the fourth week of Lent. (c) Leon, Cathedral Library. A little earlier than 1071, when it was given to the cathedral by Bishop Pelagius. Begins with the first Sunday of Advent and ends with what it calls "the twenty-fourth Sunday". According to Dom Férotin it is rich in Votive Masses, but incomplete in much else. (d) Madrid, Royal Academy of History, No. 22 (old number F. 192), dated Era 1111 (=A. D. 1073). Written by Petrus Abbas. Belonged to the Benedictine abbey of San Millan de la Cogolla.

Homiliarium.—(a) Toledo Chapter Library, 131 ff., mentioned by Burriel and Simonet. A copy of 1753 is among the Burriel MSS. at Madrid. (b) Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Nouv. Acquis. Lat. 2176, eleventh century, 390 ff. Contains Homilies from Christmas onward. Formerly belonged to Silos. (c) Nouv. Acquis. Lat. 2177, eleventh century, 770 ff. Contains homilies from Epiphany to Christmas. Belonged to Silos. (d) British Museum, Add. 30853, eleventh century, 324 ff. Contains Homilies and a Pœnitentiale.

Liber Ordinum.—(a) Silos, dated Era 1090 (=A. D. 1052), 344 ff. Copied by Bartolomæus Presbyter for Domingo, Abbot of San Prudentio de Laturce in the Rioja. Dom Férotin conjectures that it is the very copy sent in 1065 to Alexander II. San Prudentio was a cell of Albelda. Of the four books sent to Rome one was "Liber Ordinum majoris Albaldensis Cenobii", and one of the deputation, Eximino of Oca, was a personal friend of St. Dominic of Silos. The MS. contains a very full collection of the Ritual and Pontifical Offices and a large number of votive and other Masses. Fully edited and described by Dom Férotin in his "Liber Ordinum". (b) Silos, dated Era 1077 (=A. D. 1039). Written by Joannes Presbyter. Contains Calendar, Baptism, Visitation etc. of the Sick, Commendation of the Dead, Matrimony, a large collection of prayers and blessings, and Votive Masses. Edited by Dom Férotin. (c) Silos, eleventh century, 142 ff. Contains also Hours, which are offices for every hour of the twelve, as well as *Ordo Peculiaris* (Aurora), *ante Completa, ad Completa, post Completa, ante lectulum*, and *in nocturnis*. Edited, except the Hours, by Dom Férotin. (d) Madrid, Royal Academy of History, No. 56 (old number F. 224), eleventh century, 155 ff. Belonged to San Millan de la Cogolla in the Rioja. Contains a Ritual and a number of Masses. Edited by Dom Férotin.

The descriptions of all the above MSS. (except

those in the British Museum, which the writer has examined for himself) are worked out from those given by Férotin, Ewald and Loewe, Simonet, Eguren, and the list of the Burriel transcripts in Fernandez de Navarrete's "Coleccion de Documentos" (see bibliography). Very full descriptions of the principal MSS. will appear in Dom Férotin's forthcoming edition of the Mozarabic Sacramentary. The lists of Toledo MSS. given by Lorenzana and Pinius are too vague for purposes of identification. The four MSS. (Add. 30847–30850), described in the Catalogue of Additional Manuscripts of the British Museum for 1878 as Mozarabic, are all Roman, three being Romano-monastic and one secular.

Printed Editions: *Missale Mixtum* or Complete Missal.—Cardinal Ximenes's edition, Toledo, 1500, fol. Alexander Leslie's edition, Rome, 1755, 4to. Cardinal Lorenzana's edition, with Leslie's notes and additional notes by F. Arevalo, Rome, 1804, fol. Reprint of Leslie's edition in Migne, P. L., LXXXV, Paris, 1850.

Missale Omnium Offerentium, containing, besides the "Missa Omnium Offerentium", the Lesser Hours and the Commons. Edition by Lorenzana and F. Fabian y Fuero. Angelopoli (Los Angeles, Mexico), 1770, fol. Reprint, Toledo, 1875, fol. The "Missa Omnium Offerentium" is given also in La Bigne's "Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum", 1609, 1618, 1654; in J. M. Neale's "Tetralogia Liturgica", 1849; in Hammond's "Ancient Liturgies", 1878; translated and edited by T. Kranzfelder in Reithmayer's "Bibliothek der Kirchenväter", No. 215, 1869, and in J. Perez's "Devocionario Mozárabe", Toledo, 1903.

Breviary.—Cardinal Ximenes's edition, Toledo, 1502, fol. Cardinal Lorenzana's edition, Madrid, 1775, fol. Reprint in Migne (P. L., LXXXVI), Paris, 1850.

Liber Ordinum. Edited by Dom M. Férotin in Cabrol and Le Clerc's "Monumenta Ecclesiæ Liturgica", V, Paris, 1904, quarto.

Liber Orationum.—Printed in Bianchini's edition of the works of Cardinal Tommasi, Rome, 1741, fol.

Psalter, Canticles, Hymnal, and Hours.—In Lorenzana's Breviary of 1775 and the Migne reprint, from the Toledo manuscript. In the Henry Bradshaw Society's Publications, vol. XXX, edited by J. P. Gilson, London, 1905, from the British Museum MS.

Liber Comicus.—Edited by Dom G. Morin from the Paris MS. in "Anecdota Maredsolana", I, Maredsous, 1893.

III. The Liturgical Year.—In the present printed books, the offices are divided after the Roman fashion into "Officium Canonicum per Annum" (answering to the "Officium de Tempore") and the "Sanctorale". As in the Roman books, the fixed feasts from Christmas Eve to the Epiphany (except that the Breviary puts two in the "Sanctorale") come in the "de Tempore", and the Missal, but not the Breviary, includes also St. Clement (23 Nov.), St. Saturninus (29 Nov.), St. Andrew (30 Nov.), St. Eulalia (10 Dec.), the Annunciation (18 Dec.), and St. Thomas the Apostle (21 Dec.) in the same part, though several intermediate feasts come in the "Sanctorale". In the manuscripts (e. g. in the two *Libri Orationum*, Add. MS. 30852 and the Verona MS. printed in Bianchini's edition of Thomasius, which has a very complete sequence of the year) the two parts are not distinguished, and the whole set of days, fixed and moveable, are given in one series. The "Officium per Annum" of the modern books begins with the first Sunday of Advent, as in the Roman, but the "Sanctorale" begins with Sts. Julianus and Basilissa (7 Jan.), and ends in the Missal with St. Eugenia (12 Dec.), while the Breviary includes in it also Sts. Justus and Abundus (16 Dec.), the Annunciation (18 Dec.), St. Thomas the Apostle (21 Dec.), the Translation of St. James the Great (30 Dec.), and St. Columba (31 Dec.). There are six Sundays of Advent, as there were in the Gallican and are now in the Ambrosian. The key day for Advent Sunday is therefore St. Martin (11 Nov.), as it is in the Ambrosian Rite, and, as according to the Council of Mâcon (581), it was in the Gallican, but Advent Sunday is that next after, not, as in the Roman, that nearest to the key day. Thus Advent Sunday may be on any day from 12 to 18 Nov.

The four feasts which follow Christmas Day are now the same as in the Roman Rite, including St. Thomas of Canterbury. The next day is the Translation of St. James the Great and the last day of the year is St. Columba, Virgin and Martyr, though the Calendar of the Missal includes also St. Silvester. But, according to the Calendar of the Breviary, the twenty-ninth is "Jacobi Fratris Domini", and there is an office for his feast, as well as a direction to use the Common of one pontiff martyr for St. Thomas of Canterbury, and for the thirtieth there is an Office for the feast (translation) "Sancti Jacobi Fratris Sancti Joannis". In the Missal St. James the Less is not mentioned here in the Calendar, but the Mass of the twenty-ninth is his; there is nothing of St. Thomas, and the table of contents of the Ximenes Missal refers to the Mass of that day as "in translatione Jacobi Zebedei", which it certainly is not. There is no Mass for the Translation of St. James the Great in the printed books, though that for his martyrdom (25 July) is given as the specimen full Mass "Omnium Offerentium" instead of the Ordinary; but in Add. MS. 30844 (tenth century) there is one which follows the Mass of St. James the Less, though by mistake it is called by the name of St. John the Evangelist. In that MS. the days after Christmas are St. Stephen, St. Eugenia, St. James (*Frater Domini*), St. James the Great, St. Columba, leaving one day unoccupied. In Add. 30850, a tenth-century *Liber Orationum*, "De Alisione Infantum", which according to the present calendars would occupy that day (28 or 29 December), is given next after the Epiphany. In the Hymnal printed with Lorenzana's Breviary, the vacant day is occupied by St. John the Evangelist, and the rest are as in Add. 30844. The Circumcision is on 1 January. If a Sunday occurs between that day and the Epiphany it is "Dominica ante Epiphaniam". The Mass is that of the Kalends of January (i. e. New Year's Day). The three days before the Epiphany are "Jejunia in Kalendis Januarii", said to have been set apart as fasts *in contemptum superstitionis gentilium*, just as fasts were forbidden during Advent *ob impietatem Priscillianistarum*, who, denying the Incarnation, fasted at that season. There are analogous instances of this sort of fasting (or not fasting) *ad lites et contentiones* in the Byzantine practice of not fasting on certain days before Lent begins because of the Artziburion fast of the Armenians and the Ninevite Fast of the Jacobites and Nestorians. After the Epiphany (called also "Apparitio Domini") to Lent nine Sundays are given, the last being "Dominica ante Cineres", the rest being numbered one to eight "Post octavam Epiphaniæ".

Ash Wednesday (*Feria quarta in capite jejunii*) is an evident late Roman borrowing, rather clumsily inserted, for the Sunday that follows, though called "Dominica prima Quadragesimæ", has a Mass and an Office in which *Alleluia* is used, and at Vespers there is the well-known "Endless Alleluia" (*Alleluia Perenne*) hymn. In the Hymnal this hymn is entitled "Ymnus in carnes tollendas". The true liturgical Lent does not begin till the Monday after Ash Wednesday. The old Mass Lections of the Sundays in Lent have been disturbed in their order in consequence of the Gospel for the first Sunday (Christ in the Wilderness) being given to Ash Wednesday, and that of the second (The Samaritan Woman) is given to the first, that of the third (The Healing of the Blind Man) to the second, while, so as to keep the Gospel "Jam autem die festo mediante" for Mid-Lent Sunday, that of the fifth (the Raising of Lazarus) is given to the third and a new

Gospel (The Good Shepherd) is given to the fifth. The sixth is Palm Sunday, called only "Dominica in Ramis Palmarum", but including, between the Prophecy and Epistle at Mass, the *Traditio Symboli* in the form of a "Sermo ad Populum". On Maundy Thursday there occurs the same process of removing one of two consecrated Hosts to the Altar of Repose (called *monumentum* and *Sepulchrum*) as in the Roman Rite, and there is a service *ad lavandos pedes*, in both cases with different words. The Washing of the Feet takes place "clausis ostiis et laicis omnibus foris projectis", and the feet of certain priests are washed by the bishop and dried by the *archipresbyter*. "Postea ad cenam conveniunt." On Good Friday there is a penitential service "ad Nonam pro indulgentia", which consists largely of *preces* interspersed with cries of various cases of the word "indulgentia" many times repeated, and contains passages similar to the *Improperia* of the Roman Rite, as well as lections, including the Passion according to St. Matthew. It is the remains of the solemn reconciliation of penitents, and is mentioned by the fourth Council of Toledo (633), canon vi. This is followed by the Adoration of the Cross and the Procession and Communion of the Presanctified. The Easter Eve services are similar to those of the Roman Rite: the New Fire, the Easter Candle, the Prophecies (of which there are only ten, seven of which agree more or less with those of the Roman Rite, though not all in the same order), and the Blessing of the Font. But the words used throughout are very different. Even the "Exultet" is not used, but another hymn of similar import. Before the "Benedictio Cerei" there is a "Benedictio Lucernæ", and the Litany is used for the two processions, to the Font before the Blessing and back again after it.

From Easter to Pentecost there is no peculiarity except that the numbering of the Sundays includes Easter Day and that the four days before Whit-Sunday are fasts. Formerly (e. g. in the time of St. Isidore) these fasts came after Pentecost, though they answered to rogation or litany days. Leslie conjectures that the alteration was made because of the Whit-Sunday baptisms. There is no Blessing of the Font on the vigil of Pentecost, but there are allusions to baptism in the services of the vigil and the day itself. The following Sunday only commemorates the Holy Trinity in certain of the prayers at Mass (for which there is a direction to use those of Palm Sunday which have allusions to the Trinity, instead of those for the Sunday, which are to be transferred to the following Tuesday), in the title "in die Sanctissimæ Trinitatis", and in the hymns in the Breviary Office. Otherwise the day, as far as there is anything definite about it, is treated as the Octave of Pentecost and the allusions are to the Holy Spirit. Corpus Christi is kept on the following Thursday, and the Mass and Office, though naturally enough influenced by the Roman propers, are composed on a purely Mozarabic plan. In the Missal seven Sundays after Pentecost have Masses, as well as the Sunday before the fast of the Kalends of November. In the Breviary the Sundays after Pentecost are only three. There is a direction in the Breviary that if there is no Feast on any Sunday during that season, one of these three offices must be used. Two sets of three-day fasts occur in this season, one before the Feast of St. Cyprian (13 Sept.) and one before that of St. Martin (11 Nov.). They have nothing to do with either St. Cyprian or St. Martin, whose days only serve as key-days to them (cf. Holy Cross and St. Lucy, as key-days to the September and December ember-days). The November fast is called "jejunia Kalendarum Novembrium". They are really days of Litany or Rogation, and are both mentioned by St. Isidore; the September fast is evidently mentioned by the fifth Council of Toledo (can. i), though obviously by a mistake it calls it "dies Iduum *Decembrium*", and the November one by the Council of Gerona. In the *Sanctorale* there are of course a large number of Spanish saints who either do not occur at all or receive only cursory mention in the Roman Calendar, but there are also many that are common to the whole Church, and in the modern books a number of feasts, some of which were instituted after the period of the MSS., have been added.

There are two modern forms of the Calendar. In that prefixed to the Breviary a rather small number of days are marked, hardly any (as in the Ambrosian Calendar) during the possible Lenten period, but offices or references to the Common are given in a large appendix for a great number of other saints. In that prefixed to the Missal all these days are put in one series, as their Masses are in the body of the book. There are a good many discrepancies in the existing MS. calendars, and it is not always quite easy to determine the exact day of some of the older feasts, but now most of the days which are common to both have been assimilated to the Roman. The Annunciation is kept twice, on 25 March and on 18 December. The last, called "Annunciatio S. Mariæ Virginis de la O", is really the "Expectatio Partus B. M. V." Its name is referred to a curious custom in the Toledan Use, according to which the whole choir sing a loud and prolonged O at Vespers on that day, to signify, it is said, the eager desire of the saints in Limbo, the Angels in Heaven, and of all the world for the birth of the Saviour. This or the Antiphons known as the "Great O's" may be the cause of the name, which is known outside Spain. The tenth Council of Toledo (656) ordered the Annunciation to be kept on that day, because 25 March came either in the Lenten or Easter period, and thus was unsuitable, and shortly afterwards St. Ildefonsus, with reference to this decree, calls it "Expectatio Puerperii Deiparæ". In the printed Missal the same Mass is ordered also for 25 March, but no Office is given in the Breviary. (Cf. the Ambrosian custom of keeping the Annunciation on the sixth Sunday of Advent for the same reason.) Sometimes there are other disagreements between the modern Missal and Breviary. Thus, the Decollation of St. John Baptist is given for 29 Aug. (the Roman, and also the Byzantine day) in the Missal, but for 24 Sept. (the old Mozarabic day, as appears from the MSS.) in the Breviary. In both, 1 May is Sts. Philip and James, and the Mass is the same, *mutatis nominibus*, as that of Sts. Peter and Paul, while the Office is similar to that of Sts. Simon and Jude. But in the MSS. St. Philip alone is mentioned, St. James the Less being, as we have seen, already provided with a day in Christmastide, not only in them but also in the printed books. But 1 May is also the feast of St. Torquatus and his companions, the Apostles of Spain, who naturally eclipse the other Apostles. The Sunday before the Nativity of St. John Baptist is kept as "Dominica pro adventu S. Joannis Baptistæ". As its position with regard to the general sequence of Sundays is variable, its Mass and Office are given in the *Sanctorale*. The classification of feasts is very simple. There are Principal Sundays, which are those of Lent and Advent, and of course Easter Day and Whit-Sunday. Feasts are "sex capparum", "quatuor capparum", and "novem lectionum", the last being also called "duarum capparum". The distribution of these titles is occasionally rather arbitrary, and the Missal and Breviary do not always agree. If a feast comes on a Principal Sunday it is transferred to the next day, unless that is a greater feast, when it is put off to the next free day. If two equal feasts fall on the same day (the example given is Sts. Philip and James and St. Torquatus), the office is that of the saint who has a *proprietas* (proper), unless the other is the *Vocatio* (patronal feast) of the church, in which case the one with a proper is transferred. If a feast comes on an ordinary Sunday, the

Sunday is omitted (*quia satis habebit locum per annum*) and the feast is kept. During the Octaves which are kept "secundum Regulam Gregorianum", any vacant day is of the Octave, but the Office is not said *solemniter* except on the Octave day. If a greater feast is followed by a lesser one, the Vespers is of the greater but the last *Lauda*, with its prayer, is of the lesser. These rules, which do not differ in principle from those of the Roman Rite, are prefixed to the printed Breviary. Their comparative simplicity is probably more apparent than real.

IV. The Divine Office.—The present Mozarabic Divine Office differs from all others in several points. As a general rule, which applies to every other rite, Eastern or Western, the Divine Office may be defined as the recitation of the Psalter with accompanying antiphons, lections, prayers, canticles, etc., and the nucleus is the more or less regular distribution of the Psalter through the Canonical Hours, generally of one week. In the Mozarabic Rite there is now no such distribution of the Psalter. Psalms are used at all the Hours except Vespers—when, except in fasting time, there are none—but they are as a rule fixed psalms. In the first three weeks of Lent and during the three-day fasts before the Epiphany, St. Cyprian's Day, and St. Martin's Day, and the four-day fast before Pentecost, there are three selected psalms (or sometimes one or two psalms divided into three) at Matins, Terce, Sext, and generally at None, and usually one selected psalm at Vespers, but there is no consecutive order; some psalms are repeated many times, while others are omitted altogether. In the week after the first Sunday after the Epiphany, psalms i . . . xxi, xxiii, xxiv are said consecutively at Matins and Terce, three psalms or divisions of psalms at each until the Thursday, two at Terce on the Friday, and none except the usual fixed psalms on the Saturday. In the MSS. (e. g. in the Psalter in Add. MS. 30851) there are indications of a more regular distribution of the psalms. At Matins, which is a morning and not a night Office, there are no lessons like those of the Roman Rite and its variants, but a certain similarity of construction exists in the sets of three *Antiphonæ* followed by a responsory, which sets, though normally there is only one, are increased to two, three, four, and even five on certain days, though this increase is rather capricious and inconsistent. The Silos Lectionary of 1059 consists of lessons for the now obsolete Night Office; such lessons as there are now occur at Lauds, where there is one variable with the day, which is sometimes called *Prophetia*, and at Prime, Terce, Sext, and None, where there are two short Lessons, a *Prophetia* from one of the Prophets or from the Apocalypse and an *Epistola* from one of the Epistles. These have about four variations with the seasons, except during the fasts, when there are long additional lessons at Terce, Sext, and None (cf. the lessons at Terce during Lent in the Ambrosian Rite), varying every day and also of varying number. Another peculiarity is the existence of an extra hour, called *Aurora* (also *Ordo Peculiaris*), before Prime. In a *Liber Ordinum* at Silos, besides the usual Hours and this *Ordo Peculiaris*, Offices are given for all the intermediate hours of the twelve, as well as *ante Completa*, *post Completa*, and *ante Lectulum*. Vespers, Matins, and Lauds are very variable, but there is much less variability in the Lesser Hours and Compline. A considerable part of the Office is made up of *responsoria*, constructed on similar principles to those of the Roman Rite, but called by the various names of *Antiphona*, *Lauda*, *Sono* (or *Sonos*), or *Matutinarium* according to their position in the Office. (*Antiphona* also means the antiphon of a psalm or canticle, which is of the same form as in the Roman Rite.) They vary in form, but the general plan is: Verse, Response, Verse, repetition of first Response, Gloria, second repetition of Response or of first Verse and Response. The first *Lauda* at Vespers and the *Sono* are generally without the Gloria and the second repetition of the Response. These various responsories and also the psalms, canticles, etc. are generally followed by *Orationes*, which are usually founded on them, with or without special reference to the day or season.

The construction of the Hours is as follows: Before every Hour except Lauds, which follows on after Matins: Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, Kyrie eleison; Pater Noster; Ave Maria, are said secretly, kneeling. Then, standing, In nomine D.N.J.C. lumen cum pace. R. Deo gratias. V. Dominus sit semper vobiscum. R. Et cum spiritu tuo. This elongated form of the Dominus vobiscum is said very frequently after collects and responsories and in various other places. The form of the Gloria, which also occurs very frequently, is: Gloria et honor Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

Vespers (*Ad Vesperos*).—(1) *Lauda* followed by its *oratio*. Alternative names are *psalmus* and *vespertinum*, and the words are nearly always from the psalms. This form of *Lauda* has no Gloria. (2) *Sono* on Sundays and feasts, but not on ferials except in paschal time. This is also without Gloria. (3) Alleluia, followed by an *antiphona* with Gloria. Sometimes there are two *antiphonæ*, each followed by its *oratio*. In Lent, on the fasts, and in the week after the Octave of the Epiphany, a selected psalm with its antiphon takes the place of this *antiphona*. (4) Second *Lauda*, with Alleluias interspersed in rather variable fashions, with Gloria. The *Regula* in the beginning of the Breviary has this definition: "*Antiphona* est quæ dicitur sine *Alleluia*; et *Lauda* quæ cum Alleluia dicitur", but this is not an exhaustive definition, and, as in the Roman Rite, Alleluia is not used in Lent. (5) Hymn. This of course varies with the day. There is a great wealth of hymns in the Mozarabic Breviary. (6) *Supplicatio*, a Bidding Prayer generally beginning "Oremus Redemptorem mundi D.N.J.C., cum omni supplicatione rogemus", and continuing with a clause applicable to the day, with response: "Præsta æterne omnipotens Deus", and Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison, Kyrie eleison. (7) *Capitula*, a prayer of the diffuse Gallican type, often embodying the idea of the *Supplicatio*. (8) Pater noster, divided into petitions with a response of Amen to each except "Panem nostrum etc." when it is "Quia Deus es", and followed by an occasionally varying *Embolismus*. (9) *Benedictio* in four clauses with Amen after each, and preceded by "Humiliate vos ad benedictionem". (10) Third *Lauda*, with Gloria. Sometimes there are more than one of these, each followed by an *oratio*. On feasts *sex capparum* the altar is censed while this *Lauda* is sung. (11) Then follow Commemorations which are in the form of a short *Lauda* and *oratio*. (12) Dismissal: "In nomine D.N. J.C. perficiamus in pace. R. Deo Gratias." The *orationes* at Vespers, unlike those at Matins and Lauds, begin immediately without "Dominus sit semper vobiscum". Each has two Amens, one before and one after the final clause, "Per misericordiam etc."

Compline (*Completoria*).—(1) Ps. iv, 7–10, followed by three Alleluias. (2) Ps. cxxxiii, followed by three Alleluias. (3) Six selected psalms and other verses. (4) Hymn, "Sol Angelorum respice", with Ps. xii, 4, as versicle and response. (5) Ps. xc. (6) Ps. xc., 5, and Ps. cxxxiii, 3–5, with "Memor esto mei Domine" as response to each verse, and Gloria. (7) Hymn, "Cultor Dei memento". (8) Three *Supplicationes* of similar form to that at Vespers. (9) Pater noster, with Embolismus. (10) *Benedictio*. (11) Dismissal, as at Vespers. (12) *Commemoratio*. Ps. xvi., 8, 9, as *Lauda*, followed by an *oratio*. (13) "In nomine D.N.J.C. in hac nocte dormiamus et requiescamus in pace. R. Deo Gratias". There are a

few additions on Saturdays, the principal Feasts, in Lent (when there is also a short "Ordo ante Completoria"), and "De traditione Domini" (Passiontide) after the psalms, some variant hymns, and "Miserationes" with variant *capitulæ* and *Benedictiones* for each day of the week, and for the "Traditio Domini".

Matins (*Ad Matutinum*).—The week-day form is: (1) Antiphon of Our Lady, *Ave Regina Cœlorum*. (2) In nomine D.N.J.C. etc., as before the other Hours. (3) Generally Ps. l with a variable antiphon (in the Roman sense) before and after it, and an *oratio*. Sometimes Ps. iii is used here (e. g. during Lent and on other fasts and during Paschal time), and sometimes Ps. lvi. (4) The *Antiphonæ*. These are in sets of three *antiphonæ* and a responsorium. The last only differs from the *antiphonæ* in name. To each is appended its *oratio*. During the first three weeks of Lent and the fasts of Epiphany, Pentecost, St. Cyprian, and St. Martin, and on four days of the week after the Octave of the Epiphany, three varying psalms with antiphons and *orationes* followed by a *responsorium* and *oratio* take the place of the *antiphonæ*. There is usually only one set of *Antiphonæ* etc., but there may be (e. g. on the Feast of Sts. Fructuosus, Augurius, and Eulogius) as many as five. On Sundays Matins begins with the hymn "Æterne rerum conditor", and, except during Paschal time (when only Ps. iii is said), there are three psalms (iii, l, and lvi) with their *orationes*, instead of only one of these.

Lauds (*In Laudibus*) follows immediately on Matins with no preliminary except "Dominus sit semper vobiscum". Its order is: (1) A variable Canticle from the Old and occasionally from the New Testament, with an antiphon before and after it. Sometimes an *oratio* follows. On Christmas Day the *Magnificat* is said in addition to the first Canticle and on the Annunciation instead of it. (2) On Sundays and feasts, the Canticle "Benedictus es Domine Deus Patrum nostrorum" (Daniel, iii, 52 sq.), which includes a very much compressed form of the *Benedicite*. It is sometimes followed by an *oratio*. On ferials an *antiphona* or *responsorium*, called *Matutinarium*, takes the place of this canticle. (3) The *Sono*, generally the same as that at Vespers. This, as at Vespers, is not used on ferials, except in Paschal time. (4) The *Laudate* Psalms (cxlviii, cxlix, cl) preceded by a variable *Lauda*. On some ferials only Ps. cl is ordered. (5) The *Prophetia*, a lection from the Old Testament, or in Paschal time from the Apocalypse. (6) The Hymn of the day. (7) *Supplicatio*, as at Vespers. (8) *Capitula*, as at Vespers. (9) Pater noster and *Embolismus*, as at Vespers. (10) *Lauda*, as at Vespers. (11) *Benedictio*, as at Vespers. The Vesper order of these last two is reversed. The last six are as a rule a different set from those at Vespers. (12) *Commemorationes*, as at Vespers. (13) Dismissal, as at Vespers. In Lent and in the other fasts, Lauds begins with Psalm l and its antiphon. On these occasions Ps. iii is used at Matins.

Aurora.—A very simple office, without variations, said before *Prime* only on ferials. (1) Ps. lxix, cxviii, pts. 1–3, under the one antiphon, "Deus in adjutorium etc." (2) Lauda. (3) Hymn "Jam meta noctis transiit", with its versicle, of which there are three variants. (4) Kyrie eleison etc. (5) Pater noster with *Embolismus*, said as at Vespers. (6) *Preces*, a short litany for all sorts and conditions of men. There are two forms of this.

Prime, *Terce*, *Sext*, *None*.—These are constructed on the same plan, and may be taken together. The order is: (1) The Psalms. At Prime, seven (lxvi; cxliv, 1–12; cxliv, 13–21; cxii; cxviii, pts. 4–6); at Terce, four (xciv, cxviii, pts. 7–9); at Sext, four (liii; cxviii, pts. 16, 17, 18); at None, four (cxlv; cxxi; cxxii; cxxiii), in each case under one antiphon. (2) *Responsorium*, varying with the day. These variations are chiefly "commons" of classes of saints and for Lent, Advent, Christmas, and Easter. The Psalms and *Responsoria* are without *orationes*. (3) *Prophetia*, a lection from the Old Testament or Apocalypse. (4) *Epistola*, a lection from the Epistles. At Prime these lections do not vary and are very short; at Terce, Sext, and None there is more variety, and during Lent and on the fasts, when these Hours are differently arranged, there are very long lections. (5) *Lauda*, with Alleluias or "Laus tibi etc." (6) Hymn. There are a few variants for different seasons in each hour. (7) At Prime on Sundays and Feasts here follow the *Te Deum*, *Gloria in Excelsis*, and *Credo;* on ferials, instead of the first two, the *Benedictus es Domine Deus* (Dan., iii) and the *Miserere* (Ps. l) are said. At the other three Hours the *Clamores*, short supplications for mercy and pardon (a different set for each Hour), are said here. (8) *Supplicatio*, as at Vespers. (9) *Capitula*, as at Vespers. (10) Pater noster etc., as at Vespers. (11) *Benedictio*, as at Vespers. The last four have only a few variants, and generally have reference to the usual events commemorated at the Hours. On the fasts and in the week after Epiphany there are special lessons varying in number, and these are generally followed by three psalms, with their antiphons and *orationes* and a *responsorium* with its *oratio*, as at the Matins of those seasons. Then follow *Preces*, the Hymn, *Capitula*, and the rest as on the other days.

At the end of Vespers, Compline, and Lauds certain fixed *Commemorationes*, appropriate to the Hour, are said, and after Compline and the Lesser Hours, *Salve Regina* is said throughout the year, but after Lauds, *Salve Regina*, *Alma Redemptoris Mater*, *Ecce Maria genuit Salvatorem*, *Sub tuum præsidium*, and *Regina cœli* according to the season. There are many other variations, for at Vespers, Matins, and Lauds nearly everything is variable according to the day and the season, and a good deal is so at the Lesser Hours. Some few things may have been altered and added since, but the Divine Office as described above, which is that in present use, does not seem to differ materially in structure from that indicated in the tenth and eleventh century MSS. in the British Museum, except that there were formerly also certain Night Offices—"Ordo ante Lectulum", "Ad Nocturnos", "Ad Medium Noctis" etc.—which are given in Add. 30851 and elsewhere. Possibly these were only for monastic use.

V. The Mass.—In the present Mozarabic Mass two books are used, the *Missale Omnium Offerentium* and the complete Missal. The *Missale Omnium Offerentium* contains what in the Roman Rite would be called the Ordinary and Canon. As nearly the whole Mass varies with the day, this book contains a specimen Mass (that of the Feast of St. James the Great) set out in full with all its component parts, variable or fixed, in their proper order. On all other days the variables are read from the complete Missal. The reason of the name *Omnium Offerentium* has not been very satisfactorily determined. It would naturally mean "of all who offer", and the phrase "et omnium offerentium . . . peccata indulge" occurs at the oblation of the chalice. There does not seem to be any reason why this one phrase, which is not in a very striking position, should give its name to the whole service, unless those are right who (like Perez in his "Devocionario Mozárabe") apply the name only to the *Missa Catechumenorum*. There are indeed quite as improbable origins as this in liturgical nomenclature. But it is possible to conjecture another origin. In the Celtic languages the word for Mass is derived from some Latin word whose origin was the verb *offero*. The Cornish, Welsh, and Breton have *offeren;* the Gaelic *aifrionn* or *aifreann*. These are generally referred to *offerendum*, and in support of this we find the French *offrande* and Spanish *ofrenda*, both in the sense of a religious offering, equivalent to the Welsh *offrwm* and Cornish *offryn*. But the Celtic words are more prob-

ably derived from *offerentia*, a word which is used by Tertullian (Adv. Marc., xxiv) in the general sense of the act of presenting an offering, but which was perhaps used for a time in Celtic countries in the special sense of the Holy Offering. Thus it may be conjectured that the Spanish expression was originally "Missale Omnium Offerentiarum", "Missal of all Masses", which is just what it is. It has been suggested that *offerens* may have been used in very debased Latin in the sense of an act of offering as well as of one who offers. This would explain the Mozarabic phrase still better.

The Order of the Mass is as follows:

(1) *The Preparation.*—This consists of prayers during vesting, which for the most part resemble those of the Roman Rite in meaning and sometimes in actual wording. These are followed by a responsory and *oratio* for pardon and purity, after which the priest goes to the altar and says *Ave Maria, In nomine D.N.J.C., Sancti Spiritus adsit nobis gratia, Judica me*, with the Antiphon *Introibo, Confiteor*, with the absolution and the subsequent versicles and responses. The Confiteor differs from the Roman form and there are versicles and responses before it. Then *Aufer a nobis*, a longer form than the Roman. Then follows the Salutation of the Cross. The priest makes the sign of the cross on the altar, kisses the altar, and says a responsory "Salve crux pretiosa" and an *oratio*. A good deal of this preliminary matter was borrowed by Cardinal Ximenes from the Toletan (Roman) Missal, and is not Mozarabic. On great feasts the priest directly he enters sings to a rather florid piece of plain chant a prayer "Per gloriam nominis tui etc." for help.

(2) *The Preparation of the Chalice and Paten.*—The corporal is unfolded, the chalice and paten are ceremonially purified, the wine is poured into the chalice, the water is blessed and poured in, and the bread is placed on the paten. To each of these acts there is a prayer or a blessing. A preparation of the chalice before Mass, instead of at the Offertory, is to be inferred from the Irish tracts (see Celtic Rite). It is still the Byzantine practice, and is retained by the Dominicans at low Mass. Yet in the Mozarabic *Missa Omnium Offerentium* there is a direction to put wine into the chalice during the Epistle, but it is not done.

(3) *Ad Missam Officium.*—This is the Introit. *Officium* is a common alternative name, used, among other places, in the Sarum Missal. The old Mozarabic term (see Add. MS. 30844) was *Prælegendum* or *Prolegendum*. *Antiphona ad prælegendum* is the name given by St. Germanus of Paris. It is in the form of a responsory, with Alleluias and Gloria.

(4) *The Canticle or Canticles.*—This is now *Gloria in Excelsis*, omitted in Advent (except on Feasts) and Lent. On Easter Day a Latin farced Trisagion, "Sanctus Deus, qui sedes super cherubim, etc.", with optionally also the *Benedicite* in its abridged form, and on the Sunday *in Adventu S. Joannis Baptistæ* the *Benedictus* are sung as well. In Add. MS. 30844 the Trisagion (ἅγιος ὁ θεός, κ.τ.λ.) is given in Greek (transliterated) and Latin in this place on the Annunciation (18 Dec., the Mass for which day is in that manuscript a fuller one than the others, and like the Mass for Advent Sunday in the printed Missal is given by way of an Ordinary of the Mass) and the Circumcision, and the Latin farced Trisagion now used on Easter Day is given for Christmas Day. This shows that the *Ajus* of St. Germanus and the Bobbio Missal was certainly the *Trisagion*.

(5) *Oratio.*—Though this takes the position of the Roman Collect, it is really a supplementary prayer to the *Gloria in excelsis*. It is the usual practice (though like most things Mozarabic, not invariable) for psalms, hymns, canticles, and every sort of responsory to be followed by prayers which more or less sum up the leading ideas of what they follow. This is why so many Mozarabic, Gallican, and Celtic prayers are named with reference to what they follow—*post Ajus, post Prophetiam, post Nomina, post Pacem* etc. This *Oratio* on a considerable number of days merely continues the idea of the *Gloria* with little or no reference to the day, even on the Sundays of Advent, when the *Gloria* itself is omitted. These are mostly in the *Temporale*, and there are nine *Orationes* of frequent use; but on certain days (e. g. Christmas Day, the Sunday before the Epiphany, Epiphany, Ascension, Pentecost, Corpus Christi, all the Commons, and between thirty and forty days in the *Sanctorale*) this *Oratio* refers to the day and not to the *Gloria*.

(6) *The Prophecy.*—This is a lection usually from the Old Testament, except in Paschal time, when it is from the Apocalypse. (See Ambrosian Rite.) During Lent and other Fasts, there are two of these lections, one from one of the books of Solomon and the other from the Pentateuch or one of the Historical Books.

(7) *The Hymnus Trium Puerorum* occasionally follows the Prophecy. This is the *Benedictus es* (Dan., iii, 52–5) with an abridged form of the *Benedicite*, the whole preceded by Dan., iii, 49–51, rather freely quoted. The fourth Council of Toledo (can. xiv) ordered this "in omnium missarum solemnitate". It occurs in the MSS. on days when it is not given in the printed books. It used to be followed by Ps. cv, *Confitemini*, but now this is reduced to one verse.

(8) *Psallendo* (a responsory).—On the second and third Sundays and on weekdays in Lent it is a *Tractus*, which consists of psalm verses without repetitions, as in the Roman Rite. The *Tract* or *Psallendo* on Sundays of Lent, except Palm Sunday when the *Traditio Symboli* comes here, is followed by the *Preces*, a short penitential litany, differing each Sunday. Neale points out that these are in verse, though not written so.

(9) *The Epistle*, or in Paschal time a lection from the Acts of the Apostles, preceded by "silentium facite", proclaimed by the deacon.

(10) *The Gospel*, preceded only by a short prayer "Comforta me Rex Sanctorum" and the "Munda cor meum *corpusque* ac labia" (the rest as in the Roman Rite), followed by the Blessing, which is not in the Roman form. These of course are said secretly. The giving out of the Gospel and the response and the censing are similar to the Roman. After the reading the priest signs the Gospel with the cross and kisses it, saying: "Ave Verbum Divinum: reformatio virtutum: restitutio sanitatum."

(11) *The Offertory.*—This consists of: (a) The *Lauda*, a verse between two Alleluias. It is what St. Germanus calls the *Sonus*, sung during the procession of the Oblation. There is now no procession, but while it is being sung the Oblation ceremonies go on. (b) The oblation of the bread and wine, with prayers resembling but not identical with the Roman. It is at the covering of the chalice with the *filiola* (pall) that the prayer containing the words "omnium offerentium" (see above) is said. (c) The Blessing of the Oblation, for which two alternative prayers are given, one of which, that generally used, is the "In spiritu humilitatis" and "Veni sanctificator" of the Roman Rite. (d) The censing, with a blessing similar to the Roman blessing at the beginning of Mass, but a different prayer. (e) "Adjuvate me fratres", with response—the Mozarabic form of the "Orate fratres". (f) The *Sacrificium*, which is what St. Germanus calls *Laudes*. This with the *Lauda* forms the equivalent of the Roman *Offertorium*, here divided in the books by the ceremonies of the Oblation, though in practice there is very little division. (g) When there are offerings, the priest is directed to receive them and say to the offerer: "Centuplum accipias et vitam possideas in Regno Dei." This is the remains of the Offering by the people. (See Ambrosian Rite.) The words are retained, but the offering is no longer made. This is followed in the books by the *Benedictio Panis* (cf. the

Pain Bénit still used in France, and formerly in England). The form of this is nearly identical with the first of those given in the Roman and Sarum Missals. But it is now no longer used. (h) The *Lavabo*, with only the first three verses of the psalm. It is followed by a final blessing "super oblationem cum tribus digitis".

(12) *The Prayer of Humble Access*, said with bowed head by the priest.

St. Isidore in his "Etymologies" (vi, 19) mentions a dismissal of catechumens with a deacon's Proclamation as occurring at this point.

Here begins the *Missa Fidelium*, which contains the Seven Prayers spoken of by St. Isidore. These seven prayers are:—

(13) *Ad Missam Oratio*, *Oratio Missæ*, or simply *Missa*.—This is often, but not always, a Bidding Prayer. The Gallican name is *Præfatio*. It is followed in the Mozarabic by "Agios, Agios, Agios, Domine Rex æterne, tibi laudes et gratias" sung by the choir, preceded by *Oremus* (one of the only two instances of this word), and followed by a short invitation to intercessory prayer, a very much compressed form of the *Prex* (see Celtic Rite; Gallican Rite), sung by the priest.

(14) *Alia Oratio*.—This, in the Gallican books, is generally headed "Collectio sequitur". The Reichenau fragments (see Gallican Rite) are not always quite clear as to whether there are one or two prayers here, and whether this is to be identified with the *Collectio* or the *Ante Nomina* of those leaves, but neither of these have reference to the *Nomina* which follow, nor has the Mozarabic *Alia Oratio*, except in the unvarying ending "Per misericordiam tuam, Deus noster, in cujus conspectu sanctorum Apostolorum et Martyrum, Confessorum atque Virginum nomina recitantur." This is followed by another fixed passage reciting how "Sacerdotes nostri [here, according to Leslie, the Deacon recited the names of the Archbishop of Toledo and other metropolitans of Spain] Papa Romensis [here the name of the reigning pope was inserted] et reliqui [i. e. according to Leslie's conjecture, the Bishops of Carthage, Milan, Lyons etc.]," and all priests, deacons, clerks, and surrounding peoples offer the oblation for themselves and for all the brotherhood with a response: "Offerunt pro se et pro universa fraternitate". Then follow the Diptychs or lists of names commemorated, which are in two parts, Apostles and Martyrs, a list consisting of Our Lady, St. Zachary, St. John (Baptist), the Innocents, the Apostles and St. Mark and St. Luke. To this there is a response "et omnium Martyrum". The second list is "Item pro spiritibus pausantium", with forty-seven names, beginning with Sts. Hilary, Athanasius, Martin, Ambrose, and Augustine, and going on with a list of Spanish persons, many of them archbishops of Toledo, both before and after the Conquest. To this the response, as in the Stowe Missal (see Celtic Rite), is "et omnium pausantium".

(15) *The Oratio Post Nomina* continues the intercession. This, the third prayer of St. Isidore's list, is variable with the day, except for the ending, "Quia tu es vita vivorum, sanitas infirmorum et requies omnium fidelium defunctorum in æterna sæcula sæculorum."

(16) *The Pax*, with the prayer *Ad Pacem*, St. Isidore's fourth prayer. The prayer is variable, with a fixed ending, "Quia tu es vera pax nostra etc." After the prayer the priest pronounces the benediction, "Gratia Dei Patris omnipotentis, pax et dilectio D. N. J. C. et communicatio Spiritus Sancti sit semper cum omnibus nobis." In all the principal Eastern liturgies except that of St. Mark, this passage from II Cor., xiii, is separated from the *Pax* and comes immediately before the *Sursum corda* dialogue, its place before the *Pax* being taken by εἰρήνη πᾶσιν or its equivalent. In St. Mark and in the Roman it does not occur, but in the latter ever since the late fourth, or early fifth century at least, the *Pax* has been associated with the Communion, not with the beginning of the *Missa Fidelium*. In the Gallican the *Pax* came as in the Mozarabic. The Ambrosian now follows the Roman, but probably did not always do so. (See Ambrosian Rite; Celtic Rite; Gallican Rite.) In the Mozarabic Mass, the priest says "Quomodo adstatis pacem facite," and the choir sing a responsory, "Pacem meam do vobis etc.", "Novum mandatum do vobis, etc.", during which "accipiat Sacerdos pacem de patena", saying "Habete osculum dilectionis et pacis ut apti sitis sacrosanctis mysteriis Dei", and gives the kiss of peace to the deacon (*vel puero*), who passes it on to the people.

(17) *The Illatio* or *Inlatio*.—This is called *Præfatio* in the Roman and *Contestatio* or *Immolatio* in the Gallican. With the Post-Sanctus it forms St. Isidore's fifth prayer. There are proper *Illationes* to every Mass. The form is similar to the Roman Preface, but generally longer and more diffuse, as in the Gallican. It is preceded by a longer dialogue than the usual one: "Introibo ad altare Dei mei. ℟. Ad Deum qui lætificat juventutem meam. ℣. Aures ad Dominum. ℟. Habemus ad Dominum. ℣. Sursum Corda. ℟. Levemus ad Dominum. ℣. Deo ac D. N. J. C. qui est in cœlis dignas laudes, dignasque gratias referamus. ℟. Dignum et justum est. ℣. Dignum et justum est, etc." The *Illatio* ends in all manner of ways, but always leading by way of the angels to the Sanctus. This is "Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabaoth. Pleni sunt cœli et terra gloria majestatis tuæ. Osanna filio David. Benedictus etc. Agyos, Agyos, Agyos, Kyrie o Theos."

(18) *The Post-Sanctus*, part of St. Isidore's fifth prayer, is variable according to the day, but almost always begins "Vere sanctus, vere benedictus D. N. J. C.", and generally ends "Ipse Dominus ac Redemptor æternus". All liturgies except the Roman and the Romanized Celtic have some form of a very similar Post-Sanctus, which leads up to the Recital of the Institution. Even the Ambrosian has one for Easter Eve. The occurrence of a part of the Intercession after the Sanctus in the Roman makes a great difference here. The last words of the Mozarabic Post-Sanctus ought to anticipate "Qui pridie etc.", as in the Gallican, but there is an interpolation—"more suo adeo imperite ut interpolatio manifesta est", as Leslie says—as follows: "Adesto, adesto, Jesu bone Pontifex in medio nostri sicut fuisti in medio discipulorum tuorum, et sancti † fica hanc oblationem † ut sanctificata sumamus per manus sancti Angeli tui [cf. the clause "Supplices te rogamus" of the Roman Canon] sancte Domine et Redemptor æterne." The age of the interpolation is unknown, but it is probably much older than the Ximenian Missal, though it does not occur in the *Missa Omnimoda* in the Silos *Liber Ordinum* of 1052. It may have originated as a sort of parenthetical ejaculation (influenced by the Roman Canon) said secretly by the priest with bowed head before beginning the Recital of the Institution, which, like the Post-Sanctus, was possibly then said aloud. The present printed form of the Recital is that of I Cor., xi, 23–6: "D. N. J. C. in qua nocte tradebatur etc." This agrees with the principal Eastern liturgies, but the Gallican had "Qui pridie quam pateretur" or some variant thereof, and the Mozarabic must once have had the same, possibly (as Leslie suggests) combining both datings with "Qui pridie quam pateretur" and "in ipsa nocte qua tradebatur etc." The form in the Silos *Liber Ordinum* of 1052 begins as at present, and in Toledo 35.6 it begins "Quoniam Dominus Jesu in qua nocte." It is certain that the Roman form of the

Words of Institution was not used by the Spanish Church before the mission of Zannello (see above) in 924. It was then that the practice arose of saying the Roman form, instead of what was written, and that is what is done now. In the Ximenian edition the Roman Words were not printed at first, but later were printed on separate slips and gummed on to the margin. In the later editions they appear as footnotes. Elevation is ordered in the printed Missal after the Consecration of each species.

(19) *The Post-Pridie.*—St. Isidore calls it *confirmatio sacramenti*, "ut oblatio quæ Deo offertur sanctificata per Sanctum Spiritum corpori Christi et sanguine confirmetur", which seems as if he took it to be an *Epiklesis* (q. v.), needed to complete the consecration, but (in Ep. vii ad Redemptorem, sect. 2) he speaks also of "verba Dei . . . scilicet, Hoc est corpus meum", being the "substantia sacramenti". In the Gallican books there are several of these prayers with some sort of Invocation of the Holy Spirit, some quite unmistakable, others quite vague. The majority have no sign of any *Epiklesis*, and this is the case with the Mozarabic, perhaps fourteen or fifteen Masses have either a definite *Epiklesis* or what with some ingenuity and emendation can be made to look like one, while in the rest it is generally the Great Oblation, often with allusions to the day. It is followed by a fixed prayer resembling the clause *Per quem hæc omnia* in the Roman Canon, and a second elevation preceded by "Dominus sit semper vobiscum etc." and "Fidem quam corde credimus ore autem dicamus". On Sundays and most feasts *sex capparum* and *quatuor capparum* the Creed is recited; this has several verbal differences from the Roman form, among others, *credimus, confitemur* and *expectamus, vivificatorem, adorandum et conglorificandum, Omousion Patri, hoc est ejusdem cum Patre substantiæ* etc. St. Isidore (De Eccl. Off., I, xvi) mentions the recitation of the Creed "tempore sacrificii", but with him *sacrificium* sometimes means the offertory, sometimes the whole Mass. On certain days, chiefly in Lent and in votive Masses, there is an *Antiphona ad Confractionem Panis* (cf. the *Confractorium* of the Ambrosian Rite), said instead of the "Fidem quam corde credimus etc." During it or the Creed the Fraction takes place. The Host is first divided into two halves, then one half is divided into five and the other into four parts. Seven of these particles are arranged in the form of a cross, five, named *Corporatio* (Incarnation), *Nativitas, Circumcisio, Apparitio* (Epiphany), and *Passio* forming the upright part, and two, named *Mors* and *Resurrrectio*, the arms. These last are arranged on either side of the Particle *Nativitas* with the *Gloria* and *Regnum*, placed together on one side. (For instances of complicated Fractions, see Celtic Rite; Gallican Rite.) Then the priest washes his fingers, "purget bene digitos", and, the chalice being covered, says aloud "Memento pro vivis".

(20) *The Ad Orationem Dominicam*, St. Isidore's seventh and last prayer, varies with the day, and, like the *Agyos* after the *Ad Missam Oratio* is preceded by *Oremus*. It ends introducing the Pater Noster, sung by the priest, the choir responding Amen to each clause except "Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie" when the response is "Quia Deus es". The invariable *Embolismus* is a long intercessory prayer followed by the Commixture. The particle *Regnum* is held over the chalice, during Paschal time and on Corpus Christi, with the words "Vicit Leo ex tribu Juda, radix David, Alleluia. Qui sedes super cherubim, radix David, Alleluia", and then dropped into the chalice, with the words "Sancta Sanctis et conjunctio Corporis D. N. J. C. sit sumentibus et potantibus nobis ad veniam et defunctis fidelibus præstetur ad requiem."

(21) *The Benediction.*—The deacon proclaims "Humiliate vos ad Benedictionem", and the priest pronounces a Blessing in three, four, or five clauses, variable according to the day, with a response of Amen to each clause. In the Gallican Rite the long Benediction was reserved for bishops only, a short form (Pax et caritas D. N. J. C. et communicatio sanctorum omnium sit semper nobiscum) being said by priests. The Benedictions continued in France long after the extinction of the Gallican Rite (see Gallican Rite) and in England. In the Sarum Manual of 1554 directions are given for Episcopal Benedictions, with the same preliminary proclamation as in the Mozarabic.

(22) *The Communion.*—The choir sing a fixed responsory called *Ad Accidentes*, beginning "Gustate et videte", composed of Ps. xxxiii, 8, 1, 22, with Alleluias after each verse. There are variants in Lent and Eastertide (cf. Celtic Rite; Gallican Rite). The same verses are mentioned by St. Cyril of Jerusalem and occur in some Eastern liturgies. Then follows the antiphon which answers to the Roman *Communio* which is usually "Refecti Christi Corpore et Sanguine, te laudamus, Domine. Alleluia (3)", with a variant in Lent "Repletum est gaudio os nostrum, etc." This is followed by the Post-Communion, a prayer or a Bidding Prayer variable with the day, but with a rather small selection, only a few days having separate proper Post-Communions of their own, four or five being used over and over again, one for Feasts of our Lord and another for saints' days, varied only in the name of the feast. During the singing of the *Ad Accidentes* and *Communio* the priest makes his communion, with private devotions not unlike those of the Roman Rite, but including the two "Ave in ævum, etc.", passages which are found also in the Sarum and other local Missals. Just before his communion the priest holds the particle *Regnum* over the chalice saying aloud "Memento pro mortuis" (or "pro defunctis", for both forms are found).

(23) *The Dismissal.*—Of this there are two forms, that for ordinary days being "Missa acta est in nomine D. N. J. C. perficiamus cum pace. R. Deo gratias", and that for greater feasts, "Solemnia completa sunt in nomine D. N. J. C. votum nostrum sit acceptum cum pace. R. Deo gratias". Then follows "Salve Regina" with versicle and responses and the collect, "Concede nos famulos tuos etc.", which of course is not Mozarabic, and after that the Blessing "In unitate Sancti Spiritus benedicat vos Pater et Filius".

It will be seen that the fixed elements of this Mass are very few. These are: the Preparations; generally the *Gloria;* the Prayers etc. of the Offertory; the *Nomina;* the *Pax*, but not its prayer; the *Sursum Corda;* the *Sanctus;* the Recital of the Institution with its preliminary prayer; a prayer following the Post-Pridie; the Creed; the priest's part of the Fraction, Commixture, and Communion; the Lord's Prayer and *Embolismus*, but not its introduction; and the *Salve Regina* and Blessing. The variables, which in point of time and written space take up by far the larger proportion of the Mass, are: The *Officium* (Introit); the *Oratio* after the *Gloria*, the Prophecy, the *Psallendo;* the Epistle; the Gospel; the *Lauda;* the *Sacrificium; Ad Missam Oratio; Alia Oratio; Post Nomina; Ad Pacem; Illatio; Post-Sanctus; Post-Pridie; Antiphona ad Confractionem Panis; Ad Orationem Dominicam;* the Benediction; *Ad Accidentes; Communio;* Post-Communion; the Dismissal. To these may be added the additional Canticles on certain days.

VI. The Occasional Services.—At the present day those who belong to the Mozarabic Rite use the Roman Ritual, and, as their bishop is the Archbishop of Toledo, who is of the Roman Rite, the Roman Pontifical is also used for them. The date at which the old Spanish Ritual and Pontifical services ceased to be used is not known. The four existing MSS. of the *Liber Ordinum*, which contains these services, are all of the eleventh century, and belonged either to Silos or to San Millan de la Cogolla. There are none at or from Toledo, and, when Cardinal

Ximenes had the Missal and Breviary printed, there was evidently no need to print a Ritual and Pontifical, as they were probably no longer used. Of the eleventh century MSS. of the *Liber Ordinum* published by Dom Férotin, one (the Silos MSS. of 1052) contains a very complete set of occasional services. They consist of: (1) The Blessing of Oil, Salt, and Water; (2) Baptism; (3) Ordinations; (4) The Unction and Visitation of the Sick; (5) The Blessing of Virgins, Abbesses, Widows, and *Conversi;* (6) The Order of Penance and Reconciliation of heretics and schismatics and for the conversion of Jews; (7) The Order of Death and Burial; (8) *Ritus pro Rege observandus;* (9) Various Blessings; (10) Orders for Holy Week and Easter; (11) The Order of Matrimony. These are followed by a large number of Masses, chiefly votive. Of these services the following may be noted:—

(1) *Baptism.*—The order is:—(a) Insufflation. The priest breathes thrice, with the words "Exorcizo te immunde spiritus hostis humani generis". (b) Insignation. The sign of the Cross on the forehead, and exorcism towards the west. (c) Unction with oil on mouth and ears, with "Effeta, effeta cum sancto spiritu in odorem suavitatis. Bene omnia fecit et surdos fecit audire et mutos loqui". (d) Imposition of hands. (e) *Traditio symboli.* (f) Blessing of the font preceded by exorcism. (g) Interrogations and Renunciations. (h) Baptism, with "Ego te baptizo in Nomine etc., ut habeas vitam æternam." (i) Chrismation on forehead, with "Signum vitæ æternae quod dedit Deus Pater Omnipotens per Jesum Christum Filium suum credentibus in salutem." (k) Imposition of hands, with prayer. (l) "Post hæc velantur a sacerdote infantes ipsi qui baptizati sunt caput: quo peracto communicat eos" (i. e. the Vesting and Communion). On the third day the children are brought to the priest, who says over them the "Benedictio de Albis". Except in the case of converts from Arianism, no separate order of Confirmation is given. The Chrismation and Imposition of hands after Baptism, followed as it was by Communion, was evidently the only normal form of Confirmation. In the case of Arian converts the words are: "Et ego te chrismo in Nomine etc., in remissionem omnium peccatorum ut habeas vitam æternam", followed by the imposition of hands and a prayer. The ceremony of feet-washing, retained in the Celtic and Gallican Baptisms, does not appear in the Spanish *Liber Ordinum*, though mentioned by the Council of Elvira in 305 (see GALLICAN RITE).

(2) *Ordinations.*—The minor ordinations are those of *clericus, sacrista,* and *custos librorum.* These orders are preceded by "Oratio super eum qui capillos in sola fronte tondere vult"—which looks like a relic of the Celtic tonsure (see CELTIC RITE), but, as Dom Férotin conjectures, is probably of the nature of an offering "des prémisses de la chevelure" (cf. the Τριχοκουρία, seven days after Baptism, in the Byzantine Rite)—by "Oratio super parvulum quem parentes ad doctrinam offerunt" and "Benedictio super parvulum qui in ecclesia ad ministerium Dei detonditur". The "clericus" of the next section is evidently also "parvulus". The *sacrista* has a ring given to him with the words: "Esto ianitor adituum et præpositus ostiariorum". The *custos librorum* receives "anulum de scriniis", and is also appointed "senior scribarum". Then follows a curious "Ordo super eum qui barbam tangere cupit". The priest takes wax from a taper and puts a crumb of it on the right, left, and middle of the chin. Prayers are said alluding to the anointing of Aaron's beard. Then "Ista explicita intromittit in anulo barbam cum cera et in anulo barbam et ceram capulat qui barbam tangit dicens, In Nomine etc. et accipit in linteo nitido. Peracta ista omnia absolvit diaconus dicens, Missa acta est. Et post hæc si est monachus radit barbam". The ordinations of subdeacon, deacon, archdeacon, priest, archpriest, and abbot are very simple. To the subdeacon is given by the archdeacon the "ministerium ad manus lavandos" and a chalice and paten. The bishop gives him the book of St. Paul's Epistles. The bishop puts the stole (*orarium*) on the left shoulder of a deacon, and delivers a "ferula" to an archdeacon and archpriest, a "manuale" (book of sacraments) to a priest, and a staff and book of the Rule to an abbot. In each case these are accompanied by prayers, and a *confirmatio* addressed to the newly ordained, which is more or less an explanation of his duties and status. In the case of a priest the assistant priests are directed to lay their hands on him as, vested in stole and chasuble, he kneels before the altar, and, though there is no direction for the bishop to do so, it is evident from the wording of his "Benedictio" that he lays his hands on him also. There is no order given for the consecration of a bishop. The blessings of nuns and other religious are quite simple, veiling with prayer and benediction, and for an abbess the delivery of a staff and the putting on of a mitre.

(3) *The Unction of the Sick* is given together with an order for the blessing of the unguent. This was done on the Feast of Sts. Cosmas and Damian, the physician-martyrs (27 Sept.), not, as elsewhere in the West, on Maundy Thursday. The bishop makes a cross (a cross *pattée* with a pendant and the A and Ω is figured in the book) with a *graphium* (style), saying an antiphon "Sicut unguentum in capite etc.", and a prayer and benediction, both referring to the healing of the sick. The Unction of the sick was on the head only, with the sign of the Cross and the words "In Nomine Patris etc." Antiphons referring to sickness and its healing are then said. There is provision for anointing many sick persons at the same time.

The rest of the occasional services do not call for much remark. They are for the most part very simple blessings and prayers, not unlike those found in the Roman Ritual. They include, however, a few of a type found also in the Greek Euchologion for the cleansing of any polluted person, place, or thing, e. g. "super his qui morticinum comedunt vel suffocatum", "super vas in quo (sic) aliquid immundum ceciderit", etc., and the Orders when the king goes out to battle with his army, and when he returns, have a considerable historical interest.

PINIUS, *De Liturgia Antiqua Hispanica* in *Acta SS.*, July, VI, 1–112, reprinted in Bianchini's edition of Thomasius; THOMASIUS, *Opera omnia*, ed. BIANCHINI, I (Rome, 1741); FLOREZ, *España Sagrada* (Madrid, 1748); FÉROTIN, *Liber Ordinum* in CABROL AND LECLERCQ, *Monum. Eccles. Liturg.*, V (Paris, 1904); FÉROTIN, *Hist. de l'Abbaye de Silos* (Paris, 1897); IDEM, *Deux Manuscrits wisigothiques de la Bibliothèque de Ferdinand I* in *Revue de l'Ecole de Chartes*, LXII (1901); *P. L.*: vol. LXXXIII, ST. ISIDORE; vol. LXXXV, *Mozarabic Missal*, ed. LESLIE; vol. LXXXVI, *Mozarabic Breviary*, ed. LORENZANA; vol. XCVI, ST. ILDEFONSUS and ST. JULIAN OF TOLEDO; MORALEDA Y ESTABAN, *El Rito Mozárabe* (Toledo, 1857); HERNANDEZ DE VIERA, *Rubricas generales de la Misa Gothica Muzárabe* (Salamanca, 1772); PEREZ, *Devocionario Muzárabe* (Toledo, 1903); NEALE, *The Mozarabic Liturgy* in his *Essays on Liturgiology* (London, 1863); W. C. BISHOP, *The Mozarabic Rite* in *Church Quarterly* (Oct., 1906; Jan., 1907); SIMONET, *Historia de los Mozárabes* in *Memorias de la Real Academia de la Historia*, XIII (Madrid, 1903); BULDU, *Historia de la Iglesia de España* (Barcelona, 1856–7); PARRO, *Toledo en la mano* (Toledo, 1857); GAMERO, *Historia de la ciudad de Toledo* (Toledo, 1862); PISA, *Descripcion de la imperial ciudad de Toledo* (Toledo, 1605); BURRIEL, *Correspondencia, etc.* in vol. XIII (1848) of FERNANDEZ DE NAVARRETTE, ETC., *Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España* (Madrid, 1842—); IDEM, *Paleografía española* (Madrid, 1758); EGUREN, *Memoria descriptiva de los códices notables conservados en los archivos eclesiásticos de España* (Madrid, 1859); RIAÑEZ, *Critical and bibliographical notes on early Spanish music* (London, 1887); EWALD AND LOEWE, *Exempla scripturæ Visigotica* (Heidelberg, 1883); BEER, *Handschriftenschätze Spaniens* in *Sitzungsberichte, Philosophisch-Historische Classe der kaiserl. Akad. der Wissenschaften Wiens*, CXXI–CXXIV; AUDRY, *Iter Hispanicum* (Paris, 1908); DUCHESNE, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris, 1902; tr. London, 1904); PROBST, *Die abendland. Messe vom fünften bis zum achten Jahrh.* (Münster, 1896); MABILLON, *De Liturg. Gallicana* (Paris, 1685); MURATORI, *Liturgia Romana Vetus* (Venice, 1748); NEALE AND FORBES, *Ancient Liturgy of the Gallican Church* (Burntisland, 1855–67); LUCAS, *Early Gallican Liturgies* in *Dublin Review* (July, 1893; Jan., 1894); MOYES, *Mozarabic Rite and Anglican Orders* in *The Tablet* (15, 22, 29 Jan., 1910), 86–8, 123–4, 163–5; HAMMOND, *Ancient Liturgies* (Oxford, 1878); BAÜMER, *Gesch. des Breviers* (Frei-

burg, 1895; French tr., Paris, 1905); E. Bishop, *Kyrie Eleison* in *Downside Review*, XIX (1900); Labbé, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (Florence, 1759—); Antonio, *Bibliotheca Hispana Vetus* (Madrid, 1788); Idem, *Bibliotheca Hispana Nova* (Madrid, 1783–88). Cf. also the various editions of the service-books mentioned in the section of this article on manuscripts and editions.

Henry Jenner.

Mozart, Johann Chrysostomus Wolfgang Amadeus, one of the greatest musical geniuses in history, b. at Salzburg, Austria, 27 Jan., 1756; d. at Vienna, 5 Dec., 1791. His father, Leopold Mozart, assistant choir-master and court musician to the Prince-Archbishop of Salzburg, was one of the most distinguished musicians of his time. He was the author of the best method for violin-playing written up to that period, and was a man of thorough education and sterling character. Realizing his son's extraordinary endowments, and also the great musical gifts of his daughter Maria Anna, five years Wolfgang's senior, he devoted all his energy and knowledge to their education. Wolfgang at the age of three was wont to spend whole hours at the piano, discovering, to his great joy, consonant intervals, and was not yet four when he began to receive from his father systematic training in piano-playing and in the theory of music, improvising even before he could write notes. Violin-playing came to him practically by intuition, a fact which he demonstrated to the astonishment of his father and a company of artists, by performing at first sight the second violin part in a trio for stringed instruments. He was not yet five when his father wrote for him a theme for the piano with variations, which he had himself composed. So correct was the child's ear that he would remember the tone pitch of a violin which he had heard even weeks before. His sensitiveness was such that harsh sounds were distressing to him, a blast of a trumpet almost causing him to faint away.

Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart

Wolfgang was not yet eight years old when his father undertook a concert tour with his two children, visiting Munich, Vienna, and Presburg. Everywhere their performances, especially the boy's, created great astonishment. In 1763 Leopold Mozart visited Paris with his prodigies, and the following April London, where they remained until July, 1764. Received and fêted by royalty and people of high station, the Mozart children, but particularly Wolfgang, were considered the musical wonders of the world. On their way back to Salzburg they visited The Hague and the principal cities of France and Switzerland. During all these travels, and the distraction and excitement incident thereto, Wolfgang made progress in all branches of musical and other knowledge. He composed constantly and in almost every known instrumental form. Returned home, he devoted himself to the mastery of counterpoint, and the perfecting of his technique in piano, violin, and organ-playing. His patron, Archbishop von Schlatterbach, sceptical regarding the boy's reported achievements as a composer, invited Wolfgang to his palace, forbidding communication of any kind with him, and giving him the text of the first part of an oratorio, prepared by the archbishop, to set to music. The second and third parts of this work were composed by Michael Haydn and Anton Cajetan Adlgasser respectively. It was published at Salzburg in 1767, and performed during Lent of the same year. A year later, at the age of twelve, Wolfgang visited Vienna anew, and was commissioned to write an *opera buffa*, "La Finta Semplice", for which Marco Coltellini furnished the libretto. Intrigues of all kinds, especially on the part of the members of the theatre orchestra, who objected to playing under the direction of a twelve-year-old boy, prevented its performance.

Returning to Salzburg, Wolfgang was appointed concert-master, at first without compensation, but later was allowed a monthly stipend of twelve florins. Leopold Mozart, chafing under Wolfgang's lack of recognition, made every effort to secure for him a suitable appointment in the larger field of Munich and Vienna, and also Florence, but not succeeding, he finally decided to visit Italy, with a view to gaining there the prestige which success in that country then carried with it. In Bologna they became acquainted with Padre Giambattista Martini (1706–1784), the most learned musician of his time. This master put Wolfgang through tests in contrapuntal writing, which the latter withstood with ease and consummate skill. In Rome young Mozart performed his famous feat of scoring Allegri's "Miserere" for double chorus, after listening to its performance on Wednesday of Holy Week. Hearing the work repeated on the following Friday, he had but a few minor corrections to make in his manuscript. After being created Knight of the Golden Spur, fêted, and acclaimed throughout Italy by the artistic and aristocratic world as the greatest living musical genius, Wolfgang returned to his modest position in Salzburg. Again and again he tried to find a more congenial atmosphere in Munich, Mannheim, Paris, and elsewhere, but without success. He continued, except for occasional visits to other cities for the purpose of conducting new works, to reside in Salzburg until his twenty-first year, when he took up his permanent abode in Vienna.

An offer from Frederick William II of Prussia to become court conductor at Berlin at a salary of three thousand thalers he refused on patriotic grounds. Mozart was now in the full maturity of his powers, creating with astonishing rapidity works which will remain classic for all time: operas, symphonies, quartets, concertos, etc., all of which increased his fame, but did not ameliorate his material condition. Not only was due recognition denied him, but his life was one continuous battle for existence. His application for the assistant conductorship of the imperial opera house failed. He applied for a similar position at the cathedral of St. Stephen, in the hope of ultimate promotion to the post of choir-master. Only on his deathbed did he receive the news of his appointment. The great master died at the age of thirty-four and was buried, with the least possible expense because of extreme poverty, in a pauper's grave, his exact resting-place being now unknown. Only a few persons followed his remains to the cemetery.

Mozart's individuality was of an exquisitely delicate, tender, and noble character. His operas, "Don Juan", "The Magic Flute", "The Marriage of Figaro", "Così fan tutte", "La Clemenza di Tito", on ac-

count of their melodic beauty and truth of expression, have as strong a hold upon the affections of the musical public to-day as they did at the end of the eighteenth century. His instrumental works continue to delight musicians the world over. As a composer for the Church, however, he does not, even artistically, reach the high level he maintained in other fields. In his day the music of the Church, Gregorian chant, was practically ignored in Germany, and sadly neglected in other countries. Mozart had but little knowledge of the masters of the sixteenth century, and consequently his style of writing for the Church could not have been influenced by them. The proper of the Mass, which brings singers and congregation in intimate touch with the liturgy of the particular day, was rarely sung. The fifteen masses, litanies, offertories, his great "Requiem", as well as many smaller settings, most of them written for *soli*, chorus, and orchestra, in the identical style of his secular works, do not reflect the spirit of the universal Church, but rather the subjective conception and mood of the composer and the Josephinist spirit of the age. What Mozart, with his Raphaelesque imagination and temperament, would have been for church music had he lived at a different time and in different surroundings, or risen above his own, can easily be imagined.

JAHN, *W. A. Mozart*, tr. TOWNSEND (London, 1882); NOHL, *Mozart's Leben*, tr. LALOR (Chicago, 1893); NOTTEBOHM, *Mozartiana* (1880); KÖCHEL, *Chronologisch-thematisches Verzeichnis sämmtlicher Tonwerke W. A. Mozart's* (Leipzig, 1862–1889); MEINARDUS, *Mozart ein Künstlerleben* (Leipzig, 1882).

JOSEPH OTTEN.

Mozetena Indians.—A group of some half dozen tribes constituting a distinct linguistic stock upon the headwaters of the Beni river, Department of Beni, in north-western Bolivia. Among their peculiar customs is the *couvade*. In the early part of the eighteenth century, through the efforts of the Jesuits, a part of them were Christianized. They now number about 1300, and are living in three mission towns, viz., Muchanes (founded 1725), Santa Ana, and Magdalena, all on the Beni river, near the confluence of the Mapisi.

BRINTON, *American Race* (New York, 1891); HEATH in *Kansas City Review of Science*, VI (Kansas City, 1883); WEDDELL, *Voyage dans le Nord de la Bolivie* (Paris, 1853).

JAMES MOONEY.

Mozzetta, a short, cape-shaped garment, covering the shoulders and reaching only to the elbow, with an open front, which may be fastened by means of a row of small buttons; at the neck it has a very small and purely ornamental hood. The privilege of wearing the mozzetta belongs properly to no one but the pope, cardinals, exempt abbots, abbots general, and the four prelates *di fiochetti;* only through a special privilege may it be worn by other ecclesiastics, abbots, canons, etc. Cardinals wear the mozzetta over the mantelletta, but bishops wear it without the mantelletta; the latter, however, may wear the mozzetta only within their own jurisdiction, outside of which the mantelletta must be worn instead of the mozzetta. Canons who have the privilege of wearing the mozzetta may not use it outside of the church, save when the chapter appears *in corpore* (as a corporate body). The pope's mozzetta is always red, except that, in Easter week, he wears a white one. As regards material, his mozzetta during the winter half-year, that is, from the feast of St. Catherine to Ascension Day, is made of velvet or of cloth according to the character of the day or ceremony; in the summer half-year it is made of satin or fine woollen material (merino). It is edged with ermine only in the winter half-year. A cardinal's mozzetta is generally red; the colour is pink on *Gaudete* and *Lætare* Sundays, and violet in penitential seasons and for mourning. According to the time of year, it is made of silk or wool. When worn by bishops, prelates, canons, etc., the mozzetta is violet or black in colour; the material for these dignitaries is properly not silk but wool (camlet). Cardinals and bishops who belong to an order wearing a distinctive religious habit (e. g. the Benedictines, Dominicans, etc.) retain for the mozzetta the colour of the outer garment of the habit of the respective order. This also applies to abbots and Reformed Augustinian canons who have the privilege of wearing the mozzetta. The mozzetta is not a liturgical vestment, consequently, for example, it cannot be worn at the administration of the sacraments. Sometimes it is traced back to the cappa, this making it merely a shortened cappa; sometimes to the almutia. From which of the two it is derived, is uncertain. The name mozzetta permits both derivations. In all probability the garment did not come into use until the latter Middle Ages. It was certainly worn in the latter half of the fifteenth century, as is proved by the fresco of Melozzo da Forlì painted in 1477: "Sixtus IV giving the Custody of the Vatican Library to Platina". From the beginning the mozzetta has been a garment distinctive of the higher ecclesiastical dignitaries, the pope, cardinals, and bishops. (See HOOD.)

BRAUN, *Die liturg. Gewandung im Occident u. Orient* (Freiburg, 1907), 357 sq.; BARBIER DE MONTAULT, *Traité pratique de la construction des églises*, II (Paris, 1878), 506, 519, 541, 561; *Cæremon. episc.*, I, i, n. 3; iii, nn. 1–4.

JOSEPH BRAUN.

Mozzi, LUIGI, controversialist, b. at Bergamo, 26 May, 1746; d. near Milan, 24 June, 1813. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1763, and on its suppression was received into the Diocese of Bergamo, where he was shortly made a canon, and appointed archpriest and examiner of candidates for the priesthood. The zeal and ability with which he opposed the progress of Jansenism in Italy gained him a well-merited reputation, and Pius VI called him to Rome, where he became an Apostolic missionary. He was elected a member of the Accademia degli Arcadi (see ACADEMIES, ROMAN). In 1804 he hastened to rejoin the Society, which had been restored in Naples. Worn out at length by his charitable labours and penitential practices, he retired to the residence of Marquis Scotti near Milan, where he died. Among his important writings are: "Vera idea del Giansenismo" (1781); "Storia compendiosa della scisma della nuova chiesa d'Utrecht" (Ferrara, 1785); "Storia delle revoluzioni della Chiesa d'Utrecht" (Venice, 1787); "Compendio storico-cronologico . . . sopra il Baianismo, Giansenismo e Quesnellismo" (Foligno, 1792), all against Jansenism; "Il falso discepolo di S. Agostino e di S. Tommaso" (Venice, 1779), a defence of Molinism. He translated from the English the Duke of Brunswick's "Fifty Reasons for preferring the Roman Catholic Religion" (Bassano, 1789); and from the French, "Les projets des incrédules pour la ruine de la religion, dévoilés dans les œuvres de Frédéric, roi de Prusse" (Assisi, 1791).

HURTER, *Nomenclator*, III, 540; *Vita del P. L. Mozzi* (Novara, 1823).

A. A. MACERLEAN.

Mrak, IGNATIUS, second Bishop of Marquette, U. S. A., b. 16 October, 1818, in Hotovle, in the Diocese of Laibach (Carinthia), Austria; d. at Marquette, 2 Jan., 1901. He made his classical studies in the gymnasium of Laibach and his theology in the local diocesan seminary. On 13 August, 1837, Prince-Bishop Anton Aloys Wolf raised him to the priesthood. To qualify for a tutorship in the house of Field-Marshal Baron Peter Pirquet, the young priest passed a rigorous state examination, and sojourned two years at Legnago near Verona, Italy, then an Austrian possession. In 1840 he returned to his native diocese, and occupied several positions as assistant before emigrating to the United States five years later. Bishop Lefebre of Detroit received him cordially, and sent him immediately to Arbre Croche to assist the celebrated Indian missionary, Father Francis Pierz. For two years the missionaries

worked fruitfully together, and, when in 1851 Pierz removed to Minnesota, Mrak retained charge of the Indian mission. For his devotion to the red race Baraga appointed him his vicar-general, and upon the death of Baraga he was created second Bishop of Marquette. For a long time he refused to accept, but, finally yielding to the urgency of Archbishop Purcell, he was consecrated at Cincinnati on 9 February, 1869. After ten years' devotion to the administration of the diocese, although he was not unaccustomed to hardships, his health began to fail, and he was permitted to resign in 1879, and was made titular Bishop of Antinoe. For some years he remained with his successor, Bishop Vertin, and, when necessity required, performed the duties of an ordinary pastor. With the return of his health, his love for the Indians awoke, and he returned to the Indian missions, which he had left so reluctantly to accept the episcopate. Bishop Richter of Grand Rapids most cordially welcomed him, and at his own request gave him the Indian mission at Eagle Town, Leeland County. Here he lived a simple life sharing his small annuity of eight hundred dollars with the two Dominican Sisters whom he had induced to open a school for his charges. In his eighty-first year he retired to Marquette, and filled thenceforth a chaplaincy at St. Mary's Hospital to the last day of his life. His charity was as proverbial as his humility. He outlived his successor in the episcopate, and saw the election of the fourth bishop, whom he himself had raised to the priesthood. His body rests in the vault under the cathedral beside those of his predecessors, Baraga and Vertin.

IGNATIUS MRAK

REZEK, *History of the Diocese of Sault Ste. Marie and Marquette* (Houghton, Michigan, 1906); VERWYST, *Life of Bishop Baraga* (Milwaukee, 1900); *Berichte der Leopoldinen Stiftung im Kaiserthume Oesterreich* (Vienna, 1832–65); *Diocesan Archives* (Marquette).

ANTOINE IVAN REZEK.

Muchar, ALBERT ANTON VON, historian, b. at Linez, Tyrol, 22 Nov., 1781; d. at Graz, Styria, 6 June, 1849. He was descended from the noble and ancient family of the Muchars of Bied and Rangfeld, studied at the lyceum in Graz, entered the Benedictine Order, and made his vows on 16 Oct., 1808, at Admont. Ordained a priest shortly afterwards, he devoted himself entirely to the study of the oriental languages, became librarian and keeper of the archives in 1813, and later on professor of Greek and Oriental languages at the theological school of his monastery. From 1823 to 1825 he was supplementary professor of Biblical science, becoming afterwards professor of æsthetics and classical philology at the University of Graz. Pure philological studies, however, did not suit his taste, and in this branch we possess from him only a somewhat mediocre edition of Horace with German translation, which appeared in 1835 at Graz. His researches dealt chiefly with the history of Austria, for which purpose he made extensive visits to the libraries of Austria, Bavaria, and Upper Italy; thus, nearly all his historical works are based upon careful examination of the original sources. In 1829 the Academy of Sciences in Vienna elected him a member in recognition of his important contributions to national history, and he was one of the founders of the Historical Society for Inner Austria. Of his more important works may be mentioned: "Das römische Norikum" (2 vols., Graz, 1825–6); "Geschichte des Herzogtums Steiermark" (Graz, 1845–74) in nine volumes, of which the first four were edited by himself, the following two by his colleagues, Prangner and von Gräfenstein, and the last three by the Historical Society of Styria. Beside this he wrote numerous excellent essays for historical periodicals, e. g. Hormayr's "Archiv", the "Steiermärkische Zeitschrift", and the "Archiv für Kunde österreichischer Geschichtsquellen" (in which he published his valuable "Urkundenregesten für die Geschichte Innerösterreichs vom Jahre 1312–1500" (Vienna, 1849). The library of Admont possesses in manuscripts some still more extensive works, which show Muchar's great diligence as a compiler.

ILWOLF, *Albert von Muchar* in *Mitteil. des histo. Vereins Steiermark*, fasc. xiv (Graz, 1866); *Allg. Deutsche Biogr.*, XXII (Leipzig, 1885), 436–8.

PATRICIUS SCHLAGER.

Mühlbacher, ENGELBERT, historian, b. at Gresten, Austria, 4 Oct., 1843; d. at Vienna, 17 July, 1903. He received his classical education at Vienna, his father's native city. In 1862 he became a novice among the Austin Canons at St. Florian. After completing his theological studies there, he was ordained priest in 1867. As Arneth relates in his memoirs, historical studies had been successfully cultivated at St. Florian's since Provost Arneth's time, and Mühlbacher was soon active in this domain. Among his writings are articles on St. Florian's Gerhoh von Reichersberg, and the literary productions of St. Florian's. In 1872 we find Mühlbacher studying under Julius Ficker at Innsbruck, where after two years he received the degree of Doctor of Theology. He then hastened to Vienna to finish his historical training under Sickel's guidance. When Ficker entrusted the youthful scholar with the revision of the Carlovingian period of Böhmer's "Regesta", he was directing him to a domain in which he was to do imperishable work. In 1878 he was formally received as academical lecturer into the philosophical faculty of the University of Innsbruck, and between 1880 and 1889 published his masterly edition of the imperial "Regesta" of the Carlovingian period. As Redlich says, "the technique of compiling *regesta* received exemplary development at Mühlbacher's hands, and his work served as a model for the entire new edition of the imperial "Regesta". In 1892 Mühlbacher was entrusted with the editing of the Carlovingian documents for the "Monumenta Germaniæ Historica". At the same time it became necessary to bring out a new edition of his Carlovingian "Regesta". The two works proved of mutual assistance, and Mühlbacher devoted the greatest care and diligence to his tasks. He was able to see only the first part of each work through the press, but left considerable material for the use of his successors. No other German scholar was so well qualified to write the "Deutsche Geschichte unter den Karolingern", which appeared in 1896. Since 1879 Mühlbacher edited the "Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung". In 1881 he was appointed extraordinary, and in 1896 ordinary professor at Vienna. In 1895 Ficker turned over to him the management of the "Regesta Imperii". With the utmost energy he took in hand the arrangement of the Austrian State Archives, and the preparation of the more recent history of Austria. His learning and efforts did not fail to receive due recognition. He was chosen an active member of the

Imperial Academy of Sciences in Vienna. Mühlbacher's unwearying labours continued until his all too early death.

REDLICH, *Obituary* in *Mitteil. des Institutes für österr. Geschichtsforschung*, XXV (Innsbruck, 1904), 201–7, with portrait.

C. WOLFSGRUBER.

Muldoon, PETER JAMES. See ROCKFORD, DIOCESE OF.

Mulhall, MICHAEL GEORGE, statistician, b. in Dublin, 29 September, 1829; d. there 13 Dec., 1900. He was educated at the Irish College, Rome. Going to Bueños Aires he established there in 1861 the "Standard", the first paper in English published in South America. In 1869 he brought out "The Handbook of the River Plate", the first English book printed in Argentina. This was followed by his "Progress of the World" (1880); "Balance Sheet of the World, 1873–1880" (1881); "Dictionary of Statistics" (1883), a standard work of reference, few modern compilations having been more extensively used; "History of Prices since 1850" (1885). In 1896 he travelled extensively in Europe collecting material for the Committee of the English Parliament reporting on a proposed department of agriculture for Ireland. The pope decorated him in recognition of his literary work, in which his wife, Marion McMurrough Mulhall, who has also written extensively, was his active and practical assistant.

Tablet (London, 22 Dec., 1900).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Mulholland, ST. CLAIR AUGUSTINE, soldier, b. at Lisburn, Co. Antrim, Ireland, 1 April, 1839; d. at Philadelphia, 17 Feb., 1910. Emigrating to Philadelphia with his parents while a boy, his youthful tastes inclined him to military affairs and he became active in the ranks of the militia. At the breaking out of the Civil War he was commissioned Lieutenant-Colonel of the 116th Pennsylvania Volunteers which was attached to Meagher's Irish Brigade, and later was made its colonel. He was wounded during the famous charge of the Irish Brigade up Marye's Heights, at the battle of Fredericksburg, 13 Dec., 1862. At the battle of Chancellorsville, 3, 4 May, 1863, he led his regiment and distinguished himself by saving the guns of the Fifth Maine Battery that had been abandoned to the enemy. For this he was complimented in general orders and received the Medal of Honor from Congress. In this campaign he was given the command of the picket-line by General Hancock and covered the retreat of the Army of the Potomac across the Rappahannock. At Gettysburg his own regiment was so badly cut up in the first day's fight, that he changed to the 140th Penn. Volunteers and led it into action. He was wounded a second time at the battle of the Wilderness, 5 May, 1864, and for his gallant conduct was brevetted brigadier-general. At Po River he was wounded a third time but remained in hospital only ten days, and resuming his command was dangerously wounded again at Tolpotomoy. He recovered rapidly and commanded his brigade in all the actions around Petersburg, particularly distinguishing himself by storming a fort for which he was brevetted major-general 27 October, 1864. Returning to civil life after the war he was appointed Chief of Police in Philadelphia in 1868, and signalized his administration by the good order in which he kept both the force and the city. President Cleveland appointed him United States Pension Agent, in which office he was continued by Presidents McKinley and Roosevelt. He was considered an authority on the science of penology, and also devoted much of his leisure time to art studies, and as a lecturer and writer on the Civil War and its records. He compiled a history of the 116th Regiment of Pennsylvania Volunteers, and another of those to whom Congress voted the Medal of Honor. In the Catholic affairs of Philadelphia he was always active and a leader among the best known and most respected laymen.

CONYHGHAM, *The Irish Brigade and its Campaigns* (Boston, 1869); *America* (New York, 26 Feb., 1910), files; *Cath. Standard and Times* (Philadelphia, 26 Feb., 1910), files.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Mullanphy, JOHN, merchant, philanthropist, b. near Enniskillen, Co. Fermanagh, Ireland, 1758; d. at St. Louis, Missouri, U. S. A., 29 August, 1833. At twenty he went to France where he served in the Irish Brigade until the Revolution drove him back to Ireland. In 1792 with his wife and child he emigrated to Philadelphia, thence going to Baltimore where he remained until 1799. He next went to Kentucky where he opened a store at Frankfort, but left there in 1804, and settled finally in St. Louis, then a French settlement. His enterprise in business brought him large returns which he invested in real estate. He was in Baltimore during the War of 1812 with England, and took part in its defence, and later was with Jackson in 1815 at the battle of New Orleans. His business instinct prompted him to then buy a large quantity of cotton at low rates, which the ending of the war enabled him to sell at an immense profit. He had fifteen children, and spent his last years in dispensing much of his great fortune in charity. In 1827 he established the St. Louis Convent of the Religious of the Sacred Heart, the second in the United States. The following year he gave a hospital to the Sisters of Charity. A church, the Jesuit novitiate, and a convent for the Sisters of Loretto at Florisant, were also his gifts, and when he died 25,000 dollars was left in his will for education and charity. His children continued his benefactions. His only son Bryan, who died in 1851, a bachelor, lived an eccentric life. He was mayor of St. Louis in 1847, and for four years judge of the County Court. His will left one third of his estate (about 200,000 dollars) as a trust fund "to furnish relief to all poor emigrants passing through St. Louis to settle in the West". Changed conditions have frustrated that intention, and it is now devoted to charity. John Mullanphy's name is perpetuated in St. Louis by the hospital and orphan asylum so designated, and the name of his daughter, Mrs. Ann Biddle, is preserved in the Biddle Home and St. Ann's Foundling Asylum which she founded.

The Messenger (New York, July, 1908); *Church Progress* (St. Louis, February, March, 1906), files; DARBY, *Recollections of St. Louis* (St. Louis); BRACKENRIDGE, *Recollections of Persons and Places in the West* (1834); *Encyclopedia of the History of St. Louis.*

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Müller, ADAM HEINRICH, publicist and political economist, convert, b. at Berlin, 30 June, 1779; d. at Vienna, 17 Jan., 1829. It was intended that he should study Protestant theology, but from 1798 he devoted himself in Göttingen to the study of law, philosophy, and natural science. Returning to Berlin, he was persuaded by his friend Gentz to take up political science. After working for some time as referendary in the *Kurmärkische Kammer* in Berlin, he travelled in Sweden and Denmark, spent about two years in Poland, and then went to Vienna, where he was converted to the Catholic Faith on 30 April, 1805. From 1806 to 1809 he lived at Dresden as tutor of a prince of the Saxe-Weimar family and lecturer on German literature, dramatic art, and political science. In 1808 he edited with Heinrich von Kleist the periodical "Phœbus". In 1809 he returned to Berlin, and in 1811 to Vienna, where he lived in the house of Archduke Maximilian of Austria-Este and became the friend of Clement Maria Hoffbauer. In 1813 he was appointed imperial commissioner and major of the rifle-corps in Tyrol, and took part in the wars for liberty and later on, as counsellor of the government, in the reorganization of the country. In 1815 he was

called to Vienna, and went to Paris with the imperial staff. On the conclusion of peace, he became Austrian consul-general for Saxony at Leipzig, and agent for Anhalt and Schwarzburg. He edited here the periodicals: "Deutscher Staatsanzeiger" (1816–18) and "Unparteiischer Literatur- und Kirchenkorrespondent", and attended the ministerial conferences at Carlsbad and Vienna (1819–20). In 1826, at the instance of Prince von Metternich, he was ennobled as Ritter von Nittersdorf, was recalled to Vienna (1827), appointed imperial counsellor, and employed in the service of the chancery.

Müller was a man of great and versatile talents, an excellent orator, and a suggestive writer. Several of his works were based upon his own lectures; the most important (besides the above-mentioned periodicals) are: "Die Lehre von Gegensatz" (Berlin, 1804); "Vorlesungen über die deutsche Wissenschaft u. Literatur" (Dresden, 1806; 2nd ed., 1807); "Von der Idee der Schönheit" (lectures; Berlin, 1809); "Die Elemente der Staatskunst" (lectures; 3 parts, Berlin, 1809); "Ueber König Friedrich II. u. die Natur, Würde u. Bestimmung der preussischen Monarchie" (lectures; Berlin, 1810); "Die Theorie der Staatshaushaltung u. ihre Fortschritte in Deutschland u. England seit Adam Smith" (2 vols., Vienna, 1812); "Vermischte Schriften über Staat, Philosophie u. Kunst" (2 vols., Vienna, 1812; 2nd ed., 1817); "Versuch einer neuen Theorie des Geldes, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Grossbritannien" (Leipzig, 1816); "Zwölf Reden über die Beredsamkeit u. deren Verfall in Deutschland" (Leipzig, 1817); "Die Fortschritte der nationalökonomischen Wissenschaft in England" (Leipzig, 1817); "Von der Notwendigkeit einer theologischen Grundlage der gesamten Staatswissenschaften u. der Staatswirtschaft insbesondere" (Leipzig, 1820; new ed., Vienna, 1898); "Die Gewerbe-Polizei in Beziehung auf den Landbau" (Leipzig, 1824); "Vorschlag zu einem historischen Ferien-Cursus" (Vienna, 1829). A critical pamphlet, which was written in 1817 on the occasion of the Protestant jubilee of the Reformation and entitled, "Etwas das Goethe gesagt hat. Beleuchtet von Adam Müller. Leipzig den 31 Oktober, 1817", was printed but not published (reprinted in Vienna, 1910). Nevertheless, Traugott Krug's reply, entitled "Etwas, das Herr Adam Müller gesagt hat über etwas, das Goethe gesagt hat, und noch etwas, das Luther gesagt hat" (Leipzig, 1817), appeared in two editions.

In the field of literature and æsthetics, Müller belongs to the Romantic school. He is a Romanticist even in his specialty, politics and political economy. As Eichendorff says in his "Geschichte der poetischen Literatur Deutschlands" (new ed., by W. Kosch, Kempten, 1906, p. 352), Müller "mapped out a domain of his own, the application of Romanticism to the social and political conditions of life." Müller himself declares: "The reconciliation of science and art and of their noblest ideas with serious political life was the purpose of my larger works" (Vermischte Schriften, I, p. iii). His chief work is the "Elemente der Staatskunst", originating in lectures delivered before Prince Bernhard of Saxe-Weimar and an assembly of politicians and diplomats at Dresden in the winter 1808-09. It treats in six books of the state, of right, of the spirit of legislation in antiquity and in the Middle Ages, of money and national wealth, of the economical factors of the state and trade, of the relation between the state and religion. Müller endeavoured to comprehend the connexion between political and social science, and, while using the historical method, to base them upon philosophy and religion. (Cf. the preface to the first volume of the "Elemente", where he treats exhaustively of the differences between his work and Montesquieu's "Esprit des lois"; cf. also the sixth book of this work, and the above-mentioned work of 1820.) With Edmund Burke, Friedrich von Gentz, Joseph de Maistre, and Karl Ludwig von Haller, he must be reckoned among the chief opponents of revolutionary ideas in politics. In his work, "Von der Notwendigkeit einer theologischen Grundlage der gesammten Staatswissenschaften" (1820), Müller rejects, like Haller (Restauration der Staatswissenschaften, 1816), the distinction between constitutional and civil law, which rests entirely on the false idea of the state's omnipotence. His ideal is medieval feudalism, on which the reorganization of modern political institutions should be modelled. His position in political economy is defined by his strong opposition to Adam Smith's system of materialistic-liberal (so-called classical) political economy, or the so-called industry system. He is thus also an adversary of free trade. In contrast with the economical individualism of Adam Smith, he emphasizes the ethical element in national economy, the duty of the state toward the individual, and the religious basis which is also necessary in this field. Müller's importance in the history of political economy is acknowledged even by the opponents of his religious and political point of view. His reaction against Adam Smith, says Roscher (Geschichte der National-Oekonomik, p. 763), "is not blind or hostile, but is important, and often truly helpful." The reactionary and feudalistic thought in his writings, which agreed so little with the spirit of the times, prevented his political ideas from exerting a more notable and lasting influence on his age, while their religious character prevented them from being justly appreciated.

WURZBACH, *Biograph. Lex. des Kaisertums Oesterreich*, XIX (Vienna, 1868), 322–8; MISCHLER in *Allg. deutsche Biog.*, XXII (Leipzig, 1885), 501–11; ROSENTHAL, *Convertitenbilder*, I, i (3rd ed., Ratisbon, 1889), 70–93; SCHMIDT in *Staatslex.*, s. v.; GOEDEKE, *Grundriss der Gesch. der deutschen Dichtung*, VI (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1898), 196–8; ROSCHER, *Gesch. der National-Oekonomik in Deutschland* (Munich, 1874), 763–78; *Briefwechsel zwischen Friedrich Gentz u. Adam Heinrich Müller 1800–1829* (Stuttgart, 1857).

FRIEDRICH LAUCHERT.

Müller, JOHANN, physiologist and comparative anatomist, b. at Coblentz, 14 July, 1801; d. at Berlin, 28 April, 1858. He was the son of a shoemaker, but his mother succeeded in obtaining for him a good education. During his college course at Coblentz, he devoted himself to the classics and made his own translations of Aristotle. His first intention was to be a priest, but at eighteen his love for natural science turned him to medicine and he entered the University of Bonn in 1819. While a student he won a prize for original work on "Respiration of the Fœtus", a thesis that has been declared the best scientific work ever presented by a student in a prize competition. He received his degree of doctor for a thesis on animal movement. In 1824 he became *Privatdocent* at Bonn, and in 1830 ordinary professor of medicine. Before teaching at Bonn he had studied for two years with Rudolphi at Berlin, and in 1832 was appointed his successor in the professorship of anatomy there. In 1847 he was elected Rector of the University.

JOHANN MÜLLER

Müller is justly regarded as the founder of modern physiology. His claim to this title rests not only upon his personal contributions to the science, but also upon his power of co-ordinating the results ob-

tained by his predecessors, and of directing into new fields of investigation the disciples who profited by his suggestive teaching. To accuracy of observation he added such a grasp of principles and so clear a comprehension of the bearing of other sciences upon physiology that his reasoning, based throughout upon facts, is philosophical in breadth and penetration.

His first monograph, an elaboration of his prize essay, "De respiratione fœtus", was published in 1823, and was followed (1826) by two others on optical illusions and on the comparative physiology of vision. The last-named abounds in observations upon the structure and functions of the eye in lower animals, especially in insects. Among the other subjects to which Müller devoted careful and successful research may be mentioned: reflex action, the chemical composition of blood plasma, the presence of chondrin in cartilage, hermaphroditism in human beings, the minute structure and origin of glands in man and animals, the lymph hearts of amphibia, and those ducts of the preliminary kidney in the fœtus which have since been called by his name. His study of the lower animals resulted in the discovery of alternate generations and in a satisfactory account of the metamorphoses of echinodermata.

From 1834 to 1840 he edited the "Archives of Anatomy and Physiology" (Müller's Archives) and contributed articles to various scientific reviews. His own contributions to medical literature number over two hundred, most of them of great significance. His principal work is the "Handbuch der Physiologie des Menschen", which was published in 1833 and has appeared in numerous editions and translations. But the benefit which he rendered to science as an original investigator and medical editor is surpassed by his work as a teacher. Among his pupils were most of the men who made Germany the Mecca for scientific students in the latter half of the nineteenth century. They included Virchow, Helmholtz, Schwann, Du Bois-Reymond, Lieberkühn, Max Schultze, Brücke, Claparéde, Haeckel, Henle, Guido Wagener, Reichert, Ludwig, Vierordt, and Kölliker. All of these men agreed in proclaiming him the foremost physiologist of his time. Most of the important scientific societies of the world honoured him. Throughout his life he was loyal in his adherence to the Catholic Church, and his fellow-Catholics of the Rhine land have erected a noble monument to his memory at Coblentz.

VIRCHOW, *Johann Müller* (Berlin, 1858); BRÜCKE, *Medical Times and Gazette* (London, 17 July, 1858); DU BOIS-REYMOND, *Gedächtnissrede auf Johannes Müller* (Berlin, 1860); WALSH, *Makers of Modern Medicine* (New York, 1910).

JAMES J. WALSH.

Müller (REGIOMONTANUS), JOHANN, German astronomer, b. in or near Königsberg, a small town in lower Franconia (Dukedom of Coburg), 6 June, 1436; d. in Rome, 6 July, 1476. The name of the family agreed with the trade of the father who operated a mill. Regiomontanus signed himself Johannes de Monteregio, while in foreign countries he was known as Joannes Germanus or Francus. His calendars were published under various names, like Meister Hans von Kungsberg. About the age of twelve he was sent to Leipzig to study dialectics. In the university matriculations (published by Erler, 1895) his name is not registered. Hearing of the celebrated astronomer Peurbach (George of Peurbach in Upper Austria, 1423-61), Müller left Leipzig for Vienna, where he was matriculated in 1450 as Johannes Molitoris de Kunigsperg. In 1452 he received the baccalaureate and in 1457 the title *Magister*. Lectures of his at the university are recorded as follows: in 1458 on perspective, in 1460 on Euclid, in 1461 on Virgil's Bucolics. His master and friend Peurbach showed him how incorrect were the Alphonsine Tables and how false the Latin translations of the Greek astronomers from intermediate Arabic translations. Together they observed the planet Mars two degrees off the place assigned to it and a lunar eclipse over an hour late on the Tables. A new field opened to the two astronomers with the arrival in Vienna of the Greek scholar Cardinal Bessarion of Trebizond, then papal legate to the emperor, and his brother Sigismund, for the purpose of adjusting differences and uniting them against the Turks. Having changed to the Latin Rite, Bessarion mastered the Latin language like his own, and commenced translating Ptolemy directly from the Greek. On the other hand Peurbach was engaged in composing an epitome on Ptolemy's "Almagest". The double circumstance that neither of them was able to accomplish his task, the one for want of time, the other for not knowing Greek, brought about an agreement that Peurbach should accompany Bessarion to Italy together with Regiomontanus. Peurbach died 8 April, 1461, not yet thirty-eight years old, and left the "Epitome" to his pupil to be finished and published as a sacred legacy.

In company with his new patron, Müller reached Rome in the Fall of 1461. Under George of Trebizond and other teachers he acquired so much knowledge of Greek that he understood all of the obscure points of the "Epitome" of his late master. During his stay in Italy Müller continually observed the sun, the moon, and the planets, and searched the libraries for Greek manuscripts. He found another lunar eclipse over an hour in advance of the Tables. What manuscripts he could not acquire he had copied. A new Testament, written in Greek by his own hand, was his companion. The summer of 1462 was spent at Viterbo, and when Bessarion left for Greece in the Fall of the same year, Müller accompanied him as far as Venice. On the recommendation of his patron, Müller was well received in various Italian cities. In Ferrara he became acquainted with an old friend of Peurbach, Bianchini, then ninety years of age, with Theodore of Gaza, and with Guarini. He profited so well in the knowledge of Greek that he understood the whole of Ptolemy, and was able to complete the "Epitome" of Peurbach by adding seven books to the six already written by his master. In Padua he was at once enrolled among the Academicians and was invited to lecture. While awaiting the return of his patron in Venice, he discovered a portion of the Greek Arithmetic of Diophantus, continued his observations, refuted the quadrature of the circle given by Cuse, and computed a calendar with the places of sun and moon, the eclipses and the dates of Easter for the next thirty years. After two years' absence from Rome, Müller returned there alone in October, 1464, to spend four more years in studying and copying. His rich collection of manuscripts comprised at that time Bessarion's own copy of the Greek "Almagest". Müller was now able to point out grave errors in the commentaries on Ptolemy and Theon by George of Trebizond. The consequent enmity of the latter, and the absence of his patron, may have induced him to leave Italy in 1468.

The university registers in Vienna contain no record of Müller ever resuming his lectures after his return. The next three years, or part of them, he seems to have spent in Buda, being recommended by the Archbishop of Gran to King Matthias Corvinus of Hungary as custodian of the library, so rich in spoils from Athens and Constantinople. The ensuing wars of the king in Bohemia led Müller to look for a place where he could carry out his life's plan: the determination of the astronomical constants by observation and the publication of the literary treasures in print. Nüremberg, then the centre of industry and commerce in southern Germany, was his choice, and in the Fall of 1471 he was admitted to the city and even invited to lecture. A wealthy citizen, Bernhard Walther, furnished the means for an instrument shop, an observatory, and a printing office and joined Müller in the

work. The fruits soon appeared. The latitude of the place (49° 24′) and the obliquity of the ecliptic (23° 28′) were determined free from the effects of refraction; the planet Venus was made the link between the fixed stars and the sun, instead of the moon; the great comet of 1472 was observed during January and February in such a way that its orbit could be calculated. Halley writes: "This comet is the very first of which any proper observations have been handed down to us" (Phil. Trans., XXIV, 1706, p. 1883). The earlier observations of the comet of 1456 by Toscanelli, were unknown to Halley, although the comet happened to be the one that bears his name. The printing office of Walther, with the improved methods and types of Müller, turned out Peurbach's New Theory of the Comets and an astronomical poem of Manilius (1472–73); then Müller's own "Calendarium Novum" and his astronomical "Ephemerides" 1473–74) with the positions of the sun, moon, and planets, and the eclipses from 1475 to 1506. The latter guided Columbus to America and enabled him to predict the lunar eclipse of 29 February, 1504.

Müller's scientific activity in Nüremberg was brought to a close by a letter of Sixtus IV calling him to Rome for the purpose of finally settling the reform of the calendar. Gassendi relates, on the authority of Peter Ramus (1515–72) and of Paul Jovius (Giovio; 1483–1552), both humanists, that Müller was created Bishop of Ratisbon. Jovius writes in his "Eulogies appended to the true pictures of celebrated men" in the museum of Como (p. 75): "Ab hac commendatione eruditi nominis creatus est a Xysto Quarto Ratisponensis Episcopus" etc. This testimony of a man contemporary of Regiomontanus is not improbable, since by this dignitary title the pope could give more force to his invitation. Yet it seems certain that Müller never occupied the episcopal chair. Whether a papal command was needed, or whether the world's problem of adjusting the calendar had in itself sufficient attraction, Müller was again in Rome towards the end of 1475. Death overtook him in less than a year at the age of forty, and the Panthéon is said to be his resting-place, although his tomb is unknown. The cause of his death was, according to Jovius, a pestilence then raging in Rome; but according to Ramus, poison administered to him by the sons of his enemy, George of Trebizond. The historical exactness of Ramus, however, is very doubtful from his poetical stories of the iron fly and the wooden eagle, said to have been constructed in the laboratories of Nüremberg. In consequence of the untimely death of Müller, many of his works and manuscripts were lost, in particular everything on the reform of the calendar. Some works were published posthumously, like the five books on triangles and the quadrature of the circle (Nüremberg, 1533); his trigonometry (1541); the "Scripta Cl. Math. fo. Regiomontani" (1544); the "Epitome" on Ptolemy's Almagest (Venice, 1496); and part of his correspondence with Bessarion, Roder, Bianchini, and other scientists. The principal works are reviewed by Gassendi; the astronomical books are described by Delambre; and the mathematical treatises are discussed by Cantor. Bibliographies on Regiomontanus are enumerated by Stern and Ziegler. A statue of Müller was erected in the market-place of Königsberg in 1873.

JOVIUS, *Imagines clarorum virorum;* RAMUS, *Scholarum mathematicarum libri XXXI* (Basle, 1569), 65; GASSENDI, *Opera,* V (Lyons, 1658), *Miscellanea;* MONTUCLA, *Histoire des Mathématiques* (Ann. VII), I, 541–547; DELAMBRE, *Histoire de l'astronomie du Moyen Age* (Paris, 1819), 285–365; STERN in ESCH-GRUBER'S *Encyclopädie,* II (Leipzig, 1843), 205–213; ASCHBACH, *Gesch. der Wiener Universität,* I (Vienna, 1865), 537–557; ZEIGLER, *Regiomontanus, ein geistreicher Vorläufer des Columbus* (Dresden, 1874); WOLF, *Gesch. der Astronomie* (Munich, 1877); GÜNTHER in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie,* XXII (Leipzig, 1885), 564–581; CANTOR in SCHLÖMILCH'S *Zeitschrift,* XIX (1874), *Literaturz.,* 41–53; IDEM, *Vorlesungen über Gesch. der Mathematik,* II (Leipzig, 1900), 254–289. J. G. HAGEN.

Müller, KARL, professor at Düsseldorf, b. at Darmstadt, 29 Oct., 1818; d. at Neuenahr, 15 Aug., 1893, belongs to the more recent members of a school of German religious painters known as the "Nazarenes", who succeeded felicitously in popular but beautiful representation of religious devotion, and gave new renown to the Düsseldorf school even in foreign lands. His style, delicate even to softness, exhibits, however, as much naturalness, fresh, simple piety and spiritual peace as the subjects demand. Schadow, director of the Düsseldorf academy, had selected in 1837 the nineteen year old student, along with his brother Andreas, and Deger (who were later joined by Ittenbach), for the contemplated fresco paintings in the Fürstenburg church on the Apollinarisberg at Remagen. They had first to study carefully in Italy the technique of fresco painting, then little known. Karl Müller arrived in Rome at the end of 1839. The study and imitation of the art treasures of the Eternal City, as later of those of Florence, Pisa, Assisi, and other places, brought to maturity his great natural talent. His taste for landscape, which he brought with him from Düsseldorf, now found the greatest encouragement; he regarded moreover the study of models as indispensable in the practical exercise of his art. A large circle of German and Italian friends mutually helped each other by artistic excursions. His evenings he spent in composition and the like. At the end of four years the master brought home his characteristic German religious style, lightly mingled with some southern elements. In his principal paintings of the "Crowning" and the "Birth of Mary" (entirely finished in 1850) he showed himself, according to the judgment of connoisseurs, the equal of the elder Deger. The former painting unfortunately is in a bad light the greater part of the year. The lower part, the Apostles by the grave, out of which spring lilies and roses, is widely known. The leading scene in the upper part presents the Virgin Mother bowed before the Saviour in a Raphaelite beauty of colour. The painter worked so long over the "Birth of Mary" that he hoped to succeed in some degree in satisfying the spirit at once of Raphael and of Dürer. In this work the eight typical women especially deserve to be noticed. Besides these there belong to Müller in the same church the "Annunciation", the "Visitation", the "Wedding of the Virgin", and the "Lamb of God", adored by angels in the midst of the symbols of the Evangelists on a triumphant arch. In 1859 a contract was made with the authorities of the church of Notre-Dame de La Garde at Marseilles in regard to a great pictorial scheme, unfortunately never carried out. The upper part of the cartoon of a new "Coronation of Mary", wonderful in execution, is in the Berlin National Gallery. For the cathedral church at Bonn, undertaken in 1866, eighteen paintings were contemplated. The objections of the ecclesiastical authorities also caused this monumental work, to the master's unutterable sorrow, to fail. His easel pictures, however, are all the better known: "The Magnificat", "Wonder of Roses", "Immaculate Conception", "Joseph with the Boy Jesus", "The Disciples in Emmaus"; the popular round pictures; "Mary and Elizabeth", the "Holy Family at Work", also "The Holy Family", "The Holy Night", and so on. Of the highest value in art are the altar painting, "Christ with the Disciples at Emmaus," which he undertook for the church of St. Remigius at Bonn, and his last cartoon for the same church, completed by his nephew Franz Müller.

Karl Müller, Austellung (Frankfort, 1893); FINKE, *Karl Müller, Leben u. Schaffen* (Cologne, 1896); SCHAARSCHMIDT, *Gesch. der Düsseldorfer Kunst* (Düsseldorf, 1902). G. GIETMANN.

Mullock, JOHN T., Bishop of St. John's, Newfoundland, b. in 1807 at Limerick, Ireland; d. at St. John's, Newfoundland, 26 March, 1869. He became

a Franciscan and was educated at St. Bonaventure's College, Seville, and at St. Isidore's, Rome, where in 1830 he was ordained priest. After long service in Ireland, particularly at Ennis, he was appointed in 1847 coadjutor to Bishop Fleming of St. John's, Newfoundland, with the right of succession, and was consecrated by Cardinal Fransoni on 27 December, 1847, at St. Isidore's, Rome. In July, 1850, he succeeded Bishop Fleming. The church made great progress in Newfoundland during the episcopate of Dr. Mullock, a new diocese—Harbour Grace—being erected. The splendid cathedral of St. John's, begun in 1841, was consecrated on 9 September, 1855. Dr. Mullock always took a keen interest in the commercial development of Newfoundland, and was most enthusiastic about its natural resources. He was frequently consulted by the governor on matters relating to the welfare of the colony, and many of his suggestions relating to the fisheries and other matters were adopted. Before leaving Ireland he was a frequent contributor to the periodical literature of the day, and took an active part in the Irish literary movement of the forties. Long before the first attempts to lay a submarine cable across the Atlantic was made (1857), Dr. Mullock had on several occasions publicly propounded the feasibility of connecting Europe with America by means of submarine telegraph. He was the first to bring before the English-speaking world the life and works of the great Saint Alphonsus Maria Liguori, publishing his "Life" at Dublin in 1846, and in the following year a translation of the saint's "History of Heresies and their Refutation". In 1847 appeared at Dublin his "Short History of the Irish Franciscan Province", translated from the Latin work of Francis Ward; he also wrote "The Cathedral of St. John's, Newfoundland and its consecration" (Dublin, 1856).

GAMS, *Series episc. eccl. cath.*; HOWLEY, *Eccl. Hist. of Newfoundland* (Boston, 1888); contemporary files of the *Nation* (Dublin), *Tablet* (London), and *Cork Examiner*; *MSS.* in the Franciscan Convent, Dublin.

GREGORY CLEARY.

Münch-Bellinghausen, BARON ELIGIUS FRANZ JOSEPH VON (pseudonym: FRIEDRICH HALM), an Austrian dramatist, b. at Cracow, 2 April, 1806; d. at Vienna, 22 May, 1871. He was educated at the seminary of Melk and later at Vienna, where he studied philosophy and jurisprudence, and where he began his official career in 1826. Even as a boy he took a keen interest in the theatre and since 1833 enjoyed the friendship of his former teacher, the Benedictine Michael Leopold Enk von der Burg, who himself had a strong bent for the drama and encouraged the poet to offer his drama "Griseldis" to the Hofburg theatre. Its successful production in 1835 established Halm's reputation as a playwright and henceforth he continued to write for the stage with varying success. In the meantime he advanced in his official career, becoming Government councillor in 1840 and *Kustos* (chief keeper) of the Court Library in 1844, a position that Grillparzer had sought in vain. He was elected member of the Academy of Sciences in 1852 and life member of the Upper House of Parliament in 1861. In 1867 he was appointed superintendent of the two court-theatres, but three years later resigned this position which disputes had made distasteful to him. His health also had been failing.

Of his many dramatic works the best known are "Griseldis" (1837); "Der Sohn der Wildnis" (1842); and "Der Fechter von Ravenna" (1857). "Griseldis" is based on the well-known story of the faithful wife whose loyalty and devotion are put to the severest tests but who triumphs in the end. "Der Sohn der Wildnis" (The Son of the Wilderness) is a romantic drama depicting the power of womanly love and virtue over rude barbarian strength. It was presented on the English stage under the title of "Ingomar the Barbarian". "Der Fechter von Ravenna" (The Gladiator of Ravenna), regarded as Halm's best work, is a tragedy having for its hero Thumelicus the son of Arminius, the liberator of Germany from Roman rule. Theatrically these plays are very effective, but the characters are improbable and the situations are often strained. Their popularity, which they owe largely to their smooth, polished diction and skilfully interspersed lyrics, has not been lasting. Of Halm's numerous other dramas we may mention "Iphigenie in Delphi" (1856); "Begum Somru" (1863); "Wildfeuer" (1864); and a German version of Shakespeare's "Cymbeline" that appeared on the stage in 1842. Halm is also the author of lyrics, short stories, and of a narrative poem "Charfreitag" (Good Friday) (1864). A complete edition of his works, arranged in chronological order, appeared at Vienna (1856–64) in 8 vols.; four additional volumes were edited posthumously by Faust Pachler and Emil Kuh (Vienna, 1872); selections were edited by Anton Schlossar (Leipzig, —).

See the introduction to SCHLOSSAR'S edition; SEIDL in *Album österreich. Dichter* (Vienna, 1850), 139 sq.; RUDOLF GOTTSCHALL, *Porträts und Studien*, V (Leipzig, 1876), 83–129; HANS HOPFEN, *Streitfragen und Erinnerungen* (Stuttgart, 1876).

ARTHUR F. J. REMY.

Munden, JOHN, VENERABLE. See HAYDOCK, GEORGE, VENERABLE.

Mundwiler, FINTAN, abbot of the Benedictine monastery of St. Meinrad, Indiana, b. at Dietikon in Switzerland, 12 July, 1835; d. at St. Meinrad's Abbey, 14 February, 1898. He studied at the monastic school of Einsiedeln in Switzerland, where he took the Benedictine habit in 1854, made profession on 14 Oct., 1855, and was raised to the priesthood on 11 Sept., 1859. A year later he accompanied his confrère, Martin Marty, afterwards Bishop of St. Cloud, to the newly founded monastery of St. Meinrad in Indiana. Having arrived there in September, 1860, he taught in the seminary and attended a few neighbouring missions. While stationed at Terre Haute, Indiana (1864), he organized the German Catholic Congregation of St. Benedict, for which he built a church in 1865. In 1869, when St. Meinrad was raised to an abbey and Father Marty became its first abbot, Father Fintan was appointed prior and master of novices. While Abbot Marty worked among the Indians in Dakota (1876–80), Prior Fintan was administrator of the abbey, and, upon the resignation of the former, who had meanwhile been appointed Vicar Apostolic of Dakota, Fintan was elected Abbot of St. Meinrad on 3 February, 1880, and received abbatial benediction from Bishop Chatard of Vincennes on 16 May, 1880. Though above all intent upon the observance of monastic discipline, he in no way neglected the secular interests of his abbey. He enlarged the college, founded the Priory (now Abbey) of Subiaco in Arkansas and the Priory (now Abbey) of St. Joseph in Louisiana, and obtained from Rome the permission to erect the Helvetico-American Congregation of Benedictines, of which he became the first president. When St. Meinrad's Abbey was destroyed by fire on 2 Sept., 1887, the undaunted abbot rebuilt the monastery on even a greater scale, founded a commercial college at Jasper, Indiana, and assisted in the foundation of the Priory of St. Gall in North Dakota. But, in the midst of temporal cares, he remained a man of prayer. He laboured most zealously for the spread of the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament and was a fervent promoter of the Priest's Eucharistic League. In 1893 he took part in the Eucharistic Congress held at Jerusalem.

Necrologies in *Paradiesesfrüchte*, III (St. Meinrad, Indiana, 1898), 65–8; *St. John's University Record*, IX (Collegeville, Minnesota, 1898), 31–2; *Revue Bénédictine*, XV (Maredsous, 1898), 188–90.

MICHAEL OTT.

Mungret, SCHOOL OF. See LIMERICK, DIOCESE OF.

Munich-Freising, Archdiocese of (Monacensis et Frisingensis), in Bavaria.—This archdiocese originated in the ancient Diocese of Freising. The Church of Freising dates back to St. Corbinian, who, after his consecration, came in 716 to organize the Church in Bavaria. On a mountain near Freising the saint erected a Benedictine monastery and a school. He was succeeded in the government of the abbey by his brother Erembert. When St. Boniface in 738 regulated ecclesiastical affairs in Bavaria by the creation of four dioceses, Erembert was chosen first Bishop of Freising, which see was made suffragan to Mainz. The sanctuary of Our Lady, which existed on the mountain near Freising before the coming of St. Corbinian, became the cathedral, and was served by the Benedictine monks. At the time the diocese embraced the country of the Upper Isar as far east as the Inn and south to the watershed of the Inn and the Isar. The third bishop, Joseph of Verona (747–64), established a collegiate church in Isen, and shared in the founding of the convents of Schäftlarn and Scharnitz, placing the government of the latter in the hands of Abbot Atto. The last-named foundation was particularly significant, in view of the later acquisitions of the diocese in the Pustertal.

Other important convents of the diocese were Tegernsee, Moosburg, Ilmmünster, Altomünster, Schliersee, and Rot-on-the-Inn. The learned Aribo, or Arbeo (764–84), the biographer of St. Corbinian, translated the remains of this saint from Mais to Freising and interred them in the *Sepulchrum Corbiniani* which he had built (765–68) in the church of Our Lady. During his episcopate, Duke Tassilo II presented Innichen to the Abbot of Scharnitz. With the newly acquired territory, Freising gained a port of entry into Carinthia, and the diocese soon acquired possessions also in Styria and Carniola. Atto, Abbot of Scharnitz, also Archbishop of Freising (784–810), zealously undertook the task of Christianizing the Slavs of the Pustertal. On the summit of the mountain upon which Freising cathedral stood he erected a second Benedictine monastery under the same government as the first. During his time the diocese was made suffragan to Salzburg. Hitto (811–34) made a visitation of his diocese; he installed a provost and six secular canons in the church on the mountain Weihenstephan near Freising.

During the episcopate of his successor Erchambert (835–54), a deed of gift for the first time mentions cathedral canons, who were not monks (842 and 845), the cathedral chapter being thereafter composed of monks and canons. Under Bishops Anno (855–75), Arnold (875–83), and Waldo (883–903), brother of Bishop Salomo of Constance, the monastic element in the cathedral chapter gradually withdrew; the Benedictines of the cathedral mountain seem to have abandoned it and to have established themselves at the foot of the Weihenstephan. Waldo rebuilt the cathedral, which had been burned down; he was given jurisdiction over the neighbouring Abbey of Moosburg, and received from Louis the Child in 906 the right of free choice of bishops for the cathedral chapter.

The Hungarians gained an entry into Bavaria and destroyed almost entirely the spiritual life of the country. Bishop Utto fell in a battle against them in 908. Under St. Lantpert (938–57), Freising was set on fire by the Hungarians and almost entirely destroyed. After the victory of Otto I at Lechfeld, peace came again to the city, and the Church of Freising, under the guidance of competent rulers, rose from its ruins, and acquired new possessions. Abraham, of the race of the counts of Görz (956–94), obtained for his diocese from the Emperor Otto II (973) extensive possessions in Carniola. Gottschalk, Knight of Hagenau (994–1006), obtained for Freising a coinage, the privilege of holding fairs, and civic rights; and Egilbert of Moosburg (1006–39), the founder of the Benedictine Abbey of Weihenstephan, which replaced the old convent of the canons, was the recipient of additional lands in Upper Carniola. In Austria and in the Tyrol the colonies founded from the diocese were remarkably successful in development and stability. During the disturbances resulting from the conflict of investitures, Ellenhard, Count of Meran (1052–78), was ever to be found on the side of Henry IV, who repeatedly visited the bishop in Freising; Meginhard, Count of Scheyern (1078–98), who distinguished himself by spreading the Christian doctrine in Bohemia, was more favourable to the pope; Heinrich I, of Ebersdorf (1098–1137), was in his turn an adherent of the emperor. Heinrich I lived to see the destruction of Freising by Duke Welf, and, when dying, bequeathed his possessions to the diocese.

He was succeeded by the most distinguished bishop, Otto I (1137–58), the historian and philosopher. He saved the see from the ruin which threatened it, reestablished many monasteries, and delivered the diocese from the oppressive jurisdiction of the counts of Scheyern. A Cistercian himself, he once more established monastic discipline and austerity. In the last years of his administration occurred the destruction of the episcopal bridge, custom houses, mint, and salt works near Oberföhring by Duke Henry the Lion, who transferred the custom houses and bridge site to the upper part of Oberföhring, placing them in the village of Munich on the Isar. Albert I (1158–84) brought the diocese safely through the conflicts of Barbarossa with the pope; he rebuilt the cathedral, which had been burned down in 1169, making it larger and more magnificent; his successor Otto II (1184–1220) completed the work, the cathedral being consecrated in 1205. The troubled period of the thirteenth century was generally unfavourable to the spiritual life of the diocese; in addition, the acquisition of property through donation ceased altogether, and the bishops, in particular Konrad of Wittelsbach (1258–1278) and Emicho of Wittelsbach (1283–1311), organized and brought together their scattered possessions by purchase, sale, and exchange. By inheriting Werdenfels (1294), the diocese became an immediate principality of the empire.

The schism which occurred under Louis the Bavarian also divided the Church of Freising. In opposition to the bishops chosen by the cathedral chapter, which was favourable to the emperor, three others were named in succession by the pope, and for more than a century afterwards the popes appointed the bishops of this diocese, ignoring the privilege of free choice possessed by the chapter. Under the rule of Bishop Albert of Hohenberg (1349–59), chancellor of Charles IV, the diocese recovered from the evil effects produced by the schism. His successors were in great part lords from Austrian territory. In opposition to Bishop Nicodemus of Scala (1421–43), named by Martin V, who proved himself an excellent regent and promoter of ecclesiastical reform, the cathedral chapter chose the vicar-general, Johann Grünwalder, recognized by the antipope, Felix V, and by Duke Albert of Bavaria; but after the resignation of Heinrich II of Schlick (1443–48), appointed by the pope, he obtained general recognition as bishop, and showed himself to be eminently fitted for the office (1448–52). His successor, Johann IV of Tuelbeck (1453–73), was the first bishop in many years to owe his election to the cathedral chapter. He resigned in favour of his chancellor, the pious Sixtus of Tannberg, who worked zealously for reform and for the maintenance of ecclesiastical discipline. During his time, Veit Arnpeck wrote his history of Bavaria and of Freising.

After the death of Sixtus, the chapter elected in succession three brothers of the house of Wittelsbach: Ruprecht (1495–98), Philipp (1499–1541), and Heinrich (1541–1551); of these, however, only Philipp received consecration. Given up to field sports, Philipp

nevertheless steadfastly opposed the ecclesiastical innovations which seemed about to gain a footing in his diocese. Philipp was also administrator of the Diocese of Naumburg. Under Bishop Leo (1552–59), a visitation of the bishopric took place. Moritz of Sandizell (1599–66), an admirable administrator, resigned in favour of Duke Ernest of Bavaria (1556–1612). The latter was at the same time Bishop of Hildesheim, of Liège, Elector of Cologne, and Bishop of Münster. On account of his zealous activity in the North German sees, he was unable to remain long at Freising. Nevertheless he introduced many reforms, established a ducal and ecclesiastical town council in Munich, and promulgated the first Bavarian concordat (1583). Under the pious Vitus Adam von Gebeck (1618–51), the bishopric was shockingly devastated by the Thirty Years War. Emperor Ferdinand II conferred upon him and his successors the dignity of Prince-bishops.

Once more two princes of the house of Bavaria were elected to the See of Freising: Albert Sigismund (1652–85), at the same time Bishop of Ratisbon and Provost of Ellwangen, an art-loving prince, who adorned the cathedral with a magnificent portal; and Joseph Klemens (1685–94), brother of the Elector Max Emanuel, an ostentatious and extravagant prince, also Bishop of Ratisbon, Elector of Cologne, and Bishop of Liège. Papal confirmation of his appointment to the last-named see was given only in the event that he should resign from the Sees of Freising and Ratisbon. In Freising he was succeeded by Johann von Kapfing (1695–1727), who caused the cathedral to be decorated by the Asam brothers, erected a number of schools and charitable institutions, made numerous visitations, and founded a lyceum at Freising, one of the professors being the learned Benedictine Meichelbeck, who wrote the history of the bishops of Freising. Johann Theodor, Duke of Bavaria (1727–63), in whose hands were united the Dioceses of Ratisbon, Liège, and Freising, built an ecclesiastical seminary at Munich (1735). Klemens Wenceslaus of Saxony (1763–68), who from 1764 was also Bishop of Ratisbon and coadjutor of Augsburg, resigned the See of Freising when, in 1768, he was chosen Elector of Trier. Ludwig Joseph von Welden (1769–88) was specially distinguished for his erection of schools for the people. During his episcopate, a papal nunciature for the lands of Elector Karl Theodor was established in Munich (1786), which was the immediate cause of the convoking of the Congress of Ems. Maximilian Prokop, Count of Törring-Jettenbach (1788–89), was succeeded by the last Prince-Bishop of Freising, Joseph Konrad von Schroffenberg (1780–1803), the dissolution of the diocese taking place during his lifetime (d. 4 April, 1803, at Berchtesgaden).

At the time of the secularization of church property, the prince-bishopric fell to Bavaria, the parts lying in Austria and the Tyrol being turned over to Salzburg. The reformers undertook the destruction of monasteries and diocese, numerous churches were sold for the material they contained, graves were desecrated, the sacred vessels were sold at auction or melted down, and the most valuable libraries were despoiled of their treasures. Owing to the dissolution of the cathedral chapter by the Bavarian Government, the election of a vicar capitular was impossible, and the spiritual guidance of the diocese was entrusted to the vicar-general, Heckenstaller, appointed from Salzburg, who, in 1819, was named vicar Apostolic of the abandoned diocese. The most important episcopal functions were performed by the coadjutor Bishop of Ratisbon, Johann Nepomuk von Wolf. After the concordat between Pius VII and King Max Joseph I (5 June, 1817), an orderly condition of affairs was again finally inaugurated. From the territory of the dissolved Sees of Freising and Chiemsee, and the former Provostship of Berchtesgaden was created the Archdiocese of Munich-Freising, with the seat of the archbishop and the cathedral chapter in Munich. The new archdiocese was also to comprise those portions of the former Prince-Bishopric of Salzburg which lay on the left bank of the Inn. On the other hand, those parishes in the Tyrol, Carinthia, Carniola, etc., which were formerly under the bishops of Freising and Chiemsee, were subjected to the Ordinaries of Salzburg and Brixen. The church of Our Lady in Munich was made the cathedral. The Bishops of Augsburg, Passau, and Ratisbon became the suffragans of the new ecclesiastical province. The papal Bull of circumscription, "Dei ac Domini nostri", bears the date of 1 April, 1818.

Lothar Anselm, Freiherr von Gebsattel, dean of the cathedral of Würzburg and a personal friend of the king, was named the first archbishop (1817). As, at the same time as the publication of the concordat, a religious edict had been promulgated as part of the constitution, which again unfairly abrogated many of the stipulations of the concordat, Gebsattel refused to take the oath to abide by the constitution; and it was only after the Tegernsee proclamation of the king, 15 Sept., 1821, that he was consecrated in the cathedral of Munich (1821). He attained great distinction by his regulation of ecclesiastical affairs. Under his rule, a large number of monasteries were re-established or newly founded, and many churches and charitable institutions were erected. In Freising, on the site of the old episcopal residence, which Louis had restored to the bishop in 1826, an ecclesiastical seminary was established, to which were added later a lesser seminary, a gymnasium, and a lyceum.

His successor was Karl August, Count of Reisach, previously Bishop of Eichstätt, and coadjutor of Munich. He became unpopular under Maximilian II because of his efforts to uphold the rights of the Church. The king finally used his influence to have him withdrawn, and Pius IX in 1855 raised him to the cardinalate and called him to Rome. Gregor von Scherr (1856–77), former Abbot of Metten, endeavoured to preserve the Catholic character of the schools. For the maintenance of the lesser seminaries of the diocese which had been obliged to receive an exceptionally large number of candidates to the priesthood, he founded St. Corbinian's Association, and erected a lesser seminary in Freising. He introduced into his diocese the devotion of the Perpetual Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, and instituted pastoral conferences of the clergy. At the Vatican Council, he voted with the minority, but submitted at once to the decision of the council. The last years of his episcopate were embittered by the support which the Bavarian Government, under the leadership of Lutz, minister of worship, gave to the Old Catholic movement, whose founder (Döllinger) and most zealous champions were resident in Munich.

His successor, Anton von Steichele (1878–89), the learned church historian and historiographer of the Diocese of Augsburg, by the foundation of Church Building Associations kept pace with the ever-growing City of Munich by the erection of new churches and parishes, and enlarged the seminary at Freising. In January, 1887, he summoned the bishops of Bavaria to a conference at Freising, which resulted in a resolution to send to the Government a joint memorandum in regard to the status of the Catholic Church in Bavaria, which when carried into effect brought about a better arrangement of the relations between Church and State and guaranteed to the Church a greater influence upon the intermediate and higher schools. Under Archbishop Antonius von Thoma (1889–97), the Old Catholic question was finally settled in a manner favourable to the Catholic Church and to justice. Franz Joseph von Stein (1897–1909) fearlessly espoused in the Bavarian Chamber of the Council of the Empire the cause of the Catholic Church regarding instruction, upholding Catholic





MUNICH

TOWN HALL
CHURCH OF OUR LADY

UNIVERSITY

THEATINE CHURCH (1661–1675)
MAXIMILIAN I, ELECTOR OF BAVARIA

knowledge as opposed to the unchecked freedom of university teaching. In accordance with the requirements of the times, he bestowed special care upon the encouragement of Catholic orders and associations, the fostering of Christian charity, the education of the clergy, and the awakening and conservation of the spirit of the Church in the hearts of the people. The present archbishop is Franz Bettinger, appointed on 23 May, 1909, and consecrated, 15 Aug.

STATISTICS.—The archdiocese comprises the Bavarian district of Upper Bavaria, excepting those portions lying west and north of the Danube, 48 communes in the domains of Landshut, and Vilsbiburg in the district of Lower Bavaria. The suffragan dioceses are Augsburg, Passau, and Ratisbon. The diocese is divided into 36 deaneries, 3 town commissariats (Munich, Landshut, and Freising), 417 parishes, 20 *expositurен* (parishes in all but the name) and vicariates. The diocese has 460 benefices and manual benefices (i. e., benefices the incumbents of which may be removed at the will of a superior), 400 curacies, and 100 other places where church services are held. The clergy numbers (1910) 412 pastors, 162 invested beneficiaries, 677 other priests, 210 regular priests (in all 1461 priests). The number of Catholics is 1,069,300. In addition to the cathedral chapter, there are three collegiate churches: in Munich (St. Cajetan's), Laufen, and Tittmoning.

For the education of the clergy there are lesser seminaries in Scheyern (conducted by the Benedictines) and in Freising, having respectively 175 and 215 students, as well as two ecclesiastical seminaries, viz., the archiepiscopal seminary in Freising, with 171 students, and the Georgianum, founded in 1494 by Duke Georg the Rich at Ingolstadt, now transferred to Munich and administered by the State, with 103 students, of which, however, only 23 belong to the Diocese of Munich-Freising. The students attend the philosophical and theological lectures at the University of Munich and at the state lyceums at Freising.

The following orders are represented in the archdiocese:—The Benedictines possess the two Abbeys of Scheyern and St. Boniface in Munich, founded by King Louis I, as well as the Abbeys of Ettal and Schäftlarn, and 2 colleges for students in Munich,— in all (1910) 91 fathers, 27 scholastics, and 162 brothers. The Franciscans have 5 convents, with 49 fathers, 23 scholastics, and 58 lay brothers; the Capuchins, 5 convents, with 43 fathers, 9 novices, and 53 lay brothers; the Brothers of Mercy, 2 convents, with 3 fathers, and 47 brothers; the Minorites, 1 hospital, with 3 fathers, and 3 lay brothers; the Redemptorists, 2 colleges, with 28 fathers, 29 scholastics, and 46 lay brothers; the Augustinians, 1 convent, with 4 fathers, and 6 lay brothers.

Numerous female orders and congregations are to be found in the archdiocese. Of the ancient convents of women only a few are still in existence, notably the Benedictines of the Island of Frauenchiemsee, with an educational establishment and 72 sisters, and the convent of the Servites, near the pilgrimage church of the ducal hospital in Munich, with 55 sisters. The recent congregations are occupied entirely with the instruction of girls, with the care of the sick and the orphans, with the management of Catholic institutions, and so on, while the Brigittines and the Carmelites give themselves up to contemplation.

Besides the two establishments already named, there exist (1910) in the archdiocese: Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, from the mother-house in Munich, 61 convents, 842 sisters; Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, from the mother-house in Augsburg, 5 establishments, 35 sisters; English Ladies (Institute of Mary), 1 mother-house and 15 filial institutes, 609 sisters; 1 establishment of the Missionary Sisters of St. Benedict, 7 sisters; Briggitines, 1 house, 41 sisters; Dominicans, 1 establishment, 16 sisters; Franciscans, 5 houses, 139 sisters; Franciscans from the mother-house of Maria-Stern, in Augsburg, 12 establishments, 83 sisters; Poor Franciscans of the Third Order, from Mallersdorf, 65 houses, 429 sisters; Sisters of the Congregation of St. Joseph of Ursberg, 2 houses, 31 sisters; Sisters of the Good Shepherd, 1 house in Munich, 94 sisters; Carmelites, 1 house, 9 sisters; Salesians, 3 establishments, 179 sisters; Poor School Sisters, with a general mother-house, Sankt Jacob am Anger, in Munich, and 49 filial convents, in all, 764 sisters; Ursulines in Landshut, 55 sisters; Sisters of the Most Holy Redeemer from the mother-house at Niederbronn (Alsace), 23 establishments, 203 sisters.

Of the associations in the archdiocese, the following, more or less widespread, may be named: Ludwigmissionsverein (Louis missionary union), the Association of the Holy Childhood of Jesus, the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, St. Elizabeth's Guild, the Archconfraternity of the Perpetual Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, Catholic *Gesellenvereine* (Journeymen's Unions) and *Arbeitervereine* (Unions of Labourers), Catholic Students' Unions, Catholic Associations for the Young, Unions of Clerks and Employees, Servants' Unions, Associations for the Education of Neglected Children, and so forth.

Of the churches of the archdiocese, those of the city of Munich are especially noteworthy; this is so in particular of the Cathedral of Our Lady, a brick building in the Gothic style, which dates from 1468–88, with two towers 324 ft. in height, whose copper cupolas, the so-called "wälschen Kappen" (Romanesque caps), are the town's most famous landmarks. Other churches are St. Peter's, the oldest parish church of the city, dating from the year 1180, built in the Gothic and later restored in the Baroque style; Sankt Jacob am Anger, the oldest church in Munich, still retaining its original form and dating from the thirteenth century; the court church of St. Michael, built for the Jesuits, 1583–97, the most distinguished ecclesiastical production of the German Renaissance; the court church of St. Cajetan, built (1663–75) for the Theatines, in the Baroque style; the church of St. Louis, built (1830–44), mainly through the generosity of King Louis I, in medieval Italian style, containing the famous fresco of the "Last Judgment" by Cornelius; the court of All Saints, built in 1827–37 in the Romanesque-Byzantine style; and the Basilica of St. Boniface, built (1835–50) for the Benedictines, in the form of an early Christian basilica, containing frescoes taken from the life of St. Boniface. The numerous churches of the most varied styles which have been erected in Munich during the last ten years, and constitute one of the beauties of the city, e. g., those of St. Anna, St. Paul, St. Joseph, St. Rupert, bear witness to the people's devotion.

Of the other churches of the archdiocese, the following are worthy of mention: the cathedral of Freising, built 1161–1205, often restored and altered, in which is to be found the shrine containing the relics of St. Corbinian; the Gothic church of St. Martin, in the city of Landshut, dating from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, surmounted by the highest tower in Bavaria; in the same city the church of St. Jodock, also in the Gothic style, built in 1338–68; the Romanesque church of Moosburg, erected 1160; the collegiate churches of Tegernsee, Isen, Berchtesgaden, Ilmmünster, Dietramszell, and others. The places of pilgrimage include the church of the Ducal Hospital in Munich, Maria-Eich, Maria-Rammersdorf, Maria-Blutenburg in Munich, Maria-Eich at Traunstein, Tuntenhausen, Ettal, Scheyern, Mariadorfen, Birkenstein, Heiligblut at Erding.

UNIVERSITY OF MUNICH.—It was first established (1472) at Ingolstadt (q. v. for its history up to 1800).

In 1800 it was transferred to Landshut, and, later, by decree of Ludwig I (3 Oct., 1826) to Munich, where it has developed in peace. Its earliest location was the former college of the Jesuits, but in 1840 it removed to a new building which has recently (1908) been considerably enlarged. Through the munificence of the Wittelsbach dynasty, abundant provision has been made for its organization and equipment, and it now ranks as the second largest among the German universities. The revised statutes were published in 1835, and new regulations for the student body in 1849. The fourth centenary of the university was celebrated in August, 1872. The faculty of theology at Munich has a long list of distinguished names: Allioli, Döllinger, Haneberg, Hergenröther, Klee, Möhler, Phillips, Permaneder, Reischl, Schegg, Thalhofer. The Collegium Georgianum, founded in 1494 by George the Rich for the special benefit of theological students, was transferred to Munich with the rest of the university, and still serves its original purpose. The faculty numbers (1910) twelve professors and nine *Dozents;* there are 150 theological students. Among illustrious representatives of the other sciences may be mentioned: in philosophy, Schelling (1827–41); in chemistry, Liebig (1852–73); in surgery, Thiersch (1848–95), and Nussbaum (1860–90); in medicine, Ringseis (1817–80); in history, Giesbrecht (1862–89); in Germanic philology, Schmeller (1827–29); in Celtic philology, Zeuss (1847–56). In 1910 the total number of instructors was 252; of students, 6890.

MEICHELBECK, *Historia Frisingensis* (2 vols., Augsburg, 1724); *Viti Arnpeckii Liber de gestis Episcoporum Frisingensium* (new edition, Munich, 1852); DEUTINGER, *Die ältesten Matrikeln des Bistums Freising* (3 vols., Munich, 1849–50); IDEM, *Beiträge zur Geschichte, Topographie und Statistik des Erzbistums München und Freising* (6 vols., Munich, 1850–54), continued by SPECHT, vols. VII to X (Munich, 1901–10); BAUMGÄRTNER, *Geschichte der Stadt Freising und ihrer Bischöfe* (Freising, 1854); VON HUND, *Urkunden des Bistums Freising* (Munich, 1873); ZAHN, *Codex-diplomaticus Austriaco-Frisingensis* (3 vols., Vienna, 1870–71); MAYER AND WESTERMEYER, *Statistische Beschreibung des Bistums München-Freising* (3 vols., Munich and Ratisbon, 1879–84); SCHLECHT, *Bayerns Kirchenprovinzen* (Munich, 1902); BITTERAUF, *Die Traditionen des Hochstifts Freising* (Munich, 1905); *Generaliensammlung der Erzdiözese München-Freising*, I–V (Munich, 1821–98); *Pastoralblatt* [*Amtsblatt* since 1880] *für die Erzdiözese München-Freising* (Munich, 1860—); *Schematismus der Geistlichkeit des Erzbistums München-Freising* (Munich, 1821—); *Oberbayerisches Archiv für vaterländische Geschichte* (Munich, 1839—); *Sammelblatt des historischen Vereins Freising* (Freising, 1894—). Regarding the churches see: SIGHART, *Der Dom in Freising* (Landshut, 1852); IDEM, *Die mittelalterliche Kunst in der Erzdiözese München-Freising* (Freising, 1855); *Die Kunstdenkmäler Bayerns*, I; *Regierungsbezirk Oberbayern* (Munich, 1892—).

JOSEPH LINS.

Munkács, DIOCESE OF, in Hungary, of Greek Catholic Rite, suffragan of Gran. It dates from the fifteenth century. Until then the Greek Ruthenians who had emigrated to Hungary a generation before, 1254, were subject to the See of Przemysl. In 1458 the Diocese of Munkács is mentioned for the first time in a document of King Mathias as a parish with episcopal jurisdiction. It was probably established between 1439 and 1458, as the document mentions that Lucas, the occupant of the see, had already exercised the usual jurisdiction for a considerable period. Its history is connected with that of the Basilian monastery at Csernekhegy near Munkács, established supposedly in 1360 by Duke Theodore Koriatovics, but demonstrably as late as 1418. The history of the diocese falls naturally into three periods. Until 1641, when union with Rome took place, Munkács endeavoured to extend its episcopal jurisdiction over the thirteen districts (Komitate) of Hungary, later its territory. The second period lasts from 1641 to 1771, when the see was canonically established. A third period brings its history down to the present. Of its history during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries we know very little, especially in regard to the mode of episcopal appointment, although it was probably by election until 1561, with the exception of the nomination in 1458. In King Wladislaw II's documents a certain John is mentioned as bishop in 1491 and 1498; thence until 1551 we hear nothing more about the bishops, nor are we even sure that the see was occupied. The first document recording the actual appointment of a bishop dates from 1623. In 1641, under Bishop Theodore Tharassovics (1639–48), union with Rome was facilitated by the wish to have done with dependence on the lords of Munkács, but George Rákóczi I of Transylvania, Lord of Munkács, being unfavourably disposed towards union, took Tharassovics prisoner, and, although the latter obtained his freedom in 1642, he did not regain possession of the see. In 1649 the union with Rome was again proclaimed by the clergy of Munkács influenced by Bishop George Jakusich of Eger; henceforth, especially from 1689, date the efforts of the bishops of Eger to bring Munkács into close subjection.

After the union of 1649, Peter Parthenius was appointed Bishop of Munkács, and was confirmed both by King Leopold and the pope. His death was followed by a period of decadence: the diocese was divided into several parts, administered more or less independently of one another, and conflicts arose between the emperor, the pope, and the Rákóczi family, concerning the right of nomination to the see. Appointed bishop in 1689 through the efforts of Archbishop Kolonics, Joseph de Camelis, a Greek, devoted his chief energy towards fostering the religious life of the people and extirpating incontinence among the clergy. To promote these objects he held twelve synods within three years, that of Szatmár being of special importance. After Camelis's death the right of appointment was again disputed. King Joseph I appointed Joseph Hodermarszky bishop in 1705; Francis Rákóczi II, as Lord of Munkács, filled the episcopal office independently; the Holy See, on its part, appointed an administrator, not regarding the see legally established for lack of canonical creation. Hodermarszky had to resign the see in 1715, and the endeavours of the bishops of Eger to treat Munkács as a suffragan thus triumphed. Hodermarszky's successor, Gennadius Bizanczi (1716–33), had already acted as vicar Apostolic. Both he and still more his successor, Michael Olsavszky, contested the authority of the Bishop of Eger; Olsavszky's successor, John Bradács, continued the conflict, and finally triumphed. In 1771 the See of Munkács was established canonically by Clement XIV, Bradács becoming first canonical bishop. Under him the chapter, with seven canons, was also established. In 1816 the See of Eperjes was separated from Munkács, and in 1856 ninety-four parishes were incorporated in the new See of Szamosujvár. Basil Popovics (1837–64) made a lasting impression on the religious life of the diocese; Stephen Pankovics (1866–74) displayed great activity in the domain of diocesan administration, and John Pásztélyi-Kovács (1879–94) performed especially prominent service in the cause of public education. Since 1894 Julius Firczák has been bishop. The residence is at Ungvár. The see is divided into two vicariates (Mármaros and Hajdu-Dorog), seven archdeaneries, and forty-eight vice-archdeaneries. The parishes number 387, the right of patronage being exercised by ninety patrons, the parochial clergy over 500. There are five monasteries, and the chapter consists of six canons.

HODINKA, *Hist. of the Greek Catholic See of Munkács* (Budapest, 1910), with literature; *Catholic Hungary* (Budapest, 1902), both in Hungarian.

A. ALDÁSY.

Münster, DIOCESE OF (MONASTERIENSIS), in the Prussian Province of Westphalia, suffragan of Cologne.

I. SECULAR HISTORY.—The earliest name of Münster was Mimegerneford, the later form being Mimigardeford, while from 1076 it was called by the Latin

name Monasterium. It is first mentioned in 795, when St. Ludger founded a monastery here, and the place became his see when he was consecrated bishop. Even at this early date it must have been a place of some importance. Among the earliest possessions of the Church at Münster were three large landed estates, apparently the gift of Charlemagne. These lands, at least in part, lay within the area of the later city. They were called the Brockhof, the Kampwordeshof, and the Bispinghof. The last-named belonged to the bishop and, probably for this reason, bore his name. The Brockhof was owned by the cathedral chapter, the Kampwordeshof belonged later to the collegiate church of St. Moritz, to which it was apparently assigned when the church was founded. The fourth great estate, and one that is mentioned from the earliest days, the Judefelderhof, appears to have belonged originally to the Church, by which it was given in fief to a family called Jüdefeld. In 1386 the cathedral chapter obtained it by purchase. Near these four estates were quite a number of farms owned independently by free peasants; many of these in the course of time came into the possession of the Church. The monastery of St. Ludger was placed in the centre of these properties on the ground now surrounding the cathedral. From the beginning the monastery was independent of the jurisdiction of the count. How large a district enjoyed this immunity cannot now be ascertained. Neither, for lack of original authorities, can the extent of the guild in which the free peasants were united be positively settled, nor the earliest state of the community and the legal jurisdiction exercised in it. In regard to the public administration of justice, Münster was from the earliest times under the authority of the Counts of Dreingau until, on account of the privileges granted by Otto I, the rights of the count were transferred to the bishop, who exercised them, especially the higher jurisdiction, through governors. The relation of the bishop to the commune in the early period is not entirely clear, though it is evident that he exercised a certain influence over the affairs of the community.

At first the population was very small: there appears to have been a large increase in the eleventh century, when, in addition to the cathedral, the churches of Ueberwasser (1040), St. Moritz (about 1070), and St. Lambert (after 1085) were built. Münster at this time offered great advantages to merchants and mechanics, besides being the see of a bishop, with a chapter and cathedral school. Thus, close to the episcopal castle, that had been built near the minster, there arose an outlying city in which commerce and trade were fairly prosperous, as early as the twelfth century. In 1115 the castle was provided with walls, gateways, and a moat. In the twelfth century three more parish churches were built, those of St. Ludger, mentioned in 1173, St. Ægidius (1181), and St. Martin (before 1199). By the end of the twelfth century the place was virtually a city, although it cannot now be ascertained when the distinctive municipal privileges were secured by it. From not later than 1168 the city formed a separate judicial district, and with this the development into a municipality was essentially complete. Yet Münster was not a free imperial city; it was always dependent on the bishop. In 1173 the right of administering the city passed to the bishop and the cathedral chapter. From the thirteenth century these two powers entrusted the exercise of legal jurisdiction to officials (*ministerialen*) of the bishop. From the thirteenth century, in addition to the judge appointed by the bishop, there were city judges, who are first mentioned in 1255. They were appointed by the burgomasters from the members of the city council. When court was held they sat by the judge, who was the bishop's appointee in order to guard the interests of the city, but outside of this had not much influence. The city council acted as a board of assessors in the city court. The extensive commerce of the city rapidly increased its importance. As early as 1253 it formed a defensive alliance with the neighbouring cities of Osnabrück, Dortmund, Soest, and Lippstadt, and one with the cathedral chapter in 1257. At a later date it joined the confederation of the cities of the Rhine, and about 1368 entered the Hanseatic League. In this period the commercial relations of Münster extended as far as England and Flanders, and eastwards to Livonia and Novgorod.

During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries important changes appeared in the government of the city. In medieval times the population consisted of citizens and non-citizens. The citizen body was divided into the ruling patricians, who from the sixteenth century were also called "hereditary proprietors", and the commonalty. A body of city patricians can be proved to have existed at Münster from the thirteenth century. At least the burgomasters and the members of the city council were chosen from a limited number of families. From the fourteenth century the patricians had control of the court of the city; they maintained themselves in the sole ownership of the city government up into the fifteenth century. The representatives of the city were the burgomasters, first mentioned in 1253, and the assessors, mentioned in 1221. Besides its judicial authority, the body of assessors performed the duties of a city council. It was presided over by the burgomasters, who, from 1268, were not appointed by the bishop, but by those citizens (*guden luden*) who had the right of voting. Taking advantage of the bishop's pecuniary needs, the municipality gradually obtained large rights and privileges. Thus, besides its own autonomy, it acquired the military authority, the administration of a number of church prebends, and supreme jurisdiction in certain courts in the neighbouring towns and villages. In the fourteenth century it had a court formed from its own council. After 1309 it was represented in the diet of the diocese along with the cathedral chapter and the lower nobility.

Nevertheless, the bishop always appointed the judges and reserved to himself the confirmation of sentence in important cases. He levied the town-taxes which, however, he generally mortgaged; he owned the mint, and claimed certain rights at the death of every citizen. The guilds formed by the leading trades in the fourteenth century (in the sixteenth century seventeen guilds are mentioned) originally exercised no control over the city government; in the second half of that century they formed a confederation. Thus confederated, the guilds were able to influence both the internal and external affairs of the city, working apparently in amicable agreement with the Council. In 1447 the confederated guilds were regarded as a ruling corporation co-ordinate and acting in union with the Council. Their veto could stop any proceedings of the Council, which was still chosen from the patrician body. On the other hand, the Council retained a certain right of supervision over the internal affairs of the guilds. A good understanding between Council and guilds was, therefore, the primary condition for a prosperous development of the city. As a matter of fact the two bodies worked harmoniously together until the outbreak of the diocesan feud which split the city into two armed camps (see below, under II). In 1454, after the close of this feud, it was decided to choose the burgomasters and members of the Council thenceforward from both the patricians and mass of the citizens. This arrangement was maintained until the Anabaptist outbreak. Internal peace promoted prosperity and schools and learning flourished greatly. Münster was regarded as the leading commercial city between the Rhine and the Weser, and the school conducted by the Canon Rudolf of Langen had a great reputation.

In 1533–35, however, Münster was the scene of the wild excesses of the Anabaptists. During the episcopate of Bishop Frederick III, brother of Hermann of Wied, Archbishop of Cologne, the doctrines of Luther spread widely in the Diocese of Münster. In his agreement with the city (14 February, 1533) Bishop Franz of Waldeck ceded to it full religious liberty and granted the six parish churches to the adherents of the new doctrine, in return for which the city promised him obedience and support against the cathedral chapter. From 1533 the city undertook the preparation of new church ordinances. The drawing up of a form of worship was assigned to Bernt Rothmann, a preacher of Anabaptist proclivities. Supported by some preachers from Wassenberg in Jülich and by the Melchiorites (followers of Melchior Hoffmann), he began to spread his views. The strength of the Anabaptist party was steadily increased by accessions from Holland, until, in February, 1534, their leaders, John of Leyden, a tailor, and Jan Matthiesen, a baker, came to Münster from Haarlem, when the sect gained complete control of the city, and the peaceable minority either left the city voluntarily or were expelled. The Anabaptists now indulged in the wildest orgies in "the New Jerusalem", as they called Münster, introducing polygamy and communism, plundering and selling churches and monasteries.

Notwithstanding his inclination to Protestantism, the bishop was now obliged to go to war with the city in order to maintain his secular authority. In alliance with Philip of Hesse, he began (28 February, 1534) a siege of the city in which John of Leyden, as king of the New Zion, had established a reign of terror. After a siege of sixteen months the city was taken in a bloody assault (25 June, 1535). The leaders of the insurrection were executed with horrible tortures and their bodies were exposed in three cages hung on the tower of St. Lambert's Church. The return of the expelled citizens and the restoration of the Catholic Church proceeded slowly. A small Protestant community was still maintained. In 1553 the city regained its old privileges and rights. Trade, commerce, and learning once more flourished. Although disputes now arose between the guilds and the town council, and these two combined against the growing importance of the bishop, Münster enjoyed general peace and prosperity until the Thirty Years' War. Several times during that war the city was obliged to pay heavy contributions, but it was not utterly impoverished like so many other cities.

The peace negotiations carried on at Münster by the Catholic Powers, beginning in 1643, led to the neutralization of the city and its substantial benefit. Thus encouraged, the Council, a few years after the Peace of Westphalia, persuaded the citizens to make a bold attempt to throw off the sovereignty of the bishop and raise Münster to the rank of a free city of the empire. In the struggle with the Prince-Bishop Christopher Bernhard of Galen, Münster was defeated in March, 1661. It lost its privileges, and an episcopal citadel, the Paulsburg, was erected in the western part of the city. Never, while the prince-bishops remained rulers, did Münster regain its full civic liberty. After the Seven Years' War, during which Münster was not able to hold out against a second siege, in 1759, the fortifications were turned into promenades, and the citadel razed. In place of the latter a castle was built in 1768 as a residence for the prince-bishop. In 1780 a university was founded with the property of the suppressed Jesuits and of the Abbey of Ueberwasser. A circle of learned men gathered at Münster around the Princess Galitzin, amongst them being Frederick Leopold Count zu Stolberg and Overbeck.

By the Imperial delegate's enactment, the city of Münster and a part of the diocese fell to Prussia, which had already (23 May, 1802) made an agreement concerning it with the Consul Bonaparte. The Prussian troops under Blücher entered the city, 3 August. A commission accompanied the army to shape the constitution and administration of the newly-acquired district conformably with the Prussian model. Although the president of the commission, Freiherr von Stein, showed a very friendly spirit towards the city, yet the suppression of its independence and the overbearing behaviour of the Prussian officers disgusted the citizens with Prussian supremacy. Münster joyfully welcomed the French, who entered it in 1806, after the defeat of Prussia at Jena and Auerstädt. In 1808 the city was assigned to the Grand Duchy of Berg, in 1810 to Holland, and in 1811 to France, as capital of the Department of Lippe. The old city-government was dissolved and replaced by the French municipal organization. Many good measures of administration were introduced, but the enthusiasm for them was rapidly chilled by the extensive billeting of soldiers upon the citizens, and by arbitrary action, especially in ecclesiastical matters. When, therefore, after the overthrow of the Napoleonic power at the battle of Leipzig, the Prussians again entered Münster, they, in turn, were greeted with great joy. The Prussian Government was wise enough to retain many improvements made by the French, which they further developed, so that the city quickly reached an unprecedented prosperity. In 1836 the Prussian municipal ordinance was applied to Münster. The population, 13,000 at the beginning of the nineteenth century, rapidly increased with the growth of commerce and traffic, and, as capital of the Province of Westphalia, the quiet cathedral city developed into an important centre of traffic for North-Western Germany.

According to the census taken at the close of 1905, Münster had 81,468 inhabitants, of whom 67,221 were Catholics, 13,612 Protestants, and 555 Jews; in 1910 the population was about 87,000, including 72,800 Catholics. The city has 25 Catholic churches and chapels, including 12 parish churches. Catholic institutions of learning are: the theological faculty of the university with (in the summer of 1910) 316 students; the seminary for priests; 2 preparatory seminaries, namely, the Collegium Borromæum and the Collegium Ludgerianum; a Catholic state gymnasium; a seminary for teachers; a high school for girls.

II. Diocesan History.—Towards the end of the Saxon War, Charlemagne founded, about 795, several Saxon dioceses, all suffragans of Cologne, among them Münster, or Mimigerneford. The first bishop was Ludger, who, since the year 787, had been a zealous missionary in five Frisian "hundreds", or districts. The territory of the Diocese of Münster was bounded on the west, south, and north-west by the Dioceses of Cologne and Utrecht, on the east and north-east by Osnabrück. The diocese also included districts remote from the bulk of its territory, namely, the five Frisian hundreds on the lower Ems (Hugmerki, Hunusgau, Fivelgau, Federitgau, and Emsgau), also the island of Bant, which has disappeared, leaving behind it the islands of Borkum, Juist, and Norderney. Mention has already been made above (see I) of the earliest landed estates of the see. Most of the territory over which the bishop eventually exercised sovereign rights lay north of the River Lippe, extending as far as the upper Ems and the Teutoburg Forest. The most important accession was in 1252, when the see purchased the Countship of Vechta and the district of the Ems with the town of Meppen. The country between these new districts was acquired later: in 1403 the district about Cloppenburg and Oyte was gained, in 1406 the manorial domain of Ahaus and the castle of Stromberg with its jurisdiction; and in 1429 Wideshausen in pledge from the Archdiocese of Bremen. This last addition made the new territory, which was entirely separate from the southern part of the diocese, a compact body subsequently known as "the lower diocese"; it remained an integral part of the Diocese of

Münster until the Reformation, which somewhat reduced its size; what was left was retained until the secularization.

St. Ludger established his see as Mimegerneford and founded there a monastery, following the rule of Bishop Chrodegang of Metz, bishop and clergy living in community. But the most important monastery founded by St. Ludger was the Benedictine Abbey of Werden, which became a nursery for the clergy of the diocese. He also assisted in founding the convent of Nottuln, under his sister Heriburg. He was succeeded in the administration of the diocese by two nephews, Gerfrid (809–39) and Altfrid (839–49), both of whom also presided over the monastery of Werden. The special connexion of Werden with the diocese ceased on the appointment of the next bishop, Luitbert (849–71), who was not related to the family of the founder. There were even disputes between the bishop and the monastery, which the Synod of Mainz settled in favour of the latter, awarding it the right of freely electing its abbot. Bishop Wulfhelm (875–95) changed the collegiate body founded by Ludger into a cathedral chapter, with which he divided the property till then held in common, the bishop having thenceforth his special residence. Among the religious foundations of the diocese in the ninth century should be mentioned the monasteries for women at Liesborn (814), Vreden (about 839), Freckenhorst (before 857), and Metelen (before 889). The development of religious and intellectual life was checked in the first part of the tenth century by political disquiet. Better days did not begin until the reign of Emperor Otto I (936–73). Under Bishop Duodo (867–93), in 968, the abbey of Borghorst was founded for women; the same bishop built a stone cathedral near the old wooden one. Hermann I (1032–42) founded the Abbey of Our Lady of Ueberwasser; Bishop Frederick I, Count of Wettin (1064–84), established the collegiate church of St. Moritz at Münster; Bishop Erpho (1085–97) built the church of St. Lambert. Both the two just named and Bishop Burchard of Holte (1098–1118) were partisans of the emperor in the investiture conflict. During the episcopate of Dietrich II, Count of Zutphen (1118–27), several Præmonstratensian and Cistercian abbeys arose. Hermann II (1174–1203) founded collegiate churches for the canons of St. Ludger and St. Martin.

The twelfth century was marked by a considerable growth of the bishops' secular power. Bishop Ludwig I, Count of Tecklenburg (1169–73), restored to the see the temporal jurisdiction over its domains previously exercised by the Counts of Tecklenburg. Hermann II, like his immediate predecessors, Frederick II, Count of Are (1152–68), and Ludwig I, was a partisan of Frederick Barbarossa. With the overthrow of Henry the Lion, Duke of Saxony, the last obstacle in the way of the complete sovereignty of the bishops was removed, and Hermann appears as a great feudatory of the empire. During the episcopate of his second successor, Dietrich III of Isenburg (1218–26), the position of the bishop as a prince of the empire was formally acknowledged in 1220 by Frederick II. Hermann II was the last bishop directly appointed by the emperor. Dissensions arose about the election of his successor, Otto I, Count of Oldenburg (1204–18), and Emperor Otto IV decreed that thenceforward the cathedral chapter alone should elect the bishop. The See of Cologne retained the right of confirmation, and the emperor that of investiture. The bishop's temporal authority was limited in important matters, particularly in taxation, the consent of representative bodies of his subjects was necessary. Among these, the cathedral chapter appears early in the thirteenth century; later, the lower nobility, and, lastly, the city of Münster. In course of time the cathedral chapter extended its rights by agreements made with bishops before election.

The temporal power of the see increased greatly during the episcopate of Bishop Otto II, Count of Lippe (1247–59). The city, at the same time, struggled to become independent of the bishop, not, however, with complete success, notwithstanding its alliance with the cathedral chapter. Even as early as the eleventh century the bishops all belonged to noble families, generally to those possessing lands in the neighbourhood; only too often the diocese was administered for the benefit rather of the bishop's family than of the Church. The bishops were, in consequence, frequently involved in the quarrels of the nobility; ecclesiastical affairs were neglected and the prosperity of the inhabitants of the prince-bishopric suffered. Conditions were at their worst during what is known as the Münster Diocesan Feud (1450–57). The arbitrary conduct of Bishop Henry II of Mörs (1424–50) had aroused a very bitter feeling in the city. After his death the majority of the cathedral chapter elected Walram of Mörs, brother of Henry and also of the Archbishop of Cologne, while the city and a minority of the chapter demanded the election of Eric of Hoya, brother of Count John of Hoya. Although the election of Walram was confirmed by the pope, open war for the possession of the see broke out, and Walram was unable to gain possession of the city of Münster. In 1457, after his death, a compact was made by which Eric of Hoya received a life income, and the privileges of the city were confirmed, while both parties recognized the new bishop appointed by the pope, John II, Count Palatine of Simmern (1457–66). After order had been re-established, the ecclesiastical reform of the diocese was taken seriously in hand. Bishop Henry III of Schwarzburg (1466–96), Conrad of Rietberg (1497–1508), and Eric of Saxe-Lauenburg (1508–22) produced excellent results by holding synods and reforming religious foundations. Rudolf of Langen and John Murmellius made the cathedral school a nursery of humanism.

Under the indolent and thoroughly worldly Frederick III (1522–32), brother of the Archbishop of Cologne, Hermann of Wied, Lutheranism spread rapidly after 1524, especially in the city. Scarcely any opposition to the innovation was made by the next bishop, Franz of Waldeck (1532–53), who from the first planned to aid the Reformation in his three dioceses of Münster, Minden, and Osnabrück, in order to form out of these three a secular principality for himself. He was obliged, indeed, for the sake of his endangered authority, to proceed against the Anabaptists in the city of Münster; but he did little for the restoration of the Faith, and at last joined the Smalkaldic League. William of Ketteler (1553–57) was more Protestant than Catholic: although he regarded himself as an administrator of the old Church, and took the Tridentine oath, he refused to comply with the demands of Rome, and resigned in 1557. Bernhard of Raesfeld (1557–66) was genuinely devoted to the Catholic Faith, but he, too, finding himself unequal to the difficulties of his position, resigned. John of Hoya (1566–74), a faithful Catholic, in order to reorganize ecclesiastical affairs, undertook a general visitation of the diocese in the years 1571–73. The visitation revealed shocking conditions among clergy and people, and showed to what extent the Reformation had spread in the diocese under previous bishops. Not only were Protestant ideas predominant in the northern part of the country, or "lower diocese", but the western part as well had been almost entirely lost to the Church. In the cities in other parts of the diocese, too, the Faith had suffered greatly.

The good this bishop accomplished was almost undone after his death. His successor, John William of Cleves (1574–85), inherited the Duchy of Cleves in 1575, married, and gave up the administration of the diocese. A long diplomatic battle as to his successor arose between the Catholic and Protestant powers,

during which the diocese was administered by Cleves. The maintenance of Catholicism in the diocese was assured by the victory of Ernst of Bavaria (1585–1612), who was also Bishop of Freising, Hildesheim, and Liège, and Archbishop of Cologne. He zealously undertook the Counter-Reformation, invited the Jesuits to aid him, and encouraged the founding of monasteries of the old orders, although he could not repair all the losses. The western part of the Frisian district under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Münster was transferred, in 1569, to the newly-founded bishoprics of Groningen and Deventer, and with them fell into Protestantism. In the same way the possessions of the Counts of Bentheim-Steinfurt and some other fortified towns passed from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the bishop. The two immediate successors of Bishop Ernst laboured in the same spirit. Ferdinand of Bavaria (1612–50) was at the same time Elector of Cologne and Bishop of Paderborn, Hildesheim, and Liège. He founded a seminary, which he placed under the direction of Jesuits. Christopher Bernhard of Galen (1650–78) was equally efficient both as bishop and as secular ruler: he forced the refractory city of Münster, after a long siege, to acknowledge his sovereign rights, succeeded in freeing his territory from foreign troops, gained parts of the Archdiocese of Bremen and of the Diocese of Werden in a war with Sweden, restored church discipline, and established a school system for his territory.

The immediate successors of the three distinguished rulers just mentioned were Ferdinand II of Fürstenberg (1678–83), Maximilian Henry of Bavaria (1683–88), Frederick Christian of Plettenberg (1688–1712), and Francis Arnold of Wolf-Metternich (1708–18). Unfortunately, under these men church discipline declined, and much that was excellent decayed for lack of proper care, or, like the seminary for priests, ceased to exist. The next bishop was the frivolous, vain, and pomp-loving Clement Augustus of Bavaria (1719–61), who was also Elector of Cologne, and Bishop of Paderborn, Hildesheim, and Osnabrück. During his episcopate the diocese suffered terribly, in 1734–35 and during the Seven Years War, being almost ruined financially. The succeeding bishop, Maximilian Frederick of Königsegg-Rottenfels (1761–84), who was also Elector of Cologne, was a weak, though well-meaning, man. Happily, he left the administration of the Diocese of Münster to a young cathedral canon, Franz Friedrich Wilhelm von Fürstenberg (q. v.), during whose administration the diocese attained unexampled prosperity. At the election of an auxiliary bishop, von Fürstenberg was defeated by Maximilian Franz of Austria, who became the last Prince-Bishop of Münster and Elector of Cologne (1774–1801). Upon the death of Maximilian Franz, his nephew, the Archduke Anthony Victor, was elected, but could not enter upon the administration on account of the opposition of Prussia, which had long coveted the domains of the Church in Northern Germany.

In 1803 the diocese was secularized by the Imperial Delegates Enactment and broken up into numerous parts. The larger share was assigned to Prussia, which took possession in March, 1803. The rich treasury of the cathedral was transferred to Magdeburg and has never been returned. Freiherr von Fürstenberg administered as vicar-general the ecclesiastical affairs of the diocese even during the short supremacy of the French (1806–13). After his death, in 1810, the administrator was his former coadjutor, Clement Augustus von Droste-Vischering, later Archbishop of Cologne. In the years 1813–15 the diocese was administered, without the authorization of the pope, by Count Ferdinand Augustus von Spiegel, arbitrarily appointed by Napoleon, and to whom von Droste-Vischering had given his faculties by subdelegation. In 1813 the principality was again ceded to Prussia. Upon the ecclesiastical reorganization of Prussia, completed by the Bull of 16 July, 1821, "De salute animarum", the diocese was given its present boundaries (see below). The see had been vacant for twenty years when Ferdinand von Lunninck (1821–25), formerly Prince-Bishop of Corvey, was appointed. On account of illness, he left the administration to Jodok Hermann von Zurmühlen, already an old man, whom he made pro-vicar. The succeeding bishop was Caspar Max, Freiherr von Droste-Vischering (1824–46), who, having been auxiliary bishop of the diocese since 1795, had confirmed many hundreds of thousands and ordained over 2200 priests. His administration was greatly hampered by the petty and far-reaching supervision of the Government. In place of the university, suppressed in 1818, he was able to open, in 1832, an academy with philosophical and theological faculties; in 1902 this academy became a university. Ecclesiastical life in the diocese was in a somewhat unsatisfactory condition, the clergy being largely inclined to Rationalistic and Hermesian opinions.

An intellectual and religious revival throughout Germany followed the events at Cologne in 1837 (see COLOGNE). This revival and the larger freedom granted the Catholic Church of Prussia under King Frederick William IV produced excellent results in the diocese. During the episcopate of John Gregory Müller (1847–70), fruitful popular missions were held in many places, many churches were rebuilt, and a large number of religious houses and benevolent institutions were founded with the active assistance of the laity. His successor, John Bernhard Brinkmann (1870–89), laboured in the same apostolic spirit. During the *Kulturkampf* he suffered fines, imprisonment, and, from 1875 to 1884, banishment. He was obliged to witness the destruction of much that had been established by his predecessors and by himself. The present bishop is Hermann Dingelstad, born 2 March, 1835, elected 15 August, 1889, consecrated 24 February, 1890.

Statistics.—The Diocese of Münster includes: the Prussian Department of Münster in Westphalia; the parish of Lette, in the Department of Minden; three enclaves in the Department of Arensberg; the city district of Duisberg; the districts of Dinslaken, Rees, Cleves, Gildern, Kempen, and Mörs in Rhenish Prussia; the city of Wilhelmshaven in the Province of Hanover; the Duchy of Oldenburg. The 408 parishes of the diocese are distributed in 22 deaneries, of which 12 are in Westphalia, 8 in Rhenish Prussia, and 2 in Oldenburg. In 1910 there were in the diocese 1,427,203 Catholics, 664,737 Protestants, 8758 Jews. The diocesan priests numbered 1333, of whom 1259 were engaged in parochial work, teaching, or ecclesiastical administration; 74 were absent on leave or were retired; there were 133 regulars. In addition, 38 ecclesiastics not belonging to the diocese were domiciled in it. There has been an unbroken succession of auxiliary bishops since 1218. The cathedral chapter consists of a provost, dean, 8 canons, and 6 honorary canons. The vicariate-general is composed of the vicar-general, 6 ecclesiastical councillors, a notary Apostolic for the diocese, a justiciary, 3 secretaries, and 7 other officials. Besides the *officialité* at Münster, there is also one at Vechta for the Oldenburg section of the diocese. The diocesan institutions are: the seminary for priests (36 students who were already deacons in 1910), the Collegium Borromæum for theological students (182 students), the Collegium Ludgerianum (111 pupils), the institute for Church music—all at Münster; at Gaesdonck, near Goch, an episcopal seminary for assistant priests, and the Collegium Augustinianum; 4 episcopal institutions for poor children, and the Maria-Hilf institute at Tilbeck for epileptic women and girls. There are 13 ecclesiastical professors in the theological faculty and one in the philosophical faculty at Münster. Among the state-aided Catholic higher schools are 11 *Gymnasia*, one

Realschule, 6 seminaries for male and 2 for female teachers. There are also a large number of high schools for girls, generally carried on by nuns.

The city of Münster contains 27 houses of religious orders and congregations. The members conduct most of the 25 Catholic institutions for public benefit and charity in the municipality. The male orders and congregations represented in the diocese are: Franciscans, 5 monasteries, 40 fathers, 13 clerical novices, 11 lay brothers; Capuchins, 4 monasteries, 34 fathers, 9 clerics, 23 brothers; Trappists in the colony for men out of work at Maria-Venn, 8 fathers, 12 brothers; Benedictines, an abbey and a priory, 15 fathers, 28 brothers; Dominicans, 2 monasteries, 12 fathers, 7 lay brothers; Society of Missionaries of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, 1 house, 19 missionaries; Alexian Brothers, 1 institution for the care of insane men, 46 brothers; Brothers of Mercy, 2 houses, 41 brothers; Brothers of St. Francis, 3 houses, 19 brothers. Female religious orders and congregations: Benedictine nuns of the Perpetual Adoration, 3 houses, 151 sisters; Sisters of the Visitation of Mary, 1 house, 35 sisters; Poor Clares, 3 houses, 92 sisters; Ursulines at Dorsten, where they have a higher school for girls, a boarding-school, a seminary for female teachers etc., 60 sisters; Sisters of Mercy, mother-house at Münster, 81 branches in the diocese, 240 sisters; Sisters of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, mother-house and branch house, 125 sisters; Sisters of the Divine Providence, a mother-house, 63 filial houses, and 640 sisters who conduct a large number of schools for girls, homes for girls, houses for the needy and helpless, etc.; Nursing Sisters of the Third Order of St. Francis, a mother-house, 83 branch houses, 894 sisters; Sisters of Our Lady, a mother-house, 41 branch-houses, which carry on boarding schools, day-schools, homes for girls etc., 590 sisters; Sisters of the Christian Schools of Mercy, who conduct higher schools for girls, day-nurseries, sewing-schools, take care of the sick, etc., 24 houses, 146 sisters; Poor Serving Maids of Jesus Christ, 4 houses, 47 sisters; Poor Franciscans of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and Mary, a hospital with 7 sisters; Sisters of Penitence and Christian Charity of the Third Order of St. Francis, 3 houses, 152 sisters; Sisters of St. Charles Borromeo at Cleves, 13 sisters; Grey Sisters of St. Elizabeth, 1 house, 8 sisters; Daughters of the Holy Cross, 4 houses, 99 sisters; Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, a mother-house, 78 sisters; Dominican Nuns from the mother-house at Arenberg in the Diocese of Trier, 3 houses, 10 sisters. Among the religious associations are: the association of priests, young men's associations (84), Marian sodalities for young men (262), journeymen's unions in 81 towns, merchants' associations (36), workmen's unions (134), miners' unions (47), sodalities for men (77), congregations of Catholic young women (250), societies of Christian mothers (325), the Bonifaciusverein, the Societies of St. Vincent, of Blessed Albertus Magnus, etc.

The principal churches are: the cathedral (built for the most part between 1225 and 1265, in the transition period from Romanesque to Gothic architecture, while the great doorway, built in 1516, is late Gothic in style); the Gothic church of St. Lambert, built, on the site of an old parish church, in the second half of the fourteenth century, with a new Gothic tower, about 312 feet high, added in 1887–90, to replace the old one on which had hung the iron cages that held the bodies of the executed Anabaptists; the church of Our Lady, a fine fourteenth-century Gothic building erected on the site of the chapel of the Virgin, built by St. Ludger; the church of St. Ludger, built about 1170, enlarged 1383; the collegiate church of St. Moritz, founded 1070, and enlarged, 1862, in Romanesque style. Besides these, the following deserve particular mention: the Romanesque churches of Freckenhorst and Emmerich; the Gothic churches at Xanten (Cathedral of St. Victor), Lüdinghausen, Cleves, Kalten, Kempen, and Nottuln.

Works on the City of Münster: WILCKENS, *Versuch einer allgemeinen Geschichte der Stadt Münster* (Münster and Hamm, 1824); NIESERT, *Beiträge zu einem münsterischen Urkundenbuch* (2 vols., Münster, 1823); IDEM, *Münsterische Urkundensammlung* (7 vols., Coesfeld, 1826–37); ERHARD, *Geschichte Münsters* (Münster, 1837); TIBUS, *Die Stadt Münster* (Münster, 1882); VON DETTEN, *Münster in Westfalen, seine Entstehung und das Kulturbild seiner tausendjährigen Entwicklung* (Münster, 1887); *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Stadt Münster*, I (Münster, 1889); PIEPER, *Die alte Universität Münster* (Münster, 1902); SAVELS, *Der Dom zu Münster* (Münster, 1904); BÖMER, *Das literarische Leben in Münster bis zur endgültigen Rezeption des Humanismus* (Münster, 1906); HUPPERTZ, *Münster im 7-jährigen Krieg* (Münster, 1908).

On the Diocese: *Westfälisches Urkundenbuch*, I–VIII (Münster, 1847–1908) (especially II and VIII); *Die Geschichtsquellen des Bistums Münster*, I–VI (Münster, 1851–1900); *Codex Traditionum Westfalicarum* (6 vols., Münster, 1872–1907); TIBUS, *Gründungsgeschichte der Stifter, Pfarrkirchen, Klöster und Kapellen im Bereich des alten Bistums Münster* (Münster, 1893); BAHLMANN, *Der Regierungsbezirk Münster* (Münster, 1893); STAPPER, *Die älteste Agende des Bistums Münster* (Münster, 1906); *Schematismus der Diözese Münster* (Münster, 1910).—On the Diocesan Feud and the Period of the Counter-Reformation: HANSEN in *Publikationen aus den k. preussischen Staatsarchiven*, XLII (Leipzig, 1890); KELLER, *ibid.*, IX, XXXIII (Leipzig, 1881 and 1887).—On the Episcopate of Bishop Galen: TÜCKING, *Geschichte des Stifts Münster unter Ch. B. von Galen* (Münster, 1865); HÜSING, *Fürstbischof Ch. B. von Galen* (Münster, 1887).—On the Secularization of the Diocese: VON OLFERS, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Verfassung und der Zerstückelung des Oberstifts Münster* (Münster, 1848).—Numerous contributions to the history of the city and diocese of Münster are to be found in the following: *Zeitschrift für vaterländische Geschichte und Altertumskunde* (Münster) (67 vols. up to 1910); *Beiträge zur Geschichte Niedersachsens und Westfalens* (Hildesheim) (22 parts up to 1910); *Münsterische Beiträge zur Geschichtsforschung* (Münster) (26 parts up to 1910). See also ANABAPTISTS; WESTPHALIA.

JOSEPH LINS.

UNIVERSITY OF MÜNSTER.—The town of Münster in Westphalia obtained its university in 1771 through the initiative of the prince-bishop's vicar-general, Freiherr von Fürstenberg.

The foundation for the university was the cathedral school at Münster, which dated from the Middle Ages. This school, about the end of the fifteenth century, had reached a flourishing condition through the efforts of the famous humanist Rudolph von Langen (1438–1519). The disturbances caused by the Anabaptists (1533–35) had a depressing influence, but Dean Gottfried von Raesfeld succeeded in restoring it to its former position by turning its supervision over to the Jesuits in 1588. The school, now called Gymnasium Paulinum, was enlarged by the addition of courses in philosophy and theology for the scientific education of priests, and was raised by Pope Urban VIII to the rank of an academy, 9 Sept., 1629. The latter action was taken at the urgent request of Prince-Bishop Ferdinand I (1612–31), who also obtained from the Emperor Ferdinand II the document of 21 May, 1631, in which the latter granted permission to found a complete university with four faculties. The death of the bishop, the disturbances of the Thirty Years' War and the want of funds prevented the execution of this plan during the next century and a half. The clever work of Vicar-General Franz Friedrich von Fürstenberg finally accomplished the desired end: on 4 August, 1771, Prince-Bishop Maximilian Friedrich von Königseck-Rotenfels signed the document making Münster a university. Pope Clement XIV granted to the university, in a bull dated 28 May, 1773, all the privileges, indults and liberties which other universities enjoyed. The charter, signed by Emperor Joseph II in Vienna, is dated 8 Oct. of the same year. For more than thirty years Fürstenberg, as curator, laboured earnestly for the development of the university. He filled it with the spirit of positive Christianity, so that it had a beneficent influence at a time when rationalistic philosophy and false enlightenment appeared everywhere. In 1803 Münster was ceded to Prussia by the imperial deputation assembled at Ratisbon. The Prussian administrator of Münster, Baron von Stein, showed great interest in the university, but endeavoured to do away with its Catholic character. His successor,

President von Vincke, accomplished this purpose and dismissed Fürstenberg, the founder of the university, in 1805. In the autumn of 1806 the French took possession of the town. During the seven years' sway of the foreigners no remarkable progress was made in the university. After Münster had again become Prussian in 1813, the Protestant government raised the question whether the university should be reorganized or removed to another town. No decision was reached until King Frederick William III in 1815 promised his new subjects on the left bank of the Rhine that a university would be established on the Rhine. The founding of the university at Bonn carried with it the abolition of that of Münster, which took place in the summer of 1818. Only one theological course, and, by way of preparation for the same, a philological and scientific course, remained, under the name of an academy. While this academy possessed the character of a university and the right of conferring degrees, it was conducted on a rather modest scale. A department of medicine, which had been started in 1821, was discontinued in 1848. It was not until 1870 that the increasing importance of Germany as a nation infused new life into the endeavour to uplift the academy. In 1880 the modelling of the present magnificent main edifice of the university was completed, and in 1886 there was added to the academy a pharmaceutical institute. The continued efforts of the town and of the province of Westphalia finally led to the issue of a royal decree, dated 1 July, 1902, restoring to the academy a faculty of law and the title "University" (since 1907 "Westphälische Wilhelms-Universität", in honour of the Emperor William II). In 1906 there followed the establishment of the chairs and institutions required for the first half of the course in medicine, the further extension of which may be expected in the next few years.

Noteworthy among the teachers of the old episcopal university were: Clemens Becker, S.J., professor of canon law and moral theology (d. 1790); Joh. Hyac. Kistemaker, philologist and theologian, who taught the classical languages from 1786 to 1834, and, later on, exegesis. A. M. Sprickmann laboured as a jurist in Münster from 1778 to 1814, when he was called to the University of Breslau and later, in 1817, to Berlin. Anton Bruchhausen, S.J., professor of physics (1773–82), gained a great reputation among German scientists through his "Institutiones physicæ" (1775); and the philosopher Havichhorst (1773–83) through his "Institutiones logicæ". George Hermes was professor of dogmatic theology in Münster from 1807–20; he founded the so-called Hermesianism, a rationalistic tendency in theology, and d. in 1831 at Bonn, where he taught from 1820; his teachings were condemned at Rome in 1836. J. Th. H. Katerkamp, who was counted among the friends of Princess Galitzin, was professor of theology. Of the teachers in the academy there deserve to be mentioned the neo-scholastic Stöckl, professor of philosophy (1862–71); furthermore, Wilhelm Storck, interpreter of Portuguese poems (Camoens) and professor of German literature (1859–1905); and especially Johann Wilhelm Hittorf, since 1852 professor of physics and chemistry, who discovered the cathode rays, and made valuable investigations concerning electric phenomena in vacuum tubes and contributions to the theory of ions. Mention should also be made of Professors Berlage (dogmatics), Reinke (Old Testament exegetics), and Bisping (New Test. exegetus), Schwane (dogmatics).

The number of matriculated students is at present: summer of 1910, 2008 (including 68 women); there are besides 115 auditors. Teachers: in the theological faculty, 9 ordinary and 2 extraordinary professors, 2 dozents and 1 lecturer; in the law faculty, 7 ordinary and 3 extraordinary professors, 4 dozents; in the philosophical faculty, 28 ordinary and 6 extraordinary professors, 14 dozents, and 4 lecturers; in the medical faculty, 1 extraordinary and 2 ordinary professors, 2 lecturers, 1 dozent.

PIEPER, *Die alte Universität Münster* (Münster, 1902); RASSMANN, *Münsterländische Schriftsteller* (Münster, 1866); ANON., *Erinnerungen aus alter und neuer Zeit von einem alten Münsteraner* (Münster, 1880); see also the official annual reports, two senate memorials (1901, 1910), on the development of the university and another on the same subject by the Magistrate of the City of Münster (1910).

W. ENGELKEMPER.

Müntz, EUGÈNE.—French savant and historian; b. at Soulz-sous-Forêts, near Mülhausen, Alsace, 11 June, 1845; d. at Paris, 2 November, 1902. He took up the study of law, but turned aside from the legal profession to contribute to the "Revue Alsacienne" certain articles which caused much comment. Just at that time—following upon the great efflorescence of learned criticism in Germany—attention was being directed in France to the organized study of history. Albert Dumont founded at Rome the École Française, in the Farnese Palace, and Eugène Müntz became one of its first pupils. Among his fellow-students was Louis Duchesne, who afterwards became director of the school. Müntz explored the Vatican Archives and Library, and began to amass that vast fund of erudition which he revealed in later years. From that time he devoted himself to the task of unravelling the history of art in Italy. About the year 1880, he, together with such men as Morelli and Milanesi, contributed immensely to this branch of study, and applied to it the positive method of inquiry. Müntz's work is based on an exact acquaintance with original documents—papers preserved in archives, memoranda, bills, inventories, contracts—supported by an extensive and profound knowledge of monuments. He never loses sight of the bond between the arts, that close relationship by which all the art industries of a period—its engraving, its tapestry-weaving, its pottery, its cabinet-making—contribute, as so many expressions of contemporary thought, to form the genius of its painters, sculptors, and architects. Captivated by that Rome where the fairest years of his life had been spent in studious research, he never ceased to regard the Rome of Julius II and Leo X, of Bramante, Michelangelo, and Raphael, as the highest expression of human civilization. This attitude of mind at times hindered his doing justice to other schools—for instance, to those of Venice and Siena.

The earliest works of Müntz at once won for him a high place among the historians of art. In "Les Arts à la cour des papes pendant le XV^{e} et XVI^{e} siècles" (4 vols., 1875–98) he has collected evidence to show the splendid part played by the papacy as leader of the Renaissance. When two volumes of this work had appeared, its author issued "Précurseurs de la Renaissance" (1881), and followed this with "Raphaël", to which it is a sort of introduction. The "Précurseurs" and "Raphaël" are still classics (1st ed. 1881; 2nd ed. 1886); to them must be added a small but important volume "Les Historiens et les critiques de Raphaël" (1884), in which Müntz defends traditional against modern criticism, especially against Morelli. He afterwards developed his cherished ideas in a work which became the most popular manual in France on Italian art, "Histoire de l'art en Italie pendant la Renaissance" (I, "Les Primitifs", 1888; II, "L'Age d'Or", 1891; III, "La Fin de la Renaissance", 1895). His views are not very original, his taste is somewhat academic, with a bourgeois tinge; but this history is nevertheless a most valuable popular treatment of that glorious period. His picture of the Renaissance is completed by an excellent study, "Léonard de Vinci", which appeared in 1898. These books form a group by themselves; Müntz published many others, some of them works of sheer erudite research, but most of them bearing on the main work of his life, and forming supplements or additions to it. Among the former are: "Notes sur les mosaïques d'Italie" (1874–

91); "Etudes sur l'histoire de la peinture et de l'iconographie chrétiennes" (1882); "Etudes iconographiques et archéologiques sur le Moyen-Age" (1888). Among the latter we may mention: "Donatello" (1885); "Le Palais des papes à Avignon" (1886–92); "La Bibliothèque du Vatican au xvi^{e} siècle" (written in collaboration with P. Fabre—1887); "Collections des Médicis au xv^{e} siècle" (1887); "Antiquités de Rome au xiv^{e}, xv^{e}, et xvi^{e} siècles" (1887); "Florence et la Toscane" (1897); "La Tiare Pontificale du viii^{e} siècle au xvi^{e} siècle" (1897). In a third series of works he took up the study of the influence of the Italian Renaissance in other European countries, especially France: "La Renaissance en Italie et en France à l'époque de Charles VIII" (1885); "Le Château de Fontainebleau au xvi^{e} siècle" (1886), in which he collaborated with Molinier. He contemplated extending these studies to the whole of Europe when death interrupted them.

In Müntz's writings we should look in vain for a personal view, or for any such system or philosophy as gives a work a loftier scope than the merely historical. His cannot compare with the great histories of the Renaissance given us by Taine, Burckhardt, or John Addington Symonds. Still it is a treasury of information. It presents in an easy agreeable form a résumé of what research has discovered and criticism accepted. The complete edition of this History was the first model for that class of *de luxe* books which, thanks to modern processes of reproduction, have done so much in the last thirty years to spread information on art and to improve the public taste. After 1878 Müntz was connected with the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, where he took Taine's place in the chair of æsthetics from 1885 to 1892. He entered the Institute in 1893.

LOUIS GILLET.

Mura, SAINT, b. in Co. Donegal, Ireland, about 550. He was appointed Abbot of Fahan by St. Columba. The monastery was anciently known as Othan Mor, but after the death of our saint was called Fahan Mura. He was highly esteemed by Hugh, Head King of Ireland, whose obit is chronicled in 607. Numerous legends are told of Mura; he wrote many works, including chronicles and a rhymed life of St. Columba, which is quoted in the Martyrology of Donegal. He is regarded as the special patron saint of the O'Neill clan, being sixth in descent from the founder, whose name survives in Innishowen (Inis Eoghan). His death occurred about 645, and his feast is observed on 12 March. Among his relics still preserved are his crozier (*Bachall Mura*), now in the National Museum, Dublin, and his bell-shrine, now in the Wallace Collection, London. In the ruined church of St. Mura at Fahan is a beautiful Irish cross, and not far off is St. Mura's Well.

COLGAN, *Acta SS. Hib.* (Louvain, 1645); O'HANLON, *Lives of the Irish Saints*, III (Dublin, s. d.); O'DOHERTY, *Derriana* (Dublin, 1902).

W. H. GRATTAN-FLOOD.

Muratori, LUIGI ANTONIO, librarian in Modena, one of the greatest scholars of his time, b. 21 Oct., 1672; d. 23 Jan., 1750. Though he came from a poor family of Vignola in the district of Modena, he received opportunities to devote himself to the higher studies. Having first been instructed by the Jesuits, he studied law, philosophy, and theology at the University of Modena, where he plainly showed his extraordinary talents, especially in literature and history. In 1694 he was ordained priest. In 1695 Count Charles Borromeo called him to the college of "Dottori" at the Ambrosian library in Milan, where he immediately started collecting unedited ancient writings of various kinds. His first publication was the "Anecdota latina ex Ambrosianæ Bibliothecæ codicibus" (2 vols., Milan, 1697–98), followed by two other volumes (Padua, 1713). Duke Rinaldo I (1700) appointed him archivist and librarian in Modena, which position he held until his death. In 1716 Muratori became, in addition, provost of St. Maria della Pomposa, and conducted this parish with great zeal until 1733. He continued publishing unedited writings, first among which was a volume, "Anecdota græca" (Padua, 1709). At the same time he cultivated literature, as is shown by his works, "Della perfetta poesia italiana" (Modena, 1706) and "Riflessioni sopra il buon gusto nelle scienze e nelle arti" (Venice, 1708). He even intended to establish something like a general society of Italian literature, and as early as 1703 published for this purpose, under the pseudonym "Lamindo Pritanio", a plan "Primi disegni della republica letteraria d'Italia". In 1708 a quarrel broke out between the Holy See (aided by the emperor) and the Dukes of Este, over the possession of Comachio, which involved the sovereignty of the district of Ferrara. Muratori supported the claims of his sovereign and of the house of Este against the pope by means of numerous historical researches, which he later on utilized in the preparation of a great historical work, "Antichità Estensi ed Italiane" (2 vols., Modena: 1st vol., 1717; 2nd vol., 1740). He continued studying the sources for a history of Italy, and as a fruit of his untiring researches there appeared the monumental work, "Rerum italicarum Scriptores ab anno æræ christianæ 500 ad annum 1500". It was published in twenty-eight folio volumes with the assistance of the "Società Palatina" of Milan (Milan, 1723–51). A new critical edition is now (since 1900) appearing in serial form under the direction of Giosue Carducci and Vittorio Fiorini in "Città di Castello". J. Calligaris, J. Filippi, and C. Merkel published "Indices chronologici" (Turin, 1885) for the same. At the same time Muratori edited a collection of seventy-five essays on different historical themes, entitled "Antiquitates italicæ medii ævi" (6 vols. fols., Milan, 1738–42), as an elucidation and supplement to his work on the sources. In the third volume of this collection there is found the Muratorian canon (q. v.) which is of the greatest importance for the history of the New Testament canon. In order to render these researches accessible to greater masses of his countrymen, he himself published a new edition in Italian, "Dissertazioni sopra le Antichità italiane" (3 vols., Milan, 1751). Other important publications of sources are his collections of ancient inscriptions ("Novus thesaurus veterum inscriptionum", 4 vols., Milan, 1739–42), the fourth volume containing also the ancient Christian inscriptions; and the edition of the Roman Sacramentaries ("Liturgia romana vetus", 2 vols., Venice, 1748), of value to this day. He wrote a great chronological representation of Italian history ("Annali d' Italia", 12 vols. quarto, Milan, 1744–49), based upon the numerous sources which he published or which otherwise were known. After his death this work was re-edited and continued (Milan, 1753–56 in 17 vols.; new edition in 18 vols., 1818–21).



LODOVICO ANTONIO MURATORI

The great mind of this learned man was not limited to the wide province of history; he was also interested in religious questions, and he published

a work, which attracted considerable attention, on the question as to how far freedom of thinking might go in religious matters, "De ingeniorum moderatione in religionis negotio" (Paris, 1714). Many of his views and opinions were openly challenged; for instance those concerning the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin and the manner of worshipping the saints. Another work, which touches upon religious questions, "Della regolata divozione de' Cristiani" (Venice, 1723), also called out attacks. He defended himself in his work, "De superstitione vitanda" (Milan, 1742). In the quarrel about Hermesianism, his book, "De ingeniorum moderatione", was translated into German by Biunde and Braun (Coblenz, 1837) in the interest of the followers of the Hermesian doctrines. Charity is discussed by Muratori in his "Della carità cristiana" (Modena, 1723). He still continued his literary studies, as is shown by his works on Petrarch ("Vita e rime di F. Petrarca", Modena, 1711) and Castelvetro ("Vita ed opere di L. Castelvetro", Milan, 1727). On philosophy he wrote, "Filosofia morale esposta" (Venice, 1735), "Delle forze dell' intendimento umano" (Venice, 1735), and "Delle forze della fantasia" (Venice, 1745). Law and politics are treated in "Governo della Peste politico, medico ed ecclesiastico" (Modena, 1714; frequently reprinted), "Defetti della Giurisprudenza" (1741), "Della pubblica felicità" (1749). Muratori really proved himself to be a universal genius of rare calibre, at home in all fields of human knowledge. He showed extraordinary qualities as priest and man; he was zealous in the ministry, charitable to the poor, and diligent in visiting the abandoned and imprisoned. He corresponded with a large circle of acquaintances. A collection of his letters by Selmi appeared in Venice (2 vols., 1789); another by Ceruti in Modena (1885). A complete edition is being published by M. Campori ("Epistolario di L. A. Muratori", Modena, 1901 sq.). In spite of many attacks which he had to suffer for his religious views, and notwithstanding many of his opinions regarding ecclesiastical politics were not approved of in Rome, he was highly esteemed in the most exalted ecclesiastical circles, as is shown in the letter which Benedict XIV., on 15 Sept., 1748, wrote to him with the intention of easing his troubled mind. Cardinal Ganganelli, later on Clement XIV, also sent him a letter in 1748, in which he assured him of his highest esteem and respect.

MURATORI, *Vita del proposto L. A. Muratori* (Venice, 1756); SCHEDONI, *Elogio di L. A. Muratori* (Modena, 1818); REINA, *Vita di L. A. Muratori* in *Annali d'Italia*, I (Milan, 1818); FABRONIUS, *Vitæ Italorum*, X, 89–391; *Historisch-politische Blätter*, LXXIV (1874), 353, 524; GAY, *L. A. Muratori, padre della storia italiana* (Asti, 1885).

J. P. KIRSCH.

Muratorian Canon, or MURATORIAN FRAGMENT, after the name of the discoverer and first editor, L. A. MURATORI (in the "Antiquitates italicæ", III, Milan, 1740, 851 sq.), the oldest known canon or list of books of the New Testament. The MS. containing the canon originally belonged to Bobbio and is now in the Bibliotheca Ambrosiana at Milan (Cod. J 101 sup.). Written in the eighth century, it plainly shows the uncultured Latin of that time. The fragment is of the highest importance for the history of the Biblical canon. It was written in Rome itself or in its environs about 180–200; probably the original was in Greek, from which it was translated into Latin. This Latin text is preserved solely in the MS. of the Ambrosiana. A few sentences of the Muratorian Canon are preserved in some other MSS., especially in codices of St. Paul's Epistles in Monte Cassino. The canon consists of no mere list of the Scriptures, but of a survey, which supplies at the same time historical and other information regarding each book. The beginning is missing; the preserved text begins with the last line concerning the second Gospel and the notices, preserved entire, concerning the third and fourth Gospels. Then there are mentioned: The Acts, St. Paul's Epistles (including those to Philemon, Titus, and Timothy; the spurious ones to the Laodiceans and Alexandrians are rejected); furthermore, the Epistle of St. Jude and two Epistles of St. John; among the Scriptures which "in catholica habentur", are cited the "Sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta", as well as the Apocalypses of St. John and St. Peter, but with the remark that some will not allow the latter to be read in the church. Then mention is made of the Pastor of Hermas, which may be read anywhere but not in the divine service; and, finally, there are rejected false Scriptures, which were used by heretics. In consequence of the barbarous Latin there is no complete understanding of the correct meaning of some of the sentences. As to the author, many conjectures were made (Papias, Hegesippus, Caius of Rome, Hippolytus of Rome, Rhodon, Melito of Sardis were proposed); but no well founded hypothesis has been adduced up to the present. The Muratorian Canon was newly edited by Tregelles, "Canon Muratorianus" (Oxford, 1867); Westcott, "A general survey of the history of the canon" (6th ed., 1889); Buchanan, in "Journal of Theol. Stud.", VIII (1907), 540–42; Harnack in "Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.", III, 595–99; Preuschen in "Analecta, kürzere Texte zur Geschichte der alten Kirche und des Kanons" (2nd ed., Tübingen, 1910), 27–35; Rauschen, "Florilegium patristicum", III (Bonn, 1905).

ZAHN, *Gesch. des neutest. Kanons*, I, 1 (1890), 1–156; KUHN, *Das Muratorische Fragment* (1892); CHAPMAN in *Revue bénédictine* (1904), 240 sq., 369 sq.; ROBINSON, *The Authorship of the Muratorian Canon* in *The Expositor*, I (1906), 481 sq.; BARTLET, *Ibid.*, II (1906), 210 sq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Murcia. See CARTAGENA, DIOCESE OF.

Murder. See HOMICIDE.

Muret, MARC-ANTOINE, French humanist, b. at Muret, near Limoges, in 1526; d. at Rome, in 1585. He studied at Poitiers and was greatly influenced by Scaliger, whom he twice visited at Agen. He taught successively at Poitiers (1546), Bordeaux (1547), and Paris. Becoming intimate with Dorat, Joachim du Bellay, and the poets of the Pleiad, he published in French a commentary on the "Amours" of Ronsard (1553) and a collection of Latin verses, the "Juvenilia". His prosperity seemed unclouded, when accusations of heresy and immorality drove him from Paris to Toulouse, and thence to Lombardy. At last he settled at Venice, where he taught for four years (1555–58).

To the Venetian period of Muret's life belong his editions for Paulus Manutius, of Horace, Terence (1555), Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius (1558), to which must be added the three orations "De studiis litterarum" (1555). It was at Venice that he became connected with Lambinus. In 1559 Muret published the first eight books of his "Variæ lectiones", which occasioned Lambinus to accuse him of plagiarism and brought their friendship to an end. With the year 1559 began the insecure period of Muret's life, when he devoted himself to private tuition. He next entered the service of Ippolito d'Este, Cardinal of Ferrara, in whose suite he went to Paris, and thence to Rome, where he spent the remainder of his life (1563–85) expounding Aristotle, Cicero, Plato, Juvenal, and Tacitus, and teaching jurisprudence. In 1576 he received Holy orders.

Muret's editions of Latin authors and translations of Plato and Aristotle, while they hardly entitled him to rank with the great philologists of his time, show good taste, acumen, and care. As a stylist, he was long esteemed one of the modern masters of Latinity. He succeeded in imitating Cicero rather by a felicitous resemblance between his own temperament and that of his model than by any painfully laborious

search for Ciceronian locutions, and he felt compelled to protest against the exaggerations of contemporary Ciceronians. He himself tells of an amusing incident, when he purposely employed, in speaking Latin, a word not to be found in Nizolius's Ciceronian Lexicon: some of his hearers exclaimed in horror at the apparent slip, and then, when he showed them the word in Cicero's own text, were equally enthusiastic in their plaudits. His most interesting work, "Variæ lectiones" (1559, 1580, 1585), contains not only observations on ancient authors, but notes of real value in relation to the history of his own times. Such, for instance, is his account of a conversation with his patron, the Cardinal of Ferrara, about St. Pius V, whose election had put an end to the cardinal's ambitions (XVI, 4). Muret's works were edited by Ruhnken (Leyden, 4 vols., 1789), and another edition appeared at Verona (5 vols., 1727–30). Besides the editions of authors above mentioned, we are indebted to him for Cicero's Catalinian Orations (Paris, 1581), the first book of his Tusculan Disputations, his Philippics (Paris, 1562), Seneca's "De providentia", and some notes on Sallust and Tacitus.

DEJOB, *Marc-Antoine Muret* (Paris, 1881); SANDYS, *A History of Classical Scholarship*, II (Cambridge, 1903), 148.

PAUL LEJAY.

Muri (MURI-GRIES), an abbey of monks of the Order of S. Benedict, which flourished for over eight centuries at Muri near Basle in Switzerland, and which is now established under Austrian rule at Gries near Bozen in Tyrol.

The monastery of St. Martin at Muri in the Canton of Aargau, in the Diocese of Basle (but originally in that of Constance), was founded in 1027 by the illustrious house of Hapsburg. Rha, a daughter of Frederick, Duke of Lorraine, who married Rabets, Count of Hapsburg, and Werner, Bishop of Strasburg, with one accord gave the lands, which each possessed at Muri, to a monastery which they established in that place. To people the new foundation a colony of monks was drawn from the Abbey of St. Meinrad at Einsiedeln, under the leadership of Prior Reginbold, on whose death in 1055 the first abbot was chosen in the person of Burchard. During his rule the abbey church was consecrated in 1064; it was for many years the burial place of the Hapsburg dynasty. About this time the community was reinforced by the accession of a new colony of monks from the Abbey of St. Blaise in the Black Forest, one of whom, the blessed Luitfrid, continued the government of both communities till his holy death 31 December, 1096. During the Middle Ages the monastery, like so many hundreds of similar institutions of the Benedictine Order, pursued its quiet work of religion and civilization, and enjoyed the advantage of being governed by a remarkable succession of able men. Among the names of its more distinguished abbots are those of Ranzelin; Cuno, founder of its school, and a generous benefactor to the library of the monastery; Henry Scheuk who greatly increased its landed property; and Henry de Schoenwerd. The history of the last named presents a curious instance, almost without parallel, of a whole family embracing the religious life. The father with his sons entered the abbey of the monks, whilst his wife and daughters betook themselves to the adjoining convent of nuns, a community which later on was transferred to Hermetschwil, a mile or two distant from Muri. The good reputation enjoyed by the Abbey of Muri procured it many friends. In 1114 the Emperor Henry V took it under his special protection; and the popes on their side were not less solicitous for its welfare; it would seem, however, that the use of *pontificalia* was not granted to the abbots of Muri until the time of Pope Julius II (1503–1513).

Like all other institutions the place had its vicissitudes of good and bad fortune. It was laid low by two disastrous conflagrations, in 1300 and in 1363; wars and risings checked for a time its prosperity. It recovered somewhat of its old life under Abbot Conrad II, only to suffer again under his successor George Russinger in the war between Austria and Switzerland. Russinger had taken part in the Council of Constance and had caught something of the reforming spirit of that assembly. He was the means of aggregating his community to the newly formed Congregation of Bursfeld, the first serious attempt to bring about among the continental monasteries of northern Europe a sane and much needed reform of the Black Monks of St. Benedict. It was owing to him too that the Helvetic Confederation took over, as it were, the old Hapsburg friendliness towards his abbey which, thus strengthened both in its inner life and observance, and safe under the protection of the new political powers, was enabled to withstand the shock of the religious wars and ecclesiastical upheavals which marked the advent of the Protestant Reformation. When the first fury of that movement had abated Muri was fortunate in having as abbot a man of remarkable ability. Dom John Jodoc Singisen elected in 1596 proved himself a second founder of his monastery, and extending his care to the other Benedictine houses of Switzerland is rightly revered as one of the founders of the Swiss Congregation established in 1602. Largely through his efforts discipline was everywhere restored; monks of piety and letters went forth from Muri to repeople the half ruined cloisters; by his wisdom suitable constitutions were drawn up for such communities of nuns as had survived so many revolutions. His successor Dom Dominic Tschudi was a man of like mould, and a scholar whose works were held in great repute. He was born at Baden in 1595 and died there in 1654. His "Origo et genealogia comitum de Hapsburg" is his best known work. With the eighteenth century fresh honours came to Muri. The Emperor Leopold I created Abbot Placid Zurlauben and his successors Princes of the Holy Roman Empire, and spent a vast sum of money in rebuilding and embellishing the monastery and church, the ancient mausoleum of the imperial family. The abbey continued to prosper in every way; good discipline was kept up and many distinguished ecclesiastics and learned men were educated within its walls.

With the spread of revolutionary ideas, however, a great and disastrous change was impending. Some of the Swiss Cantons, Aargau among them, following the melancholy example of the revolutionary party which had wrecked religion in France, turned all their energies to the overthrow of the monasteries, the confiscation of their estates, and the elimination of Catholic influence from civil life. They were only too successful. Muri after a long series of attacks was obliged to succumb. Its abbot, an old man, had withdrawn to the monastery of Engelberg, more favourably situated, and there died on 5 November, 1838, leaving to his successor, D. Adalbert Regli, the brunt of the final conflict. The crisis came when on a winter's day in 1841 an armed force drove the monks into exile and the cantonal authorities seized the abbey and its estates. Despite this violent expulsion the community never wholly disbanded; the abbot and some of the monks held together and soon found a welcome from the Catholic Canton of Unterwalden, which invited them to undertake the management of the cantonal college at Sarnen. The kindly offer was accepted, and there the main body of the monks resided, the Lord Abbot himself taking his share in the school work, until the Austrian Emperor, Ferdinand I, offered them a residence at Gries near Bozen in Tyrol, in an old priory of Augustinian Canons of the Lateran which had been unoccupied since 1807. The Holy See concurred in the grant, and confirmed the transfer of the community of Muri to Gries by a Brief of Gregory XVI, dated 16 September, 1844. In order

to avoid complications the house of Gries was continued in its former status as a priory and incorporated with the Swiss Abbey of Muri, which is regarded as temporarily located in its Austrian dependency, the Abbot of Muri being at the same time Prior of Gries. The persecution which drove the community from its stately home at Muri seems in no way to have lessened the numbers and good works of the monks; indeed there has been a notable increase in the personnel of the convent in recent years and fresh demands are ever being made on their manifold activities. At Gries itself, the centre of this fraternity of nearly a hundred monks (over seventy priests and clerics, the rest lay-brothers), who constitute the monastic family of St. Martin of Muri, the monks conduct a college of 158 boys, and also a training college for schoolmasters attended by nearly sixty students; while at Sarnen in Switzerland their college educates about two hundred and forty boys, and at the technical school in the same place, carried on by the monks, the classes number usually between seventy and eighty scholars. The Abbot of Muri has under his care five "incorporated" parishes with two chapels of ease serving for the spiritual needs of about nine thousand souls; another parish, not incorporated with the abbey, ministers to about 418 people; and the oversight of the convent long established at Hermetschwil-Habsthal near Muri is also included in the work of the monks of Muri-Gries.

Album Benedictinum (St. Vincent's, Pennsylvania, 1880); *SS. Patriarchæ Benedicti familæ confœderatæ* (Rome, Vatican Press, 1905).

JOHN GILBERT DOLAN.

Murillo, BARTOLOMÉ ESTEBAN, Spanish painter; b. at Seville, 31 December, 1617; d. there 5 April, 1682. His family surname was Esteban; that of Murillo, which he assumed in accordance with an Andalusian custom, was his mother's. His father was an artisan. An orphan at the age of ten, Bartolomé was brought up by his uncle, J. A. Lagarès, a barber. He became the pupil, probably while still very young, of Juan del Castillo, a mediocre painter, but good teacher, whose atelier was at that time much frequented. It is said that, to gain a living, the young man in those days made *sargas*—cheap paintings on rough canvas sold at country *ferias* (fairs), and shipped to America by traders. The Museum of Cadiz claims, but without proof, that one of these Murillo *sargas* is in its possession. In 1640 Castillo went to live at Cadiz. In the meantime, Moya, having just arrived from England, where he had been Van Dyck's pupil, showed Murillo, who was an old friend of his, the cartoons, drawings, copies, and engravings he had brought with him. Murillo set out on a journey to study the great masters, but went no farther than Madrid. Velasquez, the king's painter and the friend of Olivares, was himself a native of Seville; he welcomed his young compatriot and gave him the *entrée* to all the royal galleries, where Murillo saw the masterpieces of Titian, Veronese, Tintoretto, and Rubens, not to mention Velasquez himself. He spent three years here, and this was all his travel. He returned to Seville in 1644. After this he left Seville but once, in 1681, when he went to Cadiz to paint an altar for the Capuchins which he never had the time to finish. A fall from his scaffolding or else a serious illness—accounts differ—forced him to let himself be taken back, hurriedly, to Seville, where he died after a brief period of suffering.

His was a very pure life, and perfectly happy, all spent within that one Sevillian horizon which the artist never wished to change for any other. His paintings in the *portería* of the Minims made a celebrity of him at the age of twenty-eight (1646). From that time he devoted himself to work on a large scale for the convents of his native Seville, work which, in some respects, recalls the Giottesque paintings of the fourteenth century. In contrast with Velasquez and the Madrid school, Murillo is wholly a religious painter. With the exception of a few portraits and some genre pieces, not one profane picture of his is known to exist. The product of his life's work is summed up in the great cycles of Santa Maria la Blanca (1665), of the Caridad Hospital (1670–74), of the Capuchins (1676), of the Venerables Sacerdotes (1678), of the Augustinians (1680), and, lastly, of the Cadiz Capuchins, together with a large number of pictures made at different times for the cathedral of Seville or other churches and many devotional works for private individuals. Murillo was the national painter of a country where all sentiment was still merged in the one sentiment of religion. The critics have distinguished three periods, or manners, in his work: the cold, the hot, and the "vaporous". The classification is foolish and pedantic. It is enough to look at his "Angels' Kitchen" (1646), his "Birth of the Virgin" (1655), and his "Holy Family" (1670), all in the Louvre: here we can see nothing but the natural evolution of a talent which from first to last pursued but one ideal—the poetical transfiguration of facts and ideas.

MURILLO
Painting by himself—Engraving by Calamatta

This ideal is already fully perceptible in the first of the examples cited, or in the "Death of St. Clare" (Dresden Museum), which also belongs to the *portería* series. In the "Angels' Kitchen", as in many others of his paintings, the artist's problem is to combine the supernatural with the real and familiar. Here we have a holy Franciscan in ecstasy, lifted from the ground, while angels with shining wings attend to the service of the refectory and wash the pans; and lastly, some spectators are peeping through a half-open door. The whole scene is displayed with admirable clearness, without a suggestion of hiatus between the three parts which are so diverse in character.

From this period date those few genre paintings which may be regarded as exceptional works of Murillo, the most famous example being the "Pouilleux" of the Louvre. Like every great Spanish painter, Murillo is a realist, and goes as far as anyone in the pathetic painting of suffering. But he refuses to paint these horrors with the frightful dilettantism, the cold, cruel detachment, of other Spanish artists. For him, pain and misery are objects of pity, not of curiosity or pleasure. Alone of the great painters of his race, his genius is tender, affectionate. Murillo's realism, however exact and sound, is never altogether impersonal or objective. In spite of himself, he communicates, together with the record of the reality, the emotions which it produces in himself; he does not alter its form, but he adds to it something of his own. In Spain, the classic land of brutal observation, of the "slice taken from life" served up raw and bleeding, Murillo invents, combines, achieves compositions. He has an imagination, and he does not make a point of honour of ignoring it. With more than average gifts for portraiture—as witness his portrait of Padre Cabanillas, at Madrid, or the admirable figure in the Museum of the Hispanic Society in New York—he made very few portraits. On the other hand, he has the gift and the instinct for story-telling. The Italian

BARTOLOMÉ ESTEBAN MURILLO

ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI SUPPORTING THE BODY OF CHRIST ON THE CROSS
MUSEO PROVINCIAL, SEVILLE

MADONNA AND CHILD
PITTI PALACE, FLORENCE

ST. FRANCIS OF PAULA
THE PRADO, MADRID

MADONNA AND CHILD
CORSINI GALLERY, ROME

sense of fine arrangement, of a happy symmetry and harmonious balance of grouping, as in his Holy Families, in the Louvre, is a quality which he alone seems to have possessed in his age.

Murillo was a great painter of sentiment. Like Rembrandt, he understood that the true language of the Gospel was the language of the people. Like him, he especially delighted in the merciful and tender aspects of the Gospel. Nothing can be more touching than the "Prodigal Son" of the Hermitage—not even Rembrandt's treatment of that subject—or his sketches on the same parable in the Prado. Like Rembrandt, he loves to bring the sacred truths near to us, to make us see them as intimate and familiar realities, to show us the Divine all about us in our lives. Murillo, no doubt, has the defects of these qualities. He never suffered enough. His optimism, his bonhomie, his grace, lack the seriousness that trials should have imparted. His serene smile lacks that intangible quality of having been through sorrow. Failing this experience, the soul tends somewhat to levity and to preciosity.

His pre-eminence as, superlatively, the painter of the Immaculate Conception seems to have been foreshadowed in the circumstances of his birth. At Seville, in 1617, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was solemnly promulgated for Spain; and this splendid celebration took place in Murillo's native city only a few months before his birth. The pictorial treatment of the subject had long been determined, in its main outlines, by a vision said to have been vouchsafed to a Franciscan of the sixteenth century, and a hundred examples of it are found among earlier painters. The mere theological dogma of the Immaculate Conception—exemption from the original taint—necessarily eluded all material representation: the equivalent chosen was the theme of the Assumption. The body is seen exempt from all the laws of gravitation. Murillo has treated this theme more than twenty times, without repeating himself or ever wearying: six versions at Madrid, six others at Seville, the famous Louvre picture (dated 1678), and still others scattered over Europe—all these did not exhaust the painter's enthusiasm or his power of expressing apotheosis.

It is a remarkable fact that these pictures, which represent the most transcendently spiritual action, are the most thoroughly feminine paintings in Spain. But for religious representations of the Blessed Virgin and the saints, indeed, woman is almost absent from Spanish painting. The most famous portraits of women, the *infantas* or *meninas* of Velasquez, retain nothing of feminine charm: they are *simulacra* and phantoms without verisimilitude. Side by side with these apparitions, Murillo's Virgins produce a comforting effect of relief. Here are women, true and vital, with the most thoroughly external charms of their sex. In them the impulse of love rises to ecstasy, and without Murillo Spanish painting would be deprived of its most beautiful love poems. Many persons, it is true, see in this style of painting the symptoms of decadence in Spanish religious sentiment. This question of the soundness or unsoundness of his devotional tendencies cannot be treated here, but it may at least be claimed for Murillo that his art—notably in these Immaculate Conceptions—is no less genuinely religious than the dry productions of, say, a Philippe de Champaigne.

Palomino, *Noticias, Elogios y Vidas de los Pintores* (Madrid, 1715–24); Cean Bermudez, *Diccionario histórico de los más ilustres profesores* (Madrid, 1800); Viardot, *Notices sur les principaux peintres de l'Espagne* (Paris, 1839); Passavant, *Die christliche Kunst in Spanien* (Leipzig, 1853); Tubino, *Murillo, su época, su vida, sus cuadros* (Seville, 1864); Curtis, *Velasquez and Murillo* (London, 1883); Justi, *Murillo* (Leipzig, 1892); Knackfuss, *Murillo* (Leipzig, 1897); Calvaert, *Murillo* (London, 1908).

Louis Gillet.

Murner, Thomas, greatest German satirist of the sixteenth century, b. at Oberehnheim, Alsace, 24 Dec., 1475; d. there, 1537. During the epoch immediately preceding and during the early years of the Reformation, three figures are especially prominent among the loyal champions of the Church in Germany, namely Johann Geiler von Kaysersberg, his friend Sebastian, the well-known satirist, and Thomas Murner, the ablest and most formidable of Luther's opponents. In 1481 Murner's parents, pious people in comfortable circumstances, settled in Strasburg, where his father practised as an advocate. Thomas, who was of delicate health, entered the Franciscan Order at the age of sixteen. After his ordination, he began his restless and unsettled life, visiting the most celebrated universities either as a student or as a teacher. He studied theology at Paris, philosophy and mathematics at Cracow, and law at Freiburg, where he was awarded the degree of Bachelor of Theology in 1500. Six years later, when again at Freiburg, he was made Doctor of Theology. In 1518 he graduated Doctor of Laws at Basle. His impulse towards a roving life was due, not only to his love of learning, but also to his mission as a preacher and his zeal for the interests of his order. From 1519 he took part in the controversies which began with the appearance of Luther as a reformer. In 1523 he went to England and was cordially received by Henry VIII, whose book on the sacraments he had translated into German the previous year. On his return to Strasburg, he found himself compelled to fly before the rebellious peasants and seek refuge at Lucerne. Here he became the most determined adversary of Zwingli. Together with Dr. Eck, he took part in the religious discussion at Baden in 1526. When Lucerne was taken in the first War of Kappel (1529), Murner was to have been given up. He managed, however, to escape, and, after many wanderings, was appointed pastor in his birth-place, where he spent the rest of his days.

As an author, Murner was at first an enthusiastic friend of Humanism. In Cracow he lectured on literary æsthetics, and in Freiburg on Vergil, whose "Æneid" he had translated. In token of gratitude for his appointment as poet-laureate in 1505, he dedicated this translation to Emperor Maximilian. In his "Ludus studentum Friburgensium" (1511), Murner explains the rules of prosody and quantity after the fashion of a game of chess and backgammon. This method he had already employed four years before at Cracow in his "Chartiludium logicæ", but his application of it to jurisprudence provoked the derision of the lawyers. His sympathy with Humanism did not save him from the resentment of the Alsacian Humanists, when he attacked Wimpfeling's "Germania", which aimed at proving that Alsace had never belonged to France. Murner's defence of his position, the "Germania nova", was suppressed by the Strasburg authorities: a further attempt at justifying himself against the attacks of the partisans of Wimpfeling also proved unsuccessful, and did not prevent his opponents from distorting his name into *Murnar* (growling fool). Even, in this early controversy, Murner had shown a sharp eye for his opponents' weaknesses, and a marked gift for exposing them to ridicule: in his subsequent writings, he is revealed as a master of satire. Just as Geiler illustrated his popular sermons with comparisons drawn from everyday life, Murner compares, in his "Andächtige geistliche Badefahrt" (1511), the forgiveness of sins to a hydropathic treatment. In "Narrenbeschwörung" and "Schelmenzunft" he deals with the same subject as Brant's "Narrenschiff", but his work is entirely original in treatment and far surpasses the earlier work in its popular appeal, its wit, and its vigour—degenerating, indeed, at times into coarseness. His subsequent satires, "Gäuchmatt" (Fools' Meadow) and "Die Mühle von Schwindelsheim und Gretmüllerin Jahrzeit", in which he severely criticizes a special kind of fools, the "fools of love", form a kind of sequel to the "Schelmenzunft". There is no

station, either clerical or lay, that is spared from his castigation.

The appearance of Luther diverted Murner's satire into a new course. Regarding the Wittenberg monk at first as a well-intentioned ally in the battle against the evils afflicting the Church, Murner addressed to him in 1520 an appeal entitled "Christliche und brüderliche Ermahnung an den hochgelehrten Doctor Martin Luther", which was followed by other pamphlets refuting and warning him and beseeching him to abandon his ruinous undertaking. In his "Neues Lied vom Untergang des christlichen Glaubens" (1521), Murner gives feeling expression to his sorrow over the destructive tendencies of the religious innovation. But, when the sole effect of his attempts at conciliation was to bring upon him a shower of lies and calumnies, Murner dealt Luther a crushing blow in his work, "Von dem grossen Lutherischen Narren wie ihn Doctor Murner beschworen hat". Here Murner rises to heights of satire elsewhere unattained during this whole epoch. All the reformatory endeavours are embodied in the "Great Fool", and the newly-founded church is treated allegorically as Luther's daughter Adelheid, who "has a shocking scald-head." Murner wrote many other satires against the reformers, but none which in energy and wit equals this work. This work, so full of fight and honest zeal for the old Faith, was subjected to much calumny and derision during his lifetime, but was never vanquished in controversy. Later generations did him justice. Lessing intended to write a "defence" of Murner, and literary historiographers (especially Kurtz, Vilmar, and Gödeke) have recognized his great importance in the history of literature. Critics have pointed out in his works a peculiar and original metrical and rhythmical system, which distinguished him from all poets of his time. His writings show that he possessed in a conspicuous degree the culture of his age. No doubt is entertained to-day of the purity of his intentions and the probity of his character.

GÖDEKE, *Grundriss* (2nd ed., 1884–1904), II, 215–20, mentions all Murner's (59) works. Recently edited are: *Schelmenzunft* by MATTHIAS; *Gäuchmatt* by UHL; *Narrenbeschwörung* by SPANIER. Consult POPP, *Die Metrik u. Rhythmik M.'s* (1898); OTT, *Ueber M.'s Verhältnis zu Geiler* (*Allemania*, 23). Murner is, of course, not forgotten in the numerous Protestant writings on the Reformation, which generally criticize him severely. Among recent Catholic writings of JANSSEN-PASTOR, *Gesch. des deutschen Volkes*, VI (15th ed., 1901); SALZER, *Illustrierte Gesch. der deutschen Lit.* (in course of publication), pp. 520–24.

N. SCHEID.

Muro-Lucano, DIOCESE OF (MURANENSIS), in the province of Potenza, in Basilicata, southern Italy. The town is situated on the site of the ancient Numistri, at the foot of the Apennines, the scene of a battle between Hannibal and Marcellus in the second Punic war. The town has a beautiful cathedral; and it was in its castle that Queen Joan of Naples was killed by order of her adopted son Carlo of Durazzo. The first Bishop of Muro of whom there is mention was Leo (1049). Its bishop Antonio (1376) became a partisan of the antipope Clement VII; he was therefore driven by Carlo of Durazzo to seek refuge at Polsino, whereupon Clement VII suppressed the Diocese of Muro. In 1418, however, Guiduccio de Porta was appointed to this see; he was a virtuous man, and learned in civil, as well as in canon law; among his successors were Flavio Orsini (1560), who became a cardinal; the poet Gian Carlo Coppola (1643), who later became Bishop of Gallipoli, his native town; Alfonso Pacello (1674), founder of a congregation of priests for the care of the sick of the diocese. The see is suffragan of Conza; it has 12 parishes, with 40,280 inhabitants, 100 secular priests, 2 religious houses of women, and an educational establishment for girls.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XX (Venice, 1857).

U. BENIGNI.

Murray, DANIEL, Archbishop of Dublin, b. 1768, at Sheepwalk, near Arklow, Ireland; d. 1852 at Dublin. He was educated at Dr. Betagh's school in Dublin and at Salamanca and ordained priest in 1790. After some years as curate in Dublin he was transferred to Arklow, and was there in 1798 when the rebellion broke out. The soldiers shot the parish priest in bed, and Murray, to escape a similar fate, fled to the city, where for several years after he ministered as curate. In 1809 at the request of Archbishop Troy he was appointed coadjutor-bishop, and in 1823, on Dr. Troy's death, he became Archbishop of Dublin. While coadjutor he had filled for one year the position of president of Maynooth College. Dr. Murray was an uncompromising opponent of the "veto" and a strong supporter of the Catholic Association. On other questions he was less advanced, and was in such favour at Dublin Castle that he was once offered a seat on the Privy Council, which he declined. He supported Stanley's National Education scheme and was among the first Education Commissioners; he also wished to tolerate the Queen's Colleges, in opposition to the views of Archbishop MacHale. He had no hesitation, however, in accepting the adverse decision of Rome, and was present at the Synod of Thurles where the Queen's Colleges were formally condemned. He was a charitable, kindly man, respected even by his opponents.

D'ALTON, *Archbishops of Dublin* (Dublin, 1838); HEALY, *Centenary History of Maynooth College* (Dublin, 1895); MEAGHER, *Life of Archbishop Murray* (Dublin, 1853); FITZPATRICK, *Life of Dr. Doyle* (Dublin, 1880); O'REILLY, *Life of Archbishop MacHale* (New York, 1890).

E. A. D'ALTON.

Murray, JAMES D. See COOKTOWN, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF.

Murray, PATRICK, theologian, b. in Clones, County Monaghan, Ireland, 18 November, 1811; d. 15 Nov., 1882, in Maynooth College. He received his early education in his native town of Clones, entered Maynooth College 25 August, 1829, the year of Catholic emancipation, among the first class of emancipated entrants, went through the ordinary course with great distinction and was elected a Dunboyne, or senior student in June, 1835. Towards the end of the Dunboyne course he accepted a curacy in Francis Street, Dublin, where in a short time he acquired the reputation of a zealous worker and an eloquent preacher. He was appointed professor of English and French in Maynooth, on 7 Sept., 1838, after the usual concursus, or examination, and after three years in this position he was appointed professor of theology, after another brilliant concursus, on 27 August, 1841. The remainder of his life he devoted mainly to theological science. In 1879 he was appointed prefect of the Dunboyne Establishment, which position he retained until his death in 1882. His principal works are: "Essays, Chiefly Theological" (4 vols., Dublin, 1850–53); "De Ecclesia Christi" (3 vols., Dublin, 1860–62–66); " De Ecclesia Christi", compendium (Dublin, 1874); "De Gratia" (Dublin, 1877); "De Veneratione et Invocatione Sanctorum", etc.; "De Impedimentis Matrimonii Dirimentibus" (Dublin, 1881); "Prose and Verse" (Dublin, 1867); "Lectures (on Moore's poetry) before Cork Young Men's Society" (Cork, 1856).

Dr. Murray was a man of high intellectual power, of big projects, and of great activity and perseverance. He would certainly have risen to great eminence in the world of literature, had he remained professor of English, as he was possessed of literary and poetic gifts of a high order. But he chose the domain of theology. He wrote for the Dublin Review and for magazines. In 1850 he announced his intention of publishing a series of volumes on subjects chiefly theological, to supply the Catholic laity with exact and reliable information on the debated religious questions of the day. He published four volumes under the title: "Essays, Chiefly Theological". But though he intended at the beginning to extend the work to seven or

eight volumes, he discontinued the Essays after the fourth volume, to devote himself to the great work of his life, his "De Ecclesia Christi". This work involved immense labour. It is a work of great learning, a masterpiece in positive and controversial theology, which at once placed its author in the front rank of dogmatic theologians. While not neglecting the views of the continental reformers, the author made a special study of the works of all the leading Anglican divines; and hence his work became the standard authority for the exposition and refutation of the then current Anglican views about the Church. Though writing in 1860, ten years before the Vatican definition, the author with great power establishes the doctrine of papal infallibility. The treatise, "De Gratia", excellent in itself, was intended as a text-book for students; as was also the less perfect work, "De Veneratione et Invocatione Sanctorum". Dr. Murray was ever kind and considerate for his students, by whom he was always respected and loved. He was of a retiring disposition, of a deeply religious nature, and of great saintliness of life.

HEALY, *Maynooth College; Its Centenary History, 1795–1895* (Dublin, 1895).

DANIEL COGHLAN.

Museums, CHRISTIAN.—Though applicable to collections composed of Christian objects representative of all epochs, this term is usually reserved to those museums which abound chiefly in Christian objects antedating the Middle Ages, namely, sarcophagi, inscriptions and products of the minor arts. These objects, as also those peculiar to the Middle Ages, are found in a large number of museums, but not many of these institutions are exclusively or even primarily devoted to them. The first collections that were formed (by humanists, by the Medici in Florence, etc.) occasionally included the earlier types or works of mediæval art, but more on account of their artistic merit than because of their Christian character. Collections of inscriptions had been made from the time of the Renaissance, but Christian inscriptions found no place among them. It was not until after the discovery of the Roman catacombs by Antonio Bosio that these inscriptions were visited by collectors from Rome and other cities. The first Christian museum, properly so called, was that of the Vatican, and its origin dates from Benedict XIV, who founded it under the name of "Museum Christianum". Thanks to Marchi and de Rossi, a part of the Vatican collections was taken to form the Lateran Museum, founded by a decree of Pius IX in 1854. For Christian antiquities no other museums equal the latter in point of importance. During the pontificate of Benedict XIV (1740–50) a taste for Christian antiquities was developed by other distinguished men, e. g., Cardinal Passionei and Cardinal Quirini, Bishop of Brescia, whose diligent searches were prolific of important results.

Italy is particularly rich in valuable collections of antique Christian relics. In Rome, besides the Christian Museums of the Vatican and the Lateran, the Museo Kircheriano and the San Paolo, Propaganda, and Campo Santo collections are all noteworthy. The atria of certain churches, e. g., St. Mark, Santa Maria in Trastevere, and St. Agnes, also the Grotte Vaticane, have Christian inscriptions or sculptures, and collections of inscriptions have been made in the vicinity of several Roman catacombs, e. g., St. Domitilla and St. Agnes; mention should be made also of private collections. Moreover, almost all the large museums of Italy and the treasuries of some churches have objects belonging to the early Christian era, e. g., the Museum and Library of Brescia and those of the Uffizi at Florence, the municipal Museum of Florence, the Trivulzi collection, the treasuries of the cathedrals of Milan and Monza, the Museo Nazionale at Palermo, the Museum of the Villa Cassia at Syracuse, etc. Outside of Italy, important collections of Christian antiquities are less numerous, although those of Cairo, Alexandria, Athens, of St. Louis of Carthage (the Lavigerie Museum), of Arles, Autun, Trier, etc. deserve mention. The museums of the great capitals, London, Paris, Berlin, etc., and the treasuries of some churches, e. g., the cathedral of Sens, have ivories and various woven stuffs dating from the early Christian epoch. Such woven stuffs, principally of Coptic origin, and very ancient, have lately been introduced into many collections.

Church treasuries, especially the richer ones of some German churches (cathedrals of Cologne, Trier, Hildesheim, Bamberg and the abbatial church of Essen, etc.), are noted for their medieval relics and may pass for the oldest Christian museums.

In addition to the large museums of all countries, many museums of industrial art, provincial museums, private collections and archæological societies, also episcopal museums, e. g., the rich ones of Cologne and Utrecht, contain many valuable and ancient Christian relics of an artistic kind. As a Christian museum of the Middle Ages, the Schnütgen collection at Cologne deserves special notice. It contains many religious objects, chalices, crosses, ecclesiastical vestments, etc., and offers a better opportunity than any other collection for studying the changing forms of these objects from age to age. A word is due to the museums of copies or reproductions annexed to certain institutions of higher education. The most remarkable Christian museum of this kind is that of the University of Berlin, founded 1849–1855 by Ferdinand Piper. Although largely representative of the Middle Ages, it is unparalleled for its facsimiles of Christian antiquities. More recently M. G. Millet founded at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes, in Paris, a Byzantine museum, rich in copies and stereotypes gathered during the explorations and study tours made by French scholars. (See LATERAN, CHRISTIAN MUSEUM OF; VATICAN.)

KAUFMANN, *Handbuch der christlichen Archäologie* (Paderborn, 1905), 67 sq., 74; LECLERCQ, *Manuel d'Archéologie chrétienne* (Paris, 1907), I, 429; KRAUS, *Realencyclopädie* (Freiburg, 1886), s. v. *Topographie;* FORRER AND FISCHER, *Adressbuch der Museen, Bibliotheken, Sammler und Antiquare* (Strasburg, 1896).

R. MAERE.

Mush, an Armenian Catholic see, comprising the sanjaks of Mush and Seert, in the vilayet of Bitlis. It was created by Leo XIII in 1883, and numbers about 5000 faithful, 7 secular priests, 7 churches or chapels, 5 schools, and an establishment of the Venetian Mechitarists. The chief stations outside of Mush are some neighbouring villages such as Bitlis or Van. The town is built on a hill, at the foot of a ruined citadel and in the midst of vineyards; below stretches a well-cultivated plain, about fifty miles long by eighteen miles wide. The climate is healthy and the country tolerably rich, but exposed to constant incursions of the Kurds and other nomads, who terrorize the inhabitants, especially the Christians. Built by an Armenian prince named Muchigh, the town of Mush has about 27,000 inhabitants, of whom 3,000 are Armenian Catholics, 10,000 Armenian schismatics, and 700 Protestants, the rest being Mussulmans. Besides the Catholic bishop there is an Armenian Gregorian bishop; also a Protestant missionary. The celebrated Moses of Chorene was born in the neighbouring village of Chorene.

CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie* (Paris), 571–77; *Missiones catholicæ* (Rome, 1907), 757.

S. VAILHÉ.

Mush (alias RATCLIFFE), JOHN, priest, b. in Yorkshire, 1551 or 1552; d. at Wenge, Co. Bucks, 1612 or 1613, not as Bishop Challoner thought, in 1617. Having spent six months in the English College at Douai he went to Rome (1576) where he studied for seven years. Ordained priest, he returned to England (1583) and laboured at York, being confessor

to Venerable Margaret Clitherow who suffered for harbouring him, and Venerable Francis Ingleby. Arrested 28 Oct., 1586, and condemned to die, he escaped with two other priests. For many years he laboured in the North becoming a recognized leader among his brother priests. When the dissensions among the imprisoned priests at Wisbech broke out in 1595, he with Dr. Dudley went there to arbitrate. Failing in this, together with John Colleton he set himself to devise some organization of a voluntary character among the clergy which might supply the want of episcopal government much felt after the death of Cardinal Allen in 1594. Opposed by Persons, it was rendered superfluous by the appointment of an archpriest (1599). In the ensuing controversy Mush was one of the appellant clergy who appealed to Rome against the archpriest. In connexion with this he wrote "Declaratio Motuum" and in 1602, with Champney Bluet and Cecil, went as a deputation to Rome where for eight months they fought for their petition. Their petition, first for six bishops and then for six archpriests, was refused; but though the archpriest succeeded in maintaining his position, the appellants were acquitted of the charges of rebellion and schism. On his return to England, Mush was one of the thirteen priests who signed the protestation of allegiance to Queen Elizabeth (1603). In his later years he acted as assistant to two successive archpriests, Blackwell and Birkhead, in Yorkshire, but he seems to have been acting as chaplain to Lady Dormer in Buckinghamshire at the time of his death. His works are "The Life and Death of Mistress Margaret Clitherow" (written 1586, first printed 1849); "An account of the sufferings of Catholics in the Northern Parts of England" (probably the same as the MS. account printed by Father Morris, S.J., in "Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers", series iii); "Declaratio Motuum" (Rouen, 1601). His diary of the deputation to Rome in 1602 is preserved in MS. in the Inner Temple, London. Dodd also says he wrote against the apostate priest Thomas Bell, and Pitts quotes his English translation of "Lectiones Panagorali Turini", but these latter works are not now known to exist.

KNOX, *Records of the English Catholics* (London, 1878, 1882); DODD, *Church History*, ed. TIERNEY (London, 1839–43); MORRIS, *Troubles of our Catholic Forefathers*, series ii and iii (London, 1875–77); LAW, *Jesuits and Seculars in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth* (London, 1889), and in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* s. v.; GILLOW, *Bibl. Dict. Eng. Cath.*

EDWIN BURTON.

Music, ECCLESIASTICAL.—By this term is meant the music which, by order or with the approbation of ecclesiastical authority, is employed in connexion with Divine service to promote the glorification of God and the edification of the faithful.

NATURE AND SIGNIFICANCE.—Just as St. Philip Neri spontaneously sang the prayers of the last Mass which he celebrated, so is all true religious music but an exalted prayer—an exultant expression of religious feeling. Prayer, song, the playing upon instruments, and action, when arranged by authority, constitute the elements of public worship, especially of an official liturgy. This was the case with the pagans, the Jews, and also in the Church from time immemorial. These elements constitute, when combined, an organic unity, in which, however, music forms a part only on solemn occasions, and then only in accordance with the regulations of proper authority. As man owes to God that which is highest and most beautiful, music may employ on these occasions her noblest and most effective means. Church music has in common with secular music the combination of tones in melody and harmony, the division of time in rhythm, measure, and *tempo*, dynamics, or distribution of power, tone-colour in voice and instruments, the simpler and more complicated styles of composition. All these, however, must be adapted to the liturgical action, if there be such, to the words uttered in prayer, to the devotion of the heart; they must be calculated to edify the faithful, and in short must serve the purpose for which Divine service is held. Whenever music, instead of assuming a character of independence and mere ornament, acts as an auxiliary to the other means of promoting the worship of God and as an incentive to good, it not only does not interfere with the religious ceremony, but, on the contrary, imparts to it the greatest splendour and effectiveness. Only those who are not responsive to its influence, or stubbornly cultivate other ways of devotion, can imagine that they are distracted in their worship by music. Appropriate music, on the contrary, raises man above commonplace everyday thoughts into an ideal and joyous mood, rivets mind and heart on the sacred words and actions, and introduces him into the proper devotional and festive atmosphere. This appropriateness takes into account persons and circumstances, variations being introduced according to the nature and use of the texts, according to the character of the liturgical action, according to the ecclesiastical season, and even according to the various needs of the contemplative orders and the rest of the faithful.

Natural religious instinct urges man to honour God by means of music as well as by the other arts, and to heighten his religious exaltation by joyous singing. This significance of singing in connexion with Divine service has never been lost sight of. Under the Old Law the music of the Temple filled, in compliance with the commands of God Himself, a very elaborate rôle. Songs of victory of a religious nature are mentioned in Ex., xv, and in Judges, v. Often the prophets are elated by sacred music. David beautified religious ceremonies by hymns and the use of instruments (Amos, vi, 5; II Esd., xii, 35; II Par., xxix, 25 sqq.). With him appears Asaph in the rôle of poet and singer, and the "Sons of Asaph" with other families were, from the days of David, organized into classes (I Par., xxv). The primitive Christian Church was, on account of external circumstances, very much restrained in its religious manifestations, and the adoption of the music of the Temple, in so far as it had survived, would have been difficult on account of the converts from paganism. Furthermore, the practice of religion on the part of the early Christians was of such a purely spiritual nature that any sensuous assistance, such as that of music, could be for the time easily dispensed with. Nevertheless, the words of St. Paul, even if only taken in a spiritual sense, remind one forcibly of the conception of music in the Old Testament: "Speaking to yourselves in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual canticles, singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord" (Eph., v, 19). Tertullian relates that during Divine service Holy Scripture was read and psalms sung, and that even Pliny had ascertained that the Christians honoured their Lord before dawn by singing a hymn (Apol., ii). Eusebius, in confirmation "of the regulations heretofore followed by the Church", quotes the testimony of Philo, who relates that the Therapeutæ, during their festive repasts, sang psalms from Holy Writ and other hymns of various kinds in solemn rhythm in monodic style with choral responsories (Hist. eccl., I, xvii). Whatever may have been the nature of the singing of the Therapeutæ, Eusebius bears testimony to the traditional custom of the Church. While St. Athanasius restricted the singing of the psalms to a kind of recitation, St. Ambrose introduced in Milan (and the greater part of the Western world) with great success antiphonal singing of the psalms "after the manner of the East". St. Augustine asks himself whether it would not be more perfect to deny himself the delight derived from singing, but concludes his reflection by concurring with existing practices, and frequently testifies to the customs of his time (cf. Conf., ix, 7; x, 33; In Ps. xxi and xlvi; Retr., ii, 11). St. Jerome, refer-

ring to Eph., v, 19, exhorts as follows the young whose duty it is to sing in Church: "Let the servant of God sing in such a manner that the words of the text rather than the voice of the singer cause delight, and that Saul's evil spirit may depart from those who are under its dominion, and may not enter into those who make a theatre out of the house of the Lord". A certain class of liturgical singers are also mentioned in the "Canones apostolorum". The above-mentioned antiphonal and responsorial chant intended for the people shows that the singing was not confined to the choir. St. Augustine wrote a long hymn to be sung by the people in the form of Psalm cxviii—not in classic metre, but in popular accented verses with sixteen unaccented syllables and rhyming on the final vowel. Hymnology in classic form goes back to Ambrose and Hilarius. But sufficient has been said to indicate the practice and nature of chant in the early Church, under whose fostering protection it developed so wonderfully later on. History bears the most convincing testimony to the importance which the Church has always attached to music in connexion with her worship.

Church Regulations.—The interest taken by the Church in music is also shown by her numerous enactments and regulations calculated to foster music worthy of Divine service. The right of the Church to determine the matter and manner of what shall be sung in connexion with her liturgy is incontestable. Narrow-minded musical partisans seem disposed to fear that music as an art does not receive due consideration, if it be not permitted to go its own way uncontrolled. These fears generally have for their basis the theory that art is an end in itself, and should not serve, except indirectly, any end outside of and other than itself. This principle could only have a certain justification, if the external dependency were to hinder the full development of music. But this is not the case. In point of fact, the history of its development shows that ecclesiastical music need fear no comparison between its achievements and those of secular music. Many competent musicians have frankly admitted this in the case of the simple Gregorian chant—not only men like Witt and Gevaert, but also Halévy, Mozart, and Berlioz. Halévy considers the chant "the most beautiful religious melody that exists on earth". Mozart's statement, "that he would gladly exchange all his music for the fame of having composed the Gregorian Preface", sounds almost hyperbolic. Berlioz, who himself wrote a grandiose Requiem, declared that "nothing in music could be compared with the effect of the Gregorian Dies iræ" (cf. Krutschek, "Kirchenmusik"). Ambros says: "The fundamental power, animating all music which is not made but which grew (as is the case with the folk-music), belongs pre-eminently to Gregorian chant." For this reason Gevaert considers the most characteristic quality of the chant to be the fact that it never grows stale, "as though time had no power over it". Not the most conspicuous, but the most simple artistic means produce the deepest and most lasting impression, when skilfully employed. The first requisite is that the sentiments contained in the text be given true expression, and be not obscured by obtrusive external forms. It must be acknowledged that pieces like the Te Deum, Lauda Sion, the Lamentations, the Requiem Mass, as well as many an introit, gradual, and tract, afford a never-failing pleasure, that they employ only the simplest means to express the desired mood, that they are admirably adapted to promote devotion.

The Church, however, does not despise artistic means of a more elaborate nature, as is shown by the long *jubili* of the traditional chant (as contained in the Vatican edition) and still more by ecclesiastical polyphonic music (Palestrina style). Upon this style modern musicians of the first rank have pronounced favourable judgment. Wagner was an enthusiastic admirer of Palestrina; Mendelssohn made every effort to collect masses, *impropreria*, psalms, motets of the old masters, which he preferred to all ecclesiastical music by modern writers. There are, indeed, many works by Orlandus de Lassus, Allegri, Vittoria, wherein the most elaborate means of expression are used, but which, nevertheless, conform to every liturgical requirement and are, as it were, spontaneous outpourings of adoring hearts (cf. contrapuntal or polyphonic music). Besides plain chant and the polyphonic style, the Church also admits to her service homophonic or figured compositions with or without instrumental accompaniment, written, not in the old ecclesiastical modes, but in one of the modern major or minor keys. Gregorian chant the Church most warmly recommends, the polyphonic style she expressly praises, and the modern she at least tolerates. According to the "Motu proprio" of Pius X (22 Nov., 1903), the following are the general guiding principles of the Church: "Sacred music should possess, in the highest degree, the qualities proper to the liturgy, or more precisely, sanctity and purity of form from which its other character of universality spontaneously springs. It must be holy, and must therefore exclude all profanity, not only from itself but also from the manner in which it is presented by those who execute it. It must be true art, for otherwise it cannot exercise on the minds of the hearers that influence which the Church meditates when she welcomes into her liturgy the art of music. But it must also be universal, in the sense that, while every nation is permitted to admit into its ecclesiastical compositions those special forms which may be said to constitute its native music, still these forms must be subordinated in such a manner to the general characteristics of sacred music, that no one of any nation may receive an impression other than good on hearing them."

Regarding modern music, the "Motu proprio" says: "The Church has always recognized and honoured progress in the arts, admitting to the service of religion everything good and beautiful discovered by genius in the course of ages—always, however, with due regard to the liturgical laws. Consequently, modern music is also admitted in the Church, since it, too, furnishes compositions of such excellence, sobriety, and gravity, that they are in no way unworthy of the liturgical functions. Still, since modern music has risen mainly to serve profane uses, care must be taken that musical compositions in this style admitted to the Church may contain nothing profane, be free from reminiscences of theatrical motives, and be not fashioned, even in their external forms, after the manner of profane pieces." It is very much to be regretted that the greatest masters of modern times, Mozart, Joseph Haydn, and Beethoven, devoted their wonderful gifts mainly to secular uses, and that their masses are entirely unsuitable for liturgical purposes—an unsuitability freely acknowledged by Mendelssohn, Liszt, and Wagner. The reason for their inadmissibility lies in their treatment of the sacred text, the instrumentation, in the fact that they do not conform to the liturgical action, and often in an undue elaboration of form which seriously interferes with the devotion of the faithful. A few compositions by these masters (such as Mozart's Ave verum) do not deserve this reproach. The mere fact that a Gloria or Credo by Haydn, for instance, delays the progress of the service twenty minutes, while the other parts of these masses are of equally excessive length, is sufficient to render them unsuitable for liturgical use. The following words from the "Motu proprio" are applicable to numberless compositions: "Among the different kinds of modern music, that which appears least suitable for accompanying the functions of public worship is the theatrical style, which was in the greatest vogue, especially in Italy, during the last century. This, of

its very nature, is diametrically opposed to the Gregorian chant and classic polyphony, and therefore to the most important law of all good music. Besides the intrinsic structure, the rhythm and what is known as the conventionalism of this style adapt themselves but ill to the requirements of true liturgical music."

This wish of the Church, so frequently reiterated, should never be ignored by composer or performer. As the sacredness of the liturgy has caused the Church to dictate to the priest, to the smallest detail, what vestments, words, vessels, and actions he should employ in the fulfilment of his duties—which regulations he may not disregard without sinning—so also the regulations concerning church music are binding on the singers, whether the reasons for these regulations be understood by the individuals or not. It is indeed true that unimportant deviations from the rules are, owing to special circumstances, sometimes excusable. The regulations are contained in the Missal, the "Cæremoniale episcoporum", and the decrees of councils and of the popes. The universally binding decrees of the Congregation of Rites are collected in "Decreta authentica", and have been, since 1909, published in the "Acta Apostolicæ Sedis". Purely local directions need no special publication for those immediately concerned. It is in some cases legitimate to assume that, in unessential matters, a given rule has rather a directive than a prescriptive character, provided the wording does not declare the contrary. Decrees called forth by plainly local conditions are binding only in the place to which they have been directed. In some cases it is legitimate to inquire about and remonstrate against a regulation before it becomes binding. Whenever exceptionally serious difficulties stand in the way, positive laws are not binding, unless the lawgiver explicitly insists on their fulfilment. Owing to the difference in local conditions bishops may, in the application of a given law, sometimes use their own discretion. Customs of long standing are to be treated with some leniency, unless ecclesiastical authority explicitly determines the contrary. Answers to inquiries contained in the "Decreta Authentica" or "Acta Apostolicæ Sedis" are usually considered as binding, if they are for general and not merely for local application. The degree of binding force depends on the importance of the matter in question, and it may be gathered from the degree of firmness or emphasis with which the lawgiver inculcates a given law. The verbal and musical texts are equally subject to ecclesiastical control. The use of the Vatican edition of the Gregorian chant has been generally binding since 25 Sept., 1905. However, bishops may, owing to local difficulties, defer the execution of the law. (The command is given in mild form: "It is our most keen desire that bishops", etc.) The "Motu proprio" directs that all other musical performances be watched over by a commission appointed by the ordinary, so that in all places compositions of the proper character and within the capacity of the singers may be performed.

Regulations, so wise as these, compel our obedience. Consequently, the Holy Father has a right to expect that "we obey from the conviction that by so doing we act from reasons which are clear, plain and beyond dispute." Consideration of the purpose for which music is employed in church, of its close connexion with the liturgy, and of the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, is sufficient basis for this conviction. No one is bound to admire, as in every particular unsurpassed and unsurpassable, the prescribed chant. It is sufficient to accept the Gregorian chant as the norm and supreme model for all Catholic church music and approve its use. We are not asked to abandon every personal scientific and æsthetic view, or to eschew research and theoretic discussion. If, however, the lawgiver does not urge the immediate execution of a law wherever, on account of the difficulties to be overcome, it is more likely to do more harm than good, it must not be understood that by these are meant the ordinary difficulties which had been foreseen, nor may the difference in our own taste be considered an obstacle. The regulations concerning church music are generally binding under pain of sin, and subtle distinctions to escape this responsibility are useless. For the composer of genius these prescriptions are not fetters, but rather serve to show him how to make his work a source at once of artistic delight and of edification. All these remarks apply equally to the singer.

QUALITIES.—The first and most urgent condition which the Church imposes in regard to her music is that it be in conformity with the place, time, and purpose of Divine worship; that it be sacred and not profane, in other words that it be church, and not theatrical, music. Theatrical music is just as much out of place in church, as the performance of a secular drama, the exposition of a battle scene, or even a statue representing a pagan deity. The performance of such music directs the attention not to the altar but to the organ loft. Musicians themselves have frequently failed to recognize clearly the difference between concert and church music. Mozart used parts of his religious compositions in secular cantatas and extracts from his operas for church purposes. A mass has also been compiled from some of Haydn's profane compositions. The "wassail of notes", the complete absorption of our consciousness by artistic melodic or harmonic combinations and sensuous melodies, the display of instrumental virtuosity, the joyous rush of tonal masses put to flight all devout recollection of the sacrificial act and all heartfelt prayer. March, dance, and other jerky rhythms, bravura arias, and the crash of instruments affect the senses and nerves, but do not touch the heart. Even a reminiscence of the concert hall is a distraction to those who wish to pray.

Not the least element in the effectiveness of church music is the sacred texts, which inspire composer, singer, and hearer, although in different ways. In the "Motu proprio" we read: "The liturgical text must be sung as it is in the books, without alteration or inversion of the words, without undue repetition, without breaking syllables and always in a manner intelligible to the faithful who listen." Only in this way are the sacredness of the text and the needs of the hearer safeguarded. For all official chants (Mass, Vespers, etc.) the texts are prescribed, and are in the Latin language. On this point the "Motu proprio" says: "It is not lawful to confuse the order or to change the prescribed texts for others selected at will or to omit them either entirely or in part. However, it is permissible according to the custom of the Roman Church, to sing a motet to the Blessed Sacrament after the Benedictus in a solemn mass. It is also permitted, after the Offertory of the mass has been sung, to execute during the time that remains a brief motet to words approved by the Church." On account of the diversity and changeableness of modern languages, the Church retains for her liturgical functions (even for the simple *missa cantata*) the Latin language, hallowed by ages of service. Nor does she permit that individual prayers and chants be translated into the vernacular for liturgical purposes. (The most important decision on this point will be found in the "Decreta authentica" under "Cantilena" and "Cantus".) The "Motu proprio" says: "It is forbidden to sing anything whatever in the vernacular in solemn liturgical functions; much more to sing in the vernacular the variable or common parts in the Mass and Office."

To the traditional language of her liturgy the Church joins her own traditional musical form, which characterizes her chant and distinguishes it from the music of concert and opera. The "Motu proprio" says: "The different parts of the Mass and of the Office must retain, even musically, that particular concept and form which ecclesiastical tradition assigned to

them, and which is admirably expressed in the Gregorian chant." By retaining her musical form for her various chants (e. g. for the Sanctus, the hymns, the psalms), or admitting of its modification only within certain limits, the Church protects her own music against the destruction of that character which is proper to it. The relation of church music to the text on the one hand and to instrumental music on the other is what distinguishes it essentially from secular music. The attitude of reserve maintained by the Church on this point is expressed in the "Motu proprio" as follows: "Although the music proper to the Church is purely vocal music, music with the accompaniment of the organ is also permitted. In some special cases, within due limits and within the proper regards, other instruments may be allowed, but never without the special licence of the ordinary, according to the Cæremoniale episcoporum. As the chant should always have the principal place, the organ or instruments should merely sustain and never suppress it. It is not permitted to have the chant preceded by long preludes or to interrupt it with intermezzo pieces." The pianoforte and noisy and frivolous instruments (e. g. drums, cymbals, and bells) are absolutely excluded. Wind instruments, by their nature more turbulent and obtrusive, are admissible only as an accompaniment to the singing in processions outside of the church. Within the edifice "it will be permissible only in special cases and with the consent of the ordinary to admit a number of wind instruments, limited, judicious, and proportioned to the size of the place, provided the composition and accompaniment to be executed be written in a grave and suitable style and similar in all respects to that proper to the organ." The restrictions imposed by the Church in this regard were formerly still greater. Although Josephus tells of the wonderful effects produced in the Temple by the use of instruments, the first Christians were of too spiritual a fibre to substitute lifeless instruments for or to use them to accompany the human voice. Clement of Alexandria severely condemns the use of instruments even at Christian banquets (P. G., VIII, 440). St. Chrysostom sharply contrasts the customs of the Christians at the time when they had full freedom with those of the Jews of the Old Testament (ibid., LV, 494–7). Similarly write a series of early ecclesiastical writers down to St. Thomas (Summa, II-II, Q. xci, a. 2).

In Carlovingian times, however, the organ came into use, and was, until the sixteenth century, used solely for the accompaniment of the chant, its independent use developing only gradually (Scarlatti, Couperin, Bach). Perfected organ-playing found increasing favour in the eyes of the church authorities, and only occasionally was it found necessary to correct an abuse. The Council of Trent (Sess. XXII) says: "All musical forms, whether for the organ or for voices, which are of a frivolous or sensuous character, should be excluded from the Church." The nature of the organ is, to a great extent, a protection against its misuse; its power and fullness lend themselves admirably to the majesty of the Divine service, while other instruments more readily serve profane purposes. After the sixteenth century, orchestral instruments found admittance into some churches and court chapels, but restrictive regulations soon followed. While Lasso in Munich, Monteverde in Venice, and Scarlatti in Naples had at their disposal large orchestras, smaller churches with more modest resources satisfied themselves with the use of the trumpet or trombone in addition to the organ. The cultivation of both sacred and profane music by the same musicians proved detrimental to church music, and finally the Church had to wage open war on modern theatrical music in church services. Mozart's insinuating sweetness, Haydn's pious hilarity, Beethoven's violent passionateness, and Cherubini's dramatic intensity stand in too strong contrast to the lofty religious dignity and gravity of Palestrina. Maurice Brosig, although rather unrestrained and subjective in his own compositions, always excluded their works from church. Concert instruments may, under certain circumstances, produce in church a very brilliant effect and an exalted mood. In general, however, they are rather obtrusive than devotional. Their tendency is to predominate, and they are apt to obscure the declamation of the text.

Richard Wagner says a vigorous word in favour of purely vocal music in church: "To the human voice, the immediate vehicle of the sacred word, belongs the first place in the churches, and not to instrumental additions or the trivial scraping found in most of the churches pieces to-day. Catholic Church music can regain its former purity only by a return to the purely vocal style. If an accompaniment is considered absolutely necessary, the genius of Christianity has provided the instrument worthy of such function, the organ" (Gesammelte Werke, II, 337). There is no doubt but that those qualities absolutely necessary to church music, namely modesty, dignity, and soulfulness, are more inherent in the purely vocal style than in any other. Reserve and humble restraint befits the house of God. Sentimental and effeminate melodies are incompatible with the dignified seriousness of the polyphonic a capella style, and a composer's temptation to indulge in them is more easily counteracted by this style than any other. Like the external attitude of the worshipper in church, the vocally interpreted liturgical word and the organ-playing must be respectful and decorous. That vocal music is in general more expressive than the mechanically produced tone of instruments is undeniable. Religious feeling finds its most natural expression in vocal utterance, for the human heart is the source of both devotion and song.

From these considerations it follows that the tone quality, *tempo*, and rhythm of vocal music accompanied by the organ are more in conformity with the religious mood than is the character of orchestral instruments. The organ can indeed be sweeping and powerful, but its tone volume is always more even, and is not so subject to the arbitrary will of the player as is the orchestra. Orchestral instruments permit of a wide range in the division and subdivision, retarding, and acceleration of time—subtleties which are not conducive to the calm necessary for prayer. The same holds good with regard to rhythm. Just as the great flexibility, the frivolous or passionate character of irregular rhythm in general are expressive of a worldly, superficial, and restless mood, so is reposeful and symmetrical rhythm expressive of and conducive to a prayerful mood. A slow and orderly movement is more in keeping with the nature of the organ. It was not by accident that the measured rhythm of Gregorian chant was early abandoned, nor is it desirable to interpret in too mechanical a rhythm even the polyphonic works of the old masters. The more the purely mechanical element yields to the expression of the religious mood, the more suitable the performance becomes for church. On the other hand, a delicately defined measure is æsthetically preferable to excessive freedom. Another element of the highest importance in church music, which is indeed generally suggested by the text, is the interrelation between the melodic phrases, the rhythmical proportion or symmetry between the various parts of the composition: these seem to conform externally to the breathing of the singers and internally to the emotions of the pious heart, while the measure is solely a means to regulate time.

Finally must be considered, as one of the distinctive attributes of church music, the character of the Gregorian modes. The modes, which have most in common with our modern minor key and contain the interval of the minor third, the symbol of moderation and restraint, greatly predominate in Gregorian chant.

Harmonic music has gradually narrowed down to the two modes or keys, major and minor: the major key has freer motion, greater brightness and decision, while the minor scale in its lower portion has a hesitating and mysterious character, and resembles the major only in its upper section. This hesitation and mysteriousness happily express in church music the modesty and humility of the worshipper. Even those Gregorian modes (F and G) which have most resemblance to our major scale lose that character in their upper portion. The major character, as we have it in our C major scale, occurs very seldom in Gregorian chant. The self-restraint so delicately conveyed in the church modes completely disappears in the apparently boundless freedom and stormy movement of concert music. The latter makes use of the chromatic element, modulation from one key into another, tone colour, the various forms of composition (sonata, etc.), and every other artistic means to carry the hearer from one mood to another and finally to heighten the impression to the degree of passion. As such purposes are foreign to church music, it makes of these means, whenever it employs them, a different use. It will be remembered that the contrapuntal vocal school, at one period in its history, also degenerated into artificality and the cultivation of form for its own sake, but this abuse was not only reproved by the Church, but also remedied by repeated reforms since the Council of Trent.

Various Parts of the Divine Service.—The Church has frequently legislated concerning even the smallest details of the liturgy. In connexion with the Mass, the centre of Catholic worship, the service of various arts are utilized—architecture, with its decorative and plastic elaborations, symbolic action at the altar with the accompanying vestments and sacred vessels, the significant liturgical prayers, and finally the chant carried on the waves of the organ. All these, including the music, are regulated by ecclesiastical precepts. The intonations of the celebrant and his ministers, the Orations, Epistle, Gospel, Preface, Pater Noster, Dominus vobiscum, Ite missa est, must be unaccompanied—at most the pitch may be given. The reponses of the choir or the people may be accompanied on the organ. The choir sings the Kyrie, Gloria, and Credo. In these as in all liturgical texts, the omission, transposition, alteration, substitution, or awkward combination of the words (even in inserted pieces, e. g. the Ave Maria at the Offertory, after the proper offertory has been recited) is forbidden. On the other hand, the occasional repetition of words, as an artistic necessity, is permitted. It is allowed in most cases for sufficient reason (e. g. fatigue or inability of the singers) to recite in an audible voice certain texts with subdued organ accompaniment, or to alternate recitation with singing. The Credo, however, must be sung always in its entirety, and that in a particularly distinct manner, and the celebrant may not continue the liturgical action during its performance. (Furthermore must be sung the first and last verse of the hymns and everything wherein genuflection is prescribed or which contains an intercession, as is the case with the Dies irae.) The intonations of the priest should never be repeated by the choir. The Kyrie, a cry for mercy, must never degenerate into a brilliant operatic performance, nor should the Credo, an open profession of faith, become an occasion for artistic display; besides being utterly inappropriate, this style tends towards excessive length. In general the Credo, sung to one of the Gregorian melodies, with possibly a harmonized setting of the Et incarnatus est and finale, is decidedly preferable to an exclusively figured composition. In the Gloria the music may show brilliancy, but it must be noted that not only joy, but also deep devotion and humble petition (Qui tollis . . .) are contained in the text. A very great abuse consists in the endless repetitions, which in some instances consume as much as ten minutes. Of the other invariable parts of the mass, the Sanctus should be of reasonable length, so that the celebrant may have to wait as little as possible. If the organ be played during the Elevation, it must be done softly and in a reverent manner. The Benedictus must breathe the spirit of adoration, while the following Hosanna gives moderate expression to jubilation. In the Agnus Dei the tenderest pleading of the heart must find subdued expression.

The Proper, or variable parts of the Mass, must never be changed by the choir. The recitation of the Introit has never been explicitly allowed: in any event, the Gloria Patri must be sung, on account of the enjoined inclination on the part of the celebrant and people. As in the Grâdual with the adjoined parts, the organ prelude and alternation between chanters and choir create an agreeable contrast. In the Tract and Sequence, on account of their great length, the reciting of certain parts is desirable. To omit parts of the text, even in the lengthy Lauda Sion or Dies irae, is forbidden. If the Gradual, Tract, and Sequence be set to figured music, it must be done in accordance with the spirit of the text. The Gregorian melodies to these texts offer to the composer the best possible models for imitation. After the proper offertory text has been sung or recited, a motet to approved words may be sung, provided the celebrant be not too long detained thereby. The same applies to any antiphon or motet in honour of the Blessed Sacrament, which may be sung with the Benedictus after the Elevation. Silence on the part of the organ between the Pater Noster and the following Per omnia is desirable. If Holy Communion be given, a short motet with approved Latin text may be inserted. The chants of the Requiem Mass may be accompanied on the organ in an unobtrusive manner. (The use of the organ is also permitted during Advent and Lent, but only for the accompaniment of the chant. On feast days and on Gaudete and Lætare Sundays, it may be used as usual.)

Passing over various other liturgical functions, we shall say a word about Solemn Vespers and Compline. Nothing may be abbreviated or omitted in the Vespers of the day (or the Votive Vespers, when allowed), and no psalm may be sung otherwise than antiphonally. *Falsi-bordoni,* alternating with a Gregorian melody, are successfully used in many places. The repetitions of the antiphons and certain verses of the hymn and Magnificat may be recited. The hymn may also be performed in figured settings, but musical forms, differing widely from the general character of the Gregorian chant, are to be avoided in all parts of the liturgy. On these points the "Motu proprio" of Pius X says: "The different parts of the Mass and Office must retain, even musically, that particular concept and form which ecclesiastical tradition has assigned to them, and which is admirably expressed in Gregorian chant. Different, therefore, must be the method of composing an introit, a gradual, an antiphon, a psalm, a hymn, a Gloria in excelsis.

"In particular the following rules are to be observed:

"(a) The Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, etc. of the Mass must preserve the unity of composition proper to their text. It is not lawful, therefore, to compose them in separate pieces in such a way that each of such pieces may form a complete composition in itself, and be capable of being detached from the rest and substituted by another.

"(b) In the office of Vespers it should be the rule to follow the 'Cæremoniale Episcoporum', which prescribes the Gregorian chant for the psalmody, and permits figured music for the versicles of the Gloria Patri and the hymn.

"It will, nevertheless, be lawful on the greater solemnities to alternate the Gregorian chant of the

choir with the so-called *falsi-bordoni* or with verses similarly composed in a proper manner.

"It may also be allowed sometimes to render the single psalms in their entirety in music, provided the form proper to psalmody be preserved in such composition, that is to say, provided the singers seem to be psalmodizing among themselves, either with new motifs or with those taken from the Gregorian chant based upon it.

"The psalms known, as *di concerto*, are therefore for ever excluded and prohibited.

"(c) In the hymns of the Church the traditional form of the hymn is preserved. Thus, it is not lawful to compose, for instance, a 'Tantum ergo' in such wise that the first strophe presents a romanza, a cavatina, an adagio, and the 'Genitori' an allegro.

"(d) The antiphons of the Vespers must be, as a rule, rendered with the Gregorian melody proper to each. Should they, however, in some special case, be sung in figured music they must never have either the form of a concert melody or the fulness of a motet or a cantata."

All this shows not only the great solicitude of the Church to foster worthy ecclesiastical music, but also the reasonableness of her regulations on the matter. Greater latitude is given at benediction services. It is lawful to sing hymns in the vernacular before the Blessed Sacrament exposed, but, immediately before the Benediction, the "Tantum ergo" and "Genitori" must be sung in Latin, either to a Gregorian melody or to a devotional figured setting, as a liturgical close. During and after the removal of the Blessed Sacrament, it is permitted to sing in the vernacular. An antiphon or hymn in honour of the Blessed Virgin may also be sung, but only after the reposition. If litanies (sanctioned by the Church or the ordinary) be sung, there must be no omissions, although the invocations may be taken in groups of three, followed by one *Ora pro nobis*. As in the case of the "Tantum ergo", all prescribed liturgical chants, like the "Te Deum", must be sung in Latin: any text chosen on the choir's own initiative, however, may be sung in the vernacular.

SINGING BY THE PEOPLE.—Singing by the people, so widely customary at different devotions (Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, low Mass, etc.), requires special mention. The participation of the people in the singing of the Gregorian chant has been discussed under CONGREGATIONAL SINGING. Singing in the vernacular may not be substituted for the latter. This abuse crept in after the Reformation, and flourished in the eighteenth century, particularly in Germany and adjacent countries. The wish of the Church is that this abuse should be everywhere extirpated, while violence to local customs be avoided. But Pius X has expressed himself warmly in favour of singing by the people within proper limits (e. g., in his endorsement of the endeavours of the Società italiana per la musica populare), and is far from being opposed to such in extra-liturgical services. Naturally, it would be undesirable to accustom the people to sing rather than pray, but well-ordered singing by the congregation is always edifying and devotional. In his psalm against the Donatists, which he intentionally couched in popular form, St. Augustine had an absolutely practical object. Greek and Latin hymnody is to a certain extent even more specially intended to be sung by the people than the Gregorian chant. Hymns in the vernacular were widely employed (e. g., by the early apostles of Germany) to wean the people from the pagan songs to which they were accustomed, and to initiate them in an agreeable manner into the mysteries of the Faith. The oldest of these hymns are lost to us, but we possess a Latin translation of a ninth-century hymn written in honour of St. Gall by the monk Ratpert and sung in church by the people. Of the "Wessobrunner Gebet" the German text has been preserved; of the "Petruslied" (also ninth-century) we possess the melody, the notation of which, however, is difficult to determine exactly. The frequent pilgrimages and the religious plays subsequently fostered singing among the people, while the invention of printing afforded a means for the universal propagation of popular hymns. Even Luther and Melanchthon testify to the general use of German hymns before their time. The Protestant custom of singing hymns in the vernacular, instead of the liturgical chant, reacted upon Catholics, and found its way even into the *missa cantata*.

The development of congregational singing is of early origin. St. Augustine tells us (Conf. vii, 9) that St. Ambrose introduced it in his own diocese from the Orient, and that it soon spread throughout the Western Church. Ambrose modified the still classic Latin metre to meet the popular requirements, while Augustine abandoned it altogether, to get, as he said, nearer to the people. So far we have been concerned only with the antiphonal singing of Latin psalms and hymns, although the people sang in addition the short responses to the liturgical intonations of the celebrant in solemn services. From this latter practice it is likely that the congregational song developed, at first by applying to the long neums of the "Kyrie" and the jubilations of the "Alleluia" first Latin texts, then texts in the vernacular, and finally by original compositions in imitation of the hymns and litanies. The later hymns in the vernacular may be defined (cf. Bäumker) as strophically arranged sacred songs in the vulgar tongue, which, because of their ecclesiastical character, are suitable to be sung by the whole congregation, and have been either expressly approved for this purpose by ecclesiastical authority, or at least tacitly admitted. The sacred song meditates on truths of religion, gives expression to a lyric religious mood, or rehearses, in the form of a litany, praises or petitions (e. g., pilgrimage of songs). According to Kornmüller, the requisites for a good sacred song are a genuinely ecclesiastical character and doctrine, lyric musical expression, and popular, but at the same time poetic, language. Before the advent of Luther about one hundred church hymns were in general use in Germany. These early hymns are simple, greatly resemble the Gregorian chant in melody, and are grave and noble in expression. The later development (seventeenth and eighteenth centuries) was on the whole unpropitious, but in recent years the reform initiated by Meister, Bäumker, and Dreves, has been attended with gratifying success.

WOMEN IN CHURCH CHOIRS.—In connexion with singing in the vernacular it is necessary to advert briefly to the question of women's participation in choirs. As the injunction of the Apostle that woman keep silence in church was never made applicable in the matter of her participation in the singing of the congregation, and as in religious communities of women the liturgical chant has to be performed by women, we may take it for granted that in our ordinary lay choirs, representing the congregation, the participation of women is not forbidden. The following words from the "Motu proprio" have, however, caused a great deal of uncertainty: "With the exception of the melodies proper to the celebrant at the altar and to his ministers, which must always be sung only in Gregorian chant and without the accompaniment of the organ, all the rest of the liturgical chant belongs to the choir of levites; therefore, singers in church, even when they are laymen, are really taking the place of the ecclesiastical choir." "On the same principle it follows that singers in church have a real liturgical office, and that, therefore, women, as being incapable of exercising such office, cannot be admitted to form part of the choir or of the musical chapel. Whenever, then, it is desired to employ the acute voices of sopranos and contraltos, these parts must be taken by boys, according to the most ancient usage of the

Church." But the Holy Father speaks here (as in the beginning) of the choir of levites, among whom laymen may be included, and declares soon after these quoted words that it is becoming for them to wear the ecclesiastical habit and surplice. But our ordinary lay choir represents not only the congregation, but also the official choir, without wishing to play the rôle of "levites"; for this reason it is not stationed in the sanctuary, and no one would think of proposing that its members, like acolytes, should wear the ecclesiastical habit. The lay choir is simply a substitute for the absent *chorus cantorum*, in the liturgical sense, as is the nun for the absent acolyte when she supplies from a distance the responses to the celebrant during the celebration of Mass.

Consequently, the presence of women in choirs is excusable under certain circumstances, although choirs composed of men and boys are for many reasons preferable. It is true that an inquiry about this point received an apparently negative answer on 18 Dec., 1908, but this was in regard to the conditions described in the inquiry (*prout exponitur*), and it is added that the Decree is to be understood in the sense that the women must be kept entirely separate from the men, and every precaution taken to render impossible all conduct unbecoming to the sacred edifice. From these clauses it appears that, in principle, choirs composed of men and women are not inadmissible; however, the desirability of banishing every possible occasion of indecorousness from the church renders it preferable to employ boys, rather than women, in choirs. The employment of women as soloists is all the more questionable, since solos in church are admissible only within certain limits (Motu proprio). A choir composed of women only is not forbidden (Decree of 17 Jan., 1908). To employ non-Catholics in church as singers and organists is only tolerated in case of urgent necessity, because they neither believe nor feel the words which they sing.

Reform in Practice.—The decadence of the Gregorian chant is to be ascribed primarily to the development of and preference given to polyphony. To this cause is due the disappearance from the chant of its original rhythm and the serious neglect of its simpler form. Even before the Council of Trent, ecclesiastical authority had repeatedly raised its voice against the abuses which had crept into polyphonic music. The Gregorian melodies, however, even in the hands of the contrapuntists, retained their character in a wonderful manner. Nevertheless, the contrast between the two kinds of music led, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, to an abbreviation of the long melismatic passages, to a different application of the text, and to many less important modifications (Graduale Medicæum). Many other editions, edited according to the same principle, followed until the revised "Medicæa" (printed in Ratisbon) became in 1878 the official chant book of the Church (cf. Decreta auth., n. 3830). Meanwhile, the liturgical researches of the Benedictines of Solesmes had led (since 1903–4) to the general restoration, in the Vatican edition, of the chant from the manuscripts of the twelfth century. Endeavours to restore the earlier neumed texts (tenth-century), mainly on account of the primitive rhythm, have so far met with little success.

The "Motu proprio" of Pius X had for its main purpose the reform of church music in general, and covers about the same ground as the "Regolamento per la musica sacra", which the Congregation of Sacred Rites issued under Leo XIII, but which applied more particularly to Italy (Decr. auth., loc. cit.). On the basis of these regulations, with which the earlier precepts and the modern decrees are in entire agreement, composers, singers, critics, and theorists are to carry on their work of reform. They constitute the principle which the Cäcilienverein (Cecilian Society) has long endeavoured to put into practice in Germany, Italy, North America, and elsewhere. Dr. F. X. Witt, burning with zeal for the cause of reform, founded this society in 1868, and, shortly after its papal approbation, became its first president. The object of the society is to cultivate the chant, polyphony, hymns in the vernacular, organ-playing, and orchestral music in conformity with the regulations of the Church. The reform endeavours were by no means confined to Germany, but extended to Holland, Italy, the United States, etc. The introduction of the Vatican edition of the chant has been, since the decree of Pius X, the main object of the society's activity. In the restoration and worthy performance of the traditional chant, the Benedictines have, even before the publication of Dom Pothier's work (Les mélodies grégoriennes, 1880), displayed the greatest zeal. Thus, the fathers of Solesmes in France, Beuron in Germany, St. Anselm in Rome, Maredsous in Belgium, Prague and Seckau in Austria, co-operate with the Cecilians of every part of the world in carrying out the wishes of the Holy Father and the bishops in regard to the reform of church music. Every one is under obligation to do what he can in his own particular field.

It is well to state briefly in didactic form what the Church really means by progressive reform. A first requisite is the recognition that the chant, as the true music of the Church, must be studied and performed with the greatest care. Whenever difficulties stand in the way of the introduction of the Vatican edition, the bishops will take such measures as are in conformity with the will of the pope. Schools for church music are to be founded and fostered. The "Motu proprio" (viii, 27, 28) says: "Let care be taken to restore, at least in the principal churches, the ancient *schola cantorum*, as has been done with excellent fruit in many places. It is not difficult for a zealous clergy to institute such *scholæ*, even in the minor and country churches—nay, in them they will find a very easy means for gathering around them both the children and the adults to their own profit and the edification of the people. Let efforts be made to support and promote in the best way possible the higher schools of sacred music where these already exist, and to help in founding them where they do not. It is of the utmost importance for the Church herself to provide for the instruction of its masters, organists, and singers according to the true principles of sacred art." In a similar sense it is the will of the Holy Father that in the study of liturgy attention should be directed to the principles governing liturgical music, and that æsthetic appreciation should be fostered. Singers must ever be humbly submissive to their pastor, and especially to the episcopal commission, and may never entertain the notion that the chant can be sung without due preparation, as though it were a question of merely singing the notes. Courses in the chant are given in various centres, and excellent books of instruction exist in great numbers (e. g., Singenberger's "Guide to Church Music"). To mention only one point, it is important to master, in accordance with the instructions of the Benedictines, the proper rhythmical divisions of periods and phrases as well as the *legato* delivery of the long jubilations.

In general, it is now-a-days impossible to do entirely without polyphonic music. It constitutes a welcome means of giving splendour to feast-days, but is a source of danger if over-indulged in. The works of some of the best masters of polyphony have been made accessible for study and execution by excellent editions (e. g., the works of Palestrina in Haberl's edition). There is certainly no dearth of compositions in the modern homophonic style; we have but to consult the catalogue of the Cecilian Society or the above-named "Guide". It is better to produce repeatedly a few compositions within the capacity of the choir than to introduce new works frequently, without completely mastering them. Critics who write on church music,

composers, and choir-directors, should familiarize themselves with the spirit and regulations of the Church in regard to music by means of the numerous theoretical manuals. It is the spirit which vivifies; the form serves merely to give it expression. Without studying the liturgy (at least, that part of it directly connected with the music) and the texts in the original or an easily procured translation, it is impossible to penetrate into this spirit. The Church may claim our ready allegiance and respect for the laws and regulations which she, for grave reasons and to deal with existing conditions, has enacted.

In theoretical and artistic questions, however, everyone enjoys freedom. Thus the Congregation of Rites has declared in regard to the official chant (and this declaration is of course still in force): "While students of the chant always have enjoyed full freedom, a privilege which they will not be deprived of in the future, to ascertain by scientific research what was the primitive form of the chant, and what modifications it has undergone in subsequent periods (a very laudable inquiry analogous to that being prosecuted by learned scholars into the primitive rites and other departments of the liturgy), only that form of the chant which His Holiness has proposed to us, and which has been approved by the Congregation of Sacred Rites, may to-day be considered as authoritative and legitimate" (Decr. auth., n. 3830). As for composers, they should never try to foist upon the faithful productions which do not conform to the intentions of the Church, even if the music in itself be beautiful, nor should they aim at a mere display of their own powers thereby to gain fame and merely delight their hearers. They should, on the contrary, endeavour to imitate in their compositions the simplicity and objectivity of the chant, and learn from it to accommodate themselves to the capacity of ordinary choirs. With these considerations before him, the choir-director has to choose his music, penetrate into its spirit so that he may be able to impart the same to his singers, who must sing not only correctly but also with devotion. Order and discipline among the performers are important factors in obtaining the desired results. According to the "Motu proprio", "only those are to be admitted to form part of the musical chapel of a church who are men of known purity and probity of life, and these should by their modest and devout bearing during the liturgical functions show that they are worthy of the holy office they exercise." Inasmuch as the impression produced by a performance depends greatly on the interpretation, it is incumbent upon the choir-master to insist upon distinct pronunciation of the words, a noble tone quality, and a simple expression of the mood. Church music should be free from exaggerated and extravagant expression of joy or sorrow, sentimental yearning, and theatrical effects of every kind; it should be the utterance of fervent prayer springing from faith and charity. The good intention of the singers will not only find its eternal reward, it will also evoke gratitude and respect.

The twofold aspect of the principle laid down by the Sacred Congregation for our guidance in the matter of singing in the vernacular is expressed as follows: "The Congregation urgently admonishes that hymns in the vernacular no matter of what character, should gradually and unostentatiously be eliminated from liturgical functions. On the other hand, pious hymns to approved texts, which are extensively employed, particularly in Germany, during different devotions and before the Blessed Sacrament exposed, are by no means prohibited" (3 April, 1883; Krutscheck, 3rd ed., pp. 151, 177). Songs in the vernacular, alternating with prayer, are suitable during low Mass (within narrow limits, however), benediction, but especially during processions outside of the church. An excellent means for fostering this desirable practice is the careful training of the school children, whose singing need not, however, be confined to hymns in unison, and who also may be allowed to perform occasionally more elaborate compositions in two or more parts. The singing, however, should not be permitted to gain precedence over prayer. The hymn-book should at the same time be a prayer-book, and praying aloud should alternate with the singing. It is important that the sense and spirit of the hymns be carefully explained to the children. The performance should be free from dragging and slurring, faults which should be strongly discouraged by the organist. Arbitrary, unindicated pauses should be avoided. The children, especially, should be taught to respond to the celebrant at the altar; this is the only way to educate the congregation gradually to do the same thing. No one exercises a greater influence in the reform of church music than the organist, provided he be animated by the spirit of the Church. His playing should be, like the chant of the Church, simple and grave, devotional and objective. Song preludes and intermezzi during liturgical functions are forbidden. The organ must be subordinate to the singing, must support and not drown it. The purely vocal style is the ideal of the Church. The papal choir, the Sistine, has always excluded instrumental music. The more humble and subordinate the rôle of the organist, the more faithful and conscientious he should be in filling it. He should never occupy the front of the stage, scandalize the faithful by trashy improvizations, or keep the celebrant waiting. In extra-liturgical functions, however, he may move somewhat freely. It is decidedly preferable to play the works of good masters than to improvize. In preparing for a great liturgical function, he should aim at giving suitable and full expression to the spirit of the day, the feast, and circumstance. Unceasing practice is indispensable, especially to the musician of mediocre talent, even though he always keep the text before him. He must be able to perform this with absolute sureness, mastery, and freedom. He must know how to modulate from one key into another, how to proceed from one number to another, what key to choose for the hymns sung by the congregation, how to transpose the chant from one key into another, how to combine the organ stops, and (to a certain extent at least) how to improvize and to harmonize at sight. Under no circumstances must he permit himself to carry reminiscences of the concert and opera into the church.

As to the use of instruments, other than the organ, we should remember that the special permission of the ordinary is necessary, and that their nature must always be in keeping with the occasion and the place. The employment of a full orchestra forms an exception (cf. Motu proprio, cited above). The wisdom of these restrictions has been cheerfully recognized by such unprejudiced authorities as Wagner and Beethoven—a fact which cannot be too often stated. The former maintained that "genuine church music should be produced only by voices, except a 'Gloria' or similar text." As early in his career as 1848 this master ascribed the decadence of church music to the use of instruments. "The first step toward the decadence of genuine Catholic church music was the introduction of orchestra instruments. Their character and independent use have imparted to religious expression a sensuous charm, which has proved very detrimental, and has affected unfavourably the art of singing itself. The virtuosity of instrumentalists provoked imitation on the part of singers, and soon a worldly and operatic taste held full sway in church. Certain parts of the sacred text, e. g. the 'Kyrie Eleison', became a vehicle for operatic arias, and singers trained for Italian opera were engaged as church singers" (Gesammelte Werke, II, 335). Every reform has, in accordance with the will of the Church, to be carried out in such a manner that a greater evil may not result—that is, gradually and without causing unnecessary friction (*sensim sine*

sensu), but yet with firmness, regardless of one's personal views. Moral necessity alone dispenses from a command of the Church. It must be considered as progress when features either forbidden or discouraged by the Church (e. g., hymns in the vernacular during liturgical functions, the use of orchestral instruments, women in choirs) are no longer fostered, and when one abuse after another is gradually reduced to a minimum. Those in charge should not cater to the false ideas of the people, but should make every effort by the performance of better compositions to ennoble popular taste. Offence is perhaps most easily given, when old and favourite hymns, though of an inferior quality, are withdrawn: modern hymn-books, however, contain such an abundance of excellent melodies that many an undesirable hymn is discarded without difficulty. The fundamental conditions for success are a good choir of men and boys, a capable organist, and a judicious choice of masses and other compositions by the choir-director.

The Vatican chant, however, presents difficulties of a special nature. It is true that mere recitation on a straight tone may in some cases be resorted to. It has also been customary from time immemorial to assign to a few chosen singers the more difficult passages. In regard to the rhythm, accent, and other points we now know the precise intentions of the Holy See. The "Acta Apostolicæ Sedis" (1910, pp. 145 sq.) contains a letter from the Prefect of the Congregation of Rites to the president of the German Cäcilienverein, which by this publication becomes binding on all. In this letter the direction is given that the rhythmical interpretation of the Vatican edition is to be in accordance with the rules laid down in the preface to the Graduale. The wish is also expressed that no contrary methods should be advocated in the press, as they would only cause confusion and retard the progress of music reform. Theoretic discussions seem not to have been prohibited, except in so far as they might interfere with the introduction of the Vatican edition (cf. the decree of the Congregation of Rites quoted above, which was issued under similar conditions—Decr. auth., n. 3830). A considerable latitude is allowed in the interpretation of the document. The attempts, disapproved of by the Holy Father, are characterized in a rather mild manner; critics are asked to abstain from attempting that which, in the present state of archæological studies, can have no other result than to spread confusion and divert attention from the real work of restoring the Gregorian chant to its rightful place. In spite of the many differences of opinion, we should make every effort to introduce the Vatican edition in conformity with the will of the pope. By studying the symmetrical construction of the melodies in the light of the explanations of the Benedictines, which are undoubtedly of high æsthetic value, the execution becomes not only much easier but the profound beauty of the chant is revealed to us.

Religious Music.—Finally that class of religious music which may not be placed in the same category with real church music, must be mentioned. The masses by Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven have already been spoken of. The musical interpretation of the text and their operatic form render them little suited to the church. We must also name the older Protestant masters, John Sebastian Bach and G. F. Handel, whose works for Protestant services undoubtedly deserve to be studied by the church musician. The greater latitude accorded to organ playing in the Protestant cult has given occasion to the highest productions of contrapuntal and harmonic art. We must not lose sight of the fact, however, that the predominance in their works of the instrumental element, with its obtrusive arias, duets, and choruses, is in opposition to the spirit of the Catholic liturgy, which finds a more suitable medium of expression in the purely vocal style. John Sebastian Bach (b. at Eisenach, 1685; d. at Leipzig, 1750) has also set Catholic liturgical texts to music. His mass in B minor is considered one of his greatest works, among which his oratorio, the "Passion according to St. Matthew", must be also included. Among his other compositions for Sundays and festivals, preludes and fugues hold a prominent place. He was also distinguished in the field of chamber music. George Frederick Handel (b. at Halle, 1685; d. at London, 1759) devoted his powers first to the opera and later to the oratorio. He also wrote "Te Deums", psalms, fugues, and concerti for the organ, which, like Bach's sacred works, suggest the lofty purpose of the older masters, but do not fulfil the requirements of the Church. The musical fame of these masters is thereby in nowise diminished. The church hymn or chorale, which, with the cantata and oratorio, is essential to the Protestant cult, is a development in popular form of the singing of the Gregorian chant by the congregation.

The oratorio, which Handel brought to the highest degree of perfection (Messiah, Judas Maccabeus, Israel in Egypt, etc.), stands midway between secular and liturgical music. Originally intended as an ethical-religious reaction against the Florentine opera, it treats Biblical and legendary themes in a lyric-dramatic form, but without dramatic action. It consists of recitations, arias (duets, trios, quartets), and choruses with a brilliant orchestral accompaniment. On account of its semi-operatic form the oratorio is not available for church purposes, although it was customary in former times to perform settings of the Passion in church on Good Friday. The cantata (perfected by Bach) is more lyric and less epic in style with a somewhat more modest instrumentation. The cantata and oratorio are both developments from the antiphonal sacred chants and the mystery plays of the Middle Ages. Side by side with polyphony existed the folk-song in the vernacular and also more pretentious compositions, such as the lays of the troubadours, minnesingers, and mastersingers, and the madrigal. The folk-song of olden times, springing directly from and resembling the music of the Church, was often employed as *motif* or *cantus firmus* in masses and other liturgical compositions, a proceeding which would not be allowed now-a-days. Christian pilgrims were wont to sing antiphonally hymns having for their burthen the life and death of our Saviour and similar subjects. The dramatic element inherent in these subjects was contained in the liturgy itself. It had only to be brought into conjunction with epical recitation or narrative and song in order to develop into the mystery plays, which had their secular counterparts. As far back as the eleventh century these mystery plays on feast-days served to present to the people in dramatic form the Passion, Resurrection, and Last Judgment. Their original home was the church and the monastery, from which they had later to be banished. The secular and semi-ecclesiastical or simply religious music of the Middle Ages had a decisive influence in the transformation of polyphonic music into the harmonic or homophonic, and a comparison between the various styles is a great aid in determining the character of genuine church music.

It is as important to-day as ever that we carefully distinguish between simply religious music—be it never so beautiful, artistic, and conducive to private devotion—and that kind of music which the Church requires for her services. Outside of the Church each one may sing such melodies to religious texts as best satisfy his own pious mood; he may even indulge his æsthetic predilections in choosing his hymns. The house of God, however, demands an entirely different attitude; we must realize that we are there to pray, that we may not force our personal mood on our fellow Christians, but that, on the contrary, we must follow with devout attention and pious song, according to the

will and in the spirit of the Church, the liturgical action at the altar. And, in according to the Church our filial obedience, we need entertain no fear that she, the venerable mother and protector of the arts, will assign to music a function unworthy of its powers.

KRUTSCHEK, *Die Kirchenmusik nach dem Willen der Kirche* (5th ed., Ratisbon, 1901); SINGENBERGER, *Guide to Catholic Church Music* (2nd ed., Milwaukee, 1905), published by order of the Provincial Council of Milwaukee; KORNMÜLLER, *Lex. der kirchl. Tonkunst* (2 parts, 2nd ed., Ratisbon, 1891–5); BÄUMKER, *Das kathol. Kirchenlied in seinen Singweisen* (3 vols., Freiburg, 1883–91); JUNGMANN, *Aesthetik* (Freiburg, 1886); GIETMANN, *Musik-Aesthetik* (Freiburg, 1900). Special mention must be made of the periodicals on Church music in German and French and to the American periodicals *Church Music* and *Cœcilia* (the organ of the American Cecilian Society), from which a great deal of theoretic and practical value may be gathered.

G. GIETMANN.

Musical Instruments in Church Services.—For almost a thousand years Gregorian chant, without any instrumental or harmonic addition, was the only music used in connexion with the liturgy. The organ, in its primitive and rude form, was the first, and for a long time the sole, instrument used to accompany the chant. It gave the pitch to the singers and added brilliancy and sonority. In secular music, however, instruments played an important rôle at an early date. It may be said that instrumental music developed simultaneously with secular music itself. The troubadours, trouvères, and jongleurs (who flourished in France, Italy, and Spain from the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries inclusive), and their English contemporaries, the minstrels or wayfarers, as well as the minnesingers in Germany during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, accompanied their chants and lyric improvisations on instruments. Among these were a diminutive harp, which was laid on the table while being played, the fiddle, also called *vielle* or *viola* (prototypes of our violin), the very ancient *crwth*, *crowd ar chrotta* (an instrument having originally three, but later five strings, now obsolete), and the hurdy-gurdy. The last two were more especially in use in Great Britain. Wind instruments, such as the flute in several forms, the trumpet, horn, sackbut (forerunner of our trombone), and others now obsolete were common with the wayfaring musicians. Instrumental music as an art, however, failed for a long time to gain the recognition of the educated and upper classes, chiefly because it served the purposes of the dance and mere entertainment almost exclusively, and also on account of the more or less vagabond character of most of its votaries. There was, nevertheless, constant progress both in the construction of the instruments and in a more and more widely-extended and skilful use of them. Princes maintained bands of musicians at their courts for their entertainments, and for giving zest and splendour to public festivities. Some of these early orchestras numbered as many as thirty or forty musicians. While it is certain that as early as the fifteenth century instruments besides the organ were used in connexion with polyphonic liturgical compositions, it has not been definitely ascertained to what extent such was the case, what passages were played by the instruments alone, and where they simply reinforced the voices. The difficulty in determining the precise nature of instrumental co-operation with the voices is increased by the fact that in those days the text was applied by the composer to only one voice—generally the *cantus*, or upper voice. In accordance with this model, the singers themselves applied the text to the other voices as they proceeded. At all events the instruments served at best only as a reinforcement or as substitute for the human voices and had no independent function in our modern sense. Furthermore, they were employed with sole reference to their pitch and not to their timbre, or tone-quality. Thus, instruments of the violin family and flutes would play with the high voices, sopranos and altos, whereas horns and trombones were assigned to the tenor and bass parts.

It was with the advent of monody (see HARMONY) that the use of instruments in connexion with the voices received a great impetus. The closely-knit, compact polyphonic structure which had predominated up to this time, needed no extraneous aid for its effectiveness and sonority. This was not the case with the new style of composition rapidly superseding the old school. It depended to a great extent for its tonal body and artistic existence on the aid of instruments. The great perfection reached in the construction of stringed instruments in the sixteenth century was both a manifestation of, and an aid to the growing tendency; virtuosity, not only on stringed, but also on wind instruments was a common accomplishment. The character and individuality of the instruments, so to speak, were being made available as means of expression for the subjective moods, dramatic feelings, and conceptions of the composer.

While all this development had, up to the first half of the sixteenth century, served mainly secular purposes, it was through Ludovico Grossi da Viadana (1564–1627) that the use of instruments became more common in churches. While choirmaster in Mantua and in Venice, this master published his "Cento concerti ecclesiastici", compositions to sacred texts, for one or more voices and *basso continuo*, or figured bass played on the organ and supplemented by violins, bass viols, and wind instruments, a species of composition in vogue before his time. A contemporary of Viadana, Giovanni Gabrieli (1557–1612), choirmaster of St. Mark's, Venice, went a considerable step farther than any one before him. He wrote not only numerous works for voices and instruments, but created works for instruments alone, and discovered the principle of modern orchestration by doubling the voices in octaves and applying the same process to the organ and other instruments. Another event which was destined to exercise a momentous influence, not only on the growth of the use of instruments but also on the future development of liturgical music itself, was the birth of opera with the first performance (1594) of Jacopo Peri's "Dafne" in Florence. This new art form, originating as it did with the humanistic spirit of the time and being a return to the musical and literary ideals of antiquity which enthralled the cultivated classes of the day, soon gained an enormous popularity and completely overshadowed all previously accepted ideals in popular favour. It was but a short time before the spirit and forms of the theatre, instruments and all, found their way into the Church. While formerly the spirit and form of church music dominated secular music (most early secular melodies which have come down to us belonging to one or the other of the Gregorian modes) it was now the spirit, taste, and passions of the world as expressed in opera which were in the ascendency and began to dominate the compositions to liturgical texts. It was natural that the people should like to hear in church the forms of composition which delighted them so much in the theatre. The severe simplicity of liturgical chant was set aside; polyphony was considered too formal and artificial. The spirit of universality animating them had to yield to the new style expressions of individual feeling enhanced by the sensuous charm of the instruments. That which was in accordance with the prevailing and growing taste of the generality was, if not desired, at least tolerated by those in authority, and there was no hindrance to the triumphal conquest by instrumental music which we have witnessed since.

New purely instrumental forms were developed and cultivated in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Italy, France, and especially in Germany, the most fruitful soil of all, until the symphony was evolved, through which the composer gives utterance to all the conflicting emotions which sway him. Peri, for the accompaniment of his first opera, "Dafne", used but a few instruments, namely, a

harpsichord (one of the predecessors of our modern pianoforte), a lute, a *viola da gamba* (forerunner of our violoncello), an archlute, or lute of a larger size, and a triple flute, while Claudio Monteverdi (1567–1643) employed in his opera "Orfeo" the formidable number of thirty-six instruments, as follows: two *clavicembali* (another primitive form of the pianoforte), two *contrabassi*, ten *viola da brazza* (violas), one double harp, two *violini piccolini alla Francese* (violins), two *organi di legno* (a sort of violin played or struck with the wood of the bow), three *bassi da gamba* (celli) four trombones, one *regale* (a portable organ with only one or two stops or registers), two *cornetti*, one *flautino* (small flute), one *clarino* (trumpet) and three *trombe sordine* (muted trumpets). While this was a formidable sonorous body, orchestration in our present day sense, that is, the utilization of the various instruments in accordance with their nature, tone quality, and compass, and their combination, with a view to the greatest variety of tone colour and sonority, was yet to be evolved. While Giovanni Carissimi (1604–74) in his oratorios, employs the instruments with more appreciation of their individuality than was manifested before him, it remained for his gifted pupil Alessandro Scarlatti (1657–1725), founder of the Neapolitan school, to establish the norm for the use of instruments, which remained unchanged for more than a hundred years. Scarlatti's orchestra for his oratorios and operas consisted of first and second violins, violas, violoncellos, basses, two oboes (from *hautbois*, "high wood" developed from the ancient *calamus*, "reed"; French, *chalumeau;* German, *schalmey*), two bassoons (corresponding to the oboes in the lower octaves), and two horns. This combination of instruments was still in vogue in the time of Haydn and Mozart, and was used in most of their works for the Church except that they sometimes added two flutes, two clarinets (woodwind instrument of ancient origin, so called on account of the resemblance of its tones to the high tones of the *clarino*, or trumpet), and two trumpets. In their operas and oratorios these and contemporary masters added *tympani* (kettle-drums) and three trombones.

The instrumental idea gained such a firm hold that a very large proportion of all the music written for the Church was with orchestral accompaniment. At cathedral and other churches large orchestras were permanently endowed, many of which survive today, notably in Dresden, Breslau, Freiburg-in-Baden, Munich, and Vienna. In innumerable other places, the world over, the orchestra, without being always present, would be called into service on festival occasions. Up to the middle of the nineteenth century it was considered by composers practically impossible to interpret musically the text of the Mass or requiem without calling to their aid all the resources and means of expression afforded by a complete orchestra. While Beethoven, in his "Mass in C" and "Missa solemnis", as well as Cherubini in his numerous works to liturgical texts, does not go beyond the so-called classical orchestra, that is, first and second violins, violas, cellos, basses, flutes, oboes, clarinets, bassoons, horns, trumpets, trombones, and kettle-drums, Liszt and Gounod in addition to these also employ the *piccolo* (small flute), *contrafagotto*, or bassoon bass, the harp, cymbals, and *tuba* (a brass instrument serving as a bass to the trombone family). The extreme limit in instrumental tone display in modern times was reached, however, in Hector Berlioz's "Requiem Mass", performed (1837) for the first time in Notre Dame, Paris. In this work all previous efforts in the way of tonal manifestation are far surpassed. Besides an orchestra of one hundred and thirty instruments, including sixteen kettle-drums, the author employs in the "Tuba mirum" four separate groups of brass instruments, typifying the trumpets calling from the four corners of the earth on the day of the Last Judgment. With this work, the last word of a mind and age which still believe but no longer adore, subjectivism finds its supreme manifestation, and the orchestra its most potent means of expression. The Church has never encouraged, and at most only tolerated, the use of instruments. She enjoins in the "Cæremoniale Episcoporum" that permission for their use should first be obtained from the ordinary. She holds up as her ideal the unaccompanied chant and polyphonic, *a capella*, style. The Sistine Chapel has not even an organ.

From time to time regulations have been issued governing the use of instruments and condemning existing abuses. In 1728 Benedict XIII rebuked a community of Benedictine nuns in Milan for using other instruments than the organ during high Mass and Vespers. He also forbade the Franciscans to use any other instrument than the organ in their conventual churches. Benedict XIV in his encyclical "Annus qui nunc vertentem" (19 February, 1749) tolerates only the organ, stringed instruments, and bassoons. Kettle-drums, horns, trombones, oboes, flutes, pianos, and mandolins are prohibited. In the "Regolamento" of 1884, flutes, trombones, and kettle-drums are permitted on account of the improved manner in which they are now used as compared with former times. In the name of Gregory XVI, the Cardinal-Vicar of Rome, Patrizi, prohibited (1842) the use of instruments in the Roman churches, with the exception of a few to be used in a becoming manner in accompanying the singing, and then only after permission had been secured from the proper authority. This order was renewed in 1856 by the same cardinal in the name of Pius IX. Pius X, in his "Motu proprio" on church music (22 November, 1903) in paragraph IV, says, "Although the music proper to the Church is purely vocal music, music with the accompaniment of the organ is also permitted. In some special cases, within due limits and with the proper regards other instruments may be allowed, but never without the special license of the ordinary, according to the prescription of the 'Cæremoniale Episcoporum'. As the chant should always have the first place, the organ or instruments should merely sustain and never suppress it. It is not permitted to have the chant preceded by long preludes, or to have it interrupted with intermezzo pieces", etc. Among those who have recently written, within the prescribed limits, works for voices and instruments for liturgical use, are, I. Mitterer, G. J. E. Stehle, M. Brosig, Max Filke, George Zeller, L. Bonvin, S.J., C. Greith, F. X. Witt, P. Griesbacher, J. G. Meuerer, and J. Rheinberger. The present trend is, however, decidedly away from the instrumental idea and back to the purely vocal style. And it is recognized, and in many places acted upon, that the new version of the liturgical chant, proposed to the Catholic world by Pius X, gains its full beauty and effectiveness only when sung without instrumental accompaniment of any kind.

KRUTSCHECK, *Die Kirchenmusik nach dem Willen der Kirche* (Ratisbon, 1897); RIEMANN, *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte*, II, pt. I (Leipzig, 1907); JUNGMANN, *Aesthetik* (Freiburg, 1886); NEFF, *Geschichte der deutschen Instrumentalmusik* (Leipzig, 1902); WOOLDRIDGE, *The Oxford History of Music*, II (1905); GIETMANN, *Musik-Aesthetik* (Freiburg, 1900).

JOSEPH OTTEN.

Musti, a titular see of Proconsular Africa, suffragan of Carthage. This town, which was a Roman *municipium* at an early date, is mentioned by Ptolemy, IV, 3, 33, the "Itinerarium Antonini", the Peutinger Table, and the Ravenna geographer, Vibius Sequester, who narrates the killing at this place of an enormous serpent by Regulus. Its ruins, called Mest Henshir, are seen in the vicinity of the *koubba* of the marabout Sidi Abd-er-Rehou, between Teboursouk and Keff (Tunis). Worthy of mention are two fine gates, and a triumphal arch. The inscriptions call

the inhabitants Musticenses or Mustitani; the latter name is also used by St. Augustine. In 411, at the time of the Carthage conference, Musti had besides two Donatist bishops (Felicianus and Cresconius) two Catholic bishops (Victorianus and Leontius). Antonianus was one of the bishops exiled by Huneric in 482. Musti was then included in Proconsular Numidia. In 646 Bishop Januarius signed the letter of the bishops of Proconsular Africa to Paul, Patriarch of Constantinople, against the Monothelites.

TOULOTTE, *Géogr. de l'Afrique chrétienne. Proconsulaire* (Rennes, 1892), 214–217; SMITH, *Dict. of Greek and Roman Geogr.*, s. v.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Musuros, MARKOS, learned Greek humanist, b. 1470 at Retimo, Crete; d. 1517 at Rome. The son of a rich merchant, he went, when quite young, to Italy, where he studied Greek at Florence, under the celebrated John Lascaris, whom he afterwards almost equalled in classical scholarship. In 1503 he became professor of Greek at Padua, where he taught with great success. Later at Venice, he lectured on Greek, at the expense of the republic, and became a member of the Aldine Academy of Hellenists. Musuros rendered valuable assistance to Aldus Manutius in the preparation of the earliest printed editions of the Greek authors, and his handwriting formed the model of Aldus's Greek type. He contributed greatly in giving to the Aldine editions the accuracy that made them famous, while his reputation as a teacher was such that pupils came from all countries to hear him lecture. Erasmus, who had attended his lectures at Padua, testifies to his wonderful knowledge of Latin. To his profound scholarship the editions of Aristophanes, Plato, Pindar, Hesychinus, Athenæus, and Pausanias owed their critical correctness. In 1499 he edited the first Latin and Greek lexicon, "Etymologicum Magnum", printed by Zacharias Callierges of Crete. In 1516 he was invited by Leo X to Rome, where he lectured in the pope's gymnasium and established a Greek printing-press. In recognition of the beautiful Greek poem prefixed to the *editio princeps* of Plato, Pope Leo appointed him Bishop of Malvasia (Monemvasia) in the Morea, but Musuros died before starting for his distant diocese. Besides numerous editions of different authors he wrote several Greek epigrams which with the elegy on Plato published in the Aldine edition (Venice, 1513) are about his only extant writings.

SANDYS, *History of Classical Scholarship*, II (Cambridge, 1908); LEGRAND, *Bibliographie hellénique*, I (Paris, 1885); DIDOT, *Alde Manuce* (Paris, 1875).

EDMUND BURKE.

Mutis, JOSÉ CELESTINO, eminent naturalist and scientist in South America, b. at Cadiz, Spain, 6 April, 1732; d. at Bogotá, Colombia, 2 Sept., 1808. Mutis studied medicine at Seville and Madrid and, from 1757, practised as a physician at Madrid, where he applied himself to botany. Soon afterwards he went to South America as physician-in-ordinary to the newly-appointed Viceroy of New Granada, Mesía de la Cerda (Marqués de la Vega). In November, 1760, he landed in Cartagena, and remained in New Granada for five decades. By his great zeal for science and his untiring and versatile activity, he became more and more the soul of all scientific undertakings in Spanish South America. Although he at first taught mathematics and, about the end of his life, founded an observatory in Bogotá and directed the same as astronomer, he devoted his energies almost wholly to researches in the natural history of New Granada, even continuing this work, when, in 1772, he became a cleric (priest?) and canon at the cathedral of Bogotá. During the first years of his life at Bogotá he had planned the botanical exploration of the whole country, intending to write a book on the flora of New Granada. For his researches he maintained substations at Cácota and La Montuosa, which Linné supposed to be situated in Mexico. He settled in Mariquita after he had been appointed in 1783 by Charles III, under the viceroy and Archbishop Gongora, leader of the "Expedición botánica del Nueva Reino de Granada", which was founded by the State. Here, as Alexander von Humboldt, an eyewitness, relates, Mutis laid out a plantation of cinchona. Mutis was obliged to train his whole staff of assistants (collectors, painters, engravers, etc.); he also taught several native botanists, e. g., Zea, Caldas, and Restrepo, furthermore his nephew and successor, Sinforoso Mutis. At that time, Mutis was widely known; Linné, who received from him South American plants and corresponded frequently with him, calls him "phytologorum americanorum princeps". Linné's son defined the *genus Mutisia* in 1781. The Spanish botanist Cavanilles lauded him in 1791 as "botanicorum facile princeps". At Bogotá, where he spent the last ten years of his life, the famous explorers Humboldt and Bonpland stayed with him for two months in 1801, filled with admiration for his rich collections. Their famous work, "Plantes equinoctiales" (1818), is adorned with a beautiful portrait of Mutis, and Humboldt erected a glorious monument to the American investigator by writing his biography ("Biographie universelle", XXX, Paris, 1821).

Subsequent generations were perhaps justified in judging Mutis less favourably, but it is unjust on the part of some critics to seek to degrade Mutis to the position of an unimportant amateur or to abuse him. Mutis committed the fault that he never ended his researches, and thus published almost nothing during his life-time. He, furthermore, had the misfortune to have his scientific legacy at first remain totally unnoticed in consequence of the political disorders of that time. His museum consisted of 24,000 dried plants, 5000 drawings of plants by his pupils, and a collection of woods, shells, resins, minerals, and skins. These treasures arrived safely at Madrid in 105 boxes, and the plants, manuscripts, and drawings were sent to the botanical gardens, where they were buried in a tool-house. Mutis's cinchona investigations render his work of lasting importance. While he was not the first to discover the genuine cinchona for New Granada—as became known with certainty only after his death—he rendered important services by his study of the cinchonas, their geographical distribution in Colombia, their species and varieties, and their utilization for medicine. This is shown by the trade, which developed in such a manner that (e. g.) the seaport of Cartagena alone exported from New Granada 1,200,000 pounds of cinchona bark in 1806, while previous to 1776 this country produced no quinquina at all. This is furthermore shown by Mutis's writings, which, however, were not printed in full until 1870. Mutis himself published in 1793 and 1794 a short monograph on cinchonas in "Diario de Santa Fe de Bogotá". A year later appeared "Observaciones y conocimientos de la quina" (in 4 numbers, 608–11, of "Mercurio Peruano de Lima", 1795). The above-mentioned Zea published sometime later "Memoria sobre la quina segun los principios del Señor Mutis" ("Anales de Historia Natural", Madrid, 1800). Mutis sent his chief work "El arcano de la quina" in manuscript to Madrid, but the war with France prevented its publication; in 1828 the Spanish physician Hernández de Gregorio edited the first three parts of this work with Mutis's portrait ("El arcano de la quina. Discurso que contiene la parte médica de las cuatro especies de quinas oficinalis", Madrid, 1828, 263 pages). The manuscript of the botanical-scientific part was discovered by Clements R. Markham in a shed in the botanical gardens of Madrid; he published it under the title: "Tabula synoptica ad specierum generis Chin-

chonæ determinationem. Quinilogiæ pars quarta" (edited in Markham, "The Cinchona species of New Granada", London, 1867). The tables, which Mutis selected for this work, were published in 1870 in facsimile by Triana ("Nouvelles études sur les Quinquina", Paris). Through these writings it became evident, as some special investigators confessed, that Mutis had penetrated deeply into the study of the cinchonas of Central Colombia. It may be mentioned that Mutis distinguished four species of cinchonas with an officinal bark, and he added to them twenty-four varieties. For other manuscripts of Mutis see Colmeiro; a part of Mutis's correspondence is to be found in the work: "A selection of the correspondence of Linnæus and other naturalists" (London, 1881).

COLMEIRO, *La Botánica y los Botánicos de la Península Hispano-Lusitana* (Madrid, 1858); MARKHAM, *Peruvian Bark* (London, 1880); SCHUMACHER, *Südamerikanische Studien* (Berlin, 1884).

M. ROMPEL.

Muzzarelli, ALFONSO, a learned Italian Jesuit, b. 22 August, 1749, at Ferrara; d. 25 May, 1813, at Paris. He entered the Jesuit novitiate on 20 October, 1768, and taught grammar at Bologna and Imola. After the suppression of the order in 1773 he received a benefice at Ferrara and, somewhat later, was made director of the Collegio dei Nobili at Parma. Pius VII summoned him to Rome, and appointed him theologian of the Pœnitentiaria. When Pius VII was exiled in 1809, Muzzarelli was also obliged to leave Rome and was transported to Paris, where he spent his remaining life at the convent of the Dames de Saint-Michel. He wrote numerous theological, philosophical, and ascetical works. His chief production is a collection of philosophico-theological treatises published repeatedly under the title "Il buon uso della Logica in materia di Religione" (6 vols., Foligno, 1787–9), with additions by the author (10 vols., Rome, 1807; 11 vols., Florence, 1821–3). The collection contains sketches on the theological questions of the day such as—abuses in the Church, the temporal power of the pope, religious toleration, ecclesiastical immunity, riches of the Church and its clergy, primacy and infallibility of the pope, auricular confession, religious orders, indulgences, Gregory VII, moral liberty, etc. This collection of treatises, with the exception of the last five, was translated into Latin by Zeldmayer de Buzitha ("Bonus usus logicæ in materia religionis", Kaschau, 1815–7). A French translation, containing 42 treatises, was published at Brussels in 1837. Two other important productions of Muzzarelli are: "L'Emilio disingannato" (4 vols., Siena, 1782–3) and "Confutazione del contratto sociale di Gian Jacopo Rousseau" (2 vols., Foligno, 1794) —the former is a refutation of Rousseau's "Emile", the latter of his "Contrat social". The most popular of Muzzarelli's many ascetical works is "Il mese di Maria o sia di Maggio" (Ferrara, 1785) of which about 100 editions have been issued (new ed., Bologna, 1901). It has been translated into English "The Month of Mary or the Month of May", London, 1848, 187. .); Spanish ("Las Vegas", New Mexico, 1887, 1888); Portuguese (Oporto, 1890); French (Paris, 1881, and often previously); Arabian (4 ed., Beyrouth, 1872); and adapted to the German (Mainz, 1883). Another little work that has been translated into English is: "Il buon uso delle vacanze" (Parma, 1798). Its English title is: "A Method of spending the Vacation profitably. Addressed to the Youth who frequent the Schools of the Society of Jesus" (London and Dublin, 1848).

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibl. de la C. de Jésus*, V (Brussels and Paris, 1894), 1488–1514; IX (1900), 708–710; HURTER, *Nomenclator.*

MICHAEL OTT.

Mykonos. See TINOS, DIOCESE OF.

Mylapur. See SAINT THOMAS OF MYLAPUR, DIOCESE OF.

Mylasa, a titular see of Asia Minor, suffragan of Aphrodisias, or Stauropolis, in Caria. This city, the ancient capital of Caria, was the home of the kings of the province before that honour passed to Halicarnassus. It was situated on a fertile plain at the foot of a mountain on which there are great quarries of the beautiful white marble which was used for the construction or decoration of the city's temples and other buildings. Mylasa was taken by Labienus in the civil wars. In the Græco-Roman period it enjoyed a season of brilliant prosperity, and the three neighbouring towns of Olymos, Labranda, and Euremos were included within its limits. Its finest temples were that dedicated to Zeus Osogoa, which recalled to Pausanias (VIII, x, 3) the Acropolis of Athens, and those of Zeus Karios and of Zeus Labrandenos, or Stratios (Strabo, XIV, ii, 23). Mylasa is frequently mentioned by the ancient writers. At the time of Strabo the city boasted two remarkable orators, Euthydemos and Hybreas. Various inscriptions tell us that the Phrygian cults were represented here by the worship of Sabazios; the Egyptian, by that of Isis and Osiris. There was also a temple of Nemesis.

Among the ancient bishops of Mylasa, was St. Ephrem (fifth century), whose feast was kept on 23 January, and whose relics were venerated in the neighbouring city of Leuke. Cyril and his successor, Paul, are mentioned by Nicephorus Callistus (Hist. eccl., XIV, 52) and in the Life of St. Xene. Le Quien mentions the names of three other bishops (Oriens christianus, I, 921), and since his time the inscriptions discovered refer to two others, one anonymous (C. I. G., 9271), the other named Basil, who built a church in honour of St. Stephen (Bulletin de correspondance hellénique, XIV, 616). The St. Xene referred to above was a noble virgin of Rome who, to escape the marriage which her parents wished to force upon her, donned male attire, left her country, changed her name of Eusebia to that of Xene (stranger), and lived first on the island of Cos, then at Mylasa. The site of the city is now occupied by a little village called Milas, in Mylassa, inhabited by a few hundred schismatic Greeks, and containing some fine ruins. The Cyclopean walls surrounding the sacred enclosure of the temple of Zeus Osogoa are still visible, as well as a row of fourteen columns. Pococke (Travels, II, 2), in the eighteenth century, saw the temple of Augustus and of Rome, the materials of which have since been taken by the Turks to build a mosque. There is also a two-storied tomb, called *Distega*, believed to be a simplified copy of the famous tomb of Mausolus, who was a native of Mylasa.

CHANDLER, *Asia Minor*, 234; LEAKE, *Asia Minor*, 230; FELLOWS, *Discoveries in Lycia*, 67; RAMSAY, *Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (London, 1890); IDEM, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* (Oxford, 1895); TEXIER, *Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1861), 648; LE BAS AND WADDINGTON, *Inscriptions d'Asie Mineure*, n. 380–482; *Bulletin de Correspondance hellénique*, I, 32–36; V, 31–41, 96–119; X, 433; XI, 459; XII, 8–37; XIV, 615–623; XV, 540–544; XIX, 615–623; XXII, 421–439; CALMELS in *Echos d'Orient*, II, 352–356; DESCHAMPS, *Sur les routes d'Asie* (Paris, 1894), 324 sq.

S. SALAVILLE.

Myndus, a titular see of Caria, suffragan of Stauropolis. This city, known through its coins and the quite frequent mention made of it by ancient historians and geographers, was inhabited by a Greek colony from Troezen. It was situated on the coast of Caria, lying a little northwest of Halicarnassus on the most northerly of the three Dorian peninsulas. Although a seaport and fortified town, its rôle was an unimportant one, the chief event in its history being that, aided by Halicarnassus, it repulsed an attack by Alexander the Great. The "Notitiæ episcopatuum" allude to it as late as the twelfth or thirteenth century as one of the suffragan sees of Stauropolis. However, only four of its bishops are known: Archelaus, who attended the Council of Ephesus in 431; Alphius, who assisted at the Council of Chalcedon in 451; John who was pres-

ent at the Council of Constantinople in 680; and another John who went to the Second Council of Nicæa in 787. Myndus is now the little port of Gümüshlü Liman (Liman-port) in the vilayet of Smyrna where the remains of a pier and some other ruins are to be seen.

LE QUIEN, *Oriens christ.*, I, 915; SMITH, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography*, s. v.; LEAKE, *Asia Minor*, 228.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Myra, a titular see of Lycia in Asia Minor. The city was from time immemorial one of the chief places in the province. It was situated on the banks of the River Andriacos, twenty stadia from the sea (Appian, "Bell. civil.", IV, 82; Strabo, XIV, iii, 7; Pliny, XXXII, 8; Ptolemy, V, vi, 3; Stephen of Byzantium, s. v.). The hamlet of Andriaca served as its port. On his way from Cæsarea to Rome St. Paul stayed at Myra (Acts, xxvii, 5); at least the "textus receptus" reads thus, but the Vulgate has substituted Lystra. The Codex Bezæ, the Gigas Bible, and the ancient Egyptian version also mention Myra after Patara of Lycia (Acts, xxi, 1). The "Acta Pauli" probably testify as to the existence of a Christian community at Myra in the second century (Harnack, "Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums", 465, 487). Le Quien (I, 965–70) opens his list of the bishops of this city with St. Nicander, martyred under Domitian about A. D. 95, and whose feast is celebrated 4 November (Acta SS., Nov., II, 225). As to St. Nicholas Thaumaturgus, venerated on 6 December, the "Index" of Theodorus Lector (sixth century) is the first document which inscribes his name among the fathers of Nicæa in 325 (Gelzer, "Patrum Nicænorum nomina", 67, n. 151). Theodosius II made the flourishing city of Myra the capital of Lycia and, it is said, erected there a church to St. Nicholas. Peter, Bishop of Myra composed in defence of the Council of Chalcedon writings quoted by St. Sophronius and by Photius (Bibliotheca, Codex 23). At the Sixth Œcumenical Council (787) two bishops of Myra, Theodore and Nicholas, assisted, one representing the orthodox party, the other the Iconoclasts.

Eubel ("Hierarchia catholica medii ævi", II, 1370) mentions five Latin titulars of the fifteenth century. At present Myra is only a village called Dembré in the sanjak of Adalia and the vilayet of Koniah. Its ruins are numbered among the most beautiful of Asia Minor. Among them are the remains of a temple of Apollo, mentioned by Pliny, those of a magnificent theatre, several burial-places hewn in the rock, with tombs inscribed in Lycian and Greek, some of them ornamented with bas-reliefs. Numerous Christian ruins are also found, among them those of the Church of St. Nicholas, around which Russians have recently erected a monastery.

FELLOWS, *Discoveries in Lycia*, I (London, 1857), 169; SPRATT AND FORBES, *Travels in Lycia*, I (London, 1847), 131; TEXIER, *Asie Mineure*, 691–94; RAMSAY, *St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman citizen*, 297, 300, 319; CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie* (Paris, 1892), 875–77.

S. SALAVILLE.

Myrina, a titular see of Asia Minor, suffragan of Ephesus. Herodotus (I, 149) mentions it as one of the eleven cities of Æolia; Strabo, who says it was built by the Amazon Myrina, also assigned to it an Æolian origin (Geographia, XII, iii, 21; viii, 6; XIII, iii, 6); Xenophon (Hellenica, III, i, 6) relates that Artaxerxes gave it to a chieftain named Gorgion. According to Pliny (Hist. nat., V, 30; XXXII, 6) it was famous for its oysters, and must have borne the name of Sebastopolis, of which no trace is found elsewhere. An inscription (Bulletin de correspondance hellénique, V, 283) tells us that Myrina formed part of the Kingdom of Pergamus in the third century B. C. Destroyed by an earthquake under Tiberius (Tacitus, "Annales", II, 47) and again under the Emperor Trajan (Orosius, VII, 12), it was each time rebuilt. It was the birth-place of Agathias, a Byzantine poet and historian of the sixth century. The names are known of some of the bishops of this diocese, which still existed in the fourteenth century: Dorotheus, 431; Proterius, 451; John, 553; Cosmas, 787 (Le Quien, "Oriens Christ.", I, 705). The site of Myrina was discovered at a place called Kalabassary in the caza of Menemen and the vilayet of Smyrna, at the mouth of the Hodja-Tchai, the ancient Pythicos. The remains of the harbour and the arsenal have disappeared under the alluvia of the river. Excavations (1880–1882) brought to light about four thousand tombs, dating from the two centuries immediately preceding the Christian Era, in which were found numerous objects representing the divinities of the Greek pantheon; children's toys, reproductions of famous works, etc.: most of these may be seen to-day in the Museum of the Louvre.

POTTIER AND REINACH, *La nécropole de Myrina* (Paris, 1887); *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, VI, 197–209, 388–433, 557–580; VII, 81–95, 204–50, 440–47, 493–501; VIII, 509–14; IX, 165–207, 359–74, 485–93.

S. VAILHÉ.

Myriophytum, titular see of Thracia Prima and suffragan of Heraclea. The early history of this city is not known. We find it mentioned for the first time in connexion with an earthquake which destroyed it in the year 1063 of our era (Muralt, "Essai de chronologie byzantine", II, 8). It was visited by John Cantacuzene about 1350 (Hist., III, 76). As a suffragan of Heraclea we find it, under the title of Peristasis and Myriophytum, mentioned first in a "Notitia episcopatuum" of the end of the fifteenth century (Gelzer, "Ungedruckte . . . Texte der Notitiæ episcopatuum", 633). The title of Peristasis existed already in 1170 (Parthey, "Hieroclis Synecdemus", 103). In the sixteenth century Myriophytum displaced Peristasis, and the diocese took the name of Myriophytum and Peristasis (Le Quien, "Oriens christianus", I, 1151). No change has since taken place, except that among the Greeks in 1908 it was elevated to an autocephalous metropolitan see. To-day Myriophytum is a rather busy port on the Sea of Marmora; the city numbers 5000 Greeks and 400 Turks. The schismatic archdiocese includes only ten parishes with about 22,000 souls, of whom Peristasis alone includes about 6000.

DRAKOS, *Thrakika* (in Greek, Athens, 1892), 72–93.

S. VAILHÉ.

Mysore (MAISOUR), DIOCESE OF (MYSURIENSIS), in India, suffragan to Pondicherry, comprises the territory of the Mysore native state, the British Provinces of Coorg and Collegal, part of Wynaad and the taluk of Ossoor, Salem district; surrounded by the Dioceses of Madras, Poona, Goa, Mangalore, Coimbatore, and Pondicherry. The Catholic population is about 48,202. The diocese, like the rest of the Pondicherry province, is under the Paris Society of Foreign Missions. The clergy are 65 in number (53 European and 12 native priests), having the care of 123 churches and chapels. They are assisted by the Brothers of the Immaculate Conception, the Brothers of St. Gabriel, the Nuns of the Good Shepherd Order, the Little Sisters of the Poor, the Sisters of St. Joseph of Tarbes, and Native Sisters of St. Anne and also of the Immaculate Conception. The cathedral and the bishop's residence are at Bangalore.

HISTORY.—Originally Mysore belonged to the Archdiocese of Goa, but what early mission work was done there is a matter of obscurity. In the Canarese or western portions a mission seems to have been established about the middle of the seventeenth century; in the eastern or Telugu portion another mission was brought into existence about the year 1703 by two French Jesuits who came from Vellore and founded churches at Bangalore, Devanhalli, Chikka, Ballapoora, and elsewhere. But their work was stopped and partly destroyed by the fanaticism of the sultan, Tipu (1782–99). The district came under the Foreign

Mission Society of Paris in 1776, which at that date began work at Pondicherry. The celebrated Abbé Dubois (b. 1765, d. 1848), himself a member of the Foreign Missions, spent most of his life among the Canarese Christians of Ganjam, Palhally, and Satthully (see DUBOIS). Mysore was included in the Vicariate of the Coromandel Coast (Pondicherry), erected in 1836, but was separated in 1845, and erected into a distinct vicariate-Apostolic in 1850, at the same time as the district of Coimbatore. On the establishment of the hierarchy in 1886 it was made into a diocese suffragan to Pondicherry with the same boundaries as now.

SUCCESSION OF PRELATES.—*Vicars-Apostolic:* Stephen Louis Charbonaux, 1850–73; Joseph Augustine Chevalier, 1874–1880; Jean-Yves-Marie Coadou, 1880–90 (became first bishop in 1886); second bishop, Eugène-Louis Kleiner, 1890 (absent in Europe since 1903); Augustine Francis Basle, coadjutor with right of succession, 1906, now ruling the diocese.

INSTITUTIONS.—St. Joseph's College, Bangalore, teaching up to F. A. Standard, with 600 pupils; Bangalore Convent School under the Nuns of the Good Shepherd, with 494 pupils; St. Patrick's School, Shoolay, with 156 pupils; St. Francis Xavier's School for girls, Cleveland Town, with 138 day-scholars; St. Aloysius's School, with 210 boys; native ecclesiastical seminary, with 26 students; St. Louis' Boarding School, with 58 boarders; the Brothers of the Immaculate Conception, training school for teachers, with 10 European students; convent school at Mysore, under the Good Shepherd Nuns, with 185 pupils; St. Joseph's School, Mysore, with 142 pupils; native Sisters of St. Anne, in charge of five native girls' schools; native Nuns of the Immaculate Conception, girls' school at Settihally, also a dispensary; Majanma Thumbu Chetty School for caste girls, under the Sisters of St. Joseph of Tarbes, Bangalore, with 136 pupils. *Charitable Institutions.*—St. Patrick's Orphanage, Bangalore, with 100 inmates; St. Martha's public Hospital and Dispensary, Bangalore, in charge of the Good Shepherd Nuns, 70 beds; eye infirmary under the same; Little Sisters of the Poor, Bangalore, with 101 inmates; two orphanages at Bangalore and Mysore under the Good Shepherd Nuns with total of 263 inmates; also 2 Magdalene Asylums with 129 inmates. Four agricultural farms for orphans, round which Christian villages have been formed at four places in the diocese; several small orphanages in country parishes.

Madras Catholic Directory (1909); LAUNAY, *Histoire Générale de la Société des Missions Etrangères; Atlas des Missions.*

ERNEST R. HULL.

Mysteries, PAGAN. See PAGANISM.

Mystery (Greek *μυστήριον*, from *μύειν*, "to shut", "to close").—This term signifies in general that which is unknowable, or valuable knowledge that is kept secret. In pagan antiquity the word mystery was used to designate certain esoteric doctrines, such as Pythagoreanism, or certain ceremonies that were performed in private or whose meaning was known only to the initiated, e. g., the Eleusinian rites, Phallic worship. In the language of the early Christians the mysteries were those religious teachings that were carefully guarded from the knowledge of the profane (see DISCIPLINE OF THE SECRET).

NOTION OF MYSTERY IN SCRIPTURE AND IN THEOLOGY.—The Old-Testament versions use the word *μυστήριον* as an equivalent for the Hebrew word *sôd*, "secret" (Prov., xx, 19; Judith, ii, 2; Ecclus., xxii, 27; II Mach., xiii, 21). In the New Testament the word mystery is applied ordinarily to the sublime revelation of the Gospel (Matt., xiii, 11; Col., ii, 2; I Tim., iii, 9; I Cor., xv, 51), and to the Incarnation and life of the Saviour and His manifestation by the preaching of the Apostles (Rom., xvi, 25; Eph., iii, 4; vi, 19; Col., i, 26; iv, 3). In conformity with the usage of the inspired writers of the New Testament, theologians give the name mystery to revealed truths that surpass the powers of natural reason. Mystery, therefore, in its strict theological sense is not synonymous with the incomprehensible, since all that we know is incomprehensible, i. e., not adequately comprehensible as to its inner being; nor with the unknowable, since many things merely natural are accidentally unknowable, on account of their inaccessibility, e. g., things that are future, remote, or hidden. In its strict sense a mystery is a supernatural truth, one that of its very nature lies above the finite intelligence. Theologians distinguish two classes of supernatural mysteries, the absolute or theological and the relative. An absolute mystery is a truth whose existence or possibility could not be discovered by a creature, and whose essence (inner substantial being) can be expressed by the finite mind only in terms of analogy, e. g., the Trinity. A relative mystery is a truth whose innermost nature alone (e. g., many of the Divine attributes), or whose existence alone (e. g., the positive ceremonial precepts of the Old Law), exceeds the natural knowing power of the creature.

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.—The existence of theological mysteries is a doctrine of Catholic faith defined by the Vatican Council, which declares: "If any one say that in Divine Revelation there are contained no mysteries properly so called (*vera et proprie dicta mysteria*), but that through reason rightly developed (*per rationem rite excultam*) all the dogmas of faith can be understood and demonstrated from natural principles: let him be anathema" (Sess. III, De fide et ratione, can. i). This teaching is clearly explained in Scripture. The principal proof text, which was cited in part by the Vatican Council, is I Cor., ii. Shorter passages are especially Eph., iii, 4–9; Col., i, 26–27; Matt., xi, 25–27; John, i, 17–18. These texts speak of a mystery of God, which only infinite wisdom can understand, namely, the designs of Divine Providence and the inner life of the Godhead (see also Wisdom, ix, 16–17; Rom., xi, 33–36). Tradition abounds with testimonies that support this teaching. In the Brief "Gravissimas Inter" (Denzinger, "Enchiridion", ed. Bannwart, nn. 1666–74), Pius IX defends the doctrine of supernatural mystery by many citations from the works of the Fathers. Numerous other patristic texts that bear on the same question are quoted and explained in Kleutgen's "Die Theologie der Vorzeit", II, 75 sq.; V, 220 sq.; and in Schäzler's "Neue Untersuchungen über das Dogma von der Gnade" (Mainz, 1867), 466 sq. The manifold excellence of Christian revelation offers many theological arguments for the existence of supernatural mysteries (cf. Scheeben, "Dogmatik", I, 24).

REASON AND SUPERNATURAL MYSTERY.—(1) *Errors.*—The existence of supernatural mysteries is denied by Rationalists and semi-Rationalists. Rationalists object that mysteries are degrading to reason. Their favourite argument is based on the principle that no medium exists between the reasonable and the unreasonable, from which they conclude that the mysterious is opposed to reason (Bayle, Pfleiderer). This argumentation is fallacious, since it confounds incomprehensibility with inconceivableness, superiority to reason with contradiction. The mind of a creature cannot, indeed, grasp the inner nature of the mysterious truth, but it can express that truth by analogies; it cannot fully understand the coherence and agreement of all that is contained in a mystery of faith, but it can refute successfully the objections which would make a mystery consist of mutually repugnant elements. Rationalists further object that the revelation of mysteries would be useless, since it is the nature of reason to accept only the evident (Toland), and since the knowledge of the incomprehensible can have no influence on the moral life of mankind (Kant). To

answer the first objection we have only to recall that there is a twofold evidence: the internal evidence of a thing in itself, and the external evidence of trustworthy authority. The mysteries of revelation, like the facts of history, are supported by external evidence and therefore they are evidently credible. The second difficulty rests on a false assumption. The religious life of the Christian is rooted in his faith in the supernatural, which is an anticipation of the beatific vision (St. Thomas, "Comp. Theol. ad fratrem Reg.," cap. ii), a profound act of religious homage (Contra. Gent., I, vi), and the measure by which he judges the world and the ways of God. The history of civilization bears witness to the beneficial influence that Christian faith has exerted on the general life of mankind (cf. Gutberlet, "Apologetik," II, 2 ed., Münster, 1895, 23). Some Rationalists, trusting to far-fetched similarities, pretend that the Christian mysteries were borrowed from the religious and philosophical systems of Paganism. A study of the origin of Christianity suffices to show the absurdity of such an explanation. Semi-Rationalism explains mysteries either as purely natural truths expressed in symbolic language (Schelling, Baader, Sabatier), or as soluble problems of philosophy (Günther, Frohschammer). The errors of Günther were condemned in a pontifical letter to the Archbishop of Cologne in 1857, and in another to the Bishop of Breslau in 1860 (Denzinger, "Enchiridion", ed. Bannwart, nn. 1655–1658); those of Frohschammer, in the Brief "Gravissimas Inter", 11 Dec., 1862.

(2) *Relations of Natural and Supernatural Truth.*—(a) Superiority of the Supernatural.—The mysteries contained in supernatural revelation are not simply disconnected truths lying beyond the realm of natural things, but a higher, heavenly world, a mystical *cosmos* whose parts are united in a living bond. (Scheeben, "Dogmatik", I, 25.) Even in those parts of this vast system that have been revealed to us there is a wonderful harmony. In his great work "Die Mysterien des Christenthums", Scheeben has sought to show the logical connexion in the supernatural order by considering its supreme mystery, the internal communication of Divine life in the Trinity, as the model and ideal of the external communication to the creature of the Divine life of grace and glory. The knowledge of the supernatural is more excellent than any human wisdom, because, although incomplete, it has a nobler object, and through its dependence on the unfailing word of God possesses a greater degree of certitude. The obscurity which surrounds the mysteries of faith results from the weakness of the human intellect, which, like the eye that gazes on the sun, is blinded by the fulness of light. (b) Harmony of Natural and Supernatural Truth.—Since all truth is from God, there can be no real warfare between reason and revelation. Supernatural mysteries as such cannot be demonstrated by reason, but the Christian apologist can always show that the arguments against their possibility are not conclusive (St. Thos., "Suppl. Boeth. de trinitate", Q. ii, a. 3). The nature of God, which is infinite and eternal, must be incomprehensible to an intelligence that is not capable of perfect knowledge (cf. Zigliara, "Propædeutica", I, ix). The powerlessness of science to solve the mysteries of nature, a fact that Rationalists admit, shows how limited are the resources of the human intellect (cf. Daumer, "Das Reich des Wundersamen und Geheimnissvollen," Ratisbon, 1872). On the other hand reason is able not only to recognize wherein consists the special mysteriousness of a supernatural truth, but also to dispel to some extent the obscurity by means of natural analogies and to show the fittingness of the mystery by reasons of congruity (Council of Cologne, 1860). This was done with great success by the Fathers and the Scholastic theologians. A famous example is St. Thomas' argument *ex convenientia* for the Divine processions in the Trinity (Summa Theol., I, QQ. xxvii-xxxi). (See Faith, Reason, Revelation.)

Zigliara, *Propædeutica in S. Theologiam* (Rome, 1890), 45 sq., 113 sq.; Scheeben, *Die Mysterien des Christenthums* (Freiburg, 1898); Bossuet, *Elévations à Dieu sur tous les mystères de la religion chrétienne* (Paris, 1711); Ottinger, *Theologia fundamentalis*, I (Freiburg, 1897), 66 sq.; Newman, *Critic. Essays*, I (London, 1888), 41.

J. A. McHugh.

Mystery Plays. See Miracle Plays.

Mystical Body of the Church.—The analogy borne by any society of men to an organism is sufficiently manifest. In every society the constituent individuals are united, as are also the members of a body, to effect a common end: while the parts they severally play correspond to the functions of the bodily organs. They form a moral unity. This, of course, is true of the Church, but the Church has also a unity of a higher order: it is not merely a *moral* but a *mystical* body. This truth, that the Church is the mystical body of Christ, all its members being guided and directed by Christ the head, is set forth by St. Paul in various passages, more especially in Ephesians, iv, 4–13 (cf. John, xv, 5–8). The doctrine may be summarized as follows: (1) The members of the Church are bound together by a supernatural life communicated to them by Christ through the sacraments (*ibid.*, 5). Christ is the centre and source of life to Whom all are united, and Who endows each one with gifts fitting him for his position in the body (*ibid.*, 7–12). These graces, through which each is equipped for his work, form it into an organized whole, whose parts are knit together as though by a system of ligaments and joints (*ibid.*, 16; Col., ii, 19). Through them, too, (2) the Church has its growth and increase, growing in extension as it spreads through the world, and intensively as the individual Christian develops in himself the likeness of Christ (*ibid.*, 13–15). (3) In virtue of this union the Church is the fulness or complement (πλήρωμα) of Christ (Eph., i, 23). It forms one whole with Him; and the Apostle even speaks of the Church as "Christ" (I Cor., xii, 12). (4) This union between head and members is conserved and nourished by the Holy Eucharist. Through this sacrament our incorporation into the Body of Christ is alike outwardly symbolized and inwardly actualized; "We being many are one bread, one body; for we all partake of the one bread" (I Cor., x, 17).

Franzelin, *De Ecclesia*, Thesis XVIII; Passaglia, *De Ecclesia*, II, n. 742; Pesch, *Prælect. Dogm.*, I, n. 396.

G. H. Joyce.

Mystical Phenomena. See Theology, Mystical.

Mystical Sense of Holy Scripture. See Exegesis.

Mystical Theology. See Theology, Mystical.

Mysticism (from μύειν, to initiate), according to its etymology, implies a relation to mystery. In philosophy, Mysticism is either a religious tendency and desire of the human soul towards an intimate union with the Divinity, or a system growing out of such a tendency and desire. As a philosophical system, Mysticism considers as the end of philosophy the direct union of the human soul with the Divinity through contemplation and love, and attempts to determine the processes and the means of realizing this end. This contemplation, according to Mysticism, is not based on a merely analogical knowledge of the Infinite, but on a direct and immediate intuition of the Infinite. According to its tendency, it may be either speculative or practical, as it limits itself to mere knowledge or traces duties for action and life; contemplative or affective, according as it emphasizes the part of intelligence or the part of the will; orthodox or heterodox, according as it agrees with or opposes the Catholic teaching. We shall give a brief historical sketch of

Mysticism and its influence on philosophy, and present a criticism of it.

HISTORICAL SKETCH.—In his "History of Philosophy", Cousin mentions four systems, between which, he says, philosophical thought has continually wavered, viz., Sensism, Idealism, Scepticism, and Mysticism. Whatever may be thought of this classification, it is true that Mysticism has exercised a large influence on philosophy, becoming at times the basis of whole systems, but more often entering as an element into their constitution. Mysticism dominated in the symbolic philosophy of ancient Egypt. The Taoism of the Chinese philosopher Lao-tze is a system of metaphysics and ethics in which Mysticism is a fundamental element (cf. De Harlez, "Laotze, le premier philosophe chinois", in "Mémoires couronnés et autres de l'Académie", Brussels, January, 1886). The same may be said of Indian philosophy; the end of human reflection and effort in Brahmanism and Vedantism is to deliver the soul from its transmigrations and absorb it into Brahma forever. There is little of Mysticism in the first schools of Greek philosophy, but it already takes a large place in the system of Plato, e. g., in his theory of the world of ideas, of the origin of the world soul and the human soul, in his doctrine of recollection and intuition. The Alexandrian Jew Philo (30 B. C.—A. D. 50) combined these Platonic elements with the data of the Old Testament, and taught that every man, by freeing himself from matter and receiving illumination from God, may reach the mystical, ecstatic, or prophetical state, where he is absorbed into the Divinity. The most systematic attempt at a philosophical system of a mystical character was that of the Neoplatonic School of Alexandria, especially of Plotinus (A. D. 205–70) in his "Ennéads". His system is a syncretism of the previous philosophies on the basis of Mysticism—an emanative and pantheistic Monism. Above all being, there is the One absolutely indetermined, the absolutely Good. From it come forth through successive emanations intelligence (*νοῦς*) with its ideas, the world-soul with its plastic forces (*λόγοι σπερματικοί*), matter inactive and the principle of imperfection. The human soul had its existence in the world-soul until it was united with matter. The end of human life and of philosophy is to realize the mystical return of the soul to God. Freeing itself from the sensuous world by purification (*κάθαρσις*), the human soul ascends by successive steps through the various degrees of the metaphysical order, until it unites itself in a confused and unconscious contemplation to the One, and sinks into it: it is the state of ecstasis.

With Christainity, the history of Mysticism enters into a new period. The Fathers recognized indeed the partial truth of the pagan system, but they pointed out also its fundamental errors. They made a distinction between reason and faith, philosophy and theology; they acknowledged the aspirations of the soul, but, at the same time, they emphasized its essential inability to penetrate the mysteries of Divine life. They taught that the vision of God is the work of grace and the reward of eternal life; in the present life only a few souls, by a special grace, can reach it. On these principles, the Christian school of Alexandria opposed the true gnosis based on grace and faith to the Gnostic heresies. St. Augustine teaches indeed that we know the essences of things *in rationibus æternis*, but this knowledge has its starting point in the data of sense (cf. Quæstiones, LXXXIII, c. xlvi). Pseudo-Dionysius, in his various works, gave a systematic treatment of Christian Mysticism, carefully distinguishing between rational and mystical knowledge. By the former, he says, we know God, not in His nature, but through the wonderful order of the universe, which is a participation of the Divine ideas ("De Divinis Nomin.", c, vii, §§ 2–3, in P. G., III, 867 sq.). There is, however, he adds, a more perfect knowledge of God possible in this life, beyond the attainments of reason even enlightened by faith, through which the soul contemplates directly the mysteries of Divine light. The contemplation in the present life is possible only to a few privileged souls, through a very special grace of God: it is the *θέωσις, μυστικὴ ἕνωσις*.

The works of Pseudo-Dionysius exercised a great influence on the following ages. John Scotus Eriugena (ninth century), in his "De Divisione Naturæ", took them as his guide, but he neglected the distinction of his master, identifying philosophy and theology, God and creatures, and, instead of developing the doctrine of Dionysius, reproduced the pantheistic theories of Plotinus (see ERIUGENA, JOHN SCOTUS). In the twelfth century, orthodox Mysticism was presented under a systematic form by the Victorines, Hugh, Walter, and Richard (cf. Mignon, "Les Origines de la Scolastique et Hugues de St. Victor", Paris, 1895), and there was also a restatement of Eriugena's principles with Amaury de Bène, Joachim de Floris, and David of Dinant. A legitimate element of Mysticism, more or less emphasized, is found in the works of the Schoolmen of the thirteenth century. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries there was, as a protest against a sterile dialecticism, a revival of mystical systems, some orthodox—J. Ruysbroek, Gerson, Peter d'Ailly, Denys the Carthusian—and others heterodox—John of Ghent, John of Mirecourt, the Beguines and Beghards, and various brotherhoods influenced by Averroism, and especially Meister Eckhart (1260–1327), who in his "Opus Tripartitum" teaches a deification of man and an assimilation of the creature into the Creator through contemplation (cf. Denifle in "Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters", 1886), the "Theologia Germanica", and, to a certain extent, Nicholas of Cusa (1401–64) with his theory of the *coincidentia oppositorum*. Protestantism, by its negation of all ecclesiastical authority and by advocating a direct union of the soul with God, had its logical outcome in a Mysticism mostly pantheistic.

Protestant Mysticism is represented by Sebastian Frank (1499–1542), by Valentine Weiler (1533–88), and especially by J. Böhme (1575–1624), who, in his "Aurora", conceived the nature of God as containing in itself the energies of good and evil, and identified the Divine nature with the human soul whose operation is to kindle, according to its free will, the fire of good or the fire of evil (cf. Deussen, "J. Böhme ueber sein Leben und seine Philosophie", Kiel, 1897). Reuchlin (1455–1522) developed a system of cabalistic Mysticism in his "De arte cabalistica" and his "De verbo mirifico". We may also assign to the influence of Mysticism the ontological systems of Malebranche and of the Ontologists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The romantic Mysticism of Fichte (1762–1814), Novalis (1772–1801), and Schelling (1775–1854) was a reaction against the Rationalism of the eighteenth century. A pseudo-Mysticism is also the logical outcome of the Fideism and evolutionistic Subjectivism of modern Protestants, inaugurated by Lessing (1728–81), developed by Schleiermacher (1768–1834), A. Ritschl (1822–89; cf. Goyau, "L'Allemagne Religieuse, Le Protestantisme", 6th ed., Paris, 1906), Sabatier, etc., and accepted by the Modernists in their theories of vital immanence and religious experience (cf. Encyclical "Pascendi"). (See MODERNISM.)

CRITICISM.—A tendency so universal and so persistent as that of Mysticism, which appears among all peoples and influences philosophical thought more or less throughout all centuries, must have some real foundation in human nature. There is indeed in the human soul a natural desire for, an aspiration towards the highest truth, the absolute truth, and the highest, the infinite good. We know by experience and reason that the knowledge and enjoyment of created things cannot give the fulness of truth and the perfection of beatitude which will completely satisfy our desires and aspirations. There is in our soul a capacity for

more truth and perfection than we can ever acquire through the knowledge of created things. We realize that God alone is the end of man, that in the possession of God alone we can reach the satisfaction of our aspirations. Cf. S. Thom., Theol., I, Q. ii, a. 1, ad 1um; Q. xii, a. 1; Q. xliv, a. 4, ad 3um; I-II, Q. iii, a. 8; "Contra Gentes", III, cc. i, xxv, l; "De Veritate", Q. xxii, a. 2; "Compend. Theologiæ", 104, etc. Cf. Sestili, "De naturali intelligentis animæ appetitu intuendi divinam essentiam", Rome, 1896. But the rational effort of our intelligence and positive aspirations of our will find here their limits. Is there truly possible a union of our reason and will with God more intimate than that which we possess through created things? Can we expect more than a knowledge of God by analogical concepts and more than the beatitude proportionate to that knowledge? Here human reason cannot answer. But where reason was powerless, philosophers gave way to feeling and imagination. They dreamt of an intuition of the Divinity, of a direct contemplation and immediate possession of God. They imagined a notion of the universe and of human nature that would make possible such a union. They built systems in which the world and the human soul were considered as an emanation or part of the Divinity, or at least as containing something of the Divine essence and Divine ideas. The logical outcome was Pantheism.

This result was a clear evidence of error at the starting-point. The Catholic Church, as guardian of Christian doctrine, through her teaching and theologians, gave the solution of the problem. She asserted the limits of human reason: the human soul has a natural capacity (*potentia obedientialis*), but no exigency and no positive ability to reach God otherwise than by analogical knowledge. She condemned the immediate vision of the Beghards and Beguines (cf. Denzinger-Bannwart, "Enchiridion", nn. 474–5), the pseudo-Mysticism of Eckhart (ibid., nn. 501–29), and Molinos (ibid., nn. 2121–88), the theories of the Ontologists (ibid., nn. 1659–65, 1891–1930), and Pantheism under all its forms (ibid., nn. 1801–5), as well as the vital Immanence and religious experience of the Modernists (ibid., nn. 2071–109). But she teaches that, what man cannot know by natural reason, he can know through revelation and faith; that what he cannot attain to by his natural power he can reach by the grace of God. God has gratuitously elevated human nature to a supernatural state. He has assigned as its ultimate end the direct vision of Himself, the Beatific Vision. But this end can be reached only in the next life; in the present life we can but prepare ourselves for it with the aid of revelation and grace. To some souls, however, even in the present life, God gives a very special grace by which they are enabled to feel His sensible presence: this is true mystical contemplation. In this act, there is no annihilation or absorption of the creature into God, but God becomes intimately present to the created mind and this, enlightened by special illuminations, contemplates with ineffable joy the Divine essence.

PREGER, *Gesch. der deutschen Mystik im Mittelalter* (Leipzig, 1881); SCHMID, *Der Mysticismus in seiner Entstehungsperiode* (Jena, 1824); GÖRRES, *Die christl. Mystik* (Ratisbon, 1836–42); COUSIN, *Histoire générale de la philosophie* (Paris, 1863); IDEM, *Du Vrai, du Beau et du Bien* (23rd ed., Paris, 1881), v; GENNARI, *Del falso Misticismo* (Rome, 1907); DELACROIX, *Essai sur le mysticisme spéculatif en Allemagne au xive siècle* (Paris, 1900); UEBERWEG, *Hist. of Philos.*, tr. MORRIS with additions by PORTER (New York, 1894); DE WULF, *Hist. de la Philos. médiévale* (Louvain, 1900); TURNER, *Hist. of Philos.* (Boston, 1903).

GEORGE M. SAUVAGE.

Mysticism, THEOLOGICAL. See THEOLOGY, MYSTICAL.

Mythology. See PAGANISM.

N

Naasens. See OPHITES.

Nabo or **Nebo** (נבו; Sept., Ναβαῦ), a town mentioned in several passages of the Old Testament, v. g., Num., xxxii, 3; Jer., xlviii, 1, 22; I Par., v, 8; Is., xv, 2, etc. In Numbers, xxxii, 3, it is mentioned between Saban and Beon, the latter being an abbreviation of Baalmeon. In the same chapter, verse 38, it is again mentioned between Cariathaim and Baalmeon, and it is found associated with the same names on the Mesa Stone (line 14). These and other indications go to show that the town was situated in the vicinity of Mt. Nebo, but the precise location cannot be determined. It belonged to the rich pasture lands which the tribes of Ruben and Gad asked of Moses in the distribution of the territory (Num., xxxii). The town had reverted to the Moabites at the time when Isaias prophesied against it (Is., xv, 2; cf. Jer., xlviii, 1, 22). Mesa (lines 14–18) boasts of having taken it from the Israelites. According to St. Jerome (Comment. in Is., xv, 2, in P. L., XXIV, 168), the sanctuary of the idol Chemosh was in Nabo.

LEGENDRE in VIGOUROUX, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, s. v.; BENNETT in HASTINGS, *Dictionary of the Bible*, s. v. *Nebo;* EUSEBIUS, *Onomasticon*, s. v.; ST. JEROME, *De situ et nominibus*, s. v

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

Nabor and Felix, SAINTS, martyrs during the persecution of Diocletian (303). The relics of these holy witnesses to the faith rest in Milan, where a church has been erected over their tomb. St. Ambrose extolled the virtues of these two martyrs. In later times, legendary Acts of these saints have appeared, which are imitated from Acts of other martyrs (Victor, Firmus, and Rusticus). According to these legends, which are without historical value, Nabor and Felix were soldiers in the army of Maximian Herculeus, and were condemned to death in Milan and beheaded in Lodi. Their feast is celebrated on 12 July.

MOMBRITIUS, *Sanctuarium*, II, fol. 158–159; *Acta SS.*, July, III, 291-294; *Analecta Bollandiana*, XXV (1906), 361 sq.; *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina*, II, 879; ALLARD, *Histoire des persécutions*, IV (Paris, 1890), 416; SAVIO, *Di alcune chiese di Milano anteriori a S. Ambrogio* in *Nuovo Bull. di arch. crist.* (1896), 163 sqq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Nabuchodonosor.—The Babylonian form of the name is Nabu-kudurri-usur, the second part of which is variously interpreted ("O Nebo, defend my crown", or "tiara", "empire", "landmark", "work"). The original has been more or less defaced in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin transliterations, from which are derived the modern English forms, Nabuchodonosor, Nebuchadnezzar, and Nebuchadrezzar. On the whole, Nabuchodonosor appears to be nearer to the original Babylonian pronunciation than Nebuchadrezzar and especially Nebuchadnezzar (A. V., Ezra, ii, 1) taken from the Massoretic transliteration, and would be still nearer if the "r" were restored to the second element where "n" has crept in. Two kings of this name are known to have ruled over Babylon.

NABUCHODONOSOR I (c. 1152–1124), is the most famous monarch of the dynasty of Pashi or Isin. A prince of untiring energy, he led to victory the Chaldean armies east and west, against the Lulubi, Elam, and Syria, and although twice defeated by the Assyrian king, Ashshur-resh-ishi, succeeded in arresting for a time the decay of the first Babylonian Empire (see BABYLONIA, II, 183).

NABUCHODONOSOR II is often mentioned in various parts of Holy Writ, and will claim our especial attention here. He was the oldest son of Nabopolassar, the Chaldean restorer of Babylonian independence. His long reign of forty-three years (c. 605–562 B. C.) marks the zenith of the grandeur reached by the short-lived second Babylonian Empire (625–538). Although we possess long inscriptions of Nabuchodonosor, yet as these deal chiefly with the account of his architectural undertakings, our knowledge of his history is incomplete, and we have to rely for information mostly on the Bible, Berosus, and Greek historians. Of the wars he waged either before or after his coming to his father's throne, nothing need be said here: their recital can be read in this Encyclopedia, II, 183–84; only let it be remarked that after the Cimmerians and Scythians were definitively crushed, all his expeditions were directed westwards, although a powerful neighbour lay to the North; the cause of this was that a wise political marriage with Amuhia, the daughter of the Median king, had insured a lasting peace between the two empires.

Nabuchodonosor seems to have prided himself on his constructions more than on his victories. During the last century of Ninive's existence Babylon had been greatly devastated, not only at the hands of Sennacherib and Assurbanipal, but also as a result of her ever renewed rebellions. Nabuchodonosor, continuing his father's work of reconstruction, aimed at making his capital one of the world's wonders. Old temples were restored; new edifices of incredible magnificence (Diodor. of Sicily, II, 95; Herodot., I, 183) were erected to the many gods of the Babylonian pantheon; to complete the royal palace begun by Nabopolassar, nothing was spared, neither "cedar-wood, nor bronze, gold, silver, rare and precious stones"; an underground passage and a stone bridge connected the two parts of the city separated by the Euphrates; the city itself was rendered impregnable by the construction of a triple line of walls. Nor was Nabuchodonosor's activity confined to the capital; he is credited with the restoration of the Lake of Sippar,the opening of a port on the Persian Gulf, and the building of the famous Median wall between the Tigris and the Euphrates to protect the country against incursions from the North: in fact, there is scarcely a place around Babylon where his name does not appear and where traces of his activity are not found. These gigantic undertakings required an innumerable host of workmen: from the inscription of the great temple of Marduk (Meissner, "Assyr. Studien", II, in "Mitteil. der Vorderas. Ges.", 1904, III), we may infer that most probably captives brought from various parts of Western Asia made up a large part of the labouring force used in all his public works.

From Nabuchodonosor's inscriptions and from the number of temples erected or restored by this prince we gather that he was a very devout man. What we know of his history shows him to have been of a humane disposition, in striking contrast with the wanton cruelty of most of the iron-souled Assyrian rulers. It was owing to this moderation that Jerusalem was spared repeatedly, and finally destroyed only when its destruction became a political necessity; rebel princes easily obtained pardon, and Sedecias himself, whose ungratefulness to the Babylonian king was particularly odious, would, had he manifested less stubbornness, have been treated with greater indulgence (Jer., xxxviii, 17, 18); Nabuchodonosor showed much consideration to Jeremias, leaving him free to accompany

the exiles to Babylon or to remain in Jerusalem, and appointing one of the Prophet's friends, Godolias, to the governorship of Jerusalem; he granted likewise such a share of freedom to the exiled Jews that some rose to a position of prominence at Court and Baruch thought it a duty to exhort his fellow-countrymen to have the welfare of Babylon at heart and to pray for her king. Babylonian tradition has it that towards the end of his life, Nabuchodonosor, inspired from on high, prophesied the impending ruin to the Chaldean Empire (Berosus and Abydenus in Eusebius, "Præp. Evang.", IX, xli). The Book of Daniel (iv) records how God punished the pride of the great monarch. On this mysterious chastisement, which some think consisted in an attack of the madness called lycanthropy, as well as on the interregnum which it must have caused, Babylonian annals are silent: clever hypotheses have been devised either to explain this silence, or in scanning documents in order to find in them traces of the wanted interregnum (see Oppert, "Expédit. en Mésopot." I, 186–187; Vigouroux, "La Bible et les découvertes modernes", IV, 337). Nabuchodonosor died in Babylon between the second and sixth months of the forty-third year of his reign.

On Nabuchodonosor II see *Records of the Past*, 1st ser., V, 87, 111; VII, 69, 73; XI, 92; 2nd ser., III, 102; V, 141; *Proceedings of the Society of Bibl. Archæol.*, X, 87, 215, 290 sqq.; XII, 116, 159 sqq.; SCHRADER-WHITEHOUSE, *The Cuneiform Inscr. and the Old Testament*, II, 47–52, 115, 315 etc.; POGNON, *Les inscriptions babyloniennes de Wadi-Brissa* (Paris, 1888); MENANT, *Babylone et la Chaldée*, 197–248; MASPERO, *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'Orient: Les empires* (Paris, 1904), 517–66, 623–43; VIGOUROUX, *La Bible et les découvertes modernes* (Paris, 1898), IV, 141–54, 244–338; PANNIER in VIGOUROUX, *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.; SCHRADER, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, III, part ii, 10–71, 140–41; IV, 180–201.

CHARLES L. SOUVAY.

Nacchiante (NACLANTUS), GIACOMO, Dominican theologian, b. at Florence; d. at Chioggia, 6 May, 1569; he studied at Bologna, where Michael Ghislieri, afterwards Pius V, was his fellow-student. He subsequently taught philosophy and theology for a number of years, in the college of St. Thomas of Minerva, Rome. Paul III, struck with his talents, made him Bishop of Chioggia (3 June, 1544). At the Council of Trent his vigorous protest against the words of the decree of the IV Session (8 April, 1546), which asserts that the traditions of the Church are to be received with the same reverence and piety as the Scriptures, cast some suspicions on his orthodoxy; but he gave a reverent assent to the decree, when he saw it confirmed by the authority of so great an assembly. Other serious suspicions of his orthodoxy seem afterwards to have arisen, but as Pallavicini remarks, his memory is vindicated from such charges by the grave affairs of trust which were assigned him under Pius IV. His works were published by Pietro Fratino at Venice in 1567. Among the more important are "Enarrationes . . . in ep. D. Pauli ad Ephesios"; "In ep. ad Romanos"; "S. Scripturæ medulla"; "Tractationes XVIII theologales"; "Theoremata metaphysica"; "Theoremata theologica".

HURTER, *Nomenclator Literarius*, I, 28, 29; QUÉTIF AND ECHARD, *Script. Ord. Pr.*, II, 202; STREBER in *Kirchenlexicon*, s. v.

EDWARD F. GARESCHÉ.

Nachtgall (NACHTIGALL). See LUSCINIUS, OTTMAR.

Nacolia (NACOLEIA).—A titular metropolitan see in Phrygia Salutaris. This town, which took its name from the nymph Nacola, had no history in antiquity. It was there that Valens defied the usurper Procopius; under Arcadius it was occupied by a garrison of Goths who revolted against the emperor. At first dependent on Synnada, the see became autocephalous between 787 and 862, and metropolitan between 1035 and 1066. Seven of its bishops are known, among them being Constantine, one of the chief supporters of Iconoclasm under Leo the Isaurian, who feigned to abjure his error before the patriarch, St. Germanus, and was condemned as an heresiarch at the Second Council of Nicæa (787). Nacolia is the modern village of Seyyid el-Ghâzi, chief town of Nahié, in the Villayet of Brusa, about twenty-two miles southeast of Eski Sheir. The name of the village is derived from Seyyid (Sidi) el-Battal, an Arab sheikh who was slain in 739 by the troops of Leo the Isaurian, and buried in a *tekke* of Bektashi dervishes founded by the mother of the Seljukian sultan, Aladdin the Great. Seyyid el Ghâzi contains some unimportant ruins.

RAMSAY in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, III (1882), 119 sq.; LE QUIEN, *Oriens Christ.*, I, 839; CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie*, IV, 213; RADET, *En Phrygie* (Paris, 1895), 22.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Nagasaki, DIOCESE OF (NAGASAKIENSIS).—Nagasaki, capital of the prefecture (*ken*) of the same name, is situated on a small peninsula on the south-eastern coast of the Island of Kiushiu, Japan. Its harbour, enclosed on three sides by mountains sloping down to the sea-shore and sheltered on the fourth (the entrance) by numerous islands, is one of the safest and most important in Japan. Being the first port of entry for vessels coming from the south and west, it is also one of the leading coaling-stations of the Far East. The principal industries of the town are the manufacture of engines and ship-building. It imports mainly cotton, coal, sugar, and petroleum; among its chief exports are coal, rice, flour, camphor, and tobacco. In the first ten centuries of our era we find references to the town under no less than seven distinct names, of which *Fukaye no Ura* (Fukaye Bay) is the best known. Its present name is probably derived from a certain Nagasaki Kotaro, who, about 1185–90, received Fukaye no Ura as his fief. Prior to the arrival of the Christian missionaries, however, Nagasaki was an insignificant village.

Although St. Francis Xavier's missonary labours in Japan were confined to the territory now included in the Diocese of Nagasaki, and the ecclesiastical history of this territory is practically identical with the early Christian history of Japan, the town of Nagasaki appears not to have been visited by the missionaries until 1569. In this year Father Vilela, S.J., erected a church on the site of a pagoda which had been given him by the Christian lord of the district, and in 1571 had already made 1500 converts. In 1570 the Portuguese began trading with Nagasaki. Yinzeyemon, the imperial governor of the province, received them kindly, and, perhaps to induce them to trade with him alone, and thus to prevent others from obtaining firearms, affected to favour the Christian religion. When, however, the traders and missionaries, as a safeguard against future oppression, insisted on his recognizing the ecclesiastical authority over the territory of Nagasaki, he showed great hesitation and yielded to their wishes only when they threatened to withdraw and choose some other headquarters if their request were refused. From the arrival of the foreigners dates the rapid growth of Nagasaki, numbers of the native merchants settling in the town in the hope of enriching themselves by foreign commerce. By 1587 the last traces of the Buddhist and Shinto religions had vanished from the district, which already contained three principal churches (called by the Japanese *Ki-kuwan* "strange sight") and numerous chapels. To 1587 must also be referred Hideyoshi's sudden change of attitude towards Christianity (see JAPAN). Influenced by the bonzes' insinuations concerning the ultimate aim of the missionaries, he issued, during a night of orgy (24 July), a decree proscribing the Christian religion and ordering the Jesuits to leave Japan within twenty days. Subsequently, however, the taiko grew calmer and consented to ten fathers remaining at Nagasaki, nor did he adopt any active measures to suppress Christianity as long as outward respect was shown for his decrees.

The San Felipe incident, however (see JAPAN), led to a new persecution in 1596, and twenty-six missionaries (6 Franciscans, 3 Jesuits, and 17 Japanese Christians) were crucified at Nagasaki in 1597. Persistent rumors that the taiko was about to revisit Kiushiu in person led the Governor of Nagasaki, who had previously shown himself not unfavourable towards the Christians, to send a force to destroy the churches and residences of the missionaries in 1598. In the territory of the present Diocese of Nagasaki 137 churches of the Jesuits were demolished, as well as their college in Amakusa and their seminary in Arima. The death of Hideyoshi on 16 Sept., 1598, put an end to this persecution. Iyeyasu, anxious to promote commerce with the Philippines, allowed free ingress to the missionaries, and, beyond enforcing the law that no daimio should receive baptism, showed at first no hostility to Christianity. In 1603 Nagasaki, the population of which had grown from about 2500 to 24,500 in fifty years, possessed eleven churches. About 1612 or 1613 the bonzes—assisted, it is to be feared, by some English and Dutch captains—succeeded in thoroughly alarming Iyeyasu as to some imaginary intrigue between certain of his officers and the representatives of Philip III of Spain and Portugal. On 27 January, 1614, orders were issued for the expulsion of the missionaries and the destruction of the churches. In 1622, Nagasaki was the scene of the "Great Martyrdom". (See MARTYRS, JAPANESE.) In 1629 the custom of *Fumi-ye*, or trampling on the crucifix, was introduced; paper pictures were at first used, but later more durable images were utilized—at first wood, and still later (1669) 20 bronze images cast by an engraver of Nagasaki from metal obtained from the altars of the demolished churches. Between the 4th and 9th day of the first month of each year all suspect Christians were called upon to trample on these images: those who refused were banished fom their homes, and when again caught, if still recalcitrant, were taken to the boiling springs of Shimabara and thrown in, or subjected to crucifixion and various kinds of refined torture. Goaded into action by such persecution and by the miseries consequent on the suppression of the religious houses, which had been the only source of alleviation for the needs of the impoverished peasantry, the people rose in revolt, in 1637, but, after some fierce fighting, were crushed by the shogun's forces, assisted by Dutch artillery. In 1640 four Portuguese envoys from Macao were seized at Nagasaki, and, on refusing to apostatize, were put to death.

For more than two centuries after 1640, Japan was practically closed to the outside world. The persistent attempts of missionaries to penetrate into the country during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had no other success than that of winning them the martyr's crown. The discovery of a large body of Christians by Father Petitjean on 17 March, 1865, when he was establishing the first Catholic church in Nagasaki, after the reopening of Japan to the missionaries, has been referred to in the article JAPAN. In 1866 this zealous missionary was created Bishop of Myriophyte and Vicar Apostolic of Japan, and in 1876, on the division of the territory into two vicariates, he retained the administration of Southern Japan (1879–85). On the cessation of persecution (see JAPAN), Mgr Petitjean devoted his whole energy to winning back into the Fold the descendants of the old Christians, organizing the first Christian districts, and founding a seminary for the formation of a native clergy. He was succeeded as vicar Apostolic by Mgr Julius Alphonsus Cousin (b. April, 1842), now Bishop of Nagasaki. Father Cousin landed in Japan in 1866, and was the first missionary to penetrate into the Goto Islands. In 1869 he founded the first Catholic station at Osaka, where he laboured for eighteen years. Created Bishop of Acmonia in 1885, on succeeding Mgr Petitjean, he fixed his residence at Nagasaki, when Southern Japan was divided into two vicariates, in 1887. In 1890 the First Synod of Japan was held at Nagasaki, of which Mgr Cousin became first bishop, on the establishment of the Japanese hierarchy, in 1891. In 1897 the third centennial of the twenty-six Japanese martyrs, canonized by Pius IX in 1867, was celebrated by the construction and solemn benediction of the church of Our Lady of Martyrs at Nagasaki. The episcopal jubilee of Bishop Cousin was celebrated in 1910. During his episcopate of twenty-five years, Bishop Cousin has laboured to increase the native clergy and to extend the work of the mission. He has ordained 40 Japanese priests, founded 35 new stations (with residences), established 38 new Christian settlements, and built 50 churches and chapels. During his administration the Catholic population has more than doubled.

The Diocese of Nagasaki includes Kiushiu and the neighbouring islands—Amakusa, Goto, Ikitsuki, Tsushima, Oshima, and the Ryukyu (Lu Chu) Archipelago. The total population is about 7,884,900; the Catholic population was 47,104 on 15 Aug., 1910 (23,000 in 1885). The personnel of the mission is: 1 bishop, 36 missionaries (French), 26 diocesan priests (Japanese), 6 tonsured clerics, 35 native (male or female) catechists labouring for the conversion of pagans, 350 catechists entrusted with the instruction of the Christian communities, 15 itinerant baptizers (female). The mission auxiliaries, engaged in works of education and charity, are: 17 Brothers of Mary (14 foreigners, including 3 priests), 21 Sisters of the Holy Child Jesus (Chauffailles—5 Japanese), 16 Franciscan Sisters (Missionaries of Mary), 8 Sisters of St. Paul of Chartres (3 Japanese), 10 communities of native women, with 177 members. The establishments include: 40 mission stations with residences; 35 sub-stations; 153 Christian communities; 67 blessed churches and chapels; 52 unblessed oratories and chapels; 1 seminary with 31 students (8 theological; 4 philosophical; 19 studying Latin); 1 Apostolic school with 18 pupils (10 postulants of the Brothers of Mary); 1 college, primary and commercial, with 325 pupils (30 boarders); 1 school for women catechists, with 15 pupils; 3 boarding-houses for girls with 224 pupils; 1 professional school, with 18 pupils; 1 primary school for girls, with 149 pupils; 2 kindergartens, with 79 pupils; 8 orphanages, with 244 children (65 boarders); 2 workrooms, with 39 workers; 1 leper asylum, with 28 lepers; 3 hospitals, with 92 patients; 6 dispensaries (4005 patients cared for); 15 conference halls for religious instruction (total number of hearers about 2730). The Brothers of Mary have the direction of the Apostolic school and the college. The Sisters of the Holy Child Jesus manage 2 boarding-houses (high-schools), the professional school, primary school, kindergartens, 2 orphan asylums, 1 hospital dispensary, 1 conference hall, and 1 work-room. The Franciscan Sisters have charge of the leper asylum, 1 hospital, 3 dispensaries, 2 conference halls, 1 orphan asylum, and 1 work-room; the Sisters of St. Paul of Chartres; 1 boarding-house (high-school), 1 hospital dispensary, 1 conference hall, and 1 orphan asylum. As the State insists on the attendance of all children between the ages of six and twelve at the secular public primary schools, parochial schools are practically impossible in Japan at present. The administrative statistics for the year ending 15 Aug., 1910, are: baptisms of adults, 592 (208 *in extremis* and 8 abjurations); baptisms of pagan children (*in extremis*), 811; baptisms of Christian children, 1645; annual confessions, 29,414; paschal communions, 25,015; Holy Viaticums, 340; extreme unctions, 476; marriages, 323; known deaths, 1067; increase, 1179.

In addition to the works named under JAPAN, consult THURSTON, *Japan and Christianity* in *The Month* (Feb.–May, 1905); WOOLEY, *Hist. Notes on Nagasaki* in *Asiatic Society of Japan: Transactions*, IX (Yokohama, 1881), 125–51; CARY, *Hist. of*

Christ. in Japan, I (New York, —); CHAMBERS AND MASON, *Handbook of Japan* (8th ed., London, 1907); OKUMA, *Fifty Years of New Japan* (2 vols., 2nd ed., London, 1910).

THOMAS KENNEDY.

Nagpur, DIOCESE OF (NAGPURENSIS), in India, suffragan to Madras. Formerly the north-western portion of the Vicariate Apostolic of Vizagapatam, it was erected into a diocese on 29 July, 1887, and its boundaries finally readjusted on 10 July, 1895. It comprises the greater portion of the Central Provinces, Berar, a portion of the Indore State, a strip of the Nizam's dominions as far south as the Godavery River, etc., the boundaries being in many parts independent of civil divisions. The area is about 124,000 square miles with a Catholic population of 15,000 out of a total of about 15,000,000 inhabitants. It is served by 28 priests of the Congregation of the Missionaries of St. Francis de Sales, Annecy, and 7 secular clergy, assisted by 7 brothers of the above congregation; 13 Franciscan Brothers from Paderborn in Germany; 4 Sisters of St. Joseph from St. Jean de Maurienne, Savoy; 23 Daughters of the Cross; and 28 Catechist Sisters of Mary Immaculate. The diocese has 12 churches and 33 chapels. The cathedral, bishop's residence, and diocesan seminary are at Nagpur.

HISTORY.—Although the territories comprised under Nagpur were included within the Vicariate of the Great Mogul, there is no trace of any missionary ever having set foot there till the beginning of the nineteenth century. Nagpur, Kamptee, Aurangabad, and Jaulnah were first visited by priests of the Goan jurisdiction, from Poona, about 1814. A chapel in honour of St. Anthony existed at Takli, suburb of Nagpur, where the troops of the Rajah of Nagpur were quartered. Another was built in Kamptee, and held in great veneration by native Christians. A Goan priest died at Nagpur in 1834. Simultaneously, Goan priests established themselves at Aurangabad, and built a chapel in honour of St. Francis Xavier in 1816; another chapel was built by them at Kannar, two miles from Aurangabad. Military cantonments for British troops were created at Kamptee in 1821, and at Jaulnah in 1827. The Goan priests retained their jurisdiction in these parts until 1839, when, in consequence of the Apostolic Brief "Multa præclare" of 24 April, 1838, the district fell to the jurisdiction of the Vicar Apostolic of Madras. In January, 1839, priests from Madras took possession of Kamptee and Jaulnah. They were Fathers Breen (died 1844) and Egen at Kamptee, and D. Murphy at Jaulnah. Father Murphy, whose registers are preserved in the bishop's residence at Nagpur, subsequently became Vicar Apostolic of Hyderabad and then Archbishop of Hobart Town, Tasmania, where he died in 1908. In 1845 some missionaries of St. Francis de Sales, from Annecy (Savoy, France), were appointed to the charge of the northern portion of the Vicariate of Madras, which was thus separated and made into the Vicariate of Vizagapatam. They took possession of Aurungabad, Jaulnah, and Kamptee in 1846, and visited Nagpur, Ellichpur (1848), Jubbulpur (1850), and Khandwa. Jubbulpur became a military cantonment in 1857. From 1846 to 1870 Nagpur was a sub-station of Kamptee, and then became a residential station. It developed into the headquarters of the mission when the district was finally separated from Vizagapatam and made into an episcopal see, suffragan to Madras, in 1887.

SUCCESSION OF BISHOPS.—Alexis Riccaz, 1887–92; Charles Felix Pelvat, 1893–1900; J. M. Crochet, 1901–03; E. M. Bonaventure, 1905–07; F. E. Coppel, present bishop from 1907.

INSTITUTIONS.—*Schools for Boys:* St. Francis of Sales' College, Nagpur, Calcutta, with 350 pupils, also industrial school, printing press and Catholic young men's institute; St. Francis of Sales' Native School, Nagpur, with 220 pupils; St. Joseph's Day School, Kamptee, with 130 pupils; St. Aloysius' School, Jubbulpur, with 120 pupils; small schools at Amraoti and Aurangabad; native training school at Ghogargaon with 15 boarders, and 26 other schools in the villages with 215 pupils; thirty schools in Khandwa under 25 catechist teachers with 396 pupils; 17 schools round Ellichpur under 17 catechists with 155 pupils.

Schools for Girls.—Under the Sisters of St. Joseph: six schools at Nagpur, Kamptee, Jubbulpur, Khandwa, Harda, Pachmari with 565 pupils, besides two smaller schools. Under the Daughters of the Cross: three schools at Amraoti, Aurangabad, and Badnera with 191 pupils. Under the Catechist Sisters: two schools in Nagpur with 105 pupils.

Charitable Institutions.—Poorhouse, Nagpur, with 156 inmates; also foundling home with 30 inmates; 14 dispensaries in various places; boys' orphanages at Nagpur, Kamptee, Thana, Jubbulpur, and Amraoti, with 249 inmates, and girls' orphanages at the same places with 229 inmates. St. Vincent de Paul Society at Nagpur; catechumenates at Ghogargaon, Khandwa, and Ellichpur; training schools for catechists at Ghogargaon and Ellichpur with 38 students. The mission centres are (1) Ghogargaon near Aurangabad, created in 1893, with 55 villages, 23,288 Catholics, and 26 schools; (2) Passan near Bilaspur, opened in 1900 with 80 Catholics; (3) Aulia in Khandwa, opened in 1902, 36 villages with 2100 Catholics and 30 schools; (4) Ellichpur in Berar, opened in 1903, 16 villages with 870 Catholics.

Madras Catholic Directory (1909 and previous years); *Diocesan Directory* (1907 and 1908); *La Mission de Vizagapatam* (Annecy, 1890).

ERNEST R. HULL.

Nahanes, or "People of the Setting Sun", a tribe of the great Déné family of American Indians, whose habitat is east and west of the Rocky Mountains just north of latitude 58° N. Broadly speaking they are divided into two branches, the eastern and the western Nahanes. The latter are themselves subdivided into the Thalhthans, so called after their general rendezvous at the confluence of the river of the same name with the Stickine, and the Takus, whose territory is the basin of the Taku River, together with the upper portions of the streams which flow northward to the Lewes, as far east as the upper Liard River. The Kaskas live just west, and through the Rocky Mountains, and by speech, physique, and sociology they are eastern Nahanes, while just east of the same range another subdivision of the tribe roams over the mountains of the Mackenzie. The entire tribe cannot now number much more than 1000 souls, viz., 175 Thalhthans, 200 Kaskas, 150 Takus, and 500 eastern Nahanes proper. The latter, as well as the Kaskas, are pure nomads, without any social organization to speak of, following patriarchal lines in their descent and laws of inheritance, while the westernmost Nahanes have adopted the matriarchal institutions of their neighbours on the Pacific Coast, the clans, with petty chiefs (some of whom are quite influential and are occasionally women), potlatches or public distributions of goods or eatables, cremation of the dead, ceremonial dances, etc. Physically they also resemble the coast Indians, with whom they have intermarried to a great extent, and from the language of whom they have borrowed not a few words.

From a religious standpoint the Nahanes have fared badly. The secluded position of the western branch and the nomadic habits of the eastern subdivision have conspired to keep them away from religious influences. Moreover contact with the miners of the Cassiar goldfields has considerably demoralized the Nahanes of the Far West and sadly thinned their ranks. The Anglican Church has for a dozen of years or so maintained a mission at Thalhthan, which has met with a limited measure of success. The only visit of a Catholic priest to the same was paid

by the writer in the summer of 1903, and it is understood that it is now to be followed up by either the establishment of a permanent post there or by periodical visits of Oblate missionaries. As to the eastern branch of the tribe, they have been more or less within reach of the priests of the Mackenzie valley. To this day, however, both east and west of the Rockies the tribe can be pointed out as one of the least civilized of the North American Indians.

See bibliography to DÉNÉS, HARES, and LOUCHEUX; MORICE, *The Nah'ane and their Language* in *Transactions of the Canadian Institute* (Toronto, 1903).

A. G. MORICE.

Naharro, BARTOLOMÉ DE TORRES. See TORRES NAHARRO, BARTOLOMÉ DE.

Nahum, one of the Prophets of the Old Testament, the seventh in the traditional list of the twelve Minor Prophets.

NAME.—The Hebrew name, probably in the intensive form, *Naḥḥum* (Gesenius-Kautzsch, "Heb. Gramm.", §84b, g), signifies primarily "full of consolation or comfort", hence "consoler" (St. Jerome, *consolator*), "comforter". The name Nahum was apparently of not rare occurrence. Indeed, not to speak of a certain Nahum listed in the Vulgate and Douay Version (II Esd., vii, 7) among the companions of Zorobabel, and whose name seems to have been rather Rehum (I Esd., ii, 2; Heb. has Reḥum in both places), St. Luke mentions in his genealogy of Our Lord a Nahum, son of Hesli and father of Amos (iii, 25); the Mishna also occasionally refers to Nahum the Mede, a famous rabbi of the second century (*Shabb.*, ii, 1, etc.), and another Nahum who was a scribe or copyist (*Peah*, ii, 6); inscriptions show likewise the name was not uncommon among Phœnicians (Gesenius, "Monum. Phœn.", 133; Boeckh, "Corp. Inscript. Græc.", II, 25, 26; "Corp. Inscript. Semitic.", I, 123 a^3 b^3).

THE PROPHET.—The little we know touching the Prophet Nahum must be gathered from his book, for nowhere else in the canonical Scriptures does his name occur, and extracanonical Jewish writers are hardly less reticent. The scant positive information vouchsafed by these sources is in no wise supplemented by the worthless stories concerning the Prophet put into circulation by legend-mongers, and which may be found in Carpzov's "Introd. ad lib. canon. Bibliorum Vet. Test." (III, 386 sqq.). We will deal only with what may be gathered from the canonical Book of Nahum, the only available first-hand document at our disposal. From its title (i, 1), we learn that Nahum was an Elcesite (so D. V.; A. V., Elkoshite; Heb., אלקשי). On the true import of this statement commentators have not always been of one mind. In the prologue to his commentary of the book, St. Jerome informs us that some understood 'Elqoshite as a patronymic indication: "the son of Elqosh"; he, however, holds the commonly accepted view that the word 'Elqoshite shows that the Prophet was a native of Elqosh.

But even understood in this way, the intimation given by the title is disputed by biblical scholars. Where, indeed, should this Elqosh, nowhere else referred to in the Bible, be sought? (1) Some have tried to identify it with 'Alqûsh, 27 miles north of Mossul, where the tomb of Nahum is still shown. According to this opinion, Nahum was born in Assyria, which would explain his perfect acquaintance with the topography and customs of Ninive exhibited in the book. But such an acquaintance may have been acquired otherwise; and it is a fact that the tradition connecting the Prophet Nahum with that place cannot be traced back beyond the sixteenth century, as has been conclusively proven by Assemani. This opinion is now generally abandoned by scholars. (2) Still more recent and hardly more credible is the view advocated by Hitzig and Knobel, who hold that Elqosh was the old name of the town called Capharnaum (i. e., "the village of Nahum") in the first century: a Galilean origin, they claim, would well account for certain slight peculiarities of the Prophet's diction that smack of provincialism. Apart from the somewhat precarious etymology, it may be objected against this identification that Capharnaum, however well known a place it was at the New Testament period, is never mentioned in earlier times, and, for all we know, may have been founded at a relatively recent date; moreover, the priests and the Pharisees would most likely have asserted less emphatically "that out of Galilee a prophet riseth not" (John, vii, 52) had Capharnaum been associated with our Prophet in the popular mind. (3) Still, it is in Galilee that St. Jerome located the birthplace of Nahum ("Comment. in Nah." in P. L., XXV, 1232), supposed to be Elkozeh, in N. Galilee; but "out of Galilee doth a prophet rise?" might we ask again. (4) The author of the "Lives of the Prophets" long attributed to St. Epiphanius tells us "Elqosh was beyond Beth-Gabre, in the tribe of Simeon" (Greek text in P. G., XLIII, 409; Syriac text in Nestle, "Syrische Grammatik, Chrestomathia", 99). He unquestionably means that Elqosh was in the neighbourhood of Beth-Gabre (*Beit Jibrîn*), the ancient Eleutheropolis, on the borders of Juda and Simeon. This view has been adopted in the Roman Martyrology (1 December; "Begabar" is no doubt a corrupt spelling of Beth-Gabre), and finds more and more acceptance with modern scholars.

THE BOOK.—*Contents.*—The Book of Nahum contains only three chapters and may be divided into two distinct parts: the one, including i and ii, 2 (Heb., i–ii, 1–3), and the other consisting of ii, 1, 3–iii (Heb., ii, 2, 4–iii). The first part is more undetermined in tone and character. After the twofold title indicating the subject-matter and the author of the book (i, 1), the writer enters upon his subject by a solemn affirmation of what he calls the Lord's jealousy and revengefulness (i, 2, 3), and a most forceful description of the fright which seizes all nature at the aspect of Yahweh coming into judgment (i, 3–6). Contrasting admirably with this appalling picture is the comforting assurance of God's loving-kindness towards His true and trustful servants (7–8); then follows the announcement of the destruction of His enemies, among whom a treacherous, cruel, and god-ridden city, no doubt Ninive (although the name is not found in the text), is singled out and irretrievably doomed to everlasting ruin (8–14); the glad tidings of the oppressor's fall is the signal of a new era of glory for the people of God (i, 15; ii, 2; Heb., ii, 1, 3).

The second part of the book is more directly than the other a "burden of Ninive"; some of the features of the great Assyrian city are described so accurately as to make all doubt impossible, even if the name Ninive were not explicitly mentioned in ii, 8. In a first section (ii), the Prophet dashes off in a few bold strokes three successive sketches: we behold the approach of the besiegers, the assault on the city, and, within, the rush of its defenders to the walls (ii, 1, 3–5; Heb., ii, 2, 4–6); then the protecting dams and sluices of the Tigris being burst open, Ninive, panic-stricken, has become an easy prey to the victor: her most sacred places are profaned, her vast treasures plundered (6–9; Heb.: 7–10); and now Ninive, once the den where the lion hoarded rich spoils for his whelps and his lionesses, has been swept away forever by the mighty hand of the God of hosts (10–13; Heb., 11–13). The second section (iii) develops with new details the same theme. The bloodthirstiness, greed, and crafty and insidious policy of Ninive are the cause of her overthrow, most graphically depicted (1–4); complete and shameful will be her downfall and no one will utter a word of pity (5–7). As No-Ammon was mercilessly crushed, so Ninive likewise will empty to the dregs the bitter cup of the Divine vengeance (8–11). In vain does she trust in her strongholds, her warriors, her preparations for a siege, and her officials and scribes

(12–17). Her empire is about to crumble, and its fall will be hailed by the triumphant applause of the whole universe (18–19).

Critical Questions.—Until a recent date, both the unity and authenticity of the Book of Nahum were undisputed, even by such critics as Kuenen (Onderzoek, ii, § 75), Wellhausen (Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, 1893, p. 155), and Cornill (Einleitung, 1892, p. 188), and the objections alleged by a few against the genuineness of the words "The burden of Ninive" (i, 1) and the description of the overthrow of No-Ammon (iii, 8–10) were regarded as trifling cavils not worth the trouble of an answer. In the last few years, however, things have taken a new turn: facts hitherto unnoticed have added to the old problems concerning authorship, date, etc. It may be well here for us to bear in mind the twofold division of the book, and to begin with the second part (ii, 1, 3–iii) which, as has been noticed, unquestionably deals with the overthrow of Ninive. That these two chapters of the prophecy constitute a unit and should be attributed to the same author, Happel is the only one to deny; but his odd opinion, grounded on unwarranted alterations of the text, cannot seriously be entertained.

The date of this second part cannot be determined to the year; however, from the data furnished by the text, it seems that a sufficiently accurate approximation is obtainable. First, there is a higher limit which we have no right to overstep, namely, the capture of No-Ammon referred to in iii, 8–10. In the Latin Vulgate (and the Douay Bible) No-Ammon is translated by Alexandria, whereby St. Jerome meant not the great Egyptian capital founded in the fourth century B. C., but an older city occupying the site where later on stood Alexandria ("Comment. in Nah.", iii, 8: P. L., XXV, 1260; cf. "Ep. CVIII ad Eustoch.", 14: P. L., XXII, 890; "In Is.", XVIII: P. L., XXIV, 178; "In Os.", IX, 5–6: P. L., XXV, 892). He was mistaken, however, and so were Champollion and Brugsch, according to whom No-Ammon should be sought in Lower Egypt (L'Egypte sous les Pharaons, II, 131–33); Assyrian and Egyptian discoveries leave no doubt whatever that No-Ammon is the same as Thebes in Upper Egypt. Now Thebes was captured and destroyed by Assurbanipal in 664–663 B. C., whence it follows that the opinion of Nicephorus (in the edition of Geo. Syncell, "Chronographia", Bonn, 1829, I, 759), making Nahum a contemporary of Phacee, King of Israel, the early tradition according to which this prophecy was uttered 115 years before the fall of Ninive (about 721 B. C.; Josephus, "Ant. Jud.", IX, xi, 3), and the conclusions of those modern scholars who, as Pusey, Nägelsbach, etc., date the oracle in the reign of Ezechias or the earlier years of Manasses, ought to be discarded as impossible. The lower limit which it is allowable to assign to this part of the Book of Nahum is, of course, the fall of Ninive, which a well-known inscription of Nabonidus permits us to fix at 607 or 606 B. C., a date fatal to the view adopted by Eutychius, that Nahum prophesied five years after the downfall of Jerusalem (therefore about 583–581; "Annal." in P. G., CXI, 964).

Within these limits it is difficult to fix the date more precisely. It has been suggested that the freshness of the allusion to the fate of Thebes indicates an early date, about 660 B. C., according to Schrader and Orelli; but the memory of such a momentous event would long dwell in the minds of men, and we find Isaias, for instance, in one of his utterances delivered about 702 or 701 B. C. recalling with the same vividness of expression Assyrian conquests achieved thirty to forty years earlier (Is., x, 5–34). Nothing therefore compels us to assign, within the limits set above, 664–606, an early date to the two chapters, if there are cogent reasons to conclude to a later date. One of the arguments advanced is that Ninive is spoken of as having lost a great deal of her former prestige and sunk into a dismal state of disintegration; she is, moreover, represented as beset by mighty enemies and powerless to avert the fate threatening her. Such conditions existed when, after the death of Assurbanipal, Babylonia succeeded in regaining her independence (625), and the Medes aimed a first blow at Ninive (623; Kuenen, Van Hoonacker). Modern critics (Davidson, Kennedy, etc.) appear more and more inclined to believe that the data furnished by the Prophet lead to the admission of a still lower date, namely "the moment between the actual invasion of Assyria by a hostile force and the commencement of the attack on its capital" (Kennedy). The "mauler", indeed, is already on his way (ii, 1; Heb., 2); frontier fortresses have opened their gates (iii, 12–13); Ninive is at bay, and although the enemy has not yet invested the city, to all appearances her doom is sealed.

We may now return to the first part of the book. This first chapter, on account of the transcendent ideas it deals with, and of the lyric enthusiasm which pervades it throughout has not inappropriately been called a psalm. Its special interest lies in the fact that it is an alphabetical poem. The first to call attention to this feature was Frohnmeyer, whose observations, however, did not extend beyond vv. 3–7. Availing himself of this key, Bickell endeavoured to find out if the process of composition did not extend to the whole passage and include the twenty-two letters of the alphabet, and he attempted repeatedly but without great success ("Zeitschr. der deutsch. morg. Gesell.", 1880, p. 559; "Carmina Vet. Test. metrice", 1882; "Zeitschr. für kath. Theol.", 1886), to restore the psalm to its pristine integrity. This failure did not discourage Gunkel who declared himself convinced that the poem is alphabetical throughout, although it is difficult, owing to the present condition of the text, to trace the initial letters מ to ת (Zeitschr. für alttest. Wissensch., 1893, 223 sqq.). This was for Bickell an incentive to a fresh study (Das alphab. Lied in Nah. i-ii, 3, in "Sitzungsberichte der philos.-hist. Classe der kaiser. Akademie der Wissensch.", Vienna, 1894, 5 Abhandl.), the conclusions of which show a notable improvement on the former attempts, and suggested to Gunkel a few corrections (Schöpfung und Chaos, 120). Since then Nowack (Die kleinen Propheten, 1897), Gray ("The Alphab. Poem in Nah." in "The Expositor" for Sept. 1898, 207 sqq.), Arnold (On Nah., i, 1-ii, 3, in "Zeitschr. für alttest. Wissensch.", 1901, 225 sqq.), Happel (Das Buch des Proph. Nah., 1903), Marti (Dodekaproph. erklärt, 1904), Lohr (Zeitschr. für alttest. Wissensch., 1905, I, 174), and Van Hoonacker (Les douze petits proph., 1908), have more or less successfully undertaken the difficult task of extricating the original psalm from the textual medley in which it is entangled. There is among them, a sufficient agreement as to the first part of the poem (א–ל); but the second part still remains a classical ground for scholarly tilts.

Wellhausen (Die kleinen Proph., 1898) holds that the noteworthy difference between the two parts from the point of view of poetical construction is due to the fact that the writer abandoned halfway his undertaking to write acrostically. Happel believes both parts were worked out separately from an unacrostic original. The first corrector went as far as the line beginning with the letter מ, and as the last sentence closed on the word קִשׁ, he noted in the title that his revision extended from אל to קִשׁ; and so the mysterious אל-קִשׁ (later on misconstrued and misspelled אלקשי) has neither a patronymic nor a gentile connotation. Critics are inclined to hold that the disorder and corruption which disfigure the poem are mostly due to the way it was tacked on to the prophecy of Nahum: the upper margin was first used, and then the side margin; and as, in the latter instance, the text must have been overcrowded and blurred, this later on caused in the sec-

ond part of the psalm an inextricable confusion from which the first was preserved. This explanation of the textual condition of the poem implies the assumption that this chapter is not to be attributed to Nahum, but is a later addition. So much indeed was granted by Bickell, and Van Hoonacker (not to speak of non-Catholic scholars) is inclined to a like concession. On the one hand, the marked contrast between the abstract tone of the composition and the concrete character of the other two chapters, we are told, bespeaks a difference of authorship; and, on the other hand, the artificiality of the acrostic form is characteristic of a late date. These arguments, however, are not unanswerable. In any case it cannot be denied that the psalm is a most fitting preface to the prophecy.

Little will be found in the teaching of the book of Nahum that is really new and original. The originality of Nahum is that his mind is so engrossed by the iniquities and impending fate of Ninive, that he appears to lose sight of the shortcomings of his own people. The doom of Ninive was nevertheless in itself for Juda an object-lesson which the impassioned language of the Prophet was well calculated to impress deeply upon the minds of thoughtful Israelites. Despite the uncertainty of the text in several places, there is no doubt that the book of Nahum is truly "a masterpiece" (Kaulen) of literature. The vividness and picturesqueness of the Prophet's style have already been pointed out; in his few short, flashing sentences, most graphic word-pictures, apt and forceful figures, grand, energetic, and pathetic expressions rush in, thrust vehemently upon one another, yet leaving the impression of perfect naturalness. Withal the language remains ever pure and classical, with a tinge of partiality for alliteration (i, 10; ii, 3, 11) and the use of prim and rare idioms; the sentences are perfectly balanced; in a word Nahum is a consummate master of his art, and ranks among the most accomplished writers of the Old Testament.

NAIM

PUSEY, *The Minor Prophets*, II (London, 1860); DAVIDSON, *Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah* (Cambridge, 1896), 9–44; SMITH, *The Minor Prophets*, II (London, 1898); DRIVER, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh, 1898), 334–37; GIGOT, *Special Introduction to the Study of the Old Testament*, II (New York, 1906), 422–426; KENNEDY in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v.; FILLION in VIGOUROUX, *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v.; VAN HOONACKER, *Les douze petits prophètes* (Paris, 1908), 412–52; WELLHAUSEN, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, V: *Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt mit Noten* (Berlin, 1883), 31–33; 155–161; KLEINERT, *Die Propheten Obadja, Jona, Micha, Nahum, Habakuk und Zephanja* (Bielefeld, 1893); MÜLLER, *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form* (Vienna, 1896); NOWACK, *Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt* (Göttingen, 1897), 226–46; BILLERBECK AND JEREMIAS, *Der Untergang Ninevehs und die Weisagungsschrift des Nahums von Elkosch* in *Beiträge zur Semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*, III (1898), 87–188; HAPPEL, *Das Buch des Proph. Nahums erklärt* (1903); MARTI, *Dodekapropheton erklärt* (Tübingen, 1904), 303–325; STRAUSS, *Nahumi de Nino Vaticinium* (Berlin, 1853); KNABENBAUER, *Commentarius in Prophetas Minores*, II (Paris, 1886), 1–50.

CHARLES L. SOUVAY.

Nails, HOLY.—The question has long been debated whether Christ was crucified with three or with four nails. The treatment of the Crucifixion in art during the earlier Middle Ages strongly supports the tradition of four nails, and the language of certain historical writers (none, however, earlier than Gregory of Tours, "De glor. mart.", vi; for the supposed sermon of St. Cyprian, "De passione", is a medieval fabrication), favours the same view. On the other hand, in the thirteenth century, Western art began to represent the feet of the Crucified as placed one over the other and pierced with a single nail. This accords with the language of Nonnus and Socrates and with the poem "Christus patiens" attributed to St. Gregory Nazianzus, which speaks of three nails. More recent archæological criticism has pointed out not only that the two earliest representations of the crucifixion (the Palatine *graffito* does not here come into account), viz., the carved door of Santa Sabina in Rome, and the ivory panel of the British Museum, show no signs of nails in the feet, but that St. Ambrose ("De obitu Theodosii" in P. L., XVI, 1402) and other early writers distinctly imply that there were only two nails (see Forrer and Müller, "Kreuz u. Kreuzigung Christi"). Further, St. Ambrose informs us that St. Helen had one nail converted into a bridle for Constantine's horse (early commentators quote Zach., xiv, 20, in this connexion), and that an imperial diadem was made out of the other nail. Gregory of Tours speaks of a nail being thrown (*deponi*), or possibly dipped into the Adriatic to calm a storm. It is impossible to discuss these problems adequately in brief space, but the information derivable from the general archæology of the punishment of crucifixion as known to the Romans does not in any way contradict the Christian tradition of four nails.

Very little reliance can be placed upon the authenticity of the thirty or more holy nails which are still venerated, or which have been venerated until recent times, in such treasuries as that of Santa Croce in Rome, or those of Venice, Aachen, the Escurial, Nüremberg, Prague, etc. Probably the majority began by professing to be facsimiles which had touched or contained filings from some other nail whose claim was more ancient. Without conscious fraud on the part of anyone, it is very easy for imitations in this way to come in a very brief space of time to be reputed originals. The bridle of Constantine is believed to be identical with a relic of this form which for several centuries has been preserved at Carpentras, but there is another claimant of the same kind at Milan. Similarly the diadem of Constantine is asserted to be at Monza, and it has long been known as "the iron crown of Lombardy".

ROHAULT DE FLEURY, *Mémoire sur les instruments de la passion* (Paris, 1870), 165–181; FORRER AND MÜLLER, *Kreuz u. Kreuzigung Christi in ihrer Kunstentwicklung* (Strasburg, 1894); FRIEDLIEB AND MARTIN, *Archéol. de la passion* (Paris, 1897); KRAUS, *Beiträge zur trierischen Archäol.* (Trier, 1868); FULDA, *Das Kreuz u. die Kreuzigung* (Breslau, 1878); FERRIS, *Le saint mors de Carpentras* (Carpentras, 1874); DE COMBES, *The Finding of the Cross*, tr. (London, 1907); RIANT AND MÉLY, *Exuviæ Sacræ Constantinopolitanæ* (Paris, 1877—).

HERBERT THURSTON.

Naim (NAIN), the city where Christ raised to life the widow's son (Luke, vii, 11–17). The Midrash (Bereshit rabba, 88) gives the significance "agree-

able" to a place called נעים (Naim) in the territory of Issachar, in Galilee. Eusebius and St. Jerome (Onomasticon) place Naim south of Mount Thabor, and not far from Endor. Now, opposite to Thabor, and a mile and a half north of Endûr (doubtless the Biblical Endor), lies a village called Naîn ("pleasantness"). It is situated on the north-western ridge of Jebel Dahy, the Little Hermon, and commands a magnificent view. There are traces of ruins beyond its boundary to the north, but no sign of fortifications. "The gate of the city" (Luke, vii, 12) might have belonged to a wall of enclosure, built to protect the place against marauding tribes, as was often the case in the East. A steep path leads up to the village, passing by the site of an ancient church which had been converted into a mosque, "Moukâm Lidna Aisa" (Oratory of the Lord Jesus). The mosque, having fallen into ruins, was replaced by another in the vicinity. In 1880 the Franciscans bought the ruins of the first building, and erected thereon a chapel. Not far away may be seen Jewish rock-tombs. Thus the details of Naim's graphic story find an easy localization.

ROBINSON, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, III (Boston, 1841), 226; *Survey of W. Palestine, Memoirs*, II (London, 1882), 86; GUÉRIN, *La Galilée*, I (Paris, 1880), 113–115.

BARNABAS MEISTERMANN.

Namaqualand, PREFECTURE APOSTOLIC OF GREAT. See ORANGE RIVER, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF THE.

Name, BAPTISMAL. See BAPTISM, sub-title XV: *Names, Christian.*

Name of Jesus, RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES OF THE. —(1) Knights of the Name of Jesus, also known as Seraphim, founded in 1334 by the Queens of Norway and Sweden to defend their respective countries from the onslaught of heathen hordes. They did not survive the Reformation. (2) Sisters of the Name of Jesus comprise six congregations founded in France during the nineteenth century in the Dioceses of Besançon, with mother-house at Grande-Fontaine, Paris; of Valence (1815 or 1825), mother-house at Lorial; of Rodez, mother-house at Ste-Radegonde; of Toulouse (1827); and of Marseilles (1852). These sisters devote themselves chiefly to the work of teaching and caring for the sick. (3) Confraternity of the Name of Jesus, formed by the amalgamation of the Portuguese Confraternity of the Most Holy Name of Jesus, founded by Andreas Díaz, O.P., in 1432, with the Spanish Confraternity of the Most Holy Name of God, established by Diego Victoria, O.P., in the sixteenth century. Approbation was granted by Popes Paul V (1606) and Innocent XI (1678), and the confraternity was enriched with indulgences and placed under the Dominican general.

BEISSEL in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Namen Jesu;* KELLER, *Les congrégations religieuses en France* (Paris, 1880); *Konversationslex.*

FLORENCE RUDGE MCGAHAN.

Name of Mary, FEAST OF THE HOLY.—We venerate the name of Mary because it belongs to her who is the Mother of God, the holiest of creatures, the Queen of heaven and earth, the Mother of mercy. The object of the feast is the Holy Virgin bearing the name of *Mirjam* (Mary); the feast commemorates all the privileges given to Mary by God and all the graces we have received through her intercession and mediation. It was instituted in 1513 at Cuenca in Spain, and assigned with proper Office to 15 Sept., the octave day of Mary's Nativity. After the reform of the Breviary by St. Pius V, by a Decree of Sixtus V (16 Jan., 1587), it was transferred to 17 Sept. In 1622 it was extended to the Archdiocese of Toledo by Gregory XV. After 1625 the Congregation of Rites hesitated for a while before authorizing its further spread (cf. the seven decrees, "Analecta Juris Pontificii", LVIII, decr. 716 sqq.). But it was celebrated by the Spanish Trinitarians in 1640 (Ordo Hispan., 1640). On 15 Nov., 1658, the feast was granted to the Oratory of Cardinal Berulle under the title: *Solemnitas gloriosæ Virginis, dupl. cum oct., 17 Sept.* Bearing the original title, *SS. Nominis B.M.V.*, it was granted to all Spain and the Kingdom of Naples on 26 Jan., 1671. After the siege of Vienna and the glorious victory of Sobieski over the Turks (12 Sept., 1683), the feast was extended to the universal Church by Innocent XI, and assigned to the Sunday after the Nativity of Mary by a Decree of 25 Nov., 1683 (*duplex majus);* it was granted to Austria as *d. 2. classis* on 1 Aug., 1684. According to a Decree of 8 July, 1908, whenever this feast cannot be celebrated on its proper Sunday on account of the occurrence of some feast of a higher rank, it must be kept on 12 Sept., the day on which the victory of Sobieski is commemorated in the Roman Martyrology. The Calendar of the Nuns of Perpetual Adoration, O.S.B., in France, of the year 1827, has the feast with a special Office on 25 Sept. The feast of the Holy Name of Mary is the patronal feast of the Clerics Regular of the Pious Schools (Piarists) and of the Society of Mary (Marianists), in both cases with a proper office. In 1666 the Discalced Carmelites received the faculty to recite the Office of the Name of Mary four times a year (*duplex*). At Rome one of the twin churches at the Forum Trajani is dedicated to the Name of Mary. In the Ambrosian Calendar of Milan the feast of the Holy Name of Mary is assigned to 11 September.

ALBERS, *Blüthenkränze* (Paderborn, 1894), IV, sqq.; HOLWECK, *Fasti Mariani* (Freiburg, 1892).

FREDERICK G. HOLWECK.

Names, CHRISTIAN.—"Christian names", says the Elizabethan antiquary, Camden, "were imposed for the distinction of persons, surnames for the difference of families." It would seem from this that, even in the sixteenth century, the etymological and historical significance of the phrase "Christian name" was growing dim, and it is commonly quite forgotten in our own time. But, strictly speaking, the "Christian name" is not merely the forename distinctive of the individual member of a family, but the name given to him at his "christening", i. e., his baptism. It should be remembered that in pre-Reformation England the laity were taught to administer baptism in case of necessity with the words: "I *christen* thee in the name of the Father" etc. To "christen" is therefore to "baptize", and "Christian name" means baptismal name.

ORIGINS.—Some vague idea that *nomina sunt omina* (names are omens) seems to be a sort of primitive human instinct. Thus throughout Old-Testament times the significance of names passed as an accepted principle. They were usually given in reference either to some trait in the child, actual or prophetic, or to some feeling or hope in the parent at the time of its birth. It was only a very slight development of this idea to suppose that a change of condition appropriately demanded a change of name. Thus the conversion of Abram into Abraham (the "father of many nations", Gen., xvii, 5) was imposed upon the occasion of the covenant of circumcision and ratified a claim to God's special benediction. In view, then, of this recognized congruity and of the Hebrew practice of giving a name to the male child at the time of its circumcision on the eighth day after birth (Luke, i, 59), it has been maintained that the custom of conferring a name upon the newly baptised was of Apostolic origin. An instance in point is declared to be found in the case of the Apostle of the Gentiles who before his conversion was called Saul and afterwards Paul. But modern scholarship, and with reason, has altogether rejected this contention. The baptism of St. Paul is recorded in Acts, ix, 18, but the name Paul does not occur before Acts, xiii, 9 while Saul is found several times in the interval. We have no more reason to connect the name Paul with the Apostle's bap-

tism than we have to account in the same way for the giving of the name Cephas or Peter, which we know to be due to another cause. Moreover, it is certain, both from the inscriptions of the catacombs and from early Christian literature, that the names of Christians in the first three centuries did not distinctively differ from the names of the pagans around them. A reference to the Epistles of St. Paul makes it plain that even the names of heathen gods and goddesses were borne by his converts after their conversion as before. Hermes occurs in Rom., xvi, 14, with a number of other purely pagan names, Epaphroditus in Phil., iv, 18, Phebe, the deaconess, in Rom., xvi, 1. Not less conclusive are the names which we find in the Christian inscriptions of the earlier period or in the lists of the signatories appended to such councils as Nicæa or Ancyra (see Turner, "Eccl. Occident. Mon. Juris", I, 36–90; II, 50–53), or again in the lists of martyrs. Even at a later date the names are of a most miscellaneous character. The following classification is one that has been worked out by J. Bass Mullinger founded on Martigny.

A.—Names without Christian significance and probably derived from pagan ancestors:—(1) names derived unchanged or but slightly modified from pagan mythology, e. g., Mercurius, Bacchus, Apollos (I Cor., xvi, 12), Hermogenes (Rom., xvi, 4), etc.; (2) from religious rites or omens, e. g., Augustus, Auspicius, Augurinus, Optatus; (3) from numbers, e. g., Primus, Primigenius, Secundinus, Quartus, Octavia, etc.; (4) from colours, e. g., Albanus, Candidus, Rufus, etc.; (5) from animals and birds, e. g., Agnes, Asellus, Columba, Leo, Taurus, Ursula, etc.; (6) from agriculture, e. g., Agricia, Armentarius, Palmatinus, Stercorius, etc.; (7) from flowers, e. g., Balsamia, Flosculus, Narcissus, Rosula; (8) from jewels, e. g., Chrysanthus, Margarites, Smaragdus; (9) from military life or the sea, e. g., Emerentiana, Navigia, Pelagia, Scutarius, Thalassus; (10) from countries, cities, rivers etc.; Afra, Cydnus, Galla, Jordanis, Macedonius, Maurus, Sabina, Sebastianus, etc.; (11) from the months, e. g., Aprilis, Januaria, Junia, etc.; (12) from personal qualities, etc., e. g., Aristo, Hilarius, Modestus, Pudens, etc.; (13) from servile condition, e. g., Servus, Servilianus, Vernacla; (14) names of historical celebrity, e. g., Cæsarius, Cornelia, Pompeius, Ptolemæus, Vergilius.

B.—Names of Christian origin and significance.—(1) Names apparently suggested by Christian dogmas, e. g., Anastasia, Athanasia, Christophorus, Redemptus, Restitutus, etc.; (2) from festivals or rites, e. g., Epiphanius, Eulogia, Natalis, Pascasia, Sabbatius, and the frequently recurring Martyrius; (3) from Christian virtues, e. g., Agape, Elpis, Fides, Irene, with such derivatives as Adelphius, Agapetus, Caritosa, etc.; (4) pious sentiment, e. g., Adeodata, Ambrosius, Benedictus, Deogratias, etc., and possibly such names as Gaudentianus, Hilarius, Sozomen, Victorianus, Vincentius, but it is very hard to be sure that any distinctively Christian feeling is here latent.

On the other hand though the recurrence of such names as Agnes, Balbina, Cornelius, Felicitas, Irenæus, Justinus, etc. may very probably be due to veneration for the martyrs who first bore these names, it is rather curious that the names of the saints of the New Testament are but rarely found while those of the Old Testament are hardly less uncommon. Susanna, Daniel, Moyses, Tobias, occur pretty frequently, but it is only towards the end of the fourth century that we find the name of our Blessed Lady or become at all familiar with those of the Apostles. Even then we cannot be sure that in the case of Paulus in particular there is any intentional reference to the Apostle of the Gentiles, but Johannes at least, and Andreas, with Petrus and its derivatives like Petronia, Petrius, Petronilla, etc. are less open to doubt. The name of Mary occurs occasionally in the catacomb inscriptions towards the close of the fourth century, for example, in the form LIVIA MARIA IN PACE (De Rossi, "Rom. Sot.", I, 143) and there is a martyr Maria assigned to the date A. D. 256 (De Rossi, "Rom. Sot.", III, 200 sqq. and compare other instances of the name, De Rossi, "Insc. Christ.", I, 331; II, 160 and 173).

CHANGE OF NAME AT BAPTISM.—If we could trust the authentic and contemporary character of the Acts of St. Balsamus, who died A. D. 311, we should have an early example of the connexion between baptism and the giving of a name. "By my paternal name", this martyr is said to have declared, "I am called Balsamus, but by the spiritual name which I received in baptism, I am known as Peter." It would seem in any case that the assumption of a new name for some devotional reason was fairly common among Christians. Eusebius the historian took the name Pamphili from Pamphilus the martyr whom he especially venerated. Earlier still St. Cyprian chose to be called Cyprianus Cæcilius out of gratitude to the Cæcilius to whom he owed his conversion. Moreover St. Dionysius of Alexandria (c. 260) declared "I am of opinion that there were many of the same name as the Apostle John, who on account of their love for him, and because they admired and emulated him, and desired to be loved by the Lord as he was, took to themselves the same name, just as many of the children of the faithful are called Paul or Peter" (Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl.", VII, xxv). It would be only natural that the assumption of any such new name should take place formally at baptism, in which the catechumen, then probably as now, had to be addressed by some distinctive appellation. On the other hand it seems likely that the imposition of a new name at baptism only became the invariable rule after infant baptism had become general. Every child had necessarily to receive some name or other, and when baptism followed soon after birth, this must have offered a very suitable opportunity for the public recognition of the choice made.

No doubt the thirtieth of the supposed Arabian Canons of Nicæa: "Of giving only names of Christians in baptism" is not authentic, even though it is of early date; but the sermons of St. John Chrysostom seem to assume in many different places that the conferring of a name, presumably at baptism, ought to be regulated by some idea of Christian edification, and he implies, though this does not seem to be borne out by the evidence now available, that such had been the practice of earlier generations. For example he says: "When it comes to giving the infant a name, caring not to call it after the saints, as the ancients at first did, people light lamps and give them names and so name the child after the one which continues burning the longest, from thence conjecturing that he will live a long time" (Hom. in Cor., xii, 13). Similarly he commends the practice of the parents of Antioch in calling their children after the martyr Meletius (P. G., L, 515), and again he urges his hearers not to give their children the first name that occurs, nor to seek to gratify fathers or grandfathers or other family connexions by giving *their* names, but rather to choose the names of holy men conspicuous for virtue and for their courage before God (P. G., LIII, 179). History preserves sundry examples of such a change of name in adult converts. Socrates (Hist. Eccl., VII, xxi) tells us of Athenais who married the Emperor Theodosius the Younger, and who previously to marriage was baptized (A. D. 421) receiving the name Eudoxia. Again Bede tells us of the case of King Cædwalla who went to Rome and was baptised by the Pope Sergius who gave him the name of Peter. Dying soon afterwards he was buried in Rome and his epitaph beginning "Hic depositus est Cædwalla qui est Petrus" was long pointed out (Bede, "Hist. Eccl.", V, vii). Later we have the well-known instance of Guthrum the Danish leader in England who after his long contest with King Alfred was eventually defeated and, consenting to ac-

cept Christianity, was baptized in 878 by the name of Æthelstan.

PRACTICE REGARDING NAMES.—But while various Fathers and spiritual writers, and here and there a synodal decree, have exhorted the faithful to give no names to their children in baptism but those of canonized saints or of the angels of God, it must be confessed that there has never been a time in the history of the Church when these injunctions have been at all strictly attended to. They were certainly not heeded during the early or the later Middle Ages. Any one who glances even casually at an extensive list of mediæval names, such as are perhaps best found in the indexes to the volumes of legal proceedings which have been edited in modern times, will at once perceive that while ordinary names without any very pronounced religious associations, such as William, Robert, Roger, Geoffrey, Hugh, etc. enormously preponderate (William about the year 1200 was by far the most common Christian name in England), there are also always a very considerable number of exceptional and out-of-the-way names which have apparently no religious associations at all. Such names, to take but a few specimens, as Ademar, Ailma, Ailward, Albreza, Alditha, Amaury, Ascelina, Avice, Aystorius (these come from the lists of those cured at the shrine of St. Thomas of Canterbury) are of quite frequent occurrence. The point however cannot be dwelt on here. We may note on the other hand that a rubric in the official "Rituale Romanum" enjoins that the priest ought to see that unbecoming or ridiculous names of deities or of godless pagans are not given in baptism (curet ne obscœna, fabulosa aut ridicula vel inanium deorum vel impiorum ethnicorum hominum nomina imponantur). Some of the seventeenth century French rituals have gone further than this. For example that of Bourges (1666) addressing parents and godparents urges: "Let them give to boys the names of male saints and to girls those of women saints as right order requires, and let them avoid the names of festivals like Easter (Pâques), Christmas (Noël), All Saints (Toussaint) and others that are sometimes chosen." Despite such injunctions "Toussaint" has become a not uncommon French Christian name and "Noël" has spread even to England. The addition of Marie, especially in the form Jean-Marie, for boys, and of Joseph for girls is of everyday occurrence.

In Spain and Italy again, ardent devotion to our Blessed Lady has not remained content with the simple name Maria, but many of her festivals etc. have also created names for girls: Conceptión, of which the diminutive is Concha, is one of the best known, but we have also Asunción, Encarnación, Mercedes, Dolores, etc. in Spanish and in Italian Assunta, Annunziata, Concetta, etc. It is strange on the other hand that the name Mary has by no means always been a favourite for girls, possibly from a feeling that it was too august to be so familiarly employed. In England in the twelfth century Mary as a Christian name is of very rare occurrence. George again is a name which despite the recognition of the warrior saint as patron of England, was by no means common in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, though strangely enough it grew in popularity after the Reformation. A writer who has made a minute examination of the registers of Oxford University from 1560 to 1621, has made out the following list of the more common names borne by the students in order of popularity: John, 3826; Thomas, 2777; William, 2546; Richard, 1691; Robert, 1222; Edward, 957; Henry, 908; George, 647; Francis, 447; James, 424; Nicholas, 326; Edmund, 298 (see Oxford Hist. Soc. Transactions, XIV). In Italy and Spain it has always been a tolerably common practice to call a child after the saint upon whose feast he is born.

CONFIRMATION NAMES.—The practice of adopting a new name was not limited to baptism. Many mediæval examples show that any notable change of condition, especially in the spiritual order, was often accompanied by the reception of a new name. In the eighth century the two Englishmen Winfrith and Willibald going on different occasions to Rome received from the reigning pontiff, along with a new commission to preach, the names respectively of Boniface and Clement. So again Emma of Normandy when she married King Ethelred in 1002 took the name Ælfgifu; while, of course, the reception of a new name upon entering a religious order is almost universal even in our own day. It is not strange, then, that at confirmation, in which the interposition of a godfather emphasizes the resemblance with baptism, it should have become customary to take a new name, though usually no great use is made of it. In one case, however, that of Henry III, King of France, who being the godson of our English Edward VI had been christened Edouard Alexandre in 1551, the same French prince at confirmation received the name of Henri, and by this he afterwards reigned. Even in England the practice of adopting a new name at confirmation was remembered after the Reformation, for Sir Edward Coke declares that a man might validly buy land by his confirmation name, and he recalls the case of a Sir Francis Gawdye, late Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, whose name of baptism was Thomas and his name of confirmation Francis (Co. Litt. 3a).

SCHROD in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Namen;* BASS MULLINGER in *Dict. Christ. Ant.;* CORBLET, *Histoire du sacrament de baptême*, II (Paris, 1884); MARTÈNE, *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus*, I (Venice, 1783), 17–28; YONGE, *A History of Christian Names* (London, 1894).

HERBERT THURSTON.

Names, HEBREW.—To the philosopher a name is an artificial sign consisting in a certain combination of articulate sounds, whereby a particular class of people are wont to designate one thing and distinguish it from all others. If the name conveys an idea, it is merely because of a wholly artificial relation once arbitrarily established between the name and the thing it stands for. Primitive people, using a language as it is handed down to them without inquiring into its origin, are inclined to make much of names. This is true of the old Semitic peoples, especially of the Hebrews. All Hebrew names were supposed to bear a significance, as originally individual subjects were called by a name expressive of some characteristic, e. g., Edom, red; Esau, hairy; Jacob, supplanter. They were carefully and solemnly selected, especially personal names. Leaving aside cases where the name was Divinely given (Abraham, Gen., xvii, 5; Isaac, Gen., xvii, 19; Ismael, Gen., xvi, 11; John, Luke, i, 13; Jesus, Matt., i, 21; etc.), the naming of a child usually devolved upon the parents, and, it appears, preferably upon the mother. The women of the family (Ruth, iv, 17), or the neighbours (Luke, i, 59), talked over the name to be given. The name seems to have been given ordinarily at the time of the birth; but at a late period the day of circumcision was more usual (Luke, i, 59; ii, 21). Of the customs connected with the naming of cities we know nothing, except what may be gathered from the names themselves, and what is said of a few cities named after their founders and conquerors (Gen., iv, 17; Num., xxxii, 42; Deut., iii, 14; Jos., xix, 47; etc.).

So intimate was the relation conceived to be between the individual and his name, that the latter came frequently to be used as an equivalent of the former: "to be called" meant "to be", the name being taken to be equal to the object, nay, identical with it. Nothing is more eloquent of this fact than the religious awe in which the Hebrews held the name of God (see JEHOVAH). Similar notions prevailed with regard to all proper names. Nor were the Hebrews an exception: all Semitic peoples, and, to some extent, all primitive peoples shared the same belief. This is why the study of these names is looked upon by students of history as a sort of key to the knowledge of the reli-

gious and social conditions of these peoples. We shall here discuss only Hebrew names: I. Divine Names; II. Personal Names; III. Place Names.

I. Divine Names.—*Yahweh.*—Jehovah (q. v.), the traditional form of this name in Western languages, is based on a misunderstanding of the Massoretic vocalization. The name Yahweh, of which an abbreviated form, *Yah*, and a spelling, *Yahw*, seem to have been popular, is derived doubtlessly from the verb *hayah*, "to be", and is best translated by "he is" (Lagrange in "Revue Biblique", 1903, pp. 370–86; 1908, pp. 383–86). *'El*, which is found among all Semitic peoples (Phœn., Arab.: *'El;* Assyr.: *Il, Ilu;* Aram.: *'Alah*), is, in the Bible, appellative in most cases, but was certainly in the beginning a proper name (so, e. g., in Gen., xxxi, 13; xxxiii, 20; xlvi, 3). Its etymology is to the present day a much mooted question: some derive the word from a root *'wl*, "to be strong"; others from *y'l*, which might connote the idea of "being the first"; others finally from *'lh*, by which, at an early stage of the development of the Semitic languages the idea of mere relation (*esse ad*) was conveyed. According to the first two opinions, the name is intended primarily to express the superiority of the Divine nature, whereas, according to the third, God is *'El* because He is the term of the aspirations (*finis*) of mankind (Lagrange, "Etudes sur les religions sémitiques", 70 sqq., especially 78–80; "Revue biblique", 1903, pp. 362–370). Closely related to *'El* are the names *'Eloh* and *'Elohim*, sometimes used as appellatives, but more frequently as proper names. The plural form of the latter to some extent still puzzles grammarians and students of the religious belief of the Hebrews (see Gesenius-Kautzsch, "Hebr. Gramm.", § 124, g–i; Prat, "Le nom divin est-il intensif en Hebreu?" in "Revue bibl.", 1901, p. 497 sqq.; Smith "The Religion of the Semites", London, 1907, 445; Lagrange, "Etudes sur les religions sémitiques", 77). We need not dwell upon the many cases where *'El* and *'Elohim* are used as appellatives, either by themselves, or as parts of compound names such as *'El Roy* (the God of the apparition), *'El 'Olam* (the Eternal God), *'El 'Elyon* (the Most High God), *'Elohe Sebaoth* (the God of Hosts), etc. (see Lagrange in "Revue biblique", 1903, pp. 364–67). *Shadday.*—As to the name *Shadday*, which is found sometimes alone, and at other times in connexion with *'El* (*'El Shadday*), it was originally an adjective conveying possibly the idea of fecundity (Gen., xvii, 1; xlix, 25) or of highness (Ps., xci, 1); at a later period the Prophets, in order to emphasize their threats of divine punishment, spoke as if the word were related to *shadad*, to "devastate"; but the people at large, unmindful of these etymological niceties, used *Shadday* merely as a substitute for *'El*, perhaps with the special connotation of "Almighty".

II. Personal Names.—Personal names are either purely Hebrew or hebraïcized. To the latter category belong not only (passing over foreign names as Teglathphalasar, Assuerus, etc.) Babylonian (Daniel-Balthassar) and Persian (Hadassa-Esther) names assumed by some persons of Hebrew origin living in far-away countries, and the Greek and Latin names in use among Jews of later times conjointly with their Hebrew or Aramaic names (John–Mark; Saul–Paul, etc.), but also certain very old names which were handed down by tradition, such as Cain, Abel, Noe, Abraham, etc., and treated by the sacred writers as Hebrew words. There is scarcely any doubt but that in passing from one language to the other these names were altered to some extent; and as the etymological explanation pretends to interpret the Hebrew form, the meaning arrived at can hardly be more than fanciful. It is from the original language of these names that their meaning should be sought (so Abram and Abraham may be explained from the Assyr. *Abi-râmū*, or *Abi-râme*, "my father loveth"; Sarai and Sara from *Sharat*, "the great princess"; Lot from *Lâtu*, or *Lā'itū*, "the consumer"; from the Egyptian might be explained likewise a few names, e. g., Moses, "the child", etc.). Of the pure Hebrew names some are simple and others compound. Simple names appear to have been more frequent in early times, but some are in reality hypocoristic, i. e., abbreviated forms of compound names, as Saul (asked), David (beloved), Nathan (he gave), etc., which were probably combined with a Divine name, *Yah* or *'El*.

Simple Names.—Of the simple names a few seem to have been suggested by particular circumstances, especially circumstances attending the child's birth: e. g., Jacob (the supplanter), Joseph (possibly an hypocoristic name: "Whom God added"—Eliasaph was at one time a favourite name for the youngest son in a family). A large class of proper names for men and women is made up of adjectives denoting personal characteristics. Here are a few instances: Acan (afflicting), Achaz (possessor), Agar (wanderer), 'Amos (strong), Amri (eloquent), Aod (praising), Asaph (gatherer), Aser (happy), Asir (captive), Ather (bound), Azbai (dwarf), Balac (vain), Baruch (blessed), Cetura (sweet-smelling), Dalila (yearning), Doeg (anxious), Edom (red), Esthon (woman-like), Gaddel, Geddel (tall), Gedeon (destroyer), Heled (fat), Job (ruthlessly treated), Laban (white), Manahem (consoler), Nabal (fool), Nachor (panting or snoring), Nahum (comforter), Noemi (pretty), Omri (tiro, awkward), Ornan (nimble), Ozni (long-eared), Phesse (lame), Ruth (friend), Sepho (bald-headed), etc.

Names of animals and of plants were at the same period not infrequently given to persons both by the Hebrews and by their neighbours, the Chanaanites and others. Among the names of animals assumed as proper names, we may mention: Achbor (mouse), Aia (vulture), Aran (wild goat), Caleb (dog), Debora (bee), Eglon (calf), Gaal (beetle), Hagaba, in N. T. Agabus (locust), Hulda (weasel), Jahel (chamois), Jonas (dove), Nahas (snake), Ozi (goose-like), Rachel (ewe), Saphan (coney), Sebia (gazelle), Sephora (little bird), Sual (jackal), Tabitha (Aram., gazelle), Tola (worm), Zeb (wolf).—Of the names of plants, apparently less frequently used than those of animals, here are a few instances: Asena (bush), Cassia (a kind of balsam-tree), Cos (thorn), Elas (oak), Elon (terebinth), Hadassa (myrtle), Oren (pine), Susan (lily), etc. Some modern scholars explain the relatively frequent recurrence of these two kinds of names among Palestinian populations as remnants of totemism which, these scholars maintain, prevailed in early times. This is hardly the place to discuss such a question. It is illogical to extend to all primitive peoples religious conceptions observed in some few; were we to yield to the fascination for totems which prevails among some writers, we might consider as traces of totemism such English names as Fox, Wolf, Hawthorne, and the like. Granting even that the names mentioned above are unmistakable signs of totemism among the early populations of Palestine, it would by no means necessarily follow that these names manifest the prevalence of the same religious ideas among the Hebrews. Hebrew was not the primitive language of the descendants of Abraham, they having adopted it from the natives of the land of Chanaan; naturally along with the language they adopted certain of their modes of speech.

Sometimes names of things, also of natural phenomena, even (though rarely) abstractions, and words referring to trades or avocations were taken as proper names. Of the latter class we have for instance: Abdon, Obed (servant), Amon (architect), Berzellai (blacksmith), Charmi (vine-dresser), Somer (watchman), Zamri (singer); of the former: Agag (fire), Ahod (union), 'Amos (burden), Anna (grace), Barac (lightning), Bezec (thunderbolt), Cis (straw), Core (frost), Ephron (dust), Hon (strength), Mary (stubbornness,

disobedience, see Num., xii), Naboth (fruit), Ur (light), Samson (sun), etc.

Compound Names.—Compound personal names are so numerous that only a few main points concerning them can be touched on here. First comes the question of the exact meaning of these names. Although the sense of each part separately is usually clear enough, yet that of the compound is not. The difficulty is to decide whether these parts are in genitive relation, or in relation of subject to predicate (the verb in the latter case being understood). In certain names, no matter which view is taken, the meaning remains practically the same; it is immaterial whether "Eliezer" be interpreted "God of help" or "God is help"; but with names like Abinadab, the difference in both constructions becomes marked, for "Father of generosity" is by no means equivalent to "my father is generous". Since no rule for all cases is available, for the sake of clearness it will be well to divide compound names into three classes: (1) Names having as one of their component parts a term connoting either kindred (father, son, etc.) or accidental relations (e. g., servant); (2) Names (known as theophorous names) containing a Divine element; (3) Names including terms both of kindred and Divinity.

(1) There is no doubt but that only a genitive relation will explain names having as their first element *Ben* (son), *Bath* (daughter), *Ebed* or *Obed* (servant). Thus Benjamin is to be interpreted "son of the right hand"; Bethsabee, "daughter of the oath"; Obed-edom, "servant of Edom". Names in which the first element is *Ab* (father), *Ah* (brother), *Amm* (uncle by the father's side) are to be considered sentences, for such names are applied equally to men and women,—names such as Abigail, Abisag, etc., if they meant "father of joy", "father of error", would be most unsuitable for women. The name Achab some regard as a possible exception to this rule (it might then be interpreted "brother of the father"—uncle); whether this exception is warranted remains problematical. As to the letters *i* (י) and *u* (ו) frequently introduced after the first element of this class of names (Abi, Achi, Ammi), it seems rather a connecting vowel than a personal suffix.

(2) Theophorous names were at all times widely used among Semitic peoples. To limit ourselves to names found in the Bible, although names including the Divine element *Yah*, or *Yaho*, are by far the more numerous, yet they were not in use as early as those formed with *'El*. These names have for their other component element either a verb or a noun. In the former case, the Divine name is the subject of the verb (Elisama, "God heard"; Jonathan, "Yahweh gave"); in the latter the Divine name may be regarded again as the subject, and the noun as the predicate (Elisua, "God is salvation"; Josue, "Yahweh is salvation"). Not only the name of the true God, but also names of foreign deities, especially *Adon*, *Baal*, *Melek*, entered into the composition of names taken by Hebrews at a period when the relations of God's people with their neighbours were most intimate. Naturally such names are to be interpreted in the same manner as those including *Yah* or *'El*. Hence Adonizedec shall be understood "Adon is justice", etc.; but Esbaal can hardly mean anything else than "man of Baal". In this connexion it is noticeable that at a later period abhorrence of these foreign deities prompted first the reading, and soon afterwards the writing of Bosheth (shame) in places where originally the text had Baal (Isboseth, for Isbaal). Moreover, it matters not, in theophorous names, whether the Divine element stands in the first or in the last place (theophorous names have among western Semitic peoples only two component parts, contrary to the Assyrian and Babylonian use): for Nathan-El is equivalent to El-Nathan, Josue to Isaias, etc.

Not unfrequently two Divine names are united to form a compound, as in Joel, Elimelech, etc. In these cases it is clear that we should see a sentence expressing an act of faith in the divinity of the god the subject of the sentence. Accordingly Joel will be interpreted "Yahweh is God", and Elimelech "Melech is God". On the other hand, Adonias and Malachias cannot mean "Adon is Yahweh" or "Melek is Yahweh", because, unlike *'El*, *Yah* is never appellative; in these words, *Adon* and *Melek* are common nouns, and the compounds are equivalent respectively to "Yahweh is master" and "Yahweh is king".

(3) The rules laid down for interpreting the above classes of compound names are equally applicable to those made up of a word denoting relationship and a word denoting divinity. If the first part of these names be *Ben*, *Bath*, *Bar* (Aram., son), *Ebed*, *Ish* (man), a genitive relation may be understood to exist between it and the second part; thus Benadad or Barhadad stands for "son of Hadad"; Abdeel for "servant of God"; Esbaal for "man of Baal". On the other hand, if the first element be *Ab*, *Ah*, *Amm* or the like it seems that the relation to the Divine name should be regarded rather as one of predicate to subject. It is clear that the interpretation indicated here is the right one, for otherwise some names would convey absurd meanings: surely Abia, Abiel, Abbaal, Ammiel, cannot mean "father", "uncle", "of Yahweh", "of God", "of Baal". There might be no objection, absolutely speaking, in words like Achiel, Achia, being understood "brother of God", "of Yahweh"; but it is hard to believe the sense could be, as it is, different when the elements appear in the reverse order, as in Joahe.

From this rapid survey, it appears that students of the history of religions may find in Hebrew proper names ample material for deductions concerning the religious belief and the theology of God's people. Not to mention what has been hinted at concerning the influence of Chanaanite idolatry, and passing over the preference given to the Divine name *'El* in earlier times, a fairly complete knowledge of the attributes of God may be gathered from Divine and theophorous names. Yahweh, "He whose essence is to be", is God, that is to say, the term of every being's aspirations ('El); He is Most High ('El 'Elyon), eternal ('El 'Olam), perfect (Joatham), and worthy of all praise (El-uzai) and glory (Jochabed). His eyes behold everything ('El Roy); His knowledge comprehends all things (Eliada, Joiada), and all things are ever present to His memory (Zacharias). He is all-powerful ('El Shadday), and in Him all things acknowledge their founder (Eliacim, Joiakim, Joakin) and their upholder (Joram); to Him they are indebted for their increase (Eliasaph), their beauty (Elnaim, Joada) and their strength (Eliphaz, Eliel). His generosity (Jonadab) prompts Him to communicate His gifts (Joas, Jonathan, Jozabad, Johanan, John) to creatures. To men in particular He is a father (Abias, Abiel, Joab), and a brother (Achias, Achiel): He loves them (Eliadad). Being merciful (Jerahmeel), He lends a willing ear to their prayers (Elisama); He is their master (Adonias), their king (Malachias), their defender (Jorib), their help (Eleazar, Eliezer), their saviour (Josue, Jesus, Isaias), their protector in distress (Elisaphan, Elisur, Eliaba); from Him proceeds all justice and justification (Josedec); in the end, He shall be their judge (Josaphat); from Him also shall they receive their reward (Elphaal, Eliasub, Elihoreph).

III. Place Names.—When we speak of Hebrew names of places in Palestine, it should be borne in mind that many of these names, like the towns and villages they designated, were in existence long before the Hebrews settled there, and even before any records mentioning places in Palestine were written (Inscr. of Thotmes III, about 1600 B. C.; El-Amarna letters, about 1450 B. C.). Nevertheless we are justified in

considering these names as Hebrew, since Hebrew is the Chanaanite language of the early inhabitants of Palestine, adopted by the Israelite conquerors.

In all countries, many names of places have been suggested by the topography. The Palestinians named certain towns Rama, Ramath, Ramatha, Ramathaim for the same reason we would name them "Height"; they said Gabaa, Geba, Gabaon, as we would say "Hill"; their Sela (Petra) would be our "Cliff"; what we might style our "Hollow" they called Horen or Horonaim. They had their Lebanon as we have our "White Mountains"; and where we would say "Blackrock", they said Hauran; the names of some of their rivers: Jordan, Cedron, Sichor, resemble our "Rapids", "Dusky", "Blackwater". Argob means a lay of rich soil; Horeb or Jabes, dry lands; Accaron, "Bad Lands". "Spring" and "Well" were then as now a prominent element in compound names of places (hence, Endor, Engaddi, etc.; Beroth, Bersabee, etc.); to a native of the Holy Land, Hammath, Hamman sounded like "Hot Springs" to us. A large proportion of compound names are made up of Hasor (enclosed settlement), Cariath, Ir, Qir (city), Beth (house), and another element the origin of which is not always obvious (Cariath-Arbe, Bethlehem). Sometimes also the locality derived its name from some vegetable product: Abel (meadow), Atad (some kind of Rhamnus), Baca (mulberry-tree), Abel-keramim, Bethacarem, Escol, Sorec (vine); Dilan (cucumber); Ela, Elath, Elim, Eloth, Elon (oak and terebinth); Gamzo (sycamore); Luz (almond-tree); Mount Olivet; Remmon (pomegranate); Rithma (broom); Samir, Bethsetta (acacia); Bettaffua (apple tree); Thamar (palm-tree).

Places named after animals are not rare in Palestine: Acrabim (scorpion); Aialon (stag); Arad (wild ass); Eglon, Eglaim (calf); Ephron, Ophra (gazelle); En-gaddi (kid); Etam (hawk); Bethhagla (partridge); Humta (lizard); Lais, Lebaoth (lion); Irnahas (snake); Beth-nemra (leopard); Para (cow); Seboim (hyena); Hasar-sual (jackal); Hasar-susa, -susim (horse); Telaim, Bethcar (lamb); Zora (hornet); etc.

An important and interesting class of topographical names have reference to the religious practices of the early inhabitants of Chanaan. Such cities as Bethsames, Ensemes, the various Hares clearly owed their names to their being given up to sun-worship; likewise such names as Sin, Sinai (Babyl. *Sin*, i. e., Moon-god), and Jericho, tell us of places consecrated to the cult of the moon. Many were the cities and mountains dedicated by the Chanaanites to the various Baals. Even Babylonian gods possessed shrines in Palestine: the names of Mt. Nebo, Nebo of Moab, Nebo of Juda (Esd., ii, 29), are of themselves very suggestive; Anath, the female companion of Anu, gave her name to Beth-Anath, Beth-Anoth, Anatboth; Bel was honoured in Ribla (Ar-bela); Ishtar in Astaroth, Astaroth-carnaim, Beestera; the name Beth-Dagon needs no comment.

Finally a certain number of distinctly Hebrew names, which either superseded older ones, or were given to localities before unnamed, have a special interest because they took their origin from events enshrined in the memory of the Hebrews. Bersabee recalls the league of Abraham and Abimelech (Gen., xix, 20); Eseq, the quarrel of the herdsmen of Gerara with those of Isaac (Gen., xxvi, 20); Bethel, the vision of Jacob (Gen., xxviii, 17); likewise the names Abel-Misraim (Gen., i, 11), Mara (Ex., xv, 23), Massa, Meriba (Ex., xvii, 7), Thabeera (Num., xi, 3), Horma (Num., xxi, 3), Galgala (Jos., v, 9), Bokim (Judges, ii, 5), Abenezer (I Kings, vii, 12), Pherez Oza (II Kings, vi, 8), etc., were for the Hebrew people so many records of the memorable past. And this custom of renaming places in commemoration of momentous facts persisted until the times of the New Testament, as we gather from the (Aramaic) name Haceldama (Matt., xxviii, 18; Acts, i, 19) given to the potter's field bought with blood-money.

CHEYNE in *Encycl. Bibl.*, s. vv. *Abi, Ammi;* CLAY, *Jastrow: Israel. and Assyr. Proper Names* in *Lutheran Church Review*, XIV, 196–201; GRAY, *Hebrew Proper Names* (London, 1896); IDEM, *Nebo as an Element in Hebrew Proper Names* in *Expository Times* (Feb., 1899), 232–34; IDEM in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible*, s. vv. *Name* and *Proper Names;* JASTROW, *On Compounds with Bosheth-Baal* in *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.* (1894), 19 sqq.; IDEM, *On Compounds with -yah* in *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.* (1894), 101–27; SMITH, *The Religion of the Semites* (London, 1907); IDEM, *Animal and Plant Names* in *Journ. of Phil.*, IX, 75–100; HILLER, *Onomasticum Sacrum* (Tübingen, 1706); LEUSDEN, *Onomasticum Sacrum* (Leyden, 1664); MICHAELIS, *Observat. phil. de nominibus propr. Ebreor.* (Halle, 1729); IDEM, *Nomina quædam propria Vet. et Novi Test.* (Halle, 1754); SIMONIS, *Onomasticum Vet. Test.* (Halle, 1741); LAGRANGE, *Etudes sur les religions sémitiques* (Paris, 1903); LESÊTRE in VIGOUROUX, *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Nom;* RENAN, *Sur les noms théophores dans les langues sémitiques* in *Revue des Etudes Juives* (1882), 161–77; GRUNDWALD, *Die Eigennamen des Alt. Test. in ihrer Bedeutung für die Kenntniss des hebräischen Volksglaubens* (Breslau, 1895); KERBER, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung der hebr. Eigennamen* (1897); LAGARDE, *Bildung der Nomina* (Leipzig, 1889); NESTLE, *Die israelitischen Eigennamen nach ihrer religionsgeschichtlichen Bedeutung* (Harlem, 1876).

CHARLES L. SOUVAY.

Names of Jesus and Mary, SISTERS OF THE HOLY, a religious congregation founded at Longueuil, Quebec, 8 December, 1844, under the patronage of Bishop Bourget, of Montreal, for the Christian education of young girls. The mother-house is at Hochelaga, Montreal. The institute was incorporated by Act of the Canadian Parliament, 17 March, 1845. A Decree *cum laude* was issued by Pius IX, 27 February, 1863, and a further Decree of 4 September, 1877, approved the institute; the constitutions received definite approval 26 June, 1901, and the institute was divided into seven provinces, 11 May, 1894, later increased to nine, 25 August, 1910. Under the direction of Rev. J. Allard three Canadian aspirants—Miss Eulalie Durocher, Miss Henriette Céré, and Miss Mélodie Dufresne —were trained according to the institute of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary established by Mgr Eugène de Mazenod of Marseilles. They took simple religious vows at Longueuil, 8 December, 1844, as Sisters Marie-Rose, Marie-Madeline, and Marie-Agnes. Bishop Bourget gave the institute diocesan approval and appointed Mother Marie-Rose, general superior for life. The community at Marseilles supplied the title of the congregation and, with modifications, the habit and the rule. Under Mother Marie-Rose, the congregation developed rapidly, and a course of study providing equally for English pupils and French was sketched on lines sufficiently broad to cover subsequent requirements. The teaching of boys was not at first contemplated, but missionary conditions rendering it imperative in certain provinces, permission from the Holy See has been temporarily obtained. The postulate lasts six months. At the end of the canonical year novices are sent for six additional months to the different houses, where they become practically acquainted with the life of the community. After five years, the young religious reconsiders her vocation during a retreat of thirty days. Final vows are perpetual. Young girls desirous of leading a hidden life in the apostolate of education, or possessing little aptitude for instruction, may enter as auxiliary sisters. Their spiritual preparation is similar to that of the choir sisters, and save for minor details in dress, no outward distinctions exist between the two classes. A general superior elected for five years, who may not be chosen for more than two consecutive terms, governs the entire congregation, assisted by four councillors. A general chapter assembles periodically to deliberate upon the major concerns of the institute.

In 1859 Archbishop Blanchet of Oregon City, Oregon, secured twelve sisters for his diocese. Several years later, they were invited to Seattle, Washington. To-day these two States form one province, with a novitiate (1871) and provincial headquarters at St. Mary's Academy and College, Portland. This school

was empowered to confer degrees (July, 1893), also to grant a Teachers' State Certificate good for five years, and a Teachers' State Diploma qualifying the holder for life. In 1907, an Act of the Washington State Legislature, afterwards ratified by the State Board of Education, accredited the Holy Names' Academies at Seattle and Spokane, as State Normal Schools. Two other provinces are located in the United States. That of California, established at Oakland (1868) by Bishop Alemany, possesses a novitiate since 1871; the New York province includes Florida. Quebec has four provinces; Ontario, one; Manitoba, one. Attached to Ontario are parochial schools in Detroit and Chicago. St. Mary's, Portland, opened (1860) a refuge for destitute and orphaned children and still conducts a Home for Orphan Girls. The congregation numbers (1910) professed sisters, 1257; novices, 110; postulants, 81. It conducts 99 schools, residential, select, and parochial, attended by 24,208 pupils. Of these establishments, 48 are in the United States.

MARIE R. MADDEN.

Namur, DIOCESE OF (NAMURCENSIS), constituted by the Bull of 12 May, 1559, from territory previously belonging to the Diocese of Liège, and made suffragan of the new metropolitan See of Cambrai. The Concordat of 1801 re-established a Diocese of Namur, its limits to coincide with those of the Department of Sambre-et-Meuse, and to be suffragan of Mechlin. On 14 Sept., 1823, the Diocese of Namur was increased by the territory of Luxemburg, which had formerly belonged to the Diocese of Metz, and which, forming, under the First Empire, part of the Departments of the Forêts and the Ardennes, had been given, in 1815, to the Kingdom of the Netherlands. After the Revolution of 1830, which brought about the separation between the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg and the Belgian Province of Luxemburg, the City of Luxemburg received a vicar Apostolic. In 1840 the jurisdiction of this vicar was extended to the whole grand duchy. On 7 October, 1842, the jurisdiction of the Diocese of Namur was definitively restricted to the two Belgian Provinces of Namur and Luxemburg.

In 1047, Albert II, Count of Namur, caused the erection, on the site of an ancient chapel, which an unauthenticated legend says was dedicated by Pope Cornelius in the third century, of a collegiate church, served by twelve canons, who had the right of administering justice within their lands. The first dean, Frederick of Lorraine, brother-in-law of Albert II, about 1050 secured from the chapter of Mainz a portion of the head of St. Aubain, martyr. The collegiate church took the name of St. Aubain the Martyr. In 1057 Frederick became pope under the name of Stephen IX. The various successors of Albert II enriched this foundation with numerous privileges. In 1209 Innocent III, by a Brief, took it under his protection. In 1263 Baldwin, Emperor of Constantinople, heir of the counts of Namur, sold the countship to Guy de Dampierre, Count of Flanders, and the House of Dampierre also protected the collegiate church. In 1429 Count John III sold the countship to Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy. Thenceforth, until the French Revolution, Namur belonged to the House of Burgundy-Austria, except during the years 1692–95, when it was occupied by Louis XIV. Charles the Bold, Philip the Fair, Charles V, Albert and Isabella all knelt and took the oath in the sanctuary of St. Aubain. This church thus held a most important place in the political life of the country. It was rebuilt in the eighteenth century after the model of St. Peter's at Rome, as the cathedral. Don John of Austria is buried there.

The Church of Namur resisted Josephinism. In 1789, despite the formal prohibition of Joseph II, the image of the Blessed Virgin was carried in processions through the streets in honour of the Immaculate Conception. Under the Directory, the vicar capitular, Stevens, formerly a professor in the University of Louvain, and famous for his opposition to Josephinism, directed the clergy by mysteriously circulated communications issued from his hiding-place at Fleurus. After the Concordat, when the Frenchman Leopold-Claude de Bexon had been made Bishop of Namur, Stevens feared that the new bishop would be too compliant towards Napoleon. The pamphlets which he circulated under the title "Sophisme dévoilé" advised the clergy to refuse adhesion to the Concordat, as it would be taken by the State for adhesion to the Organic Articles. A *petite église* formed of persons calling themselves "Stevenists" was formed in the diocese. It was strengthened by the subservience of Bishop Bexon, whom age had weakened, for the prefect Pérès and by the circular (13 November, 1802) in which he denied having disapproved of the Organic Articles. At last Bexon resigned, 15 Sept., 1803, and was succeeded by Pisani de la Gaude. But Stevenism continued to exist. Stevens admitted that the Concordat was legitimate, and that the new bishops might be received; he only protested against the formula of adhesion to the Concordat. But the Stevenists went farther: they held that the jurisdiction of the bishops was radically defective, and they would recognize no other spiritual head than Stevens. The schism lasted until 1814, when Pisani de la Gaude accepted the declaration recognizing the legitimate bishop which the Stevenists were willing to make. Stevens died on 5 September, 1828. He had submitted all his writings to the Holy See, which never passed judgment. Since 1866 the right of appointing the dean and chapter of Namur has been reserved to the pope. Dechamps, later Cardinal Archbishop of Mechlin, was Bishop of Namur from 1865 to 1867.

Two abbeys in the Diocese of Namur had great renown during the Middle Ages: the Benedictine Abbey of Brogne, founded by St. Gerard (see GÉRARD, SAINT, Abbot of Brogne), and the Premonstratensian Abbey of Floreffe (q. v.). In 1819 a preparatory seminary was installed at Floreffe, which was suppressed by the Government in 1825 and re-established in 1830. The Benedictine Abbey of Gemblours, founded in 922 by Guibert de Darnau, acquired great renown in the twelfth century. Sigebert and Gottschalk wrote there an important chronicle. Ravaged by the Calvinists in 1578, and by fire in 1712, the Abbey of Gemblours was suppressed in 1793. The Abbey of Waulsort was founded in 946 for Scotch (Irish) monks under Benedictine rule. Its first two abbots were St. Maccelan and St. Cadroes; the bishop St. Forannan (d. 980) was also Abbot of Waulsort. In 1131 Innocent II consecrated the main altar of the church of the Abbey of Géronsart, administered by the Canons Regular of St. Augustine. The buildings of the Abbey of Paix Notre-Dame, founded in 1613 by the Reformed Benedictines of Douai, have since 1831 sheltered a college of the Jesuits. The Assumptionist fathers have a novitiate at Bure. A very important centre of studies was founded at Maredsous in 1872 by the Benedictines; it was erected into an abbey in 1878, and in 1888 provided with a beautiful Gothic church. The "Revue Bénédictine" and the "Analecta Maredsolana" have already assured the fame of this abbey. The first abbot was Placide Wolter, who in 1890 became Abbot of Beuron; the second was Hildebrand de Hemptinne, who, in 1893, became Abbot of St. Anselm at Rome and primate of the Benedictine Order. In 1907 there were in the community of Maredsous 140 monks, 64 of whom were priests. A college for higher education and a technical school are connected with the abbey. At Maredret, near Maredsous, was established in 1893 the Benedictine abbey of St. Scholastica, which in 1907 numbered 41 nuns.

The Diocese of Namur honours with special veneration Sts. Maternus, Servatus (Servais), and Remacu-

lus, the first apostles of the Diocese of Tongres, which later became that of Liège (q. v.), and some saints of the Diocese of Liège, Sts. Lambert, Hubert, and Juliana. Mention may also be made of St. Foillan, of Irish origin, founder, in 650, of the monastery of Fosses; St. Begge, sister of St. Gertrude of Nivelles, and foundress, in 692, of the monastery of Andenne, where her relics are preserved; St. Hadelin, founder of the monastery of Celles, d. about 690; St. Walhère, or Vohy, parish priest of Onhay (thirteenth century); St. Mary of Oignies, b. at Nivelles about 1177, celebrated for her visions, d. at the béguinage of Oignies, where her director, Jacques de Vitry, who became Bishop of St. Jean d'Acre and cardinal, wished also to be buried. Lastly, the Diocese of Namur honours in a special manner the Martyrs of Gorkum, whose relics it possesses. At Arlon, which now belongs to the diocese, was born Henri Busch, famous as "Bon Henri", founder of the shoemakers' and the tailors' fraternities in Paris (seventeenth century).

The religious congregations administer in the Diocese of Namur, according to "La Belgique Charitable", 2 orphanages for boys, 7 for girls, 1 mixed, 18 hospitals or infirmaries, 4 clinics, 194 infant schools, 1 house of rescue, 6 houses for the care of the sick in their homes, 1 asylum for deaf mutes, 2 houses of retreat, 1 insane asylum. In 1907 the Diocese of Namur numbered 583,722 inhabitants, 36 deaneries, 37 parishes, 677 succursals, 96 auxiliary chapels, 111 curacies paid by the State.

GALLIOT, *Histoire générale . . . de la ville et province de Namur* (Liège, 1788–91); REIFFENBERG, BORGNET, AND RAM, *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire des provinces de Namur, de Hainaut, et de Luxembourg* (10 vols., Brussels, 1844–60); BORGNET AND BORMANS, *Cartulaire de la Commune de Namur* (Namur, 1871–76); AIGRET, *Histoire de l'église et du chapitre de S. Aubain à Namur* (Namur, 1881); BERLIÈRE, *Monasticon belge*, I (Maredsous, 1897); DOYEN, *Bibliogr. Namuroise* (Namur, 1884–1902); CLAESSENS, *La Belgique chrétienne . . . 1794–1880* (Ixelles, 1883).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Nancy, DIOCESE OF (NANCEIENSIS ET TULLENSIS), comprises the Departments of Meurthe and Moselle, France, suffragan of Besançon. The See of Nancy is the heir, so to speak, of the celebrated See of Toul.

St. Mansuetus, Apostle of the Leuci and first Bishop of Toul, and according to some a disciple of St. Peter, cannot have been anterior to the fourth century. The dates of his saintly successors, Amondus, Alchas, and Celsinus, cannot be determined. Among the bishops of Toul should be mentioned: St. Auspicius (about 470); St. Ursus (Ours), from whom Clovis in 496 requested an ecclesiastic to instruct him in the teachings of Christianity; St. Epvre (Aper) (500–505), brother of St. Evronie (Apronia); St. Alband (about 508), established a community of ecclesiastics from which originated the Abbey of St. Epvre; St. Leudinus-Bodo (second half of the seventh century), founder of the monastery of Bon Moustiers and brother of St. Salaberge, foundress and first abbess of the monastery of Laon; St. Jacob (756–65); St. Gauzelin (922–62), who reformed the monastery of St. Epvre and founded that of Notre-Dame de Bouxières; St. Gerard (963–94); Bruno of Dagsbourg (1026–51), eventually St. Leo IX; Guillaume Fillâtre (1449–60); Cardinal John of Lorraine (1517–43), who held twelve sees and six large abbeys; Charles of Lorraine, cardinal of Vaudemont (1580–87); Cardinal Nicholas François of Lorraine (1625–34); André du Saussay (1649–75), author of "Martyrologium Gallicanum".

The title of count and the rights of sovereignty of the medieval Bishops of Toul originated in certain grants which Henry the Fowler gave St. Gauzelin in 927. The See of Toul was disturbed by the Conflict of Investitures in 1108. The chapter was divided; the majority elected Riquin of Commercy bishop; the minority chose Conrad of Schwarzenburg. Henry V declared for the latter; Pascal II for the former, but nevertheless he granted Conrad the title of bishop, provided he performed no episcopal office. In 1271 grave differences broke out again in the chapter of Toul; after seven years' vacancy the Holy See rescinded the four elections made by the chapter, and in 1278 Nicholas III personally appointed as bishop Conrad of Tübingen. Thenceforth it was generally the Holy See which appointed the bishops, alleging various reasons as the vacancies arose, hence the many Italian prelates who held this important see until 1552, when Toul was occupied by France. In 1597 Charles III, Duke of Lorraine, impatient of his dependence on a diocese henceforth French, asked Clement VIII for the dismemberment of the See of Toul and the creation of a see at Nancy; this failed through the opposition

THE CATHEDRAL, NANCY

of Arnaud d'Ossat, Henry's ambassador at Rome. Clement VIII, however, decided that Nancy was to have a primatial church and that its prelate would have the title of primate of Lorraine and wear episcopal insignia, but should not exercise episcopal jurisdiction.

In 1777 and 1778 Toul lost territories out of which were formed two new dioceses: Saint-Dié and Nancy, both of them suffragans of Trier. The Concordat of 1802, which suppressed Toul, made Nancy the seat of a vast diocese which included the three Departments of Meurthe, Meuse, and Vosges; the latter two were detached from Nancy in 1822 on the re-establishment of the Dioceses of Verdun and Saint-Dié. When France lost Alsace-Lorraine in 1871, Nancy lost the arrondissements of Sarrebourg and Château-Salins which, having become German, were united with the Diocese of Metz. Nancy however annexed the arrondissement of Briey which remained French, and was detached from the Diocese of Metz (consistorial decrees of 10 and 14 July, 1874). Since 1824 the bishops of Nancy have borne the title of Bishops of Nancy and Toul, as the ancient Diocese of Toul is almost entirely united with Nancy. It has had some illustrious bishops: Forbin-Janson (1824–44); Darboy (1859–63); the future Cardinal Lavigerie (1863–67); and the future Cardinal Foulon (1867–82). Since 1165, whenever the Bishop of Toul officiated pontifically, he wore an ornament called *surhumeral*, or *rationale*, a sort of pallium covered with precious stones, which decoration he alone of all the bishops of the Latin Church wore. A brief of 16 March, 1865, re-

stored this privilege to the bishops of Nancy and Toul. Concerning the insinuations of the Old Catholics in 1870 àpropos of this Brief, see Granderath, "Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils", II, 589, and III, 748. St. Sigisbert, III (630–54), King of Austrasia, and founder of twelve monasteries, is patron of the City of Nancy.

On 5 Dec., 1572, Gregory XIII signed the Bull for the erection of a university at Pont-à-Mousson; the faculties of theology and arts were entrusted to the Jesuits; the learned Father Sirmond made his profession there, and in 1581 Queen Mary Stuart established a seminary for twenty-four Scotsmen and Irishmen. St. Peter Fourier was a pupil of this seminary. Cardinal Mathieu (d. 1908) was for many years parish priest of Pont-à-Mousson. The congregation of Our Lady of Refuge was founded at Nancy for penitent women in 1627, by Elizabeth of Ranfaing, known as Sister Mary Elizabeth of the Cross of Jesus. This congregation had numerous houses throughout France. Mattaincourt, the parish of St. Peter Fourier, belonged to Toul when the saint established his important foundations in the seventeenth century.

The chief pilgrimage centres are: Notre-Dame de Bon Secours, at Nancy, dating from the fifteenth century, and for which King Stanislaus built (1738–41) a large sanctuary on the site of the humble chapel erected by King René; Notre-Dame de Sion, at Saxe-Sion, dating from the episcopate of St. Gerard, and whose madonna, broken during the Revolution, was replaced in 1802 by another (miraculous) statue of the Blessed Virgin; and St-Nicolas du Port, in honour of St. Nicholas, Bishop of Myra, patron saint of Lorraine.

Prior to the enforcement of the Associations Law of 1901, there were in the diocese, Carthusians, Jesuits, Dominicans, Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Redemptorists, and several orders of teaching brothers, one of which, the Brothers of the Christian Doctrine (founded in 1822 by Dom Fréchard, former Benedictine of Senones Abbey), had its mother-house at Nancy.

Orders of women: the Canonesses Regular of St. Augustine of the Congregation of Notre Dame, a teaching order founded at Vezelise in 1629, and transferred to Lunéville in 1850; Sisters of St. Charles, a nursing and teaching order, the foundation of which in 1651 was due to the zeal of two laymen, Joseph and Emmanuel Chauvenal; Sisters of the Christian Doctrine, called Vatelottes, a nursing and teaching order founded about 1718 by the Duke of Lorraine and Father Jean-Baptiste Vatelot; Sisters of the Holy Childhood of Mary, a nursing and teaching order which Canon Claude Daunot took thirty-five years to establish (1820–55); Sisters of the Holy Heart of Mary, a teaching order founded in 1842 by Bishop Manjaud and Countess Clara de Gondrecourt; Daughters of Compassion, a nursing order of Servite tertiaries, established in 1854 by Abbé Thiriet at St-Firmin.

The religious congregations of the diocese conduct 6 *crèches*, 57 day-nurseries, 2 institutions for sick children, 1 school for the blind, 1 school for deaf-mutes, 3 boys' orphanages, 23 girls' orphanages, 12 sewing rooms (industrial), 3 schools for apprentices, 32 hospitals or asylums, 17 houses for visiting nurses, 16 houses of retreat, 1 insane asylum. In 1909, the Diocese of Nancy had 517,508 inhabitants, 29 deaneries, 482 succursal parishes, and 91 vicariates.

Gallia Christiana, nova (1785), XIII, 956–1065, *instrumenta*, 445–550; MARTIN, *Histoire des diocèses de Toul, de Nancy et de Saint-Dié* (3 vols., Nancy, 1901–03); PFISTER, *Histoire de Nancy* (3 vols., 1901–08); ANON., *Histoire de la Congrégation des Sœurs de Charité de Saint Charles de Nancy* (3 vols., Nancy, 1898); HALLAYS, *Nancy* (Paris, 1906); TURINAZ, *Statuts synodaux du diocèse de Nancy et de Toul* (Nancy, 1902).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Nanni, GIOVANNI. See ANNIUS OF VITERBO.

Nantes (NANNETES), DIOCESE OF (NANCEIENSIS). —This diocese, which comprises the entire department of Loire Inférieure, was re-established by the Concordat of 1802, and is suffragan of Tours. According to late traditions, St. Clarus, first Bishop of Nantes, was a disciple of St. Peter. De la Borderie, however, has shown that the ritual of the Church of Nantes, drawn up by precentor Helius in 1263, ignores the apostolic mission of St. Clarus; that St. Peter's nail in the cathedral of Nantes was not brought thither by St. Clarus, but at a time subsequent to the invasions of the Northmen in the tenth century; that St. Felix of Nantes, writing with six other bishops in 567 to St. Radegond, attributes to St. Martin the chief

CATHEDRAL OF ST-PIERRE, NANTES

rôle in the conversion of the Nantais to Christianity; that the traditions concerning the mission of St. Clarus are later than 1400. The earliest list of the bishops of Nantes (made, according to Duchesne, at the beginning of the tenth century) does not favour the thesis of a bishop of Nantes prior to Constantine. The author of the Passion of the Nantes martyrs, Sts. Donatian and Rogatian, places their death in the reign of Constantius Chlorus, and seems to believe that Rogatian could not be baptized, because the bishop was absent. Duchesne believes that the two saints suffered at an earlier date, and disputes the inference of the ancient writer concerning the absence of the bishop. He believes that the first bishop of Nantes, whose date is certain, is Desiderius (453), correspondent of Sulpicius Severus and St. Paulinus of Nola. Several bishops, it is true, occupied the see before him, among others St. Clarus and St. Similianus, but their dates are uncertain. Mgr Duchesne considers as legendary the St. Æmilianus supposed to have been Bishop of Nantes in Charlemagne's reign and to have fought the Saracens in Burgundy.

Among the noteworthy bishops are: St. Felix (550–83), whôse municipal improvements at Nantes were praised in the poems of Fortunatus, and who often mediated between the people of Brittany and the Frankish kings; St. Pacharius (end of seventh century); St. Gohard (Gohardus), martyred by the Northmen in 843, with the monks of the monastery of

Aindre; Actardus (843–71), during whose time the Breton prince, Nomenoé, in his conflict with the metropolitan See of Tours (q. v.), created a see at Guérande, in favour of an ecclesiastic of Vannes, in the heart of the Diocese of Nantes; the preacher Cospeau (1621–36). The diocese venerates: the monk St. Hervé (sixth century); the hermits Sts. Friard and Secondel of Besné (sixth century); St. Victor, hermit at Cambon (sixth or seventh century); the English hermit Vital, or St. Viaud (seventh or eighth century); the Greek St. Benoît, Abbot of Masserac in Charlemagne's time; St. Martin of Vertou (d. 601), apostle of the Herbauges district and founder of the Benedictine monastery of Vertou; St. Hermeland, sent by St. Lambert, Abbot of Fontenelle, at the end of the seventh century to found on an island in the Loire the great monastery of Aindre (now Indret); the celebrated missionary St. Amand, Bishop of Maastricht (seventh century), a native of the district of Herbauges. Blessed Françoise d'Ambroise (1427–85), who became Duchess of Brittany in 1450, had a great share in the canonization of St. Vincent Ferrier, rebuilt the choir of the collegiate church of Notre-Dame, and founded at Nantes the monastery of the Poor Clares. Widowed in 1457, she resisted the intrigues of Louis XI, who urged her to contract a second marriage, and in 1468 became a Carmelite nun at Vannes. In 1477, at the request of Sixtus IV, she restored the Benedictine monastery of Couëts, near Nantes. The philosopher Abelard (q. v.) was a native of the diocese. The Abbey of La Meilleraye, founded in 1132, was the beginning of an establishment of Trappist Fathers, who played a most important part in the agricultural development of the country. The crusades were preached at Nantes by Blessed Robert of Arbrissel, founder of Fontevrault. Venerable Charles of Blois won Nantes from his rival Jean de Montfort in 1341. On 8 August, 1499, Louis XII married Anne of Brittany at Nantes—a marriage which later led to the annexation of the Duchy of Brittany to the Crown of France (1532). Chateaubriant, a town of the diocese, was a Calvinistic centre in the sixteenth century. For the Edict of Nantes (1595), which granted Protestants religious freedom and certain political prerogatives, see HUGUENOTS.

In 1665, by order of Louis XIV, Cardinal Retz was imprisoned in the castle of Nantes, from which he contrived to escape. A college was created at Nantes in 1680 for the education of Irish ecclesiastics. Certain regions of the diocese were, during the Revolution, the scene of the War of La Vendée, waged in defence of religious freedom and to restore royalty. At Savenay in December, 1793, succumbed the remains of the Vendean army, already defeated in the battle of Cholet. The atrocities committed at Nantes by the terrorist Carrier are well-known. Four councils were held at Nantes, in 660, 1127, 1264, and 1431. The mausoleum of Francis II, last Duke of Brittany, executed in 1507 by Michel Colomb, is one of the finest monuments of the Renaissance. The chief places of pilgrimage of the diocese are: Notre-Dame de Bon Garant at Orvault, a very old pilgrimage, repeatedly made by Francis II, Duke of Brittany; Notre-Dame de Bon Secours at Nantes, a pilgrimage centre which dates back to the fourteenth century; Notre-Dame de Toutes Aides. Notre-Dame de Miséricorde became a place of pilgrimage in 1026 in memory of the miracle by which the country is said to have been freed from a dragon; the present seat of the pilgrimage is the Church of St. Similien at Nantes. Before the law of 1901 against congregations, the diocese counted Capuchins, Trappists, Jesuits, Missionary Priests of Mary, Augustinians, Franciscans, Missionaires of Africa, Premonstratensians, Sulpicians, and several orders of teaching brothers. The Ursulines of Nantes were established by St. Angela of Merici in 1540.

Among the congregations for women originating in the diocese are: the Sisters of Christian Instruction, a teaching order founded in 1820 at Beignon (Diocese of Vannes) by Abbé Deshayes, of which the mother-house was transferred to St-Gildas des Bois in 1828; Sisters of the Immaculate Conception, a teaching and nursing order, founded in 1853 (mother-house at La Haye Mahéas); Franciscan Sisters, founded in 1871 (mother-house at St-Philbert de Grandlieu); Oblate Franciscan Sisters of the Heart of Jesus, founded in 1875 by Mlle Gazeau de la Brandannière (mother-house at Nantes). At the beginning of the twentieth century, the religious congregations of the diocese conducted three *crèches*, 44 day nurseries, 3 homes for sick children, 1 institution for the blind, 1 deaf and dumb institution, 6 boys' orphanages, 17 girls' orphanages, 3 homes for poor girls, 1 institution for the extinction of mendicity, 2 houses of mercy, 1 house to supply work to the unemployed, 1 vestiary, 10 houses of visiting nurses, 7 homes for invalids and for retirement, 23 hospitals or asylums. The Diocese of Nantes has 664,971 Catholics, 52 parishes, 209 succursal parishes.

Gallia christ. (*nova*, 1856), XIV, 794–842; *Instrumenta*, 171–188; TRAVERS, *Hist. abrégée des évêques de Nantes* (3 vols., Nantes, 1836); KERSAUSON, *L'épiscopat Nantais à travers les siècles* in *Revue hist. de l'Ouest* (1888–90); DUCHESNE, *Fastes Episcopaux*, II, 356, 368; CAHOUR, *L'apostolat de Saint Clair, premier évêque de Nantes, tradition Nantaise* (Nantes, 1883); DE LA BORDERIE, *Etudes hist. bretonnes. St. Clair et les origines de l'église de Nantes* (Rennes, 1884); RICHARD, *Etudes sur la légende liturgique de Saint Clair, premier évêque de Nantes* (Nantes, 1886); RICHARD, *Les saints de l'église de Nantes* (Nantes, 1873); BOYLE, *The Irish College in Nantes* (London, 1901); LALLIÉ, *Le Diocèse de Nantes pendant la Révolution* (Nantes, 1893). For further bibliography see CHEVALIER, *Topobibl.*, s. v.

GEORGES GOYAU.

Nantes, EDICT OF. See HUGUENOTS.

Nanteuil, ROBERT, French engraver and crayonist, b. at Reims, 1623 (1626, or 1630); d. at Paris, 1678. Little is known of his early life save that his father, a merchant of Reims, sent him to the Jesuit school, where he received a splendid classical training but no encouragement to draw. In every spare moment he was busy with his pencil or burin, and he even engraved on the trees in the forest. He cut in wood a "Christ" and a "Virgin", copying from old copper plates. He later went to the Benedictines, who fostered his artistic bent; one of the order, who patiently sat for him, is seen in the "Buste d'un Religieux" (published in 1644). He also engraved ornaments for his thesis in philosophy in 1645 (Piety, Justice, and Prudence Saluting the University), both these early attempts with the graver being notable successes. His family being in dire financial straits, Nanteuil went to Paris (1648), and worked with Regnesson whose sister he had married. His style now changed and developed quickly: his first method had been to use straight lines only, shallow or deep; then he practised cross-hatching and added stippling for the middle-tints (in this following Boulanger). The acme of his style shows special strokes and individual treatment for each part of the face and for each texture of the draperies. His crayon and pastel por-

traits brought him a pension of 1000 *livres* and the appointment of Royal Engraver (1658), together with an atelier in the Gobelins. Two years later Louis XIV issued an edict, mainly inspired by Nanteuil, lifting engraving out of the realm of mechanical arts and giving to engravers all the privileges of other artists.

Nanteuil's bold, broad, and vigorous pastel or crayon life-size sketches have nearly all disappeared, for he used them only as studies for his engravings; and his rich, yet delicate and silvery tones, his splendid modelling of the face, his suggestion of colour throughout the plate and unaffected justness of the likeness are largely due to his following the fresh and crisp sketch in chalks. He engraved portraits of many of the princes of Europe and of all the celebrated men of France in Louis XIV's time. Of the *Grand Monarque* alone he made nineteen portraits at various periods of his life. He was rich, affable, and very generous, and would often send back payments for great plates when he found the sitters were poor. He was received by the nobility and men of letters, and himself wrote poetry and recited pleasingly. His verses are often to be found beneath his portraits. He was the pioneer of modern engraving, and much of his work equals and strongly resembles the best of recent times. He was a rapid and prolific worker, many of his 243 plates being life-size. Fairthorne, a great English engraver, learned much from him, and Edelinck was his friend and follower. His masterpieces are: J. B. van Steenberghen (after Duchatel), called "L'Advocat de Hollande" (1668); M. de Pomponne (after Le Brun); Jean Loret; Duchesse de Nemours; and Marshal Turenne. A few of his chalk originals are in the Louvre and all of his 243 plates are in the Bibliothèque Richelieu.

Richard, *Magazin Pittoresque* (Paris, 1859); Dumesnil, *Le Peintre Graveur Français*, IV (Paris ——); Delaborde, *La Gravure* (Paris, s. d.).

Leigh Hunt.

Naphtali. See Nephtali.

Naples, the capital of a province in Campania, southern Italy, and formerly capital of the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies; it is situated on the northern side of the bay of Naples, on the Capodimonte, the Vomero, and the Posilipo hills, in one of the most enchanting spots upon the earth. The most populous town in Italy, its suburbs stretch along the bay, as far as Torre Annunziata. Naples is a very industrial town, and its fisheries, navigation, and commerce are very active; commercially, it is the most important centre of Italy, after Genoa, and contains an arsenal of the Royal Navy. In its neighbourhood, the vine and all species of esculent plants are cultivated; and fruits and vegetables are exported in great quantities. The silk industry is very important. Naples has frequently been damaged by the eruptions of the neighbouring Mt. Vesuvius; the most memorable of these occurred in the year 72 of the Christian era, the first eruption of Vesuvius after several centuries of inactivity; in 205, 407, 512, 982, and 1139, the eruptions were less violent; until 1631, the volcano gave no signs of activity, and was covered with vegetation; there were more or less violent eruptions, however, in 1680, 1694, 1707, 1723, 1794, 1804, 1805, 1822, 1828, 1839, 1850, and 1872; the eruption of 1904 was one of the most violent of all, and caused the ruin of Ottaiano and of San Giuseppe.

Buildings.—*Sacred.*—The cathedral or church of Saint Januarius, begun by order of Charles of Anjou in 1272, on the site of the ancient Stefania cathedral of the eighth century, and completed in 1341, the work of Nicolò Pisano, Maglione, and Masuccio, is in Gothic style with three naves; the façade, modified by the restoration of 1788, has been brought again to its original style; its principal door is a work of Babuccio Piferno (1407), while its chapel of St. Restituta is said to date from the time of Constantine. The fourteen pilasters are adorned with busts of famous archbishops of Naples. In the crypt, which was built by Malvito by order of Archbishop Carafa, is venerated the body of St. Januarius, taken there from Montevergine in 1479. Of the lateral chapels, that of the Treasure is the most notable; it is there that the head of St. Januarius and the ampullæ that contain the martyr's blood are preserved (see Januarius, St.). The cathedral contains the superb sepulchres of Innocent IV and of Cardinal Minutoli, the second, a work of Girolamo d'Auria; also, valuable thirteenth-century frescos of Santafede, Vincenzo Forti, Luca Giordano, and others, and paintings by John of Nola, Franco, Perugino, and Domenichino. Among other churches are the church of St. Augustine of the Mint, which has a pulpit of the fifteenth century, sculptures by Vincent d'Angelo and Jian da Nola, and a painting by Diana (the Communion of St. Augustine); the church of the Holy Apostles, restored in 1608 by the labour of famous artists, among whom were Giordano, Marco da Siena, Bonomini, and Dolci, the tabernacle of the high altar being the work of Caugiano; the church of S. Domenico Maggiore, dating from 1255, is rich in paintings, mosaics, and sepulchres, and in the ancient monastery connected with this church is the cell of St. Thomas Aquinas; the church of Donna Regina, built by Mary of Hungary, in 1300, and renewed by the Theatine Guarino in 1670, contains valuable paintings and frescos, and also, the tomb of the foundress.

The church of St. Philip Neri, in baroque style, by Dionisio di Bartolomeo (1592), contains statues by Sammartino, and both the church and the sacristy have very valuable paintings by Luke Giordano, Guerra, Guido Reni, Caravaggio, Spagnoletto, Domenichino, and others; the church of St. Francis of Paul (1817), an imitation of the Pantheon, with two wings that have porticos, is adorned with paintings of the nineteenth century. The church of San Giacomo of the Spaniards (1540) is decorated with works of art; St. John Carbonara (1343) contains the mausoleums of King Ladislaus and of the constable Sergianni Caracciolo, and paintings by famous artists. The church of St. Barbara, a work of Giuliano di Maiano, has a beautiful bas-relief of the Madonna with angels over the principal entrance, and another fine bas-relief within the edifice; adjacent to the church is the cell inhabited by St. Francis of Paula. The church of St. Clare (1310), restored in 1752, contains the mausoleums of Robert the Wise and of other personages, and also, paintings by Lanfranco, Giotto, and other artists; the pulpit is a graceful work of art. The church of Santa Maria del Carmine, built in the thirteenth century, and restored in 1769, contains the tomb of Conradin executed by Schoepf in 1874 by order of King Louis of Bavaria. The church of St. Mary of Piedigrotta, where each year, about September, popular feasts are celebrated; the church of St. Anna of the Lombards of Mt. Olivet (1411) contains many works of art, and also the tomb of the architect Charles Fontana; the church of St. Peter *ad aram*, so called because it contains an altar upon which St. Peter is said to have celebrated Mass. The church of Santa Maria del Parto, built by the poet Sannazaro, contains the mausoleum of its founder, a work of Fra Giovanni Montorsoli; the church of S. Paolo Maggiore, built on the ruins of the ancient temple of Castor and Pollux, after the plans of the Theatin Grimaldi; the church of SS. Severinus and Sosius, which is very ancient, was restored in 1490 and in 1609. While painting the vault of this temple, the artist Correnzio, falling from the scaffolding, was killed and he lies buried at the place of his fall; other artists have also adorned this church with fine works. The church of the Most Holy Trinity, or the New Gesù, an ancient palace converted into a church by the Jesuit Provedo (1584). Mention should be made, however, of the catacombs, near the

church of St. Januarius of the Poor, famous in the second century, and of the new cemetery, rich in artistic monuments, among which are the Pietà by Calì in the chapel, and the statue of Religion by Angelini.

Secular.—The Royal Palace, which ranks among the grandest of palaces on account of the majestic severity of its style, was begun in the early part of the seventeenth century by the viceroy Count of Lemos according to the designs of Domenico Fontana; it has a sumptuous interior, and contained valuable artistic collections, one of which, consisting of 40,000 engravings, is now at the Museo Nazionale. There is another royal palace at Capodimonte, built by Charles III, where there is a collection of arms and of modern paintings; the Palace of the Prefecture is modern; S. Giacomo Palace, formerly the residence of the minister of State, now contains the municipal and

Church of St. Francis of Paula, Naples
Built by Ferdinand I, King of the Two Sicilies—Modelled after the Roman Pantheon

other offices. The Capuan Castle, built by William I in 1131, and thereafter the residence of the Durazzos, of the sovereigns of the house of Aragon, and of the viceroys, is now the court-house; the Castle of the Egg, also built by William I (1154), is at present a barrack and a fort, as are also Castel del Carmine and Castelnuovo, built by Charles I, and having a triumphal arch of Alfonso of Aragon. Castel San Erasmo is a fort, situated upon a height commanding the city and the harbour. The museum of ancient art at Naples is one of the best of its kind in the world; its chief sculptures, the Hercules, the Farnese Bull, and others, are from the collections of the Farnese family, and it possesses many interesting objects found in the ruins of Pompeii and Herculaneum, frescos and mosaics, among others; it contains also rich collections of cameos, coins, and inscriptions (Neapolitan laws), besides a gallery of pictures. At S. Martino, a former convent of the Cistercians, there is a collection of paintings by Neapolitan artists, which belonged, for the most part, to that monastery. The Filanzieri Museum and the Gallery of the Fondi palace should also be noted. The aquarium for the study of submarine animal life was established by the co-operation of several countries, among them, the United States. There is at Naples a university founded in 1224, furnished with various scientific collections and with a library of more than 250,000 volumes; the town has a seminary, a theological institute, a nautical institute, and many intermediate schools. The National Library has nearly 390,000 volumes, and the Brancacciana Library more than 115,000 volumes. The State Archives are very important. Nearly all of the great families of the ancient Kingdom of Naples built sumptuous palaces, the private monumental architecture of Naples antedating that of Florence. Naples has more than 60 charitable institutions, some of which date from the thirteenth century, as, for example, the boarding-school of St. Eligius (1273), accommodating 300 young girls; the Casa Santa dell' Annunziata (1304); the boarding-school del Carmelo (1611), for 300 girls; and St. Januarius of the Poor (1669). Few ancient monuments are to be found at Naples; there is the piercing of the Posilipo ridge (*crypta neapolitana*), 815 yards in length, done by one Cocceius, probably under Tiberius, and there are the ruins of villas of the ancient city, of a theatre and some temples; there is also the tomb of Vergil on the Pozzuoli road.

History.—Naples was founded by Greeks from Cumæ, and Cumæ, according to Mommsen, is the Palæopolis to which Livy refers as existing not far from Naples and as being allied with the latter city against the Samnites. Naples, also, was obliged to receive the Samnites within its walls and to give to them participation in the government of the city, which explains her ambiguous conduct towards Rome during the Samnite War (325 B. C.). In its alliance with Rome, Naples furnished only ships. During the Punic War, the town was so strongly fortified that Hannibal did not venture to attack it. When Roman citizenship was offered to Naples, the latter accepted, on condition that it should retain its language and its municipal institutions; and consequently, even in the time of Tacitus, Naples was a Greek city, to which those Romans who wished to devote themselves to the study of philosophy betook themselves by preference. In the games, called Sebasta, celebrated at Naples every five years, Nero once appeared. In 476, the last Emperor of the West was relegated to this city. The capture of Naples by Belisarius, in the Gothic War, when he entered the city through the tube of the aqueduct (536), is famous. Totila re-captured the town in 543, but the battle of Mt. Vesuvius decided the fate of the Goths, and Naples came under the Byzantine power, receiving a *dux* who depended

on the Exarch of Ravenna; and that condition remained, even after the invasion of the Lombards. In 616, the *dux* Cousinus attempted to establish his independence, but the exarch Eleutherius defeated and killed him in the following year. A hundred years later, at the instance of the iconoclast, Leo the Isaurian, Exhileratus moved upon Rome to assassinate Pope St. Gregory II, but he was compelled to turn back, and was killed by the infuriated people. From that time on, the Byzantine rule at Naples was merely nominal; in place of a *dux*, there was frequently a consul in command of the city, which flourished in wealth, and displayed military virtues in the defence of its independence against the Lombard dukes of Benevento, Spoleto, Capua, and Salerno, and also against the Saracens; in 850, however, the town was nearly taken by Duke Sico of Benevento. The consul Sergius drove the Saracens from the island of Ponza, while his son Cæsarius, in 846, went to the assistance of Leo IV against the same foe, and in 852, freed Gaeta; but to save their commerce, the Neapolitans thereafter allied themselves with the Mohammedans. Bishop Athanasius II imprisoned Sergius and proclaimed himself duke, but following the same friendly policy towards the Saracens, he was excommunicated by John VIII.

In the eleventh century, Pandolfo of Capua succeeded in taking possession of Naples, but, assisted by the Norman Rainulf, Duke Sergius was able to return to that city (1029), and through gratitude, gave Aversa to his ally. In 1038 the Normans assisted the Byzantine general, Maniakis, in his Sicilian undertaking, and, indignant at being defrauded of their reward, turned their arms against the Byzantines. Their subsequent conquests laid the foundation of what came to be the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, or the Kingdom of Naples. After their victory near Cannæ in 1041, the Normans were masters of Calabria and Apulia, with the exception of the seaboard towns; their capital was established at Melfi, and the twelve counts divided the territory among themselves—its reconquest by the Byzantines having been frustrated by the defection of Maniakis. In 1052, Argyros was again defeated, near Sipontum, and the troops of Leo IX were defeated near Civitella; whereupon the pope confirmed the Normans in the possession of their conquests. The first count of Apulia whose title was recognized was William of the Iron Arm, who was succeeded by his brothers, Drogo (1046), assassinated at the instigation of the Byzantines; Humphrey; and, in 1057, Robert, called Guiscard, who by the capture of Reggio (1060), Otranto (1068), and Bari and Brindisi (1071), put an end to Byzantine rule in Italy, while (1059) he obtained from Nicholas II the title of Duke of Calabria, Apulia, and Sicily, which island he had yet to conquer. On the other hand, he took the oath of allegiance to the pope, so that all his possessions and future conquests should be fiefs of the Holy See. The pope acquired a new defender, especially against the empire, and also a new encumbrance. The conquest of Sicily was accomplished by Roger, a brother of Robert, after a struggle of thirty years (1061–1091); the first city of the island that was taken from the Saracens was Messina; Girgenti and Syracuse were among the last (1086–1087); the Mussulmans, however, were given the freedom of the country. Meanwhile, Robert conquered the Republic of Amalfi (1073) and the Duchy of Salerno (1077), the last remnant of the Lombard power. He attempted the conquest of Epirus in 1082, but died in 1085, contemplating a movement against Venice. Robert was succeeded by Roger I (1085–1111), William II (1111–1127), and then, Roger II, son of the conqueror of Sicily. The latter, in 1098, had reduced Prince Richard of Capua to vassalage, and, it is said, obtained from Urban II the dignity of hereditary legate of the Holy See (see Monarchia Sicula); and his son Roger II became duke of all those states, with Palermo for his capital. In 1130 the antipope, Anacletus II, conferred upon him the title of king, confirmed by Innocent II (1139), to whom Roger renewed the oath of allegiance. On the other hand, Naples under its duke, Sergius VII, had thrown open its gates to Roger, who extended his power in Epirus and Greece (1142 sq.), and also in Africa (Tripoli and Bona, 1152). He gave new constitutions to his states, protected education, promoted agriculture and the industries, especially the silk and textile branches, and during his reign Sicily increased in population. His successor William the Wicked (1154) became a prisoner of Matteo Bonellocapo, one of the conspiring barons, but was freed by the people. William the Good (1166–89) conquered Durazzo and Saloniki. His heiress was his aunt, Constance, who married Henry VI, the future Emperor of Germany. As this was contrary to the wishes of the people and of the Holy See, who desired the kingdom to be independent of the empire, Tancred was acclaimed king.

Tancred, an illegitimate offspring of the royal house, was soon succeeded by his son William III. Henry VI triumphed in 1194, and was crowned in the cathedral of Palermo, in which city he died (1197), leaving as his heir the infant Frederick I (the II of Germany), whose tutelage was entrusted by Constance to Innocent III. In the long contest for the succession of the empire, Innocent finally permitted Frederick to occupy both thrones, on condition that the two Governments should remain separate and independent of each other, and that, at the death of Frederick, the two crowns should not be inherited by the same prince. These conditions were not fulfilled, and the long struggle between the emperor and the Holy See arose, made all the more bitter by the ecclesiastical usurpations of Frederick. Conrad and Conradin continued the struggle, as did King Manfred, a natural son of Frederick, whom the latter made administrator, but who reigned in reality as sovereign. The Holy See (Innocent IV, Clement IV, and Urban IV) as suzerain of the kingdom, offered it to whoever would free the pope of the domination of the Swabians; and Charles of Anjou, a brother of St. Louis, King of France, offered himself. Manfred perished in the battle of Benevento (1266), and Conradin, after his defeat at Tagliacozzo, was taken to Naples and executed in the Piazza del Mercato (1268). Naples then became the capital of the kingdom, to which, however, Peter III of Aragon laid claim on account of his marriage to a daughter of Manfred. The people, who could not endure French rule, opened the way for him by the Sicilian Vespers (1282), and Sicily remained in the power of the Aragonese; but, under James, second son of Peter, it became an independent kingdom. When the former was called to the throne of Aragon (1295) he wished to restore Sicily to Charles II, but a brother of James, Frederick II, was acclaimed king by the Sicilians, and Charles, although several times victorious, was obliged at the peace of Caltabellotta (1302) to recognize Frederick as King of Trinacria. Frederick was succeeded by Peter II (1336), Louis (1342), and Frederick III (1355–77), who were continually at war with Naples, and always under the domination of the two parties into which the nobility was divided, the National and the Catalonian. Mary, daughter and heiress of Frederick, was married to Martin, son of the King of Aragon, who re-united Sicily to that realm in 1410, and was succeeded by Alfonso V (1416–58). The throne of Naples had been inherited by Robert the Wise (1309–1343), whom the Guelphs of Italy regarded as their leader, and who aspired to the conquest of the Italian peninsula. He was succeeded by his daughter Joanna I, who was married four times, and the first of whose husbands, Andrew of Hungary, was brutally murdered in 1345. Louis of Hungary came to avenge his brother's death, and drove Joanna from Naples; but he was obliged to return to his coun-

try, and after a long war Joanna was restored (1352). Having no children, she adopted as her heir Louis of Anjou, a brother of Charles V, King of France. This action led Charles of Durazzo to declare war upon Joanna, in which he received the support of Urban VI; the queen was killed (1382), and Louis, also, having died (1384), the throne was left to Charles without a contestant, but Charles died in Hungary in 1386.

Many who were dissatisfied with the regency for Ladislaus I, the minor son and heir of Charles, called to the throne Louis (II) of Anjou, also a minor, and thereby gave rise to a new war between the Durazzo and the Angevin parties. Ladislaus was victorious (1400) and sought to restore to Naples its preponderance in Italy; in this attempt, he invaded the Pontifical States, and entered Rome itself (1408 and 1410). His successor was Joanna II (1414–1434), who was noted for the perversity of her life. Louis III (of Anjou) declared war against her in 1420, on which account she adopted Alfonso V, son of Ferdinand of Aragon and Sicily; but as that prince wished the immediate possession of the kingdom, Joanna adopted Louis III, and after his death in 1434 his brother René. The latter, assisted by Filippo Visconti, defeated the Sicilian fleet of Alfonso near Ponza, in 1435; Alfonso himself was taken prisoner to Milan, but was soon set at liberty, and received even the assistance of Filippo to conquer Naples, which he accomplished in 1442, establishing Spanish rule in that kingdom, which he left in 1458 to his illegitimate son, Ferdinand, while Sicily remained united to Aragon. Ferdinand refused to pay tribute to the pope, his suzerain, usurped ecclesiastical rights, violated boundaries, and in other ways provoked the displeasure of the barons of the kingdom and of Innocent VIII; the latter, therefore, gave his support to the barons, who revolted (1484–87), but Lorenzo de' Medici restored harmony to the state. Scarcely had Alfonso II ascended the throne (1494), when Charles VIII, wishing to maintain the rights which he claimed to inherit from the House of Anjou to the throne of Naples, undertook his famous expedition into Italy. Alfonso II, knowing the hatred in which he was held, abdicated in favour of his son Ferdinand II; vainly, however, for almost without striking a blow, Charles became master of the kingdom. His success was but transitory, and Ferdinand was able to return to Naples in 1496, leaving the principal ports of the Adriatic coast in the hands of the Venetians. By the Treaty of Granada, Ferdinand the Catholic and Louis XII divided the Kingdom of Naples between themselves at the expense of Frederick II, who had succeeded Ferdinand, and whose territory they invaded. There soon arose contentions between the two invaders with the result that Gonzalvo de Cordova drove the French from Italy (battle of Cerignola, 1503), and Naples thereafter was governed by Spanish viceroys. In 1528, the French general Lautrec had reached the walls of Naples, when Andrew Doria suddenly passed over with his fleet to the side of the Spaniards, who remained masters of the country. There were a great many insurrections against Spanish rule; in 1547, on account of the attempt to introduce the Inquisition; in 1599, at the instigation of Tommaso Campanella, O.P.; in 1647 (Giuseppe d'Allessio at Messina, and Masaniello at Naples) it was proposed to offer the crown to Duke Henry of Guise; in 1674, there was a revolt at Messina; all of these insurrections were suppressed.

In the war of the Spanish succession, Naples was conquered by the Austrians for Charles III, son of Emperor Leopold, and pretender to the throne of Spain; later, he became emperor as Charles VI. At the peace of Utrecht (1713), Sicily was given to King Amadeus of Savoy, but in 1720, it was reunited to Naples. In 1734 Charles of Bourbon, son of Duke Philip of Parma, assisted by the Spanish general Montemar, conquered Naples without much difficulty and took the name of Charles III; the Austrians attempted in the following year to retrieve their loss, but were defeated at Velletri. Charles introduced many reforms, several, however, to the disadvantage of the Church (Tannucci ministry), and consequently he had difficulties with the Holy See which were not entirely cleared away by the concordat of 1755. When Charles ascended the throne of Spain, he left Naples to his third son Ferdinand IV (1759–1825). Having failed to drive the French from the Papal States in 1798, Ferdinand was compelled to withdraw to Sicily; the French invaded Naples, and in January, 1799, proclaimed the Parthenopian Republic. The kingdom was soon restored, however, through the efforts of Cardinal Fabricius Ruffo Scilla. In 1806, Naples was again conquered by Joseph Bonaparte, who became its king; upon ascending the throne of Spain, he was succeeded at Naples by Murat, who was dethroned and killed in 1815. In 1820–21 sectarian agitations brought about an insurrection; the king gave a constitution, but was compelled by Austria to withdraw it, and with Austrian assistance, returned to the throne (1821). Under Francis I (1825) and Ferdinand II (1830–59), conspirators maintained their activity, especially in 1848 and 1849, when Sicily again attempted to sever its union with Naples. Cavour gave his support to the expedition of Garibaldi against Francis II. Garibaldi landed at Marsala on 11 May, 1860, and soon conquered Sicily; he then passed over to Calabria, and on 7 September, took Naples. After the battle of Volturno (1 October), the regular troops of Piedmont entered the Kingdom of Naples, and King Francis withdrew to Gaeta, where, after a brave resistance, he capitulated on 12 February, 1861, and signed the annexation of his dominions to the Kingdom of Italy.

According to a legend connected with the church of St. Peter *ad aram*, the Apostle on his way to Rome consecrated as Bishop of Naples St. Asprenus, a brother of St. Candida, who had given hospitality to St. Peter. This St. Candida, however, is probably the one who lived in the sixth century and whose metrical epitaph is preserved. At all events, it was natural that Christianity should be taken to Naples at an early date, especially among the Hebrews, since that city was in the neighborhood of Pozzuoli (Acts, xxviii, 13), and the catacombs of St. Januarius, St. Severus, and St. Gaudiosus show that there was a considerable number of Christians at Naples in the beginning of the second century. Hence the establishment of the episcopal see may date from that time, as there is record of only nine bishops prior to 300, the first of them being Asprenus; the sixth, St. Agrippinus, suffered martyrdom, possibly under Valerian; the deacons Marianus and Rufus, also, were martyred. Bishop St. Maximus was exiled by Constantius on account of the prelate's firm catholicity (357?). At the close of the fourth century, the pagans were still numerous, and the pagan Symmachus calls Naples *urbs religiosa* (Epist. I, VIII, 27). The first removal of the body of St. Januarius from Pozzuoli to Naples took place under Bishop Severus (367); Bishop St. Nostrianus (about 450) fought against Pelagianism and during his incumbency, St. Gaudiosus, fleeing from the persecutions of the Vandals in Africa, landed at Naples, and died there. Bishop Demetrius was deposed by St. Gregory the Great (593), who appointed to the See of Naples the Roman Fortunatus; the courage of Bishop St. Angelus (671–91) saved the city from the invasion of the Saracens; Sergius, before he became bishop in 716, was famous for having retaken the castle of Cuma from the Lombards. St. Paul I (762), a friend of Pope Paul I, was prevented from taking possession of his diocese by the iconoclast *dux;* St. Tiberius (818) died in prison, in which he was confined because of his condemnation of the wickedness of the consul Bonus; St. Athanasius I (850) was persecuted by his nephew, the

NAPLES

1. DRYING MACARONI
2. FESTA AT PIEDIGROTTA
3. ROYAL PALACE AND CASTEL S. ELMO
4. CATHEDRAL, INTERIOR
5. CATHEDRAL, EXTERIOR

dux Sergius, and died on a journey to Rome (872). Anastasius II, a cousin of Sergius, having become bishop, captured the *dux*, blinded him, and made himself Duke of Naples, and by favouring the Saracens, incurred excommunication by John VIII. The first Neapolitan prelate to bear the title of archbishop was Sergius (990–1005), and his successors continued to be consecrated at Rome, even after Leo the Isaurian had made all of Byzantine Italy dependent on the Patriarch of Constantinople; their clergy was in part Latin, and in part Greek. Under Archbishop Anselm (1192–1215), there was incorporated into the Diocese of Naples that of Cuma, where, in the time of Diocletian, Maxentius was bishop, and the deacon Maximus was martyred. Another bishop of Cuma was the Misenus who went in 483, with Vitalis and Felix, on a pontifical mission to Constantinople, where he betrayed the pope's interests. This city was destroyed by the Neapolitans in 1207, but many of its ruins are still in existence.

Other archbishops of Naples are Cardinal Henry Minutolo (1389), a liberal restorer of churches; Nicolò de Diano (1418), zealous for the maintenance of discipline and of good morals; between 1458 and 1575, seven archbishops of the family of Caraffa succeeded each other, with only one interruption; among them was Giovanni Pietro (1549–1555), who became Pope Paul IV. This series was followed in 1576 by Blessed Paul Burali, a cardinal, and one of the associates of St. Cajetan of Tiene who died at Naples in 1547; Cardinal Annibale da Capua (1578), who, like his predecessor, was a reformer; Cardinal Alfonso Gesualdo (1596); Cardinals Ottavio Acquaviva (1604) and Francesco Boncompagni (1626) were distinguished, the one for his benevolence, and the other for his charity on the occasion of the eruption of Mt. Vesuvius in 1631. Cardinal Antonio Pignatelli (1686) became Pope Innocent XII; during the incumbency of Giuseppe Spinelli (1734) were found the marble tables containing the ancient calendar of the Neapolitan Church, illustrated by Mazzocchi; Cardinal Giuseppe M. Capece-Zurlo (1782) was confined by the republicans in the monastery of Montevergine, where he died in 1801. Cardinal Ludovico Ruffo Scilla (1802–32) fled in 1806 to Rome, was taken to France with Pius VII in 1809, and returned with the pope to Rome; he did much for the Church, but was unfortunate under the restoration of the Bourbons at Naples. In 1818, a new concordat gave to the hierarchy of the kingdom a new organization. Cardinal Filippo Giudice Caracciolo (1833–54) restored the cathedral to its ancient architectural style; Cardinal Sisto Riario Sforza (1854–77) protested against the annexation of Naples to the Kingdom of Italy, and therefore, remained in exile at Civitavecchia, until 1866.

The suffragan sees of Naples are those of Acerra, Ischia, Nola, and Pozzuoli; the archdiocese has 95 parishes, with 600,600 inhabitants; 32 religious houses of men, 27 congregations of nuns; 7 educational establishments for boys, and 15 for girls; one Catholic daily paper, and 14 weekly and monthly publications.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, vol. XIX; ST. D'ALOE, *Storia della Chiesa di Napoli* (5 vols., Naples, 1861); *Archivio storico per le provincie napoletane* (Naples, 1878); FIESCHI, *Storia della carità napolitana* (4 vols., Naples, 1875–79); NORWAY, *Naples, Past and Present* (London, 1901); ROMANO, *La città e il Commune di Napoli dal 1100 in poi* (Naples, 1909); DI GIACOMO, *Napoli* in *Italia artistica*, n. 32 (Bergamo, 1907).

U. BENIGNI.

Napoleon I (BONAPARTE), Emperor of the French, second son of Charles-Marie Bonaparte and Maria-Lætitia Ramolino, b. at Ajaccio, in Corsica, 15 August, 1769; d. on the Island of St. Helena, 5 May, 1821. His childhood was spent in Corsica; at the end of the year 1778 he entered the college of Autun, in 1779 the military school of Brienne, and in 1783 the military school of Paris. In 1785, when he was in garrison at Valence, as a lieutenant, he occupied his leisure with researches into the history of Corsica and read many of the philosophers of his time, particularly Rousseau. These studies left him attached to a sort of Deism, an admirer of the personality of Christ, a stranger to all religious practices, and breathing defiance against "sacerdotalism" and "theocracy". His attitude under the Revolution was that of a citizen devoted to the new ideas, in testimony of which attitude we have his scolding letter, written in 1790, to Battafuoco, a deputy from the Corsican *noblesse*, whom the "patriots" regarded as a traitor, and also a work published by Bonaparte in 1793, "Le souper de Beaucaire", in which he takes the side of the Mountain in the Convention against the Federalist tendencies of the Girondins.

His military genius revealed itself in December, 1793, when he was twenty-four years of age, in his recapture of Toulon from the English. He was made a general of brigade in the artillery, 20 December, and in 1794 contributed to Masséna's victories in Italy. The political suspicions aroused by his friendship with the younger Robespierre after 9 Thermidor of the Year III (27 July, 1794), the intrigues which led to his being removed from the Italian frontier and sent to command a brigade against the Vendeans in the west, and ill-health, which he used as a pretext to refuse this post and remain in Paris, almost brought his career to an end. He contemplated leaving France to take command of the sultan's artillery. But in 1795 when the Convention was threatened, Bonaparte was selected for the duty of pouring grapeshot upon its enemies from the platform of the church of Saint-Roch (13 Vendémiaire, Year IV). He displayed great moderation in his hour of victory, and managed to earn at once the gratitude of the Convention and the esteem of its enemies.

The Campaign in Italy.—On 8 March, 1798, he contracted a civil marriage with the widow of Alexandre de Beauharnais, Marie-Joséphine-Rose Tascher de la Pagerie, who was born in Martinique, in 1763, of a family originally belonging to the neighbourhood of Blois. In the same month Napoleon set out for Italy, where the Directory, prompted by Carnot, had appointed him commander-in-chief against the First Coalition. The victory of Montenotte, over the Austrians commanded by Beaulieu, and those of Millesimo, Dego, Ceva, and Mondovi, over Colle's Piedmontese troops, forced Victor Amadeus, King of Sardinia, to conclude the armistice of Cherasco (28 April, 1796). Wishing to effect a junction on the Danube with the Army of the Rhine, Bonaparte spent the following May in driving Beaulieu across Northern Italy, and succeeded in pushing him back into the Tyrol. On 7 May he was ordered by the Directory to leave half of his troops in Lombardy, under Kellermann's command, and march with the other half against Leghorn, Rome, and Naples. Unwilling to share the glory with Kellermann, Bonaparte replied by tendering his resignation, and the order was not insisted on. In a proclamation to his soldiers (20 May, 1796) he declared his intention of leading them to the banks of the Tiber to chastise those who had "whetted the daggers of civil war in France" and "basely assassinated" Basseville, the French minister, to "re-establish the Capitol, place there in honour the statues of heroes who had made themselves famous", and to "arouse the Roman people benumbed by many centuries of bondage". In June he entered the Romagna, appeared at Bologna and Ferrara, and made prisoners of several prelates. The Court of Rome demanded an armistice, and Bonaparte, who was far from eager for this war against the Holy See, granted it. The Peace of Bologna (23 June, 1796) obliged the Holy See to give up Bologna and Ferrara to French occupation, to pay twenty-one million francs, to surrender 100 pictures, 500 manuscripts, and the busts of Junius and Marcus Brutus. The Directory thought these terms

too easy, and when a prelate was sent to Paris to negotiate the treaty, he was told that as an indispensable condition of peace, Pius VI must revoke the Briefs relating to the Civil Constitution of the clergy and to the Inquisition. The pope refused, and negotiations were broken off; they failed again at Florence, where an attempt had been made to renew them.

During these pourparlers between Paris and Rome, Bonaparte repulsed the repeated efforts of the Austrian Wurmser to reconquer Lombardy. Between 1 and 5 August, Wurmser was twice beaten at Lonato and again at Castiglione; between 8 and 15 September, the battles of Roveredo, Primolano, Bassano, and San Giorgio forced Wurmser to take refuge in Mantua, and on 16 October Bonaparte created the Cispadan Republic at the expense of the Duchy of Modena and of the Legations, which were pontifical territory. Then, 24 October, he invited Cacault, the French minister at Rome, to re-open negotiations with Pius VI "so as to catch the old fox"; but on 28 October he wrote to the same Cacault: "You may assure the pope that I have always been opposed to the treaty which the Directory has offered him, and above all to the manner of negotiating it. I am more ambitious to be called the preserver than the destroyer of the Holy See. If they will be sensible at Rome, we will profit by it to give peace to that beautiful part of the world and to calm the conscientious fears of many people." Meanwhile the arrival in Venetia of the Austrian troops under Alvinzi caused Cardinal Busca, the pope's secretary of State, to hasten the conclusion of an alliance between the Holy See and the Court of Vienna; of this Bonaparte learned through intercepted letters. His victories at Arcoli (17 November, 1796) and Rivoli (14 January, 1797) and the capitulation of Mantua (2 February, 1797), placed the whole of Northern Italy in his hands, and in the spring of 1797 the Pontifical States were at his mercy.

The Directory sent him ferocious instructions. "The Roman religion", they wrote, "will always be the irreconcilable enemy of the Republic; first by its essence, and next, because its servants and ministers will never forgive the blows which the Republic has aimed at the fortune and standing of some, and the prejudices and habits of others. The Directory requests you to do all that you deem possible, without rekindling the torch of fanaticism, to destroy the papal Government, either by putting Rome under some other power or—which would be still better—by establishing some form of self-government which would render the yoke of the priests odious." But at the very moment when Bonaparte received these instructions he knew, by his private correspondence, that a Catholic awakening was beginning in France. Clarke wrote to him: "We have become once more Roman Catholic in France", and explained to him that the help of the pope might perhaps be needed before long to bring the priests in France to accept the state of things resulting from the Revolution. Considerations such as these must have made an impression on a statesman like Bonaparte, who, moreover, at about this period, said to the parish priests of Milan: "A society without religion is like a ship without a compass; there is no good morality without religion." And in February, 1797, when he entered the Pontifical States with his troops, he forbade any insult to religion, and showed kindness to the priests and the monks, even to the French ecclesiastics who had taken refuge in papal territory, and whom he might have caused to be shot as *émigrés*. He contented himself with levying a great many contributions, and laying hands on the treasury of the Santa Casa at Loretto. The first advances of Pius VI to his "dear son General Bonaparte" were met by Bonaparte's declaring that he was ready to treat. "I am treating with this rabble of priests [*cette prêtraille*], and for this once Saint Peter will again save the Capitol", he wrote to Joubert, 17 February, 1797. The Peace of Tolentino was negotiated on 19 February: the Holy See surrendered the Legations of Bologna, Ferrara, and Ravenna, and recognized the annexation of Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin by France. But Bonaparte had taken care not to infringe upon the spiritual power, and had not demanded of Pius VI the withdrawal of those Briefs which were offensive to the Directory. As soon as the treaty was signed he wrote to Pius VI to express to him "his perfect esteem and veneration"; on the other hand, feeling that the Directory would be displeased, he wrote to it: "My opinion is that Rome, once deprived of Bologna, Ferrara, the Romagna, and the thirty millions we are taking from her, can no longer exist. The old machine will go to pieces of itself." And he proposed that the Directory should take the necessary steps with the pope in regard to the religious situation in France.

Then, with breathless rapidity, turning back towards the Alps, and assisted by Joubert, Masséna, and Bernadotte, he inflicted on Archduke Charles a series of defeats which forced Austria to sign the preliminaries of Leoben (18 April, 1797). In May he transformed Genoa into the Ligurian Republic; in October he imposed on the archduke the Treaty of Campo Formio, by which France obtained Belgium, the Rhine country with Mainz, and the Ionian Islands, while Venice was made subject to Austria. The Directory found fault with this last stipulation; but Bonaparte had already reached the point where he could act with independence and care little for what the politicians at Paris might think. It was the same with his religious policy: he now began to think of invoking the pope's assistance to restore peace in France. A note which he addressed to the Court of Rome, 3 August, 1797, was conceived in these terms: "The pope will perhaps think it worthy of his wisdom, of the most holy of religions, to execute a Bull or ordinance commanding priests to preach obedience to the Government, and to do all in their power to strengthen the established constitution. After the first step, it would be useful to know what others could be taken to reconcile the constitutional priests with the non-constitutional."

While Bonaparte was expressing himself thus, the Councils of the Five Hundred and the Ancients were passing a law to recall, amnesty, and restore to their civil and political rights the priests who had refused to take the oath of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy. But Directors Barrès, Rewbell, and Lareveillère-Lépeaux, considering that this act jeopardized the Republic, employed General Augereau, Bonaparte's lieutenant, to carry out the *coup d'état* of 18 Fructidor against the Councils (4 Sept., 1797), and France was once more a prey to a Jacobin and anti-Catholic policy. These events were immediately echoed at Rome, where Joseph Bonaparte, the general's brother, and ambassador from the Directory, was asked by the latter, to favour the Revolutionary party. Disturbances arose: General Duphot was killed in Joseph Bonaparte's house (28 December, 1797), and the Directory demanded satisfaction from the Holy See. General Bonaparte had just returned to Paris, where he apparently confined himself to his functions as a member of the Institute (Scientific Section). He was by no means anxious to lead the expedition against Rome, which the Directory was projecting, and contented himself with giving Berthier, who commanded it, certain instructions from a distance. For this expedition for Berthier's entry into Rome and the proclamation of the Roman Republic (10–15 February, 1798), and for the captivity of Pius VI, who was carried off a prisoner to Valence, see PIUS VI.

The Campaign in Egypt.—While in Paris, Bonaparte induced the Directory to take up the plan of an expedition to Egypt. His object was to make the Mediterranean a French lake, by the conquest of

Malta and the Nile Valley, and to menace England in the direction of India. He embarked on 19 May, 1798. The taking of Malta (10 June), of Alexandria (2 July), the battle of the Pyramids (21 July), gave Bonaparte the uncontested mastery of Cairo. At Cairo he affected a great respect for Islam; reproached with this later on, he replied: "It was necessary for General Bonaparte to know the principles of Islamism, the government, the opinions of the four sects, and their relations with Constantinople and Mecca. It was necessary, indeed, for him to be thoroughly acquainted with both religions, for it helped him to win the affection of the clergy in Italy and of the ulemas in Egypt." The French troops in Egypt were in great danger when the naval disaster of Aboukir, inflicted by Nelson, had cut them off from Europe. Turkey took sides with England: in the spring of 1799, Bonaparte made a campaign in Syria to strike both Turkey and England. Failing to effect the surrender of Acre, and as his army was suffering from the plague (May, 1799), he had to make his way back to Egypt. There he re-established French prestige by the victory of Aboukir (25 July, 1799), then, learning that the Second Coalition was gaining immense successes against the armies of the Directory, he left Kléber in Egypt and returned secretly to France. He landed at Fréjus, 9 October, 1799, and was in Paris seven days later. Besides certain political results, the expedition to Egypt had borne fruit for science: Egyptology dates its existence from the creation of the Institute of Egypt (Institut d'Egypte) by Bonaparte.

Bonaparte, First Consul.—While Bonaparte was in Egypt, the religious policy of the Directory had provoked serious troubles in France. Deportations of priests were multiplying; Belgium, where 6000 priests were proscribed, was disturbed; the Vendée, Normandy, and the departments of the South were rising. France was angry and uneasy. Spurred on by his brother Lucien, president of the Five Hundred, allied with Directors Sieyès and Roger-Ducos, Bonaparte caused Directors Gohier and Moulins to be imprisoned, and broke up the Five Hundred (18 Brumaire; 9–10 November, 1799). The Directorial Constitution was suppressed, and France thenceforward was ruled by three consuls. First Consul Bonaparte put into operation the Constitution known as that of the Year VIII, substituted for the departmental administrators elected by the citizens, others appointed by the Executive Power, and reorganized the judicial and financial administrations. He commissioned the Abbé Bernier to quiet the religious disturbance of the Vendeans, and authorized the return of the non-juring priests to France on condition of their simply promising fidelity to the laws of the republic. Then, to make an end of the Second Coalition, he entrusted the Army of Germany to Moreau, and, himself taking command of the Army of Italy, crossed the Great St. Bernard (13–16 May, 1800) and, with the co-operation of Desaix, who was mortally wounded, crushed the Austrians (14 June, 1800) between Marengo and San Giuliano at the very spot he had marked on the map in his study in the Tuileries. The Peace of Lunéville, concluded with Austria, 9 February, 1801, extended the territory of France to 102 departments.

Bonaparte spent the years 1801 and 1802 effecting internal reforms in France. A commission, established in 1800, elaborated a new code which, as the "Code Napoléon", was to be promulgated in 1804, to formally introduce some of the "principles of 1789" into French law, and thus to complete the civil results of the Revolution. But it was Napoleon's desire that, in the new society which was the issue of the Revolution, the Church should have a place, and consciences should be set at rest. The Concordat with the Holy See was signed on 17 July, 1801; it was published, together with the Organic Articles, as a law, 16 April, 1802. For these two acts, one of which established the existence of the Church in France, while the other involved the possibility of serious interference by the State in the life of the Church, see CONCORDAT; ARTICLES, THE ORGANIC. Napoleon never said, "The Concordat was the great fault of my reign." On the contrary, years afterwards, at St. Helena, he considered it his greatest achievement, and congratulated himself upon having, by the signature of the Concordat, "raised the fallen altars, put a stop to disorders, obliged the faithful to pray for the Republic, dissipated the scruples of those who had acquired the national domains, and broken the last thread by which the old dynasty maintained communication with the country." Fox, in a conversation with Napoleon at this period, expressed astonishment at his not having insisted upon the marriage of priests: "I had, and still have, to accomplish peace", Napoleon replied, "theological controversies are allayed with water, not with oil." The Concordat had wrecked the hopes of those who, like Mme de Staël, had wished to make Protestantism the state religion of France; and yet the Calvinist Jaucourt, defending the Organic Articles before the Tribunat, gloried in the definitive recognition of the Calvinist religion by the state. The Jewish religion was not recognized until later (17 March, 1808), after the assembly of a certain number of Jewish delegates appointed by the prefects (29 July, 1806) and the meeting of the Great Sanhedrim (10 February—9 April, 1807); the State, however, did not make itself responsible for the salaries of the rabbis. Thus did the new master of France regulate the religious situation in that country.

On 9 April, 1802, Caprara was received for the first time by Bonaparte in the official capacity of Pius VII's legate *a latere*, and before the first consul took an oath which, according to the text subsequently published by the "Moniteur", bound him to observe the constitution, the laws, statutes, and customs of the republic, and nowise to derogate from the rights, liberties, and privileges of the Gallican Church. This was a painful surprise for the Vatican, and Caprara declared that the words about Gallican liberties had been interpolated in the "Moniteur". Another painful impression was produced at the Vatican by the attitude of eight constitutional priests whom Bonaparte had nominated to bishoprics, and to whom Caprara had granted canonical institution, and who afterwards boasted that they had never formally abjured their adhesion to the Civil Constitution of the clergy. In retaliation, the Roman Curia demanded of the constitutional parish priests a formal retractation of the Civil Constitution, but Bonaparte opposed this and when Caprara insisted, declared that if Rome pushed matters too far the consuls would yield to the desire of France to become Protestant. Talleyrand spoke to Caprara in the same sense, and the legate desisted from his demands. On the other hand, though Bonaparte had at first been extremely irritated by the allocution of 24 May, 1802, in which Pius VII demanded the revision of the Organic Articles, he ended by allowing it to be published in the "Moniteur" as a diplomatic document. A spirit of conciliation on both sides tended to promote more cordial relations between the two powers. The proclamation of Bonaparte as consul for life (August, 1802) increased in him the sense of his responsibility towards the religion of the country, and in Pius VII the desire to be on good terms with a personage who was advancing with such long strides towards omnipotence.

Bonaparte took care to gain the attachment of the revived Church by his favours. While he dissolved the associations of the Fathers of the Faith, the Adorers of Jesus, and the Panarists, which looked to him like attempts to restore the Society of Jesus, he permitted the reconstitution of the Sisters of Charity, the Sisters of St. Thomas, the Sisters of St.

Charles, and the Vatelotte Sisters, devoted to teaching and hospital work, and made his mother, Madame Lætitia Bonaparte, protectress of all the congregations of hospital sisters. He favoured the revival of the Institute of the Christian Schools for the religious instruction of boys; side by side with the *lycées*, he permitted secondary schools under the supervision of the prefects, but directed by ecclesiastics. He did not rest content with a mere strict fulfilment of the pecuniary obligations to the Church to which the Concordat had bound the State; in 1803 and 1804 it became the custom to pay stipends to canons and *desservants* of succursal parishes. Orders were issued to leave the Church in possession of the ecclesiastical buildings not included in the new circumscription of parishes. Though the State had not bound itself to endow diocesan seminaries, Bonaparte granted the bishops national estates for the use of such seminaries and the right to receive donations and legacies for their benefit; he even founded, in 1804, at the expense of the State, ten metropolitan seminaries, re-established, with a government endowment, the Lazarist house for the education of missionaries, and placed the Holy Sepulchre and the Oriental Christians under the protection of France. As to the temporal power of the popes Bonaparte at this period affected a somewhat complaisant attitude towards the Holy See. He restored Pesaro and Ancona to the pope, and brought about the restitution of Benevento and Pontecorvo by the Court of Naples. After April, 1803, Cacault was replaced, as his representative at Rome, by one of the five French ecclesiastics to whom Pius VII had consented to grant the purple late in 1802. This ambassador was no other than Bonaparte's own uncle, Cardinal Joseph Fesch (q. v.), whose secretary for a short time was Chateaubriand, recently made famous by his "Le génie du Christianisme". One of Bonaparte's grievances against Cacault was a saying attributed to the latter: "How many sources of his glory would cease if Bonaparte ever chose to play Henry VIII!" Even in those days of harmony Cacault had a presentiment that the Napoleonic policy would yet threaten the dignity of the Holy See.

The idea of a struggle with England became more and more an imperious obsession of Bonaparte's mind. The Peace of Amiens (25 March, 1802) was only a truce: it was broken on 22 May, 1803, by Mortier's invasion of Hanover and the landing of the English in French Guiana. Napoleon forthwith prepared for his gigantic effort to lay the ban of Europe on England. The Duc d'Enghien, who was suspected of complicity with England and the French Royalists, was carried off from Ettenheim, a village within the territory of Baden, and shot at Vincennes, 21 March, 1804, and one of Cardinal Fesch's first acts as ambassador at Rome was to demand the extradition of the French *émigré* Vernègues, who was in the service of Russia, and whom Bonaparte regarded as a conspirator.

Napoleon Emperor. *The Coronation.*—While the Third Coalition was forming between England and Russia, Bonaparte caused himself to be proclaimed hereditary emperor (30 April–18 May, 1804), and at once surrounded himself with a brilliant Court. He created two princes imperial (his brothers Joseph and Louis), seven permanent high dignitaries, twenty great officers, four of them ordinary marshals, and ten marshals in active service, a number of posts at Court open to members of the old nobility. Even before his formal proclamation as emperor, he had given Caprara a hint of his desire to be crowned by the pope, not at Reims, like the ancient kings, but at Notre-Dame de Paris. On 10 May, 1804, Caprara warned Pius VII of this wish, and represented that it would be necessary to answer yes, in order to retain Napoleon's friendship. But the execution of the Duc d'Enghien had produced a deplorable impression in Europe; Royalist influences were at work against Bonaparte at the Vatican, and the pope was warned against crowning an emperor who, by the Constitution of 1804, would promise to maintain "the laws of the Concordat", in other words, the Organic Articles. Pius VII and Consalvi tried to gain time by dilatory replies, but these very replies were interpreted by Fesch at Rome, and by Caprara at Paris, in a sense favourable to the emperor's wishes. At the end of June, Napoleon I joyfully announced, at the Tuileries, that the pope had promised to come to Paris. Then Pius VII tried to obtain certain religious and political advantages in exchange for the journey he was asked to make. Napoleon declared that he would have no conditions dictated to him; at the same time he promised to give new proofs of his respect and love for religion, and to listen to what the pope might have to submit. At last the cleverness of Talleyrand, Napoleon's minister of foreign affairs, conquered the scruples of Pius VII; he declared, at the end of September, that he would accept Napoleon's invitation if it were officially addressed to him; he asked only that the ceremony of consecration should not be distinct from the coronation proper, and that Napoleon would undertake not to detain him in France. Napoleon had the invitation conveyed to Pius VII, not by two bishops, as the pope expected, but by a general; and before setting out for France, Pius VII signed a conditional act of abdication, which the cardinals were to publish in case Napoleon should prevent his returning to Rome; then he began his journey to France, 2 November, 1804.

Napoleon would not accord any solemn reception to Pius VII: surrounded by a hunting party, he met the pope in the open country, made him get into the imperial carriage, seating himself on the right, and in this fashion took him to Fontainebleau. Pius VII was brought to Paris by night. The whole affair nearly fell through at the last moment. Pius VII informed Josephine herself, on the eve of the day set for the coronation of the empress, that she had not been married to Napoleon in accordance with the rules of religion. To the great annoyance of the emperor, who was already contemplating a divorce, in case no heir were born to him, and was displaying a lively irritation against Josephine, Pius VII insisted upon the religious benediction of the marriage; otherwise, there was to be no coronation. The religious marriage ceremony was secretly performed at the Tuileries, on the first of December, without witnesses, not during the night, but at about four o'clock in the afternoon, by Fesch, grand almoner of the imperial household. As Welschinger has proved, Fesch had previously asked the pope for the necessary dispensations and faculties, and the marriage was canonically beyond reproach. On 2 December the coronation took place. Napoleon arrived at Notre-Dame later than the hour appointed. Instead of allowing the pope to crown him, he himself placed the crown on his own head and crowned the empress, but, out of respect for the pope, this detail was not recorded in the "Moniteur". Pius VII, to whom Napoleon granted but few opportunities for conversation, had a long memoranda drawn up by Antonelli and Caprara, setting forth his wishes; he demanded that Catholicism should be recognized in France as the dominant religion; that the divorce law should be repealed; that the religious communities should be re-established; that the Legations should be restored to the Holy See. Most of these demands were to no purpose; the most important of the very moderate concessions made by the emperor was his promise to substitute the Gregorian Calendar for that of the Revolution after 1 January, 1806. When Pius VII left Paris, 4 April, 1805, he was displeased with the emperor.

But the Church of France acclaimed the emperor. He was lauded to the skies by the bishops. The par-

ish priests, not only in obedience to instructions, but also out of patriotism, preached against England, and exhorted their hearers to submit to the conscription. The splendour of the Napoleonic victories seemed, by the enthusiasm with which it inspired all Frenchmen, to blind the Catholics of France to Napoleon's false view of the manner in which their Church should be governed. He had reorganized it; he had accorded it more liberal pecuniary advantages than the Concordat had bound him to; but he intended to dominate it. For example, in 1806 he insisted that all periodical publications of a religious character should be consolidated into one, the "Journal des curés", published under police surveillance. On 15 August, 1806, he instituted the Feast of St. Napoleon, to commemorate the martyr Neopolis, or Neopolas, who suffered in Egypt under Diocletian. In 1806 he decided that ecclesiastical positions of importance, such as cures of souls of the first class, could be given only to candidates who held degrees conferred by the university, adding that these degrees might be refused to those who were notorious for their "ultramontane ideas or ideas dangerous to authority". He demanded the publication of a single catechism for the whole empire, in which catechism he was called "the image of God upon earth", "the Lord's anointed", and the use of which was made compulsory by a decree dated 4 April, 1806. The prisons of Vincennes, Fenestrelles, and the Island of Sainte Marguerite received priests whom the emperor judged guilty of disobedience to his orders.

The Great Victories; Occupation of Rome; Imprisonment of Pius VII (1805–09).—After 1805 relations between Pius VII and Napoleon became strained. At Milan, 26 May, 1805, when Napoleon, as King of Italy, took the Iron Crown of Lombardy, he was offended because the pope did not take part in the ceremony. When he asked Pius VII to annul the marriage which his brother Jerome Bonaparte had contracted, at thé age of nineteen, with Elizabeth Paterson of Baltimore, the pope replied that the decrees of the Council of Trent against clandestine marriages applied only where they had been recognized, and the reply constituted one more cause of displeasure for the emperor, who afterwards, in 1806, obtained an annulment from the complaisant ecclesiastical authorities of Paris. And when Consalvi, in 1805, complained that the French Civil Code, and with it the divorce law, had been introduced into Italy, Napoleon formally refused to make any concession.

The great war which the emperor was just then commencing was destined to be an occasion of conflict with the Holy See. Abandoning the preparations which he had made for an invasion of England (the Camp of Boulogne), he turned against Austria, brought about the capitulation of Ulm (20 October, 1805), made himself master of Vienna (13 November), defeated at Austerlitz (2 December, 1805) Emperor Francis I and Tsar Alexander. The Treaty of Presburg (26 December, 1805) united Dalmatia to the French Empire and the territory of Venice to the Kingdom of Italy, made Bavaria and Wurtemberg vassal kingdoms of Napoleon, enlarged the margravate of Baden, and transformed it into a grand-duchy, and reduced Austria to the valley of the Danube. The victory of Trafalgar (21 October, 1805) had given England the mastery of the seas, but from that time forward Napoleon was held to be the absolute master of the Continent. He then turned to the pope, and demanded a reckoning of him.

To prevent a landing of Russian and English troops in Italy, Napoleon, in October, 1805, had ordered Gouvion Saint Cyr to occupy the papal city of Ancona. The pope, lest the powers hostile to Napoleon might some day reproach him with having consented to the employment of a city of the Pontifical States as a base of operations, had protested against this arbitrary exercise of power: he had complained, in a letter to the emperor (13 November, 1805), of this "cruel affront", declared that since his return from Paris he had "experienced nothing but bitterness and sorrow", and threatened to dismiss the French ambassador. But the treaty of Presburg and the dethronement of the Bourbons of Naples by Joseph Bonaparte and Masséna (January, 1806), changed the European and the Italian situation. From Munich Napoleon wrote two letters (7 January, 1806), one to Pius VII, and the other to Fesch, touching his intentions in regard to the Holy See. He complained of the pope's ill-will, tried to justify the occupation of Ancona, and declared himself the true protector of the Holy See. "I will be the friend of Your Holiness", he concluded, "whenever you consult only your own heart and the true friends of religion." His letter to Fesch was much more violent: he complained of the refusal to annul Jerome's marriage, demanded that there should no longer be any minister either of Sardinia or of Russia in Rome, threatened to send a Protestant as his ambassador to the pope, to appoint a senator to command in Rome and to reduce the pope to the status of mere Bishop of Rome, claimed that the pope should treat him like Charlemagne, and assailed "the pontifical camarilla which prostituted religion". A reply from Pius VII (29 January, 1806), asking for the return of Ancona and the Legations let loose Napoleon's fury. In a letter to Pius VII (13 February), he declared: "Your Holiness is the sovereign of Rome but I am its emperor; all my enemies ought to be yours"; he insisted that the pope should drive English, Russian, Sardinian, and Swedish subjects out of his dominions, and close his ports to the ships of those powers with which France was at war; and he complained of the slowness of the Curia in granting canonical institution to bishops in France and Italy. In a letter to Fesch he declared that, unless the pope acquiesced he would reduce the condition of the Holy See to what it had been before Charlemagne.

An official note from Fesch to Consalvi (2 March, 1806) defined Napoleon's demands; the cardinals were in favour of rejecting them, and Pius VII, in a very beautiful letter, dated 21 March, 1806, remonstrated with Napoleon, declared that the pope had no right to embroil himself with the other states, and must hold aloof from the war; also, that there was no emperor of Rome. "If our words", he concluded, "fail to touch Your Majesty's heart we will suffer with a resignation conformable to the Gospel, we will accept every kind of calamity as coming from God." Napoleon, more and more irritated, reproached Pius VII for having consulted the cardinals before answering him, declared that all his relations with the Holy See should thenceforward be conducted through Talleyrand, ordered the latter to reiterate the demands which the pope had just rejected, and replaced Fesch as ambassador at Rome with Alquier, a former member of the Convention. Then the emperor proceeded from words to deeds. On 6 May, 1806, he caused Civitâ Vecchia to be occupied. Learning that the pope, before recognizing Joseph Bonaparte as King of Naples, wished Joseph to submit to the ancient suzerainty of the Holy See over the Neapolitan Kingdom, he talked of "the spirit of light-headedness" (*esprit de vertige*) which prevailed at Rome, remarked that, when the pope thus treated a Bonaparte as a vassal, he must be tired of wielding the temporal power, and directed Talleyrand to tell Pius VII that the time was past when the pope disposed of crowns. Talleyrand was informed (16 May, 1806) that, if Pius VII would not recognize Joseph, Napoleon would no longer recognize Pius VII as a temporal prince. "If this continues", Napoleon went on to say, "I will have Consalvi taken away from Rome." He suspected Consalvi of having sold himself to the English. Early in June, 1806, he seized Benevento and Pontecorvo, two principalities which belonged to the Holy

See, but which were shut in by the Kingdom of Naples.

Yielding before the emperor's wrath, Consalvi resigned his office: Pius VII unwillingly accepted his resignation, and replaced him with Cardinal Casoni. But the first dispatch written by Casoni under Pius VII's dictation confirmed the pope's resistance to the emperor's behests. Napoleon then violently apostrophized Caprara, in the presence of the whole court, threatening to dismember the Pontifical States, if Pius VII did not at once, "without ambiguity or reservation", declare himself his ally (1 July, 1806). A like ultimatum was delivered, on 8 July, to Cardinal Casoni by Alquier. But Continental affairs were claiming Napoleon's attention, and the only immediate result of his ultimatum was the emperor's order to his generals occupying Ancona and Cività Vecchia, to seize the pontifical revenues in those two cities. On the other hand, the constitution of the Imperial University (May, 1806), preparing for a state monopoly of teaching, loomed up as a peril to the Church's right of teaching, and gave the Holy See another cause for uneasiness.

The Confederation of the Rhine, formed by Napoleon out of fourteen German States (12 July, 1806), and his assertion of a protectorate over the same, resulted in Francis II's abdication of the title of emperor of Germany; in its place Francis took the title of emperor of Austria. Thus ended, under the blows dealt it by Napoleon, that Holy Roman Germanic Empire which had exerted so great an influence over Christianity in the Middle Ages. The pope and the German emperor had long been considered as sharing between them the government of the world in the name of God. Napoleon had definitively annihilated one of these "two halves of God", as Victor Hugo has termed them. Frederick William II of Prussia became alarmed, and in October, 1806, formed, with England and Russia, the Fourth Coalition. The stunning victories of Auerstädt, won by Davoust, and Jena, won by Napoleon (14 October, 1806), were followed by the entry of the French into Berlin, the King of Prussia's flight to Königsberg, and the erection of the Electorate of Saxony into a kingdom in alliance with Napoleon. From Berlin itself Napoleon launched a decree (21 November, 1806) by which he organized the Continental blockade against England, aiming to close the whole Continent against English commerce. Then, in 1807, penetrating into Russia, he induced the tsar by means of the battles of Eylau (8 February, 1807) and Friedland (14 June, 1807), to sign the Peace of Tilsit (8 July, 1807). The empire was at its apogee; Prussia had been bereft of its Polish provinces, given to the King of Saxony under the name of the Grand-Duchy of Warsaw; the Kingdom of Westphalia was being formed for Jerome Bonaparte, completing the series of kingdoms given since 1806 to the emperor's brothers—Naples having been assigned to Joseph, and Holland to Louis. A series of principalities and duchies, "great fiefs", created all over Europe for his marshals, augmented the might and prestige of the empire. At home, the emperor's personal power was becoming more and more firmly established; the supervision of the press more rigorous; summary incarcerations more frequent. He created an hereditary nobility as an ornament to the throne.

To him it was something of a humiliation, that the Court of Rome persisted in holding aloof, politically, from the great conflicts of the nations. He began to summon the pope anew. He had already, soon after Jena, called Mgr Arezzo to him from Saxony, and in menacing fashion had bidden him go and demand of Pius VII that he should become the ally of the empire; once more Pius VII had replied to Arezzo that the pope could not consider the enemies of France his enemies. Napoleon also accused the pope of hindering the ecclesiastical reorganization of Germany, and of not making provision for the dioceses of Venetia. His grievances were multiplying. On 22 July, 1807, he wrote to Prince Eugène, who governed Milan as his viceroy, a letter intended to be shown to the pope: "There were kings before there were popes", it ran. "Any pope who denounced me to Christendom would cease to be pope in my eyes; I would look upon him as Antichrist. I would cut my peoples off from all communication with Rome. Does the pope take me for Louis the Pious? What the Court of Rome seeks is the disorder of the Church, not the good of religion. I will not fear to gather the Gallican, Italian, German and Polish Churches in a council to transact my business [*pour faire mes affaires*] without any pope, and protect my peoples against the priests of Rome. This is the last time that I will enter into any discussion with the Roman priest-rabble [*la prêtraille romaine*]". On 9 August Napoleon wrote again to Prince Eugène, that, if the pope did anything imprudent, it would afford excellent grounds for taking the Roman States away from him. Pius VII, driven to bay, sent Cardinal Litta to Paris to treat with Napoleon: the pope was willing to join the Continental blockade, and suspend all intercourse with the English, but not to declare war against them. The pope even wrote to Napoleon (11 September, 1807) inviting him to come to Rome. The emperor, however, was only seeking occasion for a rupture, while the pope was seeking the last possible means of pacification.

Napoleon refused to treat with Cardinal Litta, and demanded that Pius VII should be represented by a Frenchman, Cardinal de Bayanne. Then he pretended that Bayanne's powers from the pope were not sufficient. And while the pope was negotiating with him in good faith, Napoleon, without warning, caused the four pontifical Provinces of Macerata, Spoleto, Urbino, and Foligno to be occupied by General Lemarrois (October, 1807). Pius VII then revoked Cardinal Bayanne's powers. It was evident that, not only did Napoleon require of him an offensive alliance against England, but that the emperor's pretensions, and those of his new minister of foreign affairs, Champagny, Talleyrand's successor, were now beginning to encroach upon the domain of religion. Napoleon claimed that one third of the cardinals should belong to the French Empire; and Champagny let it be understood that the emperor would soon demand that the Holy See should respect the "Gallican Liberties", and should abstain from "any act containing positive clauses or reservations calculated to alarm consciences and spread divisions in His Majesty's dominions". Henceforth it was the spiritual authority that Napoleon aspired to control. Pius VII ordered Bayanne to reject the imperial demands. Napoleon then (January, 1808) decided that Prince Eugène and King Joseph should place troops at the disposition of General Miollis, who was ordered to march on Rome. Miollis at first pretended to be covering the rear of the Neapolitan army, then he suddenly threw 10,000 troops into Rome (2 February). Napoleon wrote to Champagny that it was necessary "to accustom the people of Rome and the French troops to live side by side, so that, should the Court of Rome continue to act in an insensate way, it might insensibly cease to exist as a temporal power, without anyone noticing the change". Thus it may be said that, in the beginning of 1808, Napoleon's plan was to keep Rome.

In a manifesto to the Christian powers, Pius VII protested against this invasion; at the same time, he consented to receive General Miollis and treated him with great courtesy. Champagny, on 3 February, again insisted on the pope's becoming the political ally of Napoleon, and Pius VII refused. The instructions given to Miollis became more severe every day: he seized printing presses, journals, post offices; he decimated the Sacred College by having seven cardinals conducted to the frontier, because Napoleon accused

them of dealing with the Bourbons of the two Sicilies, then, one month later, he expelled fourteen other cardinals from Rome because they were not native subjects of the pope. Cardinal Doria Pamphili, who had been appointed secretary of state, in February, 1808, was also expelled by Miollis; Pius VII now had with him only twenty-one cardinals, and the papal Government was disorganized. He broke off all diplomatic relations with Napoleon, recalled Bayanne and Caprara from Paris, and uttered his protest in a consistorial allocution delivered in March. Napoleon, on his side, recalled Alquier from Rome. The struggle between pope and emperor was taking on a tragic character.

On 2 April Napoleon signed two decrees: one annexed to the Kingdom of Italy "in perpetuity" the Provinces of Urbino, Ancona, Macerata, and Camerino; the other ordered all functionaries of the Court of Rome who were natives of the Kingdom of Italy to return to that kingdom, under pain of confiscation of their property. Pius VII protested before all Europe against this decree, on 19 May, and, in an instruction addressed to the bishops of the provinces which Napoleon was lopping off from his possessions, he denounced the religious "indifferentism" of the imperial Government, and forbade the faithful of those provinces to take the oath of allegiance to Napoleon or accept any offices from him. Miollis retaliated, 12 June, by driving Gavrielli, the new secretary of state, out of Rome. Pius VII then replaced Gavrielli with Cardinal Pacca, reputed an opponent of France; on 11 July he delivered a very spirited allocution, which, in spite of the imperial police, was circulated throughout Europe; and Pacca, on 24 August, directed a note against the institution of the "Civic Guard"—an idea recently conceived by Miollis—in which Miollis was compelling even the pope's soldiers to enroll. On 6 September, 1808, Miollis sent two officers to the Quirinal to arrest Pacca; Pius VII interposed, declaring that they should not arrest Pacca without arresting the pope, and that in future the secretary of state should sleep at the Quirinal, which was closed to all the French.

The definitive execution of Napoleon's projects against the Holy See was retarded by the wars which occupied him during the year 1808. When he transferred his brother Joseph from the Throne of Naples to that of Spain, Spain rose, and the English invaded Portugal. Dupont's capitulation, at Baylen (20 July, 1808), and Junot's at Cintra (30 August, 1808), were painful reverses for French arms. Napoleon, having made an alliance with the tsar in the celebrated interview of Erfurt (27 September–14 October, 1808), hastened to Spain. There he found a people whose spirit of resistance was exasperated all the more because they believed themselves to be fighting for their liberty and the integrity of their faith as much as for their country. In November he gained the victories of Burgos, Espinosa, Tudela, and Somo Sierra, and reopened the gates of Madrid for Joseph; on 21 February Saragossa was taken by the French armies after an heroic resistance. A Fifth Coalition was formed against Napoleon: he returned from Spain and, rushing across Bavaria, bombarded and took Vienna (11–13 May, 1809). On the day after the victory he devoted some of his leisure hours to thinking about the pope.

For some time Murat, who in 1808 had replaced Joseph as King of Naples, had been ready to support Miollis whenever Napoleon should judge that the hour had come to incorporate Rome with the empire. On 17 May, 1809, Napoleon issued from Schönbrunn two decrees in which, reproaching the popes for the ill use they had made of the donation of Charlemagne, his "august predecessor", he declared the Pontifical States annexed to the empire, and organized, under Miollis, a council extraordinary to administer them. On 10 June Miollis had the Pontifical flag, which still floated over the castle of S. Angelo, lowered. Pius VII replied by having Rome placarded with a Bull excommunicating Napoleon. When the emperor received news of this (20 June) he wrote to Murat: "So the pope has aimed an excommunication against me. No more half measures; he is a raving lunatic who must be confined. Have Cardinal Pacca and other adherents of the pope arrested." In the night of 5–6 July, 1809, Radet, a general of gendarmerie, by the orders of Miollis, entered the Quirinal, arrested Pius VII and Pacca, gave them two hours to make their preparations, and took them away from Rome at four in the morning. Pius VII was taken to Savona, Pacca to Fenestrella. Meanwhile Napoleon, completing the work of crushing Austria, had been the victor at Essling (21 May, 1809) and at Wagram (6 July, 1809), and the Peace of Vienna (15 October, 1809) put the finishing touch to the mutilation of Austria by handing over Carniola, Croatia, and Friuli to France, at the same time obliging the Emperor Francis to recognize Joseph as King of Spain. The young German, Staps, who attempted to assassinate Napoleon at Schönbrunn (13 October), died crying: "Long live Germany!"

Discussions with the Captive Pius VII; Second Marriage; Ecclesiastical Councils of 1809 and 1811.— The conflict with his prisoner, the pope, was another embarrassment, a new source of anxiety to the emperor. At first he took all possible steps to prevent the public from hearing of what had happened at Rome: the "Moniteur" made not the slightest allusion to it; the newspapers received orders to be silent. He also wished his excommunication to be ignored; the newspapers must be silent on this point also; but the Bull of Excommunication, secretly brought to Lyons, was circulated in France by members of the Congregation, a pious association, founded 2 February, 1801, by Père Delpuits, a former Jesuit. Alexis de Noailles and five other members of the Congregation were arrested by the emperor's command, and his anger extended to all the religious orders. He wrote (12 September, 1809) to Bigot de Préameneu, minister of public worship: "If on 1 October there are any missions or congregations still in France, I will hold you responsible." The celebrated Abbé Frayssinous had to discontinue his sermons; the Lazarists dispersed; the Sulpicians were threatened. Napoleon consulted Bigot de Préameneu as to the expediency of laying the Bull before the Council of State, but abstained from doing so.

It was not long, however, before he had to face an enormous difficulty: there were more than twenty bishoprics vacant, and Pius VII declared to Fesch, to Caprara, and to Maury that, so long as he was a prisoner, so long as he could not communicate freely with his natural counsellors, the cardinals, he would not provide for the institution of the bishops. Thus the life of the Church of France was partially suspended. In November, 1809, Napoleon appointed an "ecclesiastical council" to seek a solution of the difficulty. With Fesch as president, this council included as members Cardinal Maury, Barral, Archbishop of Tours, Duvoisin, Bishop of Nantes, Emery, Superior of S. Sulpice, Bishops Canaveri of Vercelli, Bourlier of Evreux, Mannay of Trèves, and the Barnabite Fontana. Bigot de Préameneu, in the name of the emperor, laid before the council several sets of questions relating to the affairs of Christendom in general, then to those of France, and lastly to those of Germany and Italy, and to the Bull of Excommunication.

In the preamble to its replies, the council gave voice to a petition for the absolute liberty of the pope and the recall of the cardinals. It declared that if a general council were assembled for the settlement of the religious questions then pending, the pope's presence at the council would be necessary, and that a national

council would not have sufficient authority in questions affecting the whole Catholic Church. It also declared that the pope could not complain of any essential violation of the Concordat, that, when he advanced his temporal spoliation, as one reason for his refusal to institute the bishops canonically, he was confounding the temporal order with the spiritual, that the temporal sovereignty was only an accessory of the papal authority, that the invasion of Rome was not a violation of the Concordat, and that the national council would interpose an appeal from the Bull of Excommunication either to the general council or to the pope better informed. The manner in which canonical institution might be secured for the bishops, if the pope should continue his resistance, was twice discussed. Urged by the Government, the council admitted that, taking the circumstances into consideration, the conciliary institution given by a metropolitan to his suffragans, or by the senior suffragan to a new metropolitan, might possibly be recognized by a national council as, provisionally, a substitute for pontifical Bulls. Emery, thinking the council too lenient, refused to endorse the answers, which were sent to Napoleon on 11 January, 1810.

On 17 February, 1810, the Act regulating the Roman territory and future condition of the pope, introduced by Régnault de Saint-Jean d'Angély, was passed unanimously by the senate. The Papal States, in accordance with this decree, were to form two departments; from Rome, which was declared the first city of the empire, the prince imperial was to take his title of king. The emperor, already crowned once at Notre-Dame, was to go within ten years to be crowned at St. Peter's. The pope was to have a revenue of two millions. The empire was to charge itself with the maintenance of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda. The pope, on his accession, must promise to do nothing contrary to the four articles of the Gallican Church. Another Act of the Senate, of 25 February, 1810, made the Declaration of 1682 a general law of the empire. Thus did Napoelon flatter himself that he would reduce the papacy to servitude and bring Pius VII to live in Paris. He even prepared a letter to Pius VII in which he told him: "I hold in execration the principles of the Bonifaces and the Gregorys. It is my mission to govern the West; do not meddle with it." This letter he would have had taken to the pope by bishops who were to give notice to Pius VII that in future the popes must swear allegiance to Napoleon, as of yore to Charlemagne, and to inform him that he himself would be dispensed from this obligation, but that he must undertake not to reside at Rome. Napoleon expected in this way to bend the pope to his will. Wiser counsellors, however, prevailed upon him not to send this insulting letter. Nevertheless, to carry out his plan of removing the papal throne from Rome, he ordered Miollis to compel all the cardinals who were still at Rome to set out for Paris, and to have the Vatican archives transported thither. In 1810 there were twenty-seven Roman cardinals in Paris: he lavished gifts upon them, invited them to the court festivals, and wished them to write and urge Pius VII to yield; but, following the advice of Consalvi, the cardinals refused.

It was in the midst of these bitter conflicts with the church that, Napoleon desiring an heir, resolved to divorce Josephine. Ever since the end of 1807 Metternich had been aware of the reports that were current about the emperor's approaching divorce. On 12 December, 1807, Lucien Bonaparte had vainly endeavored to obtain from Josephine her consent to this divorce; some time after, Fouché had made a similar attempt with no better success. In December, 1809, at Fontainebleau, in the presence of Prince Eugène, Josephine's son, the emperor induced her to consent; on 15 December, this was solemnly proclaimed in the throne room, in the presence of the Court, in an address delivered by Napoleon, and another read by the unhappy Josephine, who was prevented by her tears from finishing it. The Act of the Senate (16 December), based on a report of Lacépède, the naturalist, himself a member of the Senate, ratified the divorce. Napoleon then thought of marrying the tsar's sister. But Metternich, getting wind of this project, made Laborde and Schwarzenberg sound the Tuileries to see if Napoleon would marry an Austrian archduchess. The idea pleased Napoleon. The Court of Vienna, however, first required that the spiritual bond between Napoleon and Josephine should be severed.

This bond the pope alone was competent to dissolve; Louis XII had had recourse to Alexander VI; Henry IV to Clement VIII; but Napoleon, excommunicated by his prisoner Pius VII, could not apply to him. Cambacérès, the arch-chancellor, sent for the diocesan officials of Paris and explained to them that the marriage of Napoleon and Josephine had been invalid in consequence of the absence of the parish priest of the two parties and of witnesses. In vain did they object that only the pope could decide such a case; they were told to commence proceedings, and be quick about it. On 26 December, the promoter of the case, Rudemare, begged Cambacérès to submit the matter to the ecclesiastical council over which Fesch presided. On 2 January, 1810, Cambacérès sent a request to the official, Boislesve, for a declaration of nullity of the marriage, alleging, this time, that there had been absence of consent on Napoleon's part. On the next day the ecclesiastical council replied that if the defect of Napoleon's consent could be proved to the officiality, the marriage would be null and void. Cambacérès wished to produce Fesch, Talleyrand, Duroc, and Berthier as witnesses. The testimony of Fesch was very confused; he explained that the pope had given him the necessary dispensations to bless the marriage; that two days later he had given Josephine a marriage certificate; that the emperor had then upbraided him, declaring to him that he (the emperor) had only agreed to this marriage in order to quiet the empress, and that it was, moreover, impossible for him to renounce his hopes of direct descendants. The other two witnesses told how Napoleon had repeatedly expressed the conviction that he was not bound by this marriage and that he regarded the ceremony only as "a mere concession to circumstances [*acte de pure circonstance*] which ought not to have any effect in the future".

On 9 January the diocesan authorities declared the marriage null and void, on the ground of the absence of the lawful parish priest and of witnesses; it pronounced this decision only in view of the "difficulty in the way of having recourse to the visible head of the Church, to whom it has always belonged in fact to pronounce upon these extraordinary cases." The promoter Rudemare had concluded with the recommendation that the tribunal should at least lay a precept upon the two parties to repair the defect of form which had vitiated their marriage; Boilesve, the official, refrained from proffering this invitation. Rudemare then appealed to the metropolitan authorities on this point. On 12 January, 1810, the official, Lejeas, with much greater complaisance, admitted both the grounds of nullity advanced by Cambacérès—that is, not only the defect of form, but also the defect of the emperor's consent. He alleged that the civil marriage of Napoleon and Josephine had been annulled by the decree of the Senate, that by the concordatary laws (*lois concordataires*) the religious marriage ought to follow the civil, and that the Church could not now ask two parties who were no longer civilly married to repair the defects of form in their religious marriage. Thus, he declared, the marriage was religiously annulled. It may be noted here that the Catholic Church cannot be held responsible for the excessive complaisance shown in this matter by the ecclesiasti-

NAPOLEON—PAUL DELAROCHE

cal council and the diocesan authorities of Paris. On 21 January, 1810, Napoleon resolved to ask for the hand of Marie-Louise. The French ambassador at Vienna, at the request of the Archbishop of Vienna, gave him his word of honour that the sentence pronounced by the diocesan authorities of Paris was legal. At last all the religious obstacles to the celebration of the new marriage were disposed of.

It took place on 1 April, 1810, but thirteen of the cardinals then in Paris refused to be present. These thirteen cardinals were turned away when they presented themselves at the Tuileries two days later; the minister of public worship informed them that they were no longer cardinals, that they no longer had any right to wear the purple; the minister of police forwarded them, two by two, to small country towns; their pensions were suppressed, their property sequestrated. People called them "the black cardinals". The bishops and priests of the Roman States were treated with similar violence; nineteen out of thirty-two bishops refused the oath of allegiance to the emperor, and were imprisoned, while a certain number of non-juring parochial clergy were interned in Corsica, and the emperor announced his intention of reducing the number of dioceses and parishes in the Roman States by three-fourths. This policy of bitter persecution coincided with fresh overtures to his prisoner, the pope, through the Austrian diplomat Lebzeltern (May, 1810). Pius VII's reply was that, to negotiate, he must be free and able to communicate with the cardinals. In July Napoleon sent Cardinals Spina and Caselli to Savona, but they obtained nothing from the pope. There had been no solution of the internal crisis of the Church of France; while Pius VII was a prisoner the bishops were not to receive canonical institution. Bigot de Préameneu and Maury suggested to the emperor a possible arrangement: to invite the chapter in each diocese to designate the bishop who had been nominated, but not yet canonically instituted, provisional administrator. Fesch refused to lend himself to this expedient and occupy the Archbishopric of Paris; but a certain number of nominated bishops did go to their episcopal cities in the capacity of provisional administrators. Going one step further, Napoleon removed Maury from the See of Montefiascone, and d'Osmond from that of Nancy, and had them designated by the respective chapters provisional administrators of the two vacant Archdioceses of Paris and Florence. Maury and d'Osmond, at the emperor's bidding, left the dioceses given them by the pope to install themselves in these archdioceses.

Despite the rigour of his captivity, Pius VII was able to make known the pontifical commands to Cardinal di Pietro at Semur: a secret agency at Lyons, established by certain members of the Congregation, devised ingenious ways of facilitating these communications as well as the circulation of Bulls. In November, 1810, the Court was stupefied with the news that two Bulls of Pius VII, addressed to the Chapters of Florence and Paris, forbade their recognizing d'Osmond and Maury. The imperial fury was let loose. On 1 January, 1811, Napoleon, during an audience to Maury and the canons, demanded an explanation from d'Astros, the vicar capitular, who had received the Bull, telling him that there is "as much difference between the religion of Bossuet and that of Gregory VII as between heaven and hell"; d'Astros, taken by Maury himself to police headquarters, was imprisoned at Vincennes. At the Council of State, 4 January, 1811, Portalis, a relative of d'Astros, was openly accused of treason by Napoleon, and immediately put out of the council chamber (with a brutality that the emperor afterwards regretted) and was then ordered to quit Paris. Cardinals di Pietro, Oppizzone, and Gabrielli, and the priests Fontana and Gregori, former counsellors of the pope, were thrown into prison. Maury used his influence with the canons of Paris to induce them to apologize to Napoleon, who received them, told them that the pope must not treat him as a *roi fainéant*, and declared that, since the pope was not acting up to the Concordat in the matter of institution of bishops, the emperor, on his side, renounced the Concordat. The conditions of the pope's captivity were made more severe; all his correspondence had to pass through Paris, to be inspected by the Government; the lock of his desk was picked; he could no longer receive visits without the presence of witnesses; a gendarme demanded of him the ring of St. Peter, which Pius VII surrendered after breaking it in two. Chabrol, the pope's custodian, showed him the addresses in which some of the chapters were expressing their submission to the emperor, but Pius VII was inflexible. A commission of jurisconsults in Paris, after discussing the possibility of a law regulating the canonical institution of bishops without the pope's cooperation, ended by deciding that to pass such a law was almost equivalent to schism.

Napoleon was not willing to go so far. He summoned the ecclesiastical council which he had already established and, 8 February, 1811, proposed to it these two questions; (1) All communication between the pope and the emperor's subjects being interrupted, to whom must recourse be had for the dispensations ordinarily granted by the Holy See? (2) What canonical means is there of providing institution for bishops when the pope refuses it? Fesch and Emery tried to sway the council towards some courses which would save the papal prerogative. But the majority of the council answered: (1) That recourse might be had, provisionally, to the bishops for the dispensations in question; (2) That a clause might be added to the Concordat stipulating that the pope must grant canonical institution within a stated time; failing which, the right of institution would devolve upon the council of the province; and that, if the pope rejected this amendment of the Concordat, the Pragmatic Sanction would have to be revived so far as concerned bishops. The council added that, if the pope persisted in his refusal, the possibility of a public abolition of the Concordat by the emperor would have to be considered; but that these questions could be broached only by a national council, after one last attempt at negotiation with the pope.

On 16 March, 1811, Napoleon summoned to the Tuileries the members of the council and several of the great dignitaries of the empire; inveighing bitterly against the pope, he proclaimed that the Concordat no longer existed and that he was going to convoke a council of the West. At this meeting Emery, who died on 28 April, boldly faced Napoleon, quoting to him passages from Bossuet on the necessity of the pope's liberty. Pius VII not yielding to a last summons on the part of Chabrol, the council was convoked on 25 April to meet on 9 June. By this step Napoleon expected to subdue the pope to his will. In pursuance of a plan outlined by the philosopher Gerando, Archbishop Barral, and Bishops Duvoisin and Mannay were sent to Pius VII to gain him over on the question of the Bulls of institution. They were joined by the Bishop of Faenza, and arrived at Savona on 9 May. At first the pope refused to discuss the matter, not being free to communicate with his cardinals. But the bishops and Chabrol insisted, and the pope's physician added his efforts to theirs. They represented that the Church was becoming disorganized. At the end of nine days, the pope, who was neither eating nor drinking anything, being very much fatigued, consented, not to ratify, but to take as "a basis of negotiation" a note drawn up by the four bishops to the purport that, in case of persistent refusal on his part, canonical institution might be given to bishops after six months. On 20 May, at four o'clock in the morning, the bishops started for Paris with this note; at seven o'clock the pope summoned Chabrol and told him

that he did not accept the note in any definitive sense, that he considered it only a sketch, and that he had made no formal promise. He also asked that a courier should be sent after the bishops to warn them of this. The courier bearing this message overtook the bishops at Turin on 24 May. Pius VII warned Chabrol that if the first note were exploited as representing an arrangement definitely accepted by the pope, he "would make a noise that should resound through the whole Christian world". Napoleon, in his blindness, resolved to do without the pope and put all his hopes in the council.

Council of 1811.—The council convoked for 9 June, 1811, was not opened at Notre-Dame until 17 June, the opening being postponed on account of the baptism of the King of Rome, just born of Marie-Louise. Paternal pride and the seemingly assured destinies of his throne, rendered Napoleon still more inflexible in regard to the pope. Only since 1905 has the truth about this council been known, thanks to Welschinger's researches. Under the Second Empire, when D'Haussonville wrote his work on the Roman Church and the First Empire (see below) Marshal Vallant had refused him all access to the archives of the council. These archives Welschinger was able to consult. Boulogne, Bishop of Troyes, in his opening sermon affirmed the solidarity of the pope and the bishops, while Fesch, as president of the council, made all its members swear obedience and fidelity to Pius VII. Upon this Napoleon gave Fesch a sound rating, on the evening of 19 June, at Saint-Cloud. The emperor had packed his council in very arbitrary fashion, choosing only 42 out of 150 Italian bishops to mix with the French bishops, with a view to œcumenical effect. A private bulletin sent to the emperor, 24 June, noted that the fathers of the council themselves were generally impressed with a sense of restraint. The opposition to the emperor was very firmly led by Broglie, Bishop of Ghent, seconded by Aviau, Archbishop of Bordeaux, Dessole, Bishop of Chambéry, and Hirn, Bishop of Tournai. The first general assembly of the council was held on 20 June. Bigot de Préameneu and Marescalchi, ministers of public worship for France and Italy, were present and read the imperial message, one draft of which had been rejected by Napoleon as too moderate. The final version displeased all the bishops who had any regard for the papal dignity. Napoleon in this document demanded that bishops should be instituted in accordance with the forms which had obtained before the Concordat, no see to be vacant for longer than three months, "more than sufficient time for appointing a new incumbent". He wished the council to present an address to him, and the committee that should prepare this address to be composed of the four prelates he had sent to Savona. The address, which was prepared in advance by Duvoisin, one of these four prelates, was an expression of assent to Napoleon's wishes. But the council decided to have on the committee besides these four prelates, some other bishops chosen by secret ballot, and among the latter figured Broglie. Broglie discussed Duvoisin's draft and had a number of changes made in it, and Fesch had some trouble in keeping the committee from at once demanding the liberation of the pope. The address, as voted, was nonsensical. It was not what Napoleon expected, and the audience which he was to have given to the members of the council on 30 June, did not take place.

Another committee was appointed by the council to inquire into the pope's views on the institution of bishops. After a conflict of ten days, Broglie secured against Duvoisin, by a vote of 8 to 4, a resolution to the effect that, in this matter, nothing must be done without the pope, and that the council ought to send him a deputation to learn what was his will. Napoleon was furious and said to Fesch and Barral: "I will dissolve the council. You are a pack of fools". Then, on second thought, he informed the council that Pius VII by way of concession, had formally promised canonical institution to the vacant bishoprics and had approved a clause enabling the metropolitans themselves in future, after six months vacancy of any see, to give canonical institution. Napoleon required the council to issue a note to this effect and sent a deputation to thank the pope. First the committee voted as the emperor wished, then on more mature consideration, suspecting some stratagem on the emperor's part, it recalled its vote, and, on 10 July, Hirn, Bishop of Tournai, speaking for the committee, proposed to the council that no decision be made until a deputation had been sent to the pope. Then, on the morning of 11 July, Napoleon pronounced the council dissolved. The following night Broglie, Hirn, and Boulogne were imprisoned at Vincennes. The emperor next thought of turning over the administration of the dioceses to the prefects, but presently took the advice of Maury, viz., to have all the members of the council called up, one by one, by the minister of public worship, and their personal assent to the imperial project obtained in this way. After fifteen days devoted to conversations between the minister and certain of the bishops, the emperor reconvoked the council for 5 August, and the council, by a vote of 80 to 13, passed the decree by which canonical institution was to be given within six months, either by the pope or, if he refused, by the metropolitan. The bishops who passed this decree tried to palliate their weakness by saying that they had no idea of committing an act of rebellion, but formally asked for, and hoped to obtain, the pope's assent. Napoleon believed himself victorious; he held in his hands the means of circumventing the pope and organizing without his co-operation the administration of French and Italian dioceses. He had brought the Sacred College, the Dataria, the Penitentiary, and the Vatican Archives to Paris, and had spent several millions in improving the archiepiscopal palace which he meant to make the pontifical palace. He wished to remove the Hôtel-Dieu, install the departments of the Roman Curia in its place, and make the quarter of Notre-Dame and the Isle de Saint-Louis the capital of Catholicism. But his victory was only apparent: to make the decree of the national council valid, the pope's ratification was needed, and once more the resistance of Pius VII was to hold the emperor in check.

On 17 August Napoleon commissioned the Archbishops of Tours and Mechlin, the Patriarch of Venice, the Bishops of Evreux, Trier, Feltro, and Piacenza to go to Savona and demand of the pope his full adhesion to the decree of 5 August; and the bishops were even to be precise in stating that the decree applied to episcopal sees in the former Papal States, so that, in giving his assent, Pius VII should by implication assent to the abolition of the temporal power. That Pius VII might not allege the absence of the cardinals as a reason for postponing his decisions, Napoleon sent to Savona five cardinals on whom he could rely (Roverella, Dugnani, Fabrizio Ruffo, Bayanne, and Doria), with instructions to support the bishops. The emperor's artifice was successful. On 6 September, 1811, Pius VII declared himself ready to yield, and charged Roverella to draw up a Brief approving the Decree of 5 August, and on 20 September the pope signed the Brief. But even then, the Brief as it was, was not what Napoleon wanted: Pius VII abstained from recognizing the council as a national council, he treated the Church of Rome as the mistress of all the Churches, and did not specify that the decree applied to the bishoprics of the Roman States; he also required that, when a metropolitan gave canonical institution, it should be given in the name of the pope. Napoleon did not publish the Brief. On 17 October he ordered the deputation of prelates to notify the pope that the

decree applied equally to bishoprics in the Roman States. This interpretation Pius VII then formally repudiated, and announced once more that any further decision on his part would be postponed until he should have with him a suitable number of cardinals. Napoleon first wreaked his irritation on the Bishops of Ghent, Tournai, and Troyes, whom he forced to resign their sees and caused to be deported to various towns, then, on 3 December, he declared the Brief unacceptable, and charged the prelates to ask for another. Pius VII refused.

On 9 January, 1812, the prelates informed the pope, from the emperor, that, if the pope resisted any longer, the emperor would act on his own discretion in the matter of the institution of bishops. Pius VII sent a personal reply to the emperor, to the effect that he (the pope) needed a more numerous council and facility of communication with the faithful, and that he would then do, "to meet the emperor's wishes, all that was consistent with the duties of his Apostolic ministry." By way of rejoinder, Napoleon dictated to his minister of public worship, on 9 February, an extraordinarily vehement letter, addressed to the deputation of prelates. In it he refused to give Pius VII his liberty or to let the "black cardinals" go back to him; he made known that if the pope persisted in the refusal to govern the Church, they would do without the pope; and he advised the pope, in insulting terms, to abdicate. Chabrol, the prefect of Montenotte, read this letter to Pius VII, and advised him to surrender the tiara. "Never", was the pope's answer. Then on 23 February, Chabrol notified the pope, in the emperor's name, that Napoleon considered the Concordats abrogated, and that he would no longer permit the pope to interfere in any way in the canonical institution of the bishops. Pius VII answered that he would not change his attitude. Mme de Staël wrote to Henri Meister: "What a power is religion which gives strength to the weak when all that was strong has lost its strength!" The difference between the pope and the emperor naturally reacted upon the feelings of the clergy towards Napoleon, and upon the emperor's policy towards religion. From this time Napoleon refused the seminarists any exemption from military service. He made stricter the university monopoly of teaching, and Broglie, Bishop of Ghent, who, after leaving the prison of Vincennes, had continued to correspond with his clergy, was sent to the Island of Sainte-Marguerite.

Last Great Wars: Concordat of Fontainebleau.— At this time Napoleon was absolutely drunk with power. The French Empire had 130 departments; the Kingdom of Italy 240. The seven provinces of Illyria were subject to France. The rigour of the Continental blockade was ruining English commerce and embarrassing the European states. The tsar would have liked Napoleon, master of the West, to leave him freedom of action in Poland and Turkey; enraged at receiving no such concessions, he approached England. The French armies in Spain were exhausting their strength in a savage and ineffectual war against a ceaseless uprising of the native population; nevertheless Napoleon resolved to attack Russia also. At Dresden, from March to June, 1812, he held a congress of kings, and prepared for war. It was at Dresden, in May, 1812, that, under pretext of satisfying the demands of Francis Joseph for gentler treatment of the pope, Napoleon decided to have Pius VII removed from Savona to Fontainebleau; the fact is that he was afraid the English would attempt a *coup de main* on Savona and carry off the pope. After a journey the painful incidents of which have been related by d'Haussonville, following a manuscript in the British Museum, Pius VII reached Fontainebleau on 19 June. Equipages were placed at his disposal, he was desired to appear in public and officiate; but he refused, led a solitary life in the interior of the palace, and gave not the least indication of being ready to yield to Napoleon's demands.

Napoleon definitely declared war against the tsar on 22 June, 1812. The issue was soon seen to be dubious. The Russians devastated the whole country in advance of the French armies, and avoided pitched battles as much as possible. The victory of Borodino (7 September, 1812), an extremely bloody one, opened to Napoleon the gates of Moscow (14 September, 1812). He had expected to pass the winter there, but the conflagration brought about by the Russians forced him to retrace his steps westward, and the retreat of the "Grande Armée" so heroically covered by Marshal Ney, cost France the lives of numberless soldiers. The passage of the Beresina was glorious. As far as Lithuania, Napoleon shared the sufferings of his army, then he hastened to Paris, where he suppressed General Malet's conspiracy and prepared a new war for the year 1813. When he set out for Prussia it was his idea to extend his march beyond that country, through Asia to India, to knock over "the scaffolding of mercantile greatness raised by the English, and strike England to the heart". "After this", he declared, "it will be possible to settle everything and have done with this business of Rome and the pope. The cathedral of Paris will become that of the Catholic world. . . . If Bossuet were living now, he would have been Archbishop of Paris long ago, and the pope would still be at the Vatican, which would be much better for everybody, for then there would be no pontifical throne higher than that of Notre-Dame, and Paris could not fear Rome. With such a president, I would hold a Council of Nicæa in Gaul."

But the failure of the Russian campaign upset all these dreams. The emperor's haughty attitude towards the Church was now modified. On 29 December, 1812, he wrote with his own hand an affectionate letter to the pope expressing a desire to end the quarrel. Duvoisin was sent to Fontainebleau to negotiate a Concordat. Napoleon's demands were these: the pope must swear to do nothing against the four articles; he must condemn the behaviour of the black cardinals towards the emperor; he must allow the Catholic sovereigns to choose two-thirds of the cardinals, take up his residence in Paris, accept the decree of the council on the canonical institution of bishops, and agree to its application to the bishoprics of the Roman States. Pius VII spent ten days discussing the matter. On 18 January, 1813, the emperor himself came to Fontainebleau and spent many days in stormy interviews with the pope though, according to Pius VII's own statement to Count Paul Van der Vrecken, on 27 September, 1814, Napoleon committed no act of violence against the pope. On 25 January, 1813, a new Concordat was signed. In it there was no mention either of the Four Articles, or of the nomination of cardinals by the Catholic sovereigns, or of the pope's place of residence: the six suburbican dioceses were left at the pope's disposition, and he could moreover provide directly for ten bishoprics, either in France or in Italy—on all these points Napoleon made concessions. But on the other hand, the pope confirmed the decree of the Council of 1811 on the canonical institution of bishops.

According to the very words of its preamble, this Concordat was intended only "to serve as basis for a definitive arrangement". But, on 13 February, Napoleon had it published, just as it stood, as a law of the State. This was very unfair towards Pius VII: the emperor had no right to convert "preliminary articles" thus into a definitive act. On 9 February the imprisoned cardinals had been liberated by Napoleon; going to Fontainebleau, they had found Pius VII very anxious on the subject of the signature he had given, and which he regretted. With the advice of Consalvi, he prepared to retract the "preliminary articles". In his letter of 24 March to Napoleon he reproached him-

self for having signed these articles and disavowed the signature he had given. Napoleon had failed egregiously. He did not listen to the advice of the Comte de Narbonne, who, in a letter drafted by young Villemain, expressed the opinion that the pope ought to be set at liberty and sent back to Rome. It has been claimed that Napoleon had said to his ministers of State: "If I don't knock the head off the shoulders of some of those priests at Fontainebleau, matters will never be arranged." This is a legend; on the contrary, he ordered the minister of public worship to keep secret the letter of 24 March. Immediately, acting on his own authority, he declared the Concordat of Fontainebleau binding on the Church, and filled twelve vacant sees. On 5 April he had Cardinal di Pietro removed from Fontainebleau and threatened to do the same for Cardinal Pacca.

In the Dioceses of Ghent, Troyes, and Tournai, the chapters regarded the bishops appointed by Napoleon as intruders. The irregular measures of the emperor only exasperated the resistance of the clergy. The Belgian clergy, warned by Count Van der Vrecken of the pope's retractation, began to agitate against the imperial policy. Meanwhile, on 25 April, 1813, Napoleon assumed command of the Army of Germany. The victories of Lutzen (2 May) and Bautzen (19–22 May) weakened the Prussian and Russian troops. But the emperor made the mistakes of accepting the mediation of Austria—only a device to gain time—and of consenting to hold the Congress of Prague (July). A letter from Pius VII, secretly carried in the face of many dangers by Van der Vrecken, warned the Congress of Prague that the pope formally rejected the articles of 25 January. Napoleon continued nevertheless to send from his headquarters with the army severe orders calculated to overcome the resistance of the Belgian clergy: on 6 August he caused the director of the seminary of Ghent to be imprisoned, and all the students to be taken to Magdeburg; on 14 August he had the canons of Tournai arrested. But his perils were increasing. Joseph had been driven out of Spain. Bernadotte, King of Sweden, one of Napoleon's own veterans, was driving the French troops out of Stralsund. Under Schwarzenberg, Blücher and Bernadotte, three armies were forming against the emperor. He had but 280,000 men against 500,000. He was victor at Dresden (27 August), but his generals were falling away on all sides. He was deserted by the Bavarian contingents in the celebrated "Battle of the Nations" at Leipzig (18–19 October), the defection of the Wurtembergers and the Saxons was the chief cause of his defeat. The victories of Hanau (30 October) and Hocheim (2 November) enabled his troops to get back to France, but the Allies were soon to enter that land.

Liberation of the Pope: End of the Empire.—The liberation of the pope figured on the programme of the Allies. In vain did the emperor send the Marchesa di Brignoli to Consalvi, and Fallot de Beaumont, Archbishop of Bourges, to Pius VII, to open negotiations. In vain, on 18 January, 1814, when he learned that Murat had gone over to the Allies and occupied the Roman provinces on his own account, did he offer to restore the Papal States to Pius VII. Pius VII declared that such a restitution was an act of justice, and could not be made the subject of a treaty. Meantime, Blücher and Schwarzenberg were advancing through Burgundy. On 24 January, Lagorse, the commandant of gendarmes who had guarded Pius VII for four years, announced to him that he was about to take him back to Rome. The pope was conveyed by short stages through southern and central France. Napoleon defeated the Allies at Saint-Dizier and at Brienne (27–29 January, 1814), the princes offered peace on condition that Napoleon should restore the boundaries of France to what they were in 1792. He refused. As the Allies demanded the liberation of the pope, Napoleon sent orders to Lagorse, who was taking him through the south of France, to let him make his way to Italy. On 10 March the prefect of Montenotte received orders to have the pope conducted as far as the Austrian outposts in the territory of Piacenza. The captivity of Pius VII was at an end.

The war was resumed immediately after the Congress of Chatillon. In five days Napoleon gave battle to Blücher four times at Champaubert, Montmirail, Chateau-Thierry, and Vauchamp, and hurled him back on Chalons; against Schwarzenberg he fought the battles of Guigues, Mormant, Nangis, and Méry, thus opening the way to Troyes. But Lyons was taken by the Austrians, Bordeaux by the English. Exhausted as he was, Napoleon beat Blücher again at Craonne (7 March), retook Reims and Epernay, and contemplated cutting off the retreat of Blücher and Schwarzenberg on the Rhine. He caused a general levy to be decreed; but the Allies had their agents in Paris. Marmont and Mortier capitulated. On 31 March the Allies entered Paris. On 3 April the Senate declared Napoleon dethroned. Returning to Fontainebleau, the emperor, determined to try one last effort, was stopped by the defection of Marmont's corps at Essonnes. On 20 April he left Fontainebleau; on 4 May he was in Elba.

At the end of ten months, learning of the unpopularity of the regime founded in France by Louis XVIII, Napoleon secretly left Elba, landed at Cannes (1 March, 1815), and went in triumph from Grenoble to Paris (20 March, 1815). Louis XVIII fled to Ghent. Then began the Hundred Days. Napoleon desired to give France liberty and religious peace forthwith. On the one hand, by the *Acte Additionnel*, he guaranteed the country a constitutional Government; on the other hand (4 April, 1815), he caused the Duke of Vicenza to write to Cardinal Pacca, and he himself wrote to Pius VII, letters in a pacific spirit, while Isoard, auditor of the Rota, was commissioned to treat with the pope in his name. But the Coalition was re-formed. Napoleon had 118,000 recruits against more than 800,000 soldiers; he beat Blücher at Ligny (16 June), whilst Ney beat Wellington at Quatre Bras; next day, at Waterloo, Napoleon was victorious over Bülow and Wellington until seven o'clock in the evening, but the arrival of 30,000 Prussians, under Blücher, resulted in the emperor's defeat. He abdicated in favour of his son, set out for Rochefort, and claimed the hospitality of England. England declared him the prisoner of the Coalition and, in spite of his protests, had him taken to the Island of St. Helena. There he remained until his death, strictly watched by Hudson Lowe, and dictated to General Montholon, Gourgaud, and Bertrand those "Mémoires" which entitle him to a place among the great writers. Las Casas, at the same time, wrote day by day, the "Mémorial de Sainte-Hélène", a journal of the emperor's conversations. In the first of his captivity, Napoleon complained to Montholon of having no chaplain. "It would rest my soul to hear Mass", he said. Pius VII petitioned England to accede to Napoleon's wish, and the Abbé Vignali became his chaplain. On 20 April, 1821, Napoleon said to him: "I was born in the Catholic religion. I wish to fulfil the duties it imposes, and receive the succour it administers." To Montholon he affirmed his belief in God, read aloud the Old Testament, the Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles. He spoke of Pius VII as "an old man full of tolerance and light". "Fatal circumstances", he added, "embroiled our cabinets. I regret it exceedingly." Lord Rosebery has attached much importance to the paradoxes with which the emperor used to teaze Gourgaud, and amused himself in maintaining the superiority of Mohammedanism, Protestantism, or Materialism. One day, when he had been talking in this strain, Montholon said to him: "I know that

your Majesty does not believe one word of what you have just been saying". "You are right", said the emperor. "At any rate it helps to pass an hour."

Napoleon was not an unbeliever; but he would not admit that anyone was above himself, not even the pope. "Alexander the Great", he once said to Fontanes, "declared himself the son of Jupiter. And in my time I find a priest who is more powerful than I am". This transcendent pride dictated his religious policy and utterly vitiated it. By the Concordat, as Talleyrand said, he had "done not only an act of justice, but also a very clever act, for by this one deed he had rallied to himself the sympathies of the whole Catholic world." But the same Talleyrand declares, in his "Mémoires", that his struggle with Rome was produced by "the most insensate ambition", and that when he wished to deprive the pope of the institution of bishops, "he was all the more culpable because he had had before him the errors of the Constituent Assembly". This double judgment of the former Constitutional bishop, later the emperor's minister of foreign affairs, will be accepted by posterity. By a strange destiny, this emperor who travelled all over Europe, and whose attitude towards the Catholic religion was in a measure inherited from the old Roman emperors, never set foot in Rome; through him Rome was for many years deprived of the presence of the remotest successor of St. Sylvester and of Leo III; but the successor of Constantine and of Charlemagne did not see Rome, and Rome did not see him.

CHIEF SOURCES.—*Correspondance de Napoléon premier* (1858–sqq.); LECESTRE, *Lettres inédites de Napoléon I* (Paris, 1897); *Œuvres de Napoléon Bonaparte* (Paris, 1822); *Mémoires dictés a Sainte-Hélène*, ed. LACROIX (Paris, 1904); LAS CASAS, *Mémorial de Sainte-Hélène* (London, 1853); *Memoirs* of CHATEAUBRIAND and TALLEYRAND.

GENERAL WORKS.—THIERS, *The Consulate and the Empire under Napoleon* (tr. London, 1893); ALLISON, *History of Europe from the commencement of the French Revolution to the restoration of the Bourbons* (Edinburgh, 1849–1858); ROSE, *The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Era* (Cambridge, 1907); HAZLITT, *Life of Napoleon Bonaparte* (London, 1894); WATSON, *Napoleon, a Sketch of his Life* (New York, 1902); SLOANE, *Life of Napoleon Bonaparte* (New York, 1896); TAINE, *Modern Régime*, tr. DURAND (London, 1904); LEVY, *Napoléon intime* (Paris, 1893; reprinted, Edinburgh, 1910); MASSON, *Napoléon dans sa jeunesse* (Paris, 1907); IDEM, *Napoléon et sa famille* (Paris, 1897–1907); IDEM, *Napoléon et son fils* (Paris, 1904); IDEM, *Napoléon inconnu* (Paris, 1895); IDEM, *Josephine empress and queen*, tr. HOEY (London, 1899). In France Frédéric Masson is now the foremost student of Napoleonic history. His numerous works are indispensable for a knowledge of the Empire.

SPECIAL STUDIES:—*His Religious Sentiments.*—BOURGINE, *Première communion et fin chrétienne de Napoléon* (Tours, 1897); FISCHER, *Napoléon I, dessen Lebens und Charaktersbild mit besonderer Rücksicht auf seine Stelling zur christlichen Religion* (Leipzig, 1904). *His Youth.*—CHUQUET, *La jeunesse de Napoléon* (Paris, 1897–98); BROWNING, *Boyhood and Youth of Napoleon, 1760–1793* (London, 1906). *The Coming of Napoleon.*—VANDAL, *Avènement de Bonaparte* (Paris, 1902–1907). *Relations with England.*—COQUELLE, *Napoleon and England (1803–1813)*, tr. KNOX (London, 1904); LEVY, *Napoléon et la paix* (Paris, 1902); WHEELER AND BROADLEY, *Napoleon and the Invasion of England, the story of the Great Terror* (London, 1908); ALGER, *Napoleon's British visitors and captives* (Westminster, 1904); GRAND CARTERET, *Napoléon en images, estampes anglaises* (Paris, 1895); ASHTON, *English Caricature and Satire on Napoleon I* (London, 1884). *Relations with Spain.*—DE GRANDMAISON, *L'Espagne sous Napoléon* (Paris, 1908). *The Divorce.*—WELSCHINGER, *Le divorce de Napoléon* (Paris, 1889); RINERI, *Napoleone e Pio VII (1804–1813)* (Turin, 1906). *Relations with Russia.*—VANDAL, *Napoléon et Alexandre I* (Paris, 1891–1894); DE SÉGUR, *Histoire de Napoléon et de la Grande-Armée pendant l'année 1812* in the *Nelson collection* (Edinburgh, 1910). *The End.*—WOLSELEY, *Decline and Fall of Napoleon* (London, 1895); ROSEBERY, *Napoleon, the Last Phase* (London, 1900); BROWNING, *Fall of Napoleon* (London, 1907); HOUSSAYE, *1814* (Paris, 1888); IDEM, *1815* (Paris, 1893–99); IDEM, *Waterloo*, tr. MANN (London, 1900); SEATON, *Napoleon's captivity in relation to Sir Hudson Lowe* (London, 1903).

Italian and Religious Policy.—DE BARRAL, *Fragments relatifs à l'histoire ecclésiastique du 19e siècle* (Paris, 1814); DE PRADT, *Les quatre concordats* (Paris, 1818); RICARD, *Correspondance diplomatique et papiers inédits du cardinal Maury* (Paris, 1891). *Works of Erudition.*—BOUVIER, *Bonaparte en Italie: 1796* (Paris, 1899); DRIAULT, *Napoléon en Italie* (Paris, 1906); D'HAUSSONVILLE, *L'église romaine et le premier empire* (Paris, 1868); WELSCHINGER, *Le pape et l'empereur 1804–1815* (Paris, 1905); RINIERI, *Napoleone e Pio VII, 1804–1813* (Turin, 1906); MADELIN, *La Rome de Napoléon: la domination française à Rome de 1809 à 1814* (Paris, 1906); CHOTARD, *Le pape Pie VII à Savone* (Paris, 1887); DESTRAM, *La déportation des prêtres sous Napoléon I* in *Rev. Hist.*, XI (1879); DE LANZAC DE LABORIE, *Paris sous Napoléon: la religion* (Paris, 1907); LYONNET, *Histoire de Mgr d'Aviau* (Paris, 1847); MÉRIC, *Histoire de M. Emery* (Paris, 1895); DE GRANDMAISON, *Napoléon et les Cardinaux noirs* (1895); CAUSSETTE, *Vie du Card. d'Astros* (Paris, 1853); GUILLAUME, *Vie épiscopale de Mgr d'Osmond* (Paris, 1862); MARMOTTAN, *L'institution canonique et Napoléon I; l'archevêque d'Osmond à Florence* in *Revue Historique*, LXXXVI (1904); see also bibliographies to CONCORDAT OF 1801; ARTICLES, THE ORGANIC; PIUS VI; PIUS VII. For a fuller bibliography of the subject, consult KIRCHHEISEN, *Bibliographie de l'époque de Napoléon I* (Paris, 1908); DAVOIS, *Bibliographie Napoléonienne française jusqu'en 1908*, I (Paris, 1909); *Rivista Napoleonica* (1901 sqq.).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Napoleon III (CHARLES-LOUIS-NAPOLÉON), originally known as LOUIS-NAPOLÉON-BONAPARTE, Emperor of the French; b. at Paris, 20 April, 1808; d. at Chiselhurst, England, 6 January, 1873; third son of Louis Bonaparte, King of Holland and Hortense de Beauharnais, daughter of the Empress Josephine. After the fall of the First Empire, Hortense, who had been separated from her husband, took her two sons to Geneva, Aix in Savoy, Augsburg, and then (1824) to the castle of Arenenberg in Switzerland. Louis Napoleon had for tutor the scholar Le Bas, son of a member of the Convention. The "principle of nationalities" attracted him in youth, and with his brother, he took part in an attempted insurrection in the States of the Church, in 1831. He was on the point of setting out for Poland when he heard that the Russians had entered Warsaw. On the death of the Duke of Reichstadt (1832) he regarded himself as the heir of the Napoleonic Empire. The Republican press, engaged in a struggle with Louis Philippe's government, manifested a certain sympathy for Louis Napoleon. Though Casimir Périer had expelled him from France in 1831, he and a few officers from Strasburg attempted, but failed in, a *coup de main* (1836). In his book, "Idées Napoléoniennes", published in 1838, he appears as the testamentary executor of Napoleon I and a bold social reformer. His attempted descent on Boulogne, in August, 1840, resulted in a sentence of life imprisonment, notwithstanding his defence by Berryer. While in prison at Ham, he wrote, among other brochures, one on the "Extinction of Pauperism". He escaped from Ham in 1846. After the Revolution of 1848 he returned to Paris, became a member of the Constituent Assembly, and finally was elected President of the Republic by 5,562,834 votes, on 10 December, 1848.

Presidency of Louis Napoleon.—Before his election Louis Napoleon had entered into certain engagements with Montalembert in regard to freedom of teaching and the restoration of Pius IX, who had been driven to Gaeta by the Roman Revolution. When General Oudinot's expedition made its direct attack on the Roman Republic, April, 1849, and the Constituent Assembly passed a resolution of protest (7 May, 1849), a letter from Louis Napoleon to Oudinot requested him to persist in his enterprise and assured him of reinforcements (8 May, 1849); at the same time, however, Louis Napoleon sent Ferdinand de Lesseps to Rome to negotiate with Mazzini, an agreement soon after disavowed. In this way the difficulties of the future emperor reveal themselves from the beginning; he wished to spare the religious susceptibilities of French Catholics and to avoid offending the national susceptibilities of the Italian revolutionists—a double aim which explains many an inconsistency and many a failure in the religious policy of the empire. "The more we study his character, the more nonplussed we are", writes his historian, de la Gorce. Oudinot's victory (29 June, 1849) having crushed the Roman Republic, Napoleon, ignoring the decided Catholic majority in the Legislative Assembly elected on 18 May, addressed to Colonel Ney, on 18 August, 1849, a sort of manifesto in which he asked of Pius IX a general amnesty, the secularization of his administration, the establishment of the Code Napoléon, and a Liberal Government. The Legislative Assembly, on

Montalembert's motion, voted approval of the "Motu Proprio" of 12 September, by which Pius IX promised reforms without yielding to all the president's imperative demands. The president was dissatisfied, and forced the Falloux Cabinet to resign; but he was soon working with all the influence of his position for the passage of the Falloux Law on freedom of teaching—a law which involved a great triumph for the Catholics—while, in the course of his journeys through France, his deferential treatment of the bishops was extremely marked. And when, by the *Coup d'Etat* of 2 December, 1851, Louis Napoleon had dissolved the Assembly, and by the *plébiscite* appealed to the French people as to the justice of that act, many Catholics, following Montalembert and Louis Veuillot, decided in his favour; the prince-president obtained 7,481,231 votes (21 November, 1852). The Dominican Lacordaire, the Jesuit Ravignan, and Bishop Dupanloup were more reserved in their attitude. Lacordaire went so far as to say: "If France becomes accustomed to this order of things, we are moving rapidly towards the Lower Empire".

Dictatorial Period of the Empire, 1852–60.—The first acts of the new government were decidedly favourable to the Church. By the "Decree Law" of 31 January, 1852, the congregations of women, which previously could be authorized only by a legislative act, were made authorizable by simple decrees. A great many bishops and parish priests hailed with joy the day on which Louis Napoleon was proclaimed emperor and the day (30 January, 1853) of his marriage with the Spanish Eugénie de Montijo, which seemed to assure the future of the dynasty. At this very time Dupanloup, less optimistic, published a pastoral letter on the liberty of the Church, while Montalembert began to perceive symptoms which made him fear that the Church would not always have reason to congratulate itself on the new order. For some years the Church enjoyed effective liberty: the bishops held synods at their pleasure; the budget of public worship was forthcoming; cardinals sat in the Senate as of right; the civil authorities appeared in religious processions; missions were given; from 1852–60 the State recognized 982 new communities of women; primary and secondary educational institutions under ecclesiastical control increased in number, while, in 1852, Pères Petetot and Gratry founded the Oratory as a Catholic centre of science and philosophy. Catholics like Ségur, Cornudet, Baudon, Cochin, and the Vicomte de Melun founded many charitable institutions under state protection. Napoleon III was anxious that Pius IX should consent to come to crown him at Notre Dame. This request he caused to be preferred by Mgr de Ségur, auditor of the Rota, and Pius IX explained that, if he crowned Napoleon III, he would also be obliged to go and crown Francis Joseph of Austria, hinting, at the same time, that Napoleon could come to Rome; and he gave it to be understood that, if the emperor were willing to suppress the Organic Articles, he, the pope, might be able to accede to his request at the end of three months. Pius IX also wished Napoleon III to make the Sunday rest obligatory and abrogate the legal necessity of civil marriage previous to the religious ceremony. After two years of negotiations the emperor gave up this idea (1854), but thereafter his relations with the Church seemed to be somewhat less cordial. The Bull in which Pius IX defined the Immaculate Conception was admitted into France grudgingly, and after some very lively opposition on the part of the Council of State (1854). Dreux Brézé, Bishop of Moulins, was denounced to the Council of State for infringement of the Organic Articles, while the "Correspondant" and the "Univers", having defended the bishop, were rigorously dealt with by the authorities. Lastly, the return to the *Cour de Cassation* (Court of Appeals) of the former *procureur général* Dupin, who had resigned in 1852, was looked upon as a victory for Gallican ideas.

The Crimean War (1853–56) was undertaken by Napoleon, in alliance with England, to check Russian aggression in the direction of Turkey. The Fall of Sebastopol (8 September, 1855) compelled Alexander II to sign the Treaty of Paris (1856). In this war Piedmont, thanks to its minister, Cavour, had had a part, both military and diplomatic; for the first time Piedmont was treated as one of the Great Powers. After all, the Italian Question interested the emperor more than any other, and upon this ground difficulties were about to arise between him and the Church. As early as 1856 Napoleon knew, through Cavour, that the Piedmontese programme involved the dismemberment of the Pontifical States; at the promptings of the French Government the Congress of Paris expressed a wish that the pope should carry out liberal reforms, and that the French and Austrian troops should soon leave his territories. The attempt on the emperor's life by the Italian Orsini (14 January, 1858), set in motion a policy of severe repression ("Law of General Security" and proceedings against Proudhon, the socialist). But the letter which Orsini wrote from his prison to Napoleon, beseeching him to give liberty to twenty-five million Italians, made a lively impression upon the emperor's imagination. Pietri, the prefect of police obtained from Orsini another letter, pledging his political friends to renounce all violent methods, with the understanding that the enfranchisement of Italy was the price to be paid for this assurance. From that time, it was Napoleon's active wish to realize Italian unity. On 21 July, 1858, he had an interview with Cavour at Plombières. It was agreed between them that France and Piedmont should drive the Austrians from Italy, and that Italy should become a confederation, under the rule of the King of Sardinia, though the pope was to be its honorary president. The result of this interview was the Italian War. For this war public opinion had been schooled by a series of articles in Liberal and government organs—the "Siècle", "Presse", and "Patrie"—by Edmond About's articles on the pontifical administration, published in the "Moniteur", and by the anonymous brochure "L'Empereur Napoléon III et l'Italie" (really the work of Arthur de la Guéronnière), which denounced the spirit of opposition to reform shown by the Italian governments. Catholics tried to obtain Napoleon's assurance that he would not aid the enemies of Pius IX. In the House of Representatives (Corps Législatif) the Republican Jules Favre asked: "If the government of the cardinals is overthrown shall we shed the blood of the Romans to restore it?" And the minister, Baroche, made no answer (26 April, 1859). But Napoleon, in the proclamation announcing his departure for Italy (10 May, 1859), declared that he was going to deliver Italy as far as the Adriatic, and that the pope's power would remain intact. The victories of the French troops at Magenta (4 June, 1859) and Solferino (24 June, 1859) coincided with insurrectionary movements against the papal authority. Catholics were alarmed, and so was the emperor; he would not appear as an accomplice of these movements, and on 11 July he signed the treaty of Villafranca. Austria ceded Lombardy to France, and France retroceded it to Sardinia. Venetia was still to belong to Austria, but would form part of the Italian Confederation which would be under the honorary presidency of the pope. The pope would be asked to introduce the indispensable reforms in his state. In November, 1859, at Zurich, these preliminaries were formally embodied in a treaty.

Neither the pope nor the Italians were pleased with the emperor. On the one hand the pope did not thank Napoleon for his hints on the way to govern the Romagna, and an eloquent brochure from the pen of

Dupanloup denounced the schemes which menaced the pope. On the other hand it was plain to the Italians that the emperor had halted before enfranchising Italy as far as the Adriatic. Napoleon then dreamed of settling the affairs of Italy by means of a congress, and Arthur de la Guéronnière's pamphlet, "Le pape et le congrès", demanded of Pius IX, in advance, the surrender of his temporal power. On 1 January, 1860, Pius IX denounced this pamphlet as a "monument of hypocrisy", and on 9 January he answered with a formal refusal a letter from Napoleon advising him to give up the Legations. A few months later, the Legations themselves joined Piedmont, while Napoleon, by making Thouvenel his minister of foreign affairs and by negotiating with Cavour the annexation of Nice and Savoy to France, proved that he was decidedly more devoted to the aspirations of Piedmont than to the temporal power of the pope. Meanwhile the Catholics in France commenced violent press campaigns under the leadership of the "Univers" and the "Correspondant". On 24 January, 1869, the "Univers" was suppressed. The minister of state, Billault, prosecuted the Catholic publications and pulpit utterances deemed seditious. To be sure Baroche, on 2 April, announced in the Corps Législatif, that the French troops would not leave Rome so long as the pope was unable to defend himself. But Napoleon, only too anxious to withdraw his troops, at one moment thought of having them replaced by Neapolitan troops, and then proposed to Pius IX, though in vain, that the Powers of the second order should be induced to organize a body of papal troops, to be paid by all the Catholic states jointly. Pius IX, on the other hand, allowed Mgr de Mérode to make an appeal to the aristocracy of France and Belgium for the formation of a special corps of pontifical troops, which should enable the pope to do without the emperor's soldiers. Among these soldiers of the pope were a large number of French Legitimists; Lamoricière, their commander, had always been a foe of the imperial regime. Napoleon III was annoyed, and ordered his ambassador at Rome to enter into negotiations for the withdrawal of the French troops: on 11 May, 1860, it was decided that within three months the soldiers given to the pope by Napoleon III should return to France.

In the meantime, however, Garibaldi's campaign in Sicily and Calabria opened. Farini and Cialdini, sent by Cavour to Napoleon, represented to him (28 August) the urgent necessity of checking the Italian revolution, that Garibaldi was about to march on Rome, and that France ought to leave to Piedmont the task of preserving order in Italy, for which purpose the Piedmontese must be allowed to cross the pontifical territories so as to reach the Neapolitan frontier. "Faites vite (act quickly)", said the emperor, and himself left France, travelling in Corsica and Algeria, while the Piedmontese troops invaded Umbria and the Marches, defeated the troops of Lamoricière at Castelfidardo, captured Ancona, and occupied all the States of the Church except Rome and the province of Viterbo. Napoleon publicly warned Victor Emmanuel that, if he attacked the pope without legitimate provocation, France would be obliged to oppose him; he withdrew his minister from Turin, leaving instead only a chargé d'affaires, and was a mere spectator of that series of events which, in February, 1861, ended in Victor Emmanuel's being proclaimed King of Italy. The expedition to Syria (1859), in which 80,000 French troops went to the relief of the Maronite Christians, who were being massacred by the Druses with the connivance of the Turks, the two expeditions to China (1857 and 1860), in co-operation with England, which resulted, among other things, in the restoration to the Christians of their religious establishments, and the joint expedition of France and Spain (1858–62) against the Annamese Empire, which avenged the persecution of Christians on Annam and ended in the conquest of Cochin China by France, merited for the armies of France the gratitude of the Church. Still the attitude of Napoleon III in regard to Italian affairs caused great pain to Catholics. Falloux in an article entitled "Antécédents et conséquences de la situation actuelle", published in the "Correspondant", implied that Napoleon was an accomplice in the Italian revolution. The Catholic associations formed to collect subscriptions for the pope's benefit were suppressed, and Pius IX, in the consistorial allocution of 17 December, 1860, accused the emperor of having "feigned" to protect him.

Liberal Period of the Empire, 1860–70.—It was just at this time that the emperor, by the decree of 24 November, 1860, made his first concession to the Opposition, and to Liberal ideas, by granting more independence and power of initiative to the Legislature. But the Liberal opposition was not disarmed, and the Catholic discontent was aggravated by his Italian policy. The emperor replied to Pius IX by publishing la Guéronnière's book, "La France, Rome et l'Italie", a violent arraignment of Rome. Then Bishop Pie of Poitiers published his pastoral charge in which the words, "Lavetes mains, O Pilate" (Wash thy hands, O Pilate), were addressed to Napoleon III. In the Senate, an amendment in favour of the temporal power of the pope was lost by only a very small majority; in the Corps Législatif, one-third of the deputies declared themselves for the pontifical cause. The emperor asserted his Italian sympathies more and more clearly: in June, 1862, he recognized the new kingdom; he sent an ambassador to Turin, and to Rome two partisans of Italian unity; and he used his influence with Russia and Prussia to procure their recognition of the Kingdom of Italy. One striking symptom of the emperor's changed feelings towards the Church was the circular of January, 1862, by which Persigny declared all the St. Vincent de Paul societies dissolved. Following upon Garibaldi's blow at the Pontifical States, which had been stopped by his defeat at Aspramonte (29 August, 1862), General Durando, minister of foreign affairs in Ratazzi's cabinet, declared in a circular that "the whole Italian nation demanded its capital". Thus were the Italians proclaiming their eagerness to be installed at Rome. Fearing that at the forthcoming legislative elections the Catholics would revolt from the imperial party, Napoleon suddenly manifested a much colder feeling for Italy. The Catholic influence of the empress gained the upper hand of Prince Napoleon's anti-religious influence. Thouvenel was supplanted by Drouin de Lhuys (15 October, 1862), who was made to give out a curt statement that the French Government had no present intention of taking any action in consequence of the Durando circular, thus bringing about the fall of the Ratazzi cabinet in Italy. A great many Catholics recovered their confidence in Napoleon; but a political alliance between a certain number of Liberal Catholics, devoted to the Royalist cause and members of the Republican party resulted, in

NAPOLEON III

June, 1863, in the return of thirty-five Opposition members to the Chamber, mostly men of great ability. Republicans and Monarchists, Freethinkers and Catholics, they grouped themselves around Thiers, who had been Louis Philippe's minister, and who won the confidence of Catholics by pronouncing unequivocally in favour of the temporal power. But the alliance between Republicans who wanted Napoleon to desist from protecting the temporal power and Catholics who thought he did not protect it enough, could not be very stable. From 1862 to 1864 the emperor did nothing in regard to Italy that could cause Pius IX any uneasiness. He was at that period busy with the early stages of the Mexican War, in which he had very imprudently allowed himself to become involved. Four years of fighting against President Juarez were destined to end in the evacuation of Mexico by the French troops, early in 1867, and the execution of Maximilian, brother of the Emperor of Austria, whom France had caused to be proclaimed Emperor of Mexico. The impression created by this disaster notably increased the strength of the Opposition in France.

Negotiations between Napoleon III and Italy recommenced in 1864, the Italian Government beseeching the emperor to put an end to the French occupation of the Pontifical States. The Convention of 15 September, 1864, obliged Italy to refrain from attacking the actual possessions of the Holy See and, on the contrary, to defend them, while France promised to withdraw her troops within a period of not more than two years, *pari passu* with the organization of the pope's army. This arrangement caused profound sorrow at the Vatican; Pius IX drew the conclusion that Napoleon was preparing to leave the States of the Church at the mercy of the Italians. The diplomatic remonstrances with which the emperor's government replied to the Syllabus, its prohibition against the circulation of that document, and Duruy's project to organize primary education without the concurrence of the Church, were causes of dissatisfaction to Rome and to the Catholics. The speech of Thiers against Italian unity, denouncing the imprudence of the Imperial policy, was loudly applauded by the faithful supporters of the Holy See. Napoleon III, always a prey to indecision, no doubt asked himself from time to time whether his policy was a wise one, but the circumstances which he himself had created carried him along. Late in 1864 he thought of negotiating an alliance between the Courts of Berlin and Turin against Austria, so as to allow Italy to get possession of Venetia. Having paved the way for Italian unity, he was inaugurating a policy by means of which Prussia was to achieve German unity. He did nothing to prevent the conquest of Austria by Prussia at Sadowa (1866), and when he made a vain attempt to have Luxemburg ceded to him, Bismarck exploited the proceedings to convince public opinion in Germany of the danger of French ambition and the serious necessity of arming against France. By the end of 1866 the withdrawal of the French troops which had guarded the pope was complete. But Napoleon at the very time when he was thus carrying out the Convention of 15 September was organizing at Antibes a legion to be placed at the disposal of the pope; he once more exacted of Italy a pledge not to invade the Papal States; he conceived a plan to obtain from the Powers a collective guarantee of the pope's temporal sovereignty. On 3 November, 1866, he wrote to his friend Francesco Arese: "People must know that I will yield nothing on the Roman question, and that my mind is made up, while carrying out the Convention of 15 September, to support the temporal power of the pope by all possible means". But the season of ill-luck and of blundering was setting in for the Imperial diplomacy. None of the Powers responded to Napoleon's appeal. Italy, displeased at the organization of the Antibes Legion and the confidence reposed by the emperor in Rouher, a devoted champion of Catholic interests, complained bitterly: Napoleon answered by complaining of the Garibaldian musters that threatened the pope's territories. When the Garibaldians made an actual incursion, on 25 October, 1867, the French troops which had for some weeks been concentrated at Toulon, embarked for Cività Vecchia and helped the papal troops defeat the invaders at Mentana. Cardinal Antonelli asked that the French forces should be directed against those of Victor Emmanuel, but the emperor refused. Menabrea, Victor Emmanuel's minister, though he gave orders for the arrest of the Garibaldians, published in spite of Napoleon, a circular affirming Italy's right to possess Rome. Napoleon found it increasingly difficult to extricate himself from the coils of the Roman Question; he was still thinking of a European congress, but Europe declined. At the close of 1867, Thier's speech in support of the temporal power gave Rouher occasion to say, amid the applause of the majority, "We declare it in the name of the French government, Italy shall not take possession of Rome. Never, never will France tolerate such an assault upon her honour and her Catholicity". That *never* was extremely unpleasant to the Italian patriots. The emperor had offended both the pope and Italy at the same time. When the Vatican Council was convoked the imperial government manifested no antagonism. M. Emile Ollivier, president of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, opined, on 2 January, 1870, that the States ought not to interfere in the deliberations of the council. His colleague Daru instructed Banneville, the French ambassador to Rome, on 20 February, to protest in the name of French Constitutional law against the programme of enactments "De ecclesia", and tried to bring about concerted action of the Powers; but, after Antonelli's demurrer of 10 March, Daru confined himself to reiterating his objections in a memorandum (5 April) which Pius IX declined to submit to the council. M. Ollivier, against the requests of certain anti-infallibilist prelates, directed Banneville not to try to meddle in the proceedings of the council.

In 1870 Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern's claim to the crown of Spain brought on a conflict between France and King William of Prussia. A dispatch relating to a conversation which took place at Ems, between William and Napoleon's ambassador, Benedetti, was, as Bismarck himself afterwards confessed, tampered with in such a way as to make war inevitable. Bismarck's own "Recollections" thus supply the refutation of the charge made by him in the Reichstag (5 December, 1874), that the empress and the Jesuits had desired the war and driven him into it. The German historian Sybel has formally cleared the empress and the Jesuits of this accusation. (On this point, which has provoked numerous polemics, see Dühr, "Jesuitenfabeln", 4th ed., Freiburg, 1904, pp. 877–79). Pius IX wrote to Emperor William offering his good offices as mediator (22 July, 1870), but to no purpose. As for the Italian government, on 16 July, 1870, it refused an alliance with France because Napoleon had refused it Rome. On 20 July Napoleon promised that the imperial troops should be recalled from Rome, but no more, and so, as usual, he offended both the pope, whom he was about to leave defenceless, and Italy, whose highest ambitions he was balking. The negotiations between France and Italy were continued in August, by Prince Napoleon, who made a visit to Florence. Italy absolutely insisted upon being allowed to take Rome, and, on 29 August, Visconti Venosta, minister of foreign affairs, affirmed the right of the Italians to have Rome for their capital. The anti-Catholic controversialists of France have often made use of these facts to support their allegation that the emperor would have had the Italian alliance in the War of 1870 if he had not persisted in his demand that

the pope should remain master of Rome, and that Italy's abstention entailed that of Austria, which would have helped France if Italy had. M. Welschinger has proved that in 1870 these two powers were in no condition to be of material assistance to France. After the surrender of Sedan (2 September, 1870), Napoleon was sent, a prisoner, to Wilhelmshöhe, where he learned that the Republic had been proclaimed at Paris, 4 September, and that the Piedmontese had occupied Rome (20 September). The National Assembly of Bordeaux, on 28 February, 1871, confirmed the emperor's dethronement. After the Peace of Frankfort he went to reside at Chiselhurst, where he died. His only son, Eugène-Louis-Jean-Joseph-Napoléon, born 16 March, 1856, was killed by the Zulus, 23 June, 1879. Napoleon III left unfinished a "Vie de César", begun in 1865, with the assistance of the historian Duruy, and of which only three volumes were published. His history still affords occasion for numerous polemics animated by party feeling. The portrait of him drawn by Victor Hugo in "Les Châtiments" is extremely unfair. Napoleon was a tender-hearted dreamer, kindness was one of his most evident qualities. As regards his personal practice of religion, he was faithful to his Easter duties. Much of the censure which his foreign policy has merited is equally applicable to the anticlericals and the Republicans of his time, whose press organs were clamouring for French aid towards the speedy realization of Italian unity, while their systematic opposition, in 1868, to the Government programme for strengthening the army was partly responsible for the military weakness of France in 1870.

The works of Napoleon III, including those written before he became emperor, his speeches as president, and his military works were published in 5 vols., Paris, 1854–57, and 1869; THIRRIA, *Napoléon III avant l'Empire* (2 vols., Paris, 1896); DE LA GORCE, *Histoire du second Empire* (7 vols., Paris, 1895–1902); BLANCHARD JERROLD, *Life of Napoleon III* (4 vols., London, 1882); FORBES, *The Life of Napoleon the Third* (London, 1898); WOESTE, *Le règne de Napoléon III* (Brussels, 1907); OLLIVIER, *L'Empire libéral* (14 vols., Paris, 1895–1910); GIRAUDEAU, *Napoléon III intime* (Paris, 1895); WELSCHINGER, *La Guerre de 1870, causes et responsabilités* (2 vols., Paris, 1910). On Napoleon III and the Italian question, see bibliographies to FALLOUX, MONTALEMBERT, DUPANLOUP, PIUS IX, VEUILLOT; also GIACOMETTI, *La question italienne* (Paris, 1893); IDEM, *L'unité italienne* (2 vols., Paris, 1896–98); THOUVENEL, *Le secret de l'empereur* (2 vols., Paris, 1889); CHIALA, *Politica segreta di Napoleone III e di Cavour in Italia e in Ungheria* (Turin, 1895); BOURGEOIS AND CLERMONT, *Rome et Napoléon III* (Paris, 1907); BONFADINI, *Vita di Francesco Arese* (Turin, 1894); CAUVIÈRE, *Un Portrait inédit de Napoléon III* in *Revue de l'Institutut Catholique de Paris* (1910), attributed to Falloux, characterizing the attitude of Napoleon III in Italian affairs.

GEORGES GOYAU.

Napper (or NAPIER), GEORGE, VENERABLE, English martyr, b. at Holywell manor, Oxford, 1550; executed at Oxford 9 November, 1610. He was a son of Edward Napper (d. in 1558), sometime Fellow of All Souls College, by Anne, his second wife, daughter of John Peto, of Chesterton, Warwickshire, and niece of William, Cardinal Peto. He entered Corpus Christi College 5 January, 1565–6, but was ejected in 1568 as a recusant. On 24 August, 1579, he paid a visit to the English College at Reims, and by December, 1580, he had been imprisoned. He was still in the Wood Street Counter, London, on 30 September, 1588; but was liberated in June, 1589, on acknowledging the royal supremacy. He entered the English College, Douai, in 1596, and was sent on the mission in 1603. He appears to have lived with his brother William at Holywell. He was arrested at Kirtlington, four miles from Woodstock, very early in the morning of 19 July, 1610, when he had on him a pyx containing two consecrated Hosts as well as a small reliquary. Brought before Sir Francis Eure at Upper Heyford (Wood says before a justice named Chamberlain), he was strictly searched; but the constable found nothing but his breviary, his holy oils, and a needle case with thread and thimble. The next day he was sent to Oxford Castle, and indicted at the sessions soon after under 27 Eliz., c. 2 for being a priest. The possession of the oils was held to be conclusive and he was condemned, but reprieved. In gaol he reconciled a condemned felon named Falkner, and this was held to aggravate his crime, but as late as 2 November it was believed that he would have his sentence commuted to one of banishment. As he refused the oath of allegiance, which described the papal deposing power as a "false, damnable, and heretical" doctrine, it was decided to execute him. He suffered between one and two in the afternoon, having said Mass that morning. His head according to Wood was set up on Tom Gateway; according to Challoner's less probable statement on Christ Church steeple. His quarters were placed on the four city gates, but at least some were secretly removed, and buried in the chapel (now a barn) of Sanford manor, formerly a preceptory of Knights Templar.

CHALLONER, *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*, II, no. 147; CLARK, *Wood's City of Oxford*, III (Oxford, 1899), 184, 186; WOOD, *Annals*, II (Oxford, 1796), 165, 166; FOWLER, *History of Corpus Christi College* (Oxford, 1893), 389; STAPLETON, *Post-Reformation Catholic Missions in Oxfordshire* (London, 1906), 4, 190, 199, 211–8, 323–4; KNOX, *First and Second Diaries of the English College, Douay* (London, 1878), 16, 33, 155, 174; *Catholic Record Soc. Publ.* (London, 1905—), I, 133-4, II, 284; LEMON, *Calendar State Papers Domestic 1581–90* (London, 1865), 606.

JOHN B. WAINEWRIGHT.

Narbonne. See TOULOUSE, ARCHDIOCESE OF.

Nardi, JACOPO, Italian historian; b. at Florence, 1476; d. at Venice, 11 March, 1563. His father, Salvestro Nardi, belonged to an old Florentine family, originally from the suburbs of the city. Jacopo was an earnest follower of Savonarola, whose death he witnessed. He was attached to the Republican party, under which he held various offices in the State, but nevertheless kept on friendly terms with the Medici after their restoration in 1512, and even composed pageants for them. Having been concerned in the Republican revolution of 1527, he was banished from Florence in 1530, and took a leading part in the efforts of the exiles to return, pleading their cause against the tyranny of Duke Alessandro before Charles V, in 1536. He finally settled at Venice, where he died in poverty. All his contemporaries bear witness to his upright and noble character. Before his exile, Nardi composed two comedies "L'Amicizia" and "I Due Felici Rivali", together with a few *canti carnascialeschi*, or carnival-songs. To a later date belong his political discourses, his translations from Livy and Cicero, and his Life of Antonio Giacomini, an austere soldier of the republic who died in 1517. His "Istorie della città di Firenze" (History of the City of Florence) was written in the last years of his life. It deals with the tragic epoch in Florentine history from 1494 until within a few years of the author's death, and is especially noteworthy for its high moral tone and its faithful record of the events in which Nardi himself had shared.

GELLI, ed., *Istorie della città di Firenze di Jacopo Nardi* (Florence, 1858); GARGIOLLI, ed., *Vita di Antonio Giacomini e altri scritti minori di Jacopo Nardi* (Florence, 1867); PIERALLI, *La vita e le opere di Jacopo Nardi* (Florence, 1901).

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

Nardò, DIOCESE OF (NERITONENSIS), in southern Italy. Nardò was already an episcopal see, when, about 761, Greek monks arrived there, fleeing from the persecutions of the Iconoclasts. Paul I assigned to these monks the episcopal palace and the revenues of the see, then vacant, and the city was made part of the Diocese of Brindisi. The monastery became a centre of Greek culture; but, in 1090, Urban II put Latin Benedictines there, and Paschal II gave episcopal jurisdiction to the abbot; for a long time the Greek and Latin rites were maintained together at the monastery. In 1388, a bishop was established at Nardò by the antipope, Clement VII, but was deposed by Boniface IX, who entrusted the care of the diocese to the Archbishop of Otranto. The latter proposed to

suppress the Greek Rite in the diocese, but, at the instance of the Benedictines and of King Ladislaus, the pope maintained its use. From the report made on this subject, it is known that the Greek Rite obtained in sixteen towns of the diocese, and that there was a protopope at Balatone. The see was re-established in 1413, in favour of Giovanni degli Epifani. Other bishops were Ambrogio Salvi, O.P. (1569), who introduced the reforms of the Council of Trent; Fabio Fornari (1583), who also tried to abolish the use of the Greek Rite; Lelio Landi (1607), a learned Orientalist, employed by the Congregation *de auxiliis* and also in the correction of the Vulgate; Fabio Chigi (1635), who became Alexander VII; Antonio Sanfelice (1707), founder of a public library and of a workhouse for girls. The diocese is directly dependent on the Holy See. It has 16 parishes, with 70,500 inhabitants, 2 houses of Franciscans, and 4 religious houses of women, 2 schools for boys, and 4 for girls.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, XX (Venice, 1857).

U. BENIGNI.

Narni and Terni, UNITED DIOCESES OF (NARNIENSIS ET INTERAMNENSIS), in Central Italy. Narni is the ancient Nequinum of the Sabines; in 300 and 299 B. C., it was besieged by the Romans, who destroyed the city and sent there a Latin colony, changing the name to Narnia. Luitprand captured the town in 726, but Pope Zacharias persuaded him to restore it to the Duchy of Rome in 742, after which it remained under pontifical rule. From 1198 to 1214, Narni was in rebellion against Innocent III, who temporarily suppressed its episcopal see. The churches of this city contain many paintings of the ancient Umbrian school. This town is the birthplace of the Blessed Lucia of Narni, a tertiary of St. Dominic, who died in 1544, and of the *condottiere* Erasmo Gattamelata. Narni venerates as its first bishop the martyr Juvenalis, who died in the second half of the fourth century; St. Maximus, who was bishop in 425, was succeeded by his two sons Hercules and Pancratius; St. Gregory the Great refers to the bishop St. Cassius, who died in 558; the same pontiff wrote a letter to the bishop Projectinus which shows that, at Narni, at that time, there were still pagans to be converted; Bishop John (940) was succeeded by his son, who became John XIII; among other bishops were: William, a Franciscan, whom Urban V employed against the Fraticelli (1367); and Raimondo Castelli (1656), founder of the seminary.

In 1908, the sees of Narni and of Terni were united. Terni is on the river Nera, at its confluence with the Velino; the magnificent cascade of the latter is well-known through the noble description by Lord Byron in "Childe Harold". Terni is the ancient Interamna Nahars of the Umbrians, and its former splendour is witnessed to by the ruins of an amphitheatre in the garden of the episcopal palace, a theatre, and baths near the church of St. Nicholas. The cathedral, and other churches, are built on the sites of pagan temples. After the Lombard invasion, Terni belonged to the Duchy of Spoleto, and with the latter, came into the Pontifical States; it was at this town that Pope Zacharias entered into the agreement with King Luitprand for the restitution of the cities of Bieda, Orte, Bomarzo, and Amelia to the Duchy of Rome. It is believed that the gospel was preached at Terni by St. Peregrinus, about the middle of the second century. The townsmen have great veneration for St. Valentinus, whose basilica is outside the city, and was, probably, the meeting-place of the first Christians of Terni. There were other martyrs from this city, among them, Sts. Proculus, Ephebus, Apollonius, and the holy virgin Agape. In the time of Totila, the Bishop of Terni, St. Proculus, was killed at Bologna, and St. Domnina and ten nuns, her companions, were put to death at Terni itself. After the eighth century Terni was without a bishop until 1217, in which year the diocese was re-established. Among its bishops since that time, were Ludovico Mazzanco III (1406), who governed the diocese for fifty-two years; Cosmas Manucci (1625), who gave the high altar to the cathedral, and Francesco Rapaccioli (1646), a cardinal who restored the cathedral. The united sees are immediately dependent upon Rome; they have 57 parishes, with 66,600 inhabitants, 3 religious houses of men, and 11 of women.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, VI; MAGALOTTI, *Terni ossia l'antica Interamna* (Foligno, 1795).

U. BENIGNI.

Narthex, in early Christian architecture a portion of the church at the west end, separated from the nave by a low wall or screen and reserved for the catechumens, energumens, and penitents who were not admitted amongst the congregation. The narthex was of two kinds, exterior and interior: the former consisted of an open atrium arcade continued across the front of the church; in the latter, the aisle and gallery were returned across the nave. A survival of the exterior narthex may be found in the church of San Ambrogio at Milan; of the interior narthex, in Santa Agnese, at Rome. The outer narthex was sometimes used as a hall of judgment and for other secular purposes, and, after the sixth century, as a place of burial, while the inner narthex, sometimes called the *matroneum*, was used, probably, for certain persons of rank or distinction, rather than as a women's gallery. After the abandonment of the atrium in the West, about 1000, the narthex developed by degrees into the great west porch which is so characteristic of the churches of southern France. Among the monastic orders it continued in use down to the beginning of the thirteenth century, as, for example, in the abbeys of Cluny and Vézelay. With the full development of Gothic it disappeared, its place being taken by the three great western porches, or doorways. Properly speaking, the name should have ceased with the function, and the so-called narthex of medieval churches and abbeys should justly be called a porch. For the same reason there is no excuse for the recent revival of the word as a designation either of an exterior porch, or an interior vestibule.

RALPH ADAMS CRAM.

Nashville, DIOCESE OF, comprises the entire territory of the State of Tennessee. From its inland location and peculiar civil history, it has not profited much from the tide of immigration, and hence its Catholic development has been chiefly due to its own internal work. There is little need of consulting any historical references as to the growth of the Church in Tennessee since no such work of any importance exists. This is chiefly due to the fact that heretofore the diocese was in an embryo state and those who could write its history had neither time nor opportunity to do what was so much needed. Up to twenty years ago, or in the decade of 1880–90, much of the diocesan history could have been learned from the early pioneers of Catholicity, or their children, who were then living. The Diocese of Nashville was established 28 July, 1837, having been separated from the Diocese of Bardstown (now Diocese of Louisville) and the first Bishop of Nashville was Rt. Rev. Richard Pius Miles, consecrated at Bardstown, 16 Sept., 1838. Before this date there is no authentic record of any ecclesiastical missionary work in what is now the State of Tennessee, except in sporadic efforts. The earliest records attainable are two letters in the archives of Baltimore, dated 1799, to Bishop Carroll from Father Badin, concerning an offer from John Sevier, the first governor of Tennessee, that Father Badin might arrange for the immigration of at least one hundred Catholic families for whose maintenance the governor guaranteed sep-

NARNI

PIAZZA GARIBALDI AND LATERAL FAÇADE OF THE CATHEDRAL

PORTICO OF THE CATHEDRAL

arate tracts of land. The offer of the warrior-statesman was not accepted, however, although many distinctly Catholic names are to be found to-day among the inhabitants of east Tennessee, probably due to the fact that the insurgents of Ireland were sold into a species of slavery by the English government to the American colonists. That they or their children have fallen from the old faith of their fathers can be accounted for by the fact that the exiles had then neither church nor priests, nor Catholic schools. For a good many years the present writer has been seeking information as to early Catholic settlers and Catholic work, but must confess the evidence very doubtful as to whether the first priestly ministrations were in the neighbourhood of Nashville or Knoxville. Civic history and geographical position seem to give the preference to Knoxville.

The first authentic records of a priest in Tennessee are contained in the archives of St. Mary's cathedral, Nashville, when Father Abell came (1820) from Bardstown to attend the few Catholics then living in Nashville. Shortly after his arrival, Father Abell undertook the building of the first church in Tennessee, at Nashville, a small building on what is now Capitol hill. The State Capitol now occupies the site. Father Abell visited Nashville as a mission for four or five years, and then (1849) Father Durbin took charge, and about the following year he was assisted by Father Brown who made Ross Landing (now Chattanooga) his headquarters, just previous to the advent of Bishop Miles. After a difficult journey on horseback and in a canoe from Bardstown, Ky., Bishop Miles took possession of his diocese and early in 1839, began his first episcopal visitation of Tennessee. At the end of his journey he declared that he did not find more than three hundred Catholics in Tennessee. In 1840, he again journeyed to Memphis to establish there the first church, under the management of Father McEleer; it has since been rebuilt as St. Peter's by the Dominicans. In 1844 he laid the corner stone of St. Mary's cathedral, Nashville. In addition mission churches were established in outlying stations so that in 1847 Bishop Miles was able to report to Rome that he had 6 priests, 6 churches, 8 chapels, and a Catholic population of about 1500.

In 1849 a church was erected at Jackson; in 1852 one at Chattanooga; in 1854 one at Knoxville; in 1856 one at McEwen; in 1857 one at Edgefield (now East Nashville); in 1858 one at Shelbyville (later discontinued); and in 1858 one at Nashville (church of the Assumption). Bishop Miles died on 19 February, 1860, at the outbreak of the Civil War, and he was succeeded by Bishop Whelan. His diocese became the great theatre of war; his cathedral was converted into a hospital; his flock scattered. The burden proved too great for his strength, and in 1863 he was forced to resign. Two years later Bishop Feehan succeeded him. Under his jurisdiction, new priests were added to the diocese, new churches were built, especially St. Patrick's (1866), St. Bridget's (1870), and St. Joseph's (1875), all at Memphis. In 1881 St. Columba's church in East Nashville was built, to replace the old St. John's church, which was burned down a few years previously. In the decade 1870–80, mission chapels were erected at Humboldt, Belview, and Lawrenceburg; Bishop Feehan reported to Rome (1880) that his diocese had 30 churches of which 18 had resident priests, besides numerous stations. This was a rapid growth, when we consider the ravages of pestilence which visited the people during 1873, 1878, and 1879, and which buried from the ranks of the Catholics in Memphis alone, twenty-two priests and thousands of lay people. In 1880 Bishop Feehan became the first Archbishop of Chicago, Illinois. Bishop Rademacher succeeded him as Bishop of Nashville in 1883, but owing to ill-health his work was somewhat retarded, although some progress was made. During his administration St. Joseph's and St. Patrick's churches were built at Nashville. In July, 1893, Bishop Rademacher was transferred to the Diocese of Fort Wayne, Ind., where he died in 1900.

In 1894, the present head of the diocese, Bishop Byrne, was consecrated Bishop of Nashville, and his work has not only been that of restoration, but also of great progress; while the ranks of the clergy have been strengthened by the addition of many new men. Faithful and tireless in his energy, scholarly in his attainments, he has aroused the latent zeal in his clergy and people. Among his many undertakings may be mentioned the building of the new pro-cathedral, the enlarging of the Assumption church and St. Joseph's church at Nashville, the building of the Holy Family church for coloured people at Nashville, the rebuilding of St. Patrick's church, and the building of the Sacred Heart church at Memphis, the building of the Holy Ghost church at Knoxville, besides numerous mission chapels throughout the diocese. In addition to this he has directed the building or enlarging of various institutions of charity and learning. He also convoked, 10 Feb., 1905, the first synod of the diocese, at which 34 priests were present, with 7 unavoidably absent. Scarcely had the diocese been formed, when its bishops and priests recognized the need of these institutions, and with their untiring energy, asylums, hospitals, and schools sprang into existence. Chief among them may be mentioned first of all that every parish having a residential pastor has also a Catholic school, and in addition there are four academies for young ladies, St. Agnes (Memphis), conducted by the Dominican (Ky.) Sisters, established in 1850; the Sacred Heart (Memphis), conducted by Dominican (Nashville) Sisters, established in 1890; St. Cecilia's (Nashville), conducted by Dominican Sisters at their mother-house, established in 1860; St. Bernard's (Nashville), conducted by the Sisters of Mercy, established in 1868. For the higher education and technical instruction of coloured girls, the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament (Pa.) conduct an academy at Nashville, established in 1905. The Christian Brothers at Memphis, since 1871, conduct a college for young men. For charitable institutions, there are two well equipped orphanages, one at Nashville and one at Memphis; St. Joseph's Hospital at Memphis, erected in 1885, is conducted by the Sisters of St. Francis, while St. Thomas' Hospital at Nashville is conducted by the Sisters of Charity from Emmitsburg. The Sisters of the Good Shepherd have a home at Memphis for the reformation of wayward girls, and the Little Sisters of the Poor have an institution at Nashville for the aged and infirm. There are also in the diocese the Franciscans and the Dominicans, each with a parish church at Memphis; the Josephite Fathers, having churches at Nashville and Memphis; the Paulist Fathers, with a Mission house at Winchester; the Sisters of the Precious Blood (Maria Stein), having a school at Lawrenceburg. Bishop Byrne has at present (1910) under his direction, 46 priests; 25 parishes with a resident priest and parochial schools, and under Catholic care in schools and institutions for children, about 5000 pupils; the total Catholic population is between 20,000 and 25,000.

JAS. T. LORIGAN.

Nasoræans, sometimes called MANDÆANS, SABIANS, or CHRISTIANS OF ST. JOHN, are pagan Gnostics who shortly before the rise of Christianity, formed a sect which flourished in Mesopotamia and Babylonia, and which was one of the foremost religions in Western Asia in the early years of Mohammedanism. Though some 2000 families strong in the seventeenth century, they have dwindled at the present day to some 1500 adherents living on the Shat-el-Arab near the Persian Gulf. It is the only Gnostic sect that has survived and the sacred writings of which are still extant; a few

remnants excepted, the writings of the so-called Christian Gnostics have perished. I Names, II Doctrines, III Discipline and Ritual, IV History.

I Names. Mandæan (מנדאיא) is a Babylonian-Aramaic word in dialectic form, meaning: Gnostics, γνωστικοί, "those who are good at knowing". The Hebrew word for knowledge מדע Madda is of the same root and is the noun from which the adjective Mandaya is derived. It is the name adopted by the sect itself, being employed in their sacred books, and is characteristic of their worship of the מנדא דחיא γνῶσις τῆς ζωῆς or "knowledge of life". Another name also found in their sacred books is that of Sabians (צביא) which means Baptists (צבע to baptize in Syriac and Aramaic). This name is known to the Mohammedans (sing. *Sabia*, pl. fr. *Subâ'u*) from the Koran (Sure V, 73; II, 59; XXII, 17) in which Christians, Sabians, and Jews are enumerated as religions which can be tolerated by Islam. It is based on the prominence of frequent baptism in their religious discipline and hence they are no doubt referred to by the Fathers as Hemerobaptists ἡμεροβαπτίσται i. e. practising daily baptism. The name Σουβαῖοι was even known in Greek writers. The name, however, most frequently used in their sacred literature is that of Nasoræans, נאצוראיא which is also the usual Arabic (sing. *Nasrani*, pl. Nasâra) for Christians. The coincidence is striking, the more so as the Nasoræans have no leaning towards Christianity, but rather contempt and hatred for it; nor do their doctrines betray any approximation to Christian beliefs, except perhaps in that of the existence of a saviour, although some of their ceremonies bear a superficial resemblance to Christian mysteries. If, however, we remember that the Manichæans in Europe paraded as the true Christians, though their system has but the use of half a dozen terms in common with Christianity, and that some Gnostic sects had barely any similarity with the Church of Christ, though self-styled Christians, it becomes less strange that even Mandæans should have styled themselves Nasoræans. The term Kristiânâ, as transliteration of the Greek word, they reserve for the followers of Jesus Christ. Christianity was no doubt a name to conjure with, but the absence of any reason for the adoption of the title remains a mystery. It is suggested by some that the name is only given to the most perfect amongst them, but this seems contrary to fact. The name "Christians of St. John" is of European origin and based on a mistake. The Nasoræans have an extraordinary veneration for St. John the Baptist, who figures largely in their mythology. This veneration, together with the similarity of their rites to Christian sacraments, led the first missionaries from Europe to regard them as decendants of the Christians baptized only with the baptism of St. John. Such, e. g. was the impression of the Carmelite Ignatius a Jesu, who lived some years in Bassa and wrote a description of the sect (1652).

II Doctrines. These are to be gathered from a voluminous compilation called Genza or "The Treasure", and sometimes Sidra Rabba or "The Great Book", of which copies dating from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries are in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris and have been published by Petermann (Thesaurus s. Liber Magnus, vulgo Liber Adami, etc., Berlin, 1867) in Nasoræan script and language. The former is not unlike Estrangela with vowels added in the modifications of the consonants, and the latter closely resembles that of the Aramaic in the Talmud. The same text in Syriac characters with a somewhat free Latin translation was published by Norberg (London and Gotha, 1817). Selections from the Genza (about one fourth) have been translated into German by Brandt. This book is arbitrarily divided into two sections, called the Right and the Left Genza from the curious Nasoræan custom of writing these two portions in one volume but in inverted positions, the left being used at funerals and being written for the benefit of the dead. The Genza is a collection of writings from all ages and sources, some dating even after the Mohammedan conquest. Another sacred book is the Kolasta, or "Summa" or practical *vademecum* containing hymns, liturgies, rites for marriages, etc. (published as "Qolasta" by Euting, Stuttgart, 1867). The Sidra de Yahya i. e. Book of St. John or Drâshê de malkê, "Lectures of the Kings" was published in 1905 by Lidzbarski and translated with commentary by Ochser in 1905. The Diwan, a priestly ritual, was published by Euting (1904), but the Asfar Malwâshe, an astrological work on the signs of the Zodiac, is not yet published. In recent years finds of Nasoræan inscriptions on pottery have added to our knowledge of their popular superstitions (Pognon, "Une incantation en Mandaïte", Paris, 1892; "Inscriptions Mand." Paris, 1898–9; Lidzbarski, "Ephem f. Sem. Epigr.", Giessen, 1900).

These sources show Nasoræanism to be a form of Gnosticism which stands towards late Babylonian polytheism somewhat as Neo-Platonism stands towards the Greek and Roman Pantheon. It is an attempt to allegorize the ancient myths as being phases of man's creation and salvation, though Nasoræanism never rids itself of fantastic Eastern imagery. Probably through Nabatæan commerce these southern Babylonians came into contact with the Jews of the east of the Jordan and developed a worship of St. John the Baptist. Their daily baptism is however earlier than St. John's practice and is probably the cause of their belief regarding St. John rather than the effect of it. They likewise absorbed a great deal of Indian and Parsee philosophy till they developed their doctrine of the Light-King, which is similar to the Manichæan concept of the universe, though without an absolutely rigid dualism. No religion therefore bears a nearer resemblance to Nasoræanism than that of Mani, who himself was an eastern Baptist in his youth. Finally, through contact with the monotheism of Jews, Christians, Mohammedans, and later Parsees, they gradually drifted towards the acceptance of one God. Their worship of the Light-King is one of singular beauty and elevation. Their æonology is extremely intricate; the æons are called by the mystical name Utra (עותרייא which means: Riches or Potencies; Hebrew עשר). It will suffice to mention a few prominent ideas. Pira Rabba is the source, origin, and container of all things. The meaning of Pira (פירא) is uncertain; of various suggested meanings, perhaps that of "Fruit" (Hebr. פרי) is the most likely. This "Fruit" is like the Indian "Golden Egg", the transcendental and unconscious "Fullness of Being" out of which all things develop; it is the seed of the fig tree of the Gnostic Docetæ (q. v.); it is the βύθος of the Valentinians. This Pira Rabba is possessed and filled by the Mânâ Rabbâ: the Great Spirit, the Great Illustrious One, the Great Splendour or Majesty. From the Mânâ Rabbâ emanates the First Life, who prays for companionship and progeny, whereupon the Second Life, the Utra Mkayyema or World-constituting Æon, the Architect of the Universe, comes into being. This divine architect gives forth a number of æons, who with his permission intend to erect the universe. This however displeases the First Life at whose request the Mânâ Rabbâ produces as surveyor or foreman of the architect's æons the Mandâ d'Hayye or γνῶσις τῆς ζωῆς the Personified Knowledge of Life i. e. the friend and counsellor of the First Life.

This Manda de Hayye is the Christ of the Nasoræans after whom they are called and around whom all their religious ideas group themselves. As god of order he has to battle with the æons of chaos and thus realize the divine idea in the world. The whole is a bold and obvious allegory: Marduk is sent by his father Ea to do battle with the powers of Tiamat.

This female monster of chaos Nasoræans called the Holy Ghost, the Deceiver (spirit is feminine in Aramaic) or Ruha, no doubt to spite the Christians. This Ruha has a son called Ur, the prince of devils. Manda de Hayye conquers him and throws him into chains. Unfortunately while Gabriel the Apostle and Petahiel are beginning to create a good world, Ur escapes and begets with Ruha the seven planets, the twelve signs of the Zodiac, and the five elements. A truce is called and Petahiel amicably shares the creation of the world with the sons of Ur and Ruha. The lifeless body of Adam is created, but the "Image of God" is without motion. With the help of Abel, Seth, Enos, and Adakas there is breathed into him the spirit of life. The seven planets, however, and the twelve signs of the Zodiac constitute an evil influence in the world, which is continually being overcome by the Manda de Hayye. With the doctrine of the Light-King a considerable modification of æonology was introduced, but the main outline remained the same. The Light-King, the Father of the æons, begets Manda de Hayye or Protanthropos, Adam as the First man. This Manda de Hayye becomes incarnate in Hibil the Glorious or Hibil Ziva (היביל זיוא). Kessler pointedly remarks that if Manda is the Christ then Hibil is the Jesus Christ of Nasoræanism. Hibil's descents into Hades play a great rôle in their theology. Hibil is the Saviour and the Prophet of man. He is Marduk attempting to displace Jesus of Nazareth. A last emanation of the Light-King was John the Baptist, who with Hibil, Seth, and Enos are brethren of the Manda de Hayye. Frequent mention is made of heavenly Jordans, being streams of living waters from the transcendental realm of light. Hibil Ziva was baptized in 360,000 of them before his descent to the nether world.

III. Discipline and Ritual.—The Nasoræans strongly repudiate all ideas of celibacy and asceticism; they have a true Semitic contempt for the unmarried and repeatedly inculcate the precept "increase and multiply". They reject all fasting and self-denial as useless and unnatural, and if they observed the Mohammedan fasts at least in outward appearance it was only to avoid trouble and persecutions. They are the reverse of Manichæans; there may be much evil in this world but man is bound to make the best of it. No wonder Mani left them. They observe no distinctions of food, except that blood and things strangled are forbidden them, also all food prepared by strangers, and even food bought in the market, must be washed. They have no special hours for prayer except that they must only pray when it is light, no prayer is heard as long as it is dark. Not the Mohammedan Friday, or the Jewish Sabbath, but the Christian Sunday is their weekly holyday. This, however, is not a conscious imitation of the Christians, whose "Carpenter-god" they hate as a son of the devil. The religious observance of other holidays seems of more recent origin, though no doubt their civil observance, as in the case of New Year's day (first day of Wintermonth; their months have thirty days with five intercalary days to make a solar year), is ancient enough, being a festival of ancient Babylonia. They observe Ascension day (of Hibil Ziva returning from Hades) on the eighteenth of first Springmonth, the Great Baptismal Festival on the intercalary days, the Feast of the Egyptians apparently drowned in the Red Sea under Pharaoh (they were not really drowned, but escaped and were the forefathers of the Nasoræans), and a few other feasts. They possessed a hierarchical priesthood to whom they paid a profound veneration. Their patriarch is the Rash Amma, chief of the people, but they seem but rarely to have had such a dignitary; legend says only one before and one after John the Baptist. A kind of bishops, priests, and deacons form the hierarchy; they are called Ganzivrâ, Tarmîdhâ, and Shecandâ, or Treasurer, Disciple, and Messenger. The ordination to the priesthood is preceded by a so-called retreat of sixty days during which the candidate submits to many quaint rules and baptisms. The Shecanda is only an assistant, but the priest's privilege is the power to baptize; the bishop is the administrator of the community. They possess three great sacramental rites, Masbutha or baptism; Pehta and Mabuha or communion, really morsel (bread) and draught (water); and Kusta or troth, a handshake and plighting of troth. Baptism, always in flowing or living water of rivers and brooks, is the greatest of all the rites. Children are baptized as soon as they can bear total immersion. Self-baptism is frequent; the priest when baptizing used originally the formula: Thou art signed with the sign of life: The Name of the Life and the Manda de Hayye is named over thee. Baptism takes place on Sunday and on many other occasions when forgiveness of sin is required. It is followed by a kind of anointing with moist sesame. Communion is given in thin unleavened cakes kept in the priest's house and a handful of water. Kushta is a solemn sign of fellowship with brother Nasoræans. "Brethren of the flesh pass away, Kushta brethren remain forever", says the proverb. The history of Nasoræanism is practically unknown. The Genza contains a Book of Kings of a pseudo-historical character, but the utter confusion of their historical reminiscences makes it difficult to find a kernel of truth. The Nasoræans were lost to history till Ignatius a Jesu brought the news of their existence. They have been a prominent religion, as they were classed with Christians and Jews by the Mohammedans. It is often held that they once actually dwelt in Palestine near the Jordan and immigrated into Chaldea. Their bitter hatred of all that is Jewish or Christian (for Moses is a false prophet, Jesus, the Great Deceiver, whom Enos justly brings to the cross), together with their extensive use of Biblical names, would lead one to believe that though their "theology" is Indian-Babylonian they were once historically connected with Jewish Christians.

Brandt, *Die mandäische Religion* (Leipzig, 1889); Idem, *Das Schicksal der Seele nach dem Tode etc.* in *Jahrbüch. der prot. Theol.* (1892); Idem, *Mandäische Schriften* (Göttingen, 1893); Kessler, an extensive article in *Realencykl. für prot. Theolog.* (1903), s. v. *Mandäer;* Idem, *Mandæans* in *Encyclopæd. Britan.;* Ochser, *Sidra d'Nismata* (*Book of Souls*), tr.; *Zeitschrift d. deut. morgenl. Gesell.* (1907); de Morgan, *Textes Mandaïtes* in *Missions Scientifiques en Perse*, V (Paris, 1904); Siouffi, *Etudes sur la religion des Soubbas* (Paris, 1880); Babelon, *Les Mendaïtes* in *Annales de Philos. Chrét.* (1881); Petermann, *Reisen im Orient* (Leipzig, 1861); Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1875).

J. P. Arendzen.

Natal, Vicariate Apostolic of.—The history of the Catholic Church in South Africa goes back to 1660, when a French bishop and a few priests were saved from the wreck of the Marichal near the Cape of Good Hope. But they were only allowed to land, and no permission was given them to minister to the few Catholics who were already in Cape Town. It was not until 1803 that a Catholic priest was permitted to say Mass in Cape Colony. Fathers Joannes Lansink, Jacobus Melissen, and Lambertus Prinsen landed at Cape Town in 1803; the following year they were expelled. Pius VII by letters Apostolic dated 8 June, 1818, appointed the Rt. Rev. Edward Bede Slater, O.S.B., the first vicar Apostolic of the Cape of Good Hope and the neighbouring islands, Mauritius included. Bishop Slater on his way to Mauritius in 1820, left Rev. Fr. Scully at Cape Town in charge of the Catholics. In 1826 Rev. Theodore Wagner became resident priest. He was succeeded by Rev. E. Rishton in 1827. On 6 June, 1837, Gregory XVI established the Vicariate of the Cape of Good Hope, separate from Mauritius, and from that time Cape Colony has had its own bishops.

South Africa, comprising the country between Cape Agulhas and the tenth degree of south latitude, and

between the tenth and fortieth degrees of east longitude, was too much for one bishop. On 30 July, 1847, Pius IX established a new vicariate in the eastern portion of Cape Colony. This new vicariate included first the eastern district of Cape Colony, Natal, and the Orange Free State (Orange River Colony since the late South African war). The same pontiff on 15 November, 1830 separated Natal and the Orange Free State from the Eastern Vicariate. The first bishop appointed by Rome to take charge of the Eastern Vicariate was the Rt. Rev. Aidan Devereaux, D.D. He was consecrated bishop at Cape Town, 27 December, 1847 by the Right Rev. Dr. Griffith. When Pius IX erected the Vicariate of Natal, on 15 November, 1830, the area of the new vicariate comprised all the portion of South Africa extending outside the then existing boundaries of Cape Colony. The first vicar Apostolic was the Right Rev. Dr. Allard, O.M.I. He landed at Port Natal with five missionaries of the same French order. The name of this colony dates from Vasco da Gama, the Portuguese voyager, who sighted its headlands on Christmas Day, 1497, which suggested the name of *Terra Natalis*. In 1760 the Dutch had a trading settlement at the site of the present harbour of Durban, speedily abandoned; and more than a hundred years passed before Natal was again visited by Europeans.

After several wars between Dutch, British, and natives, Natal was declared a British colony in 1843. Nine years later, Dr. Allard and his five companions landed on the African shores. Till that time, no priest had been residing in Natal. The country had been occasionally visited by a priest from Cape Colony. The first missionary who ministered to the Catholics of Natal was Rev. Father Murphy, sent by Bishop Devereaux. Its area is about 35,371 square miles, and it is bounded on the north by Transvaal Colony and Portuguese East Africa; on the east by the Indian Ocean; on the south by Cape Colony (Pondoland); and on the west by Cape Colony (Griqualand East), Basutoland, and Orange River Colony from which it is separated by the Drakensberg Mountains. At the time of the advent of the first missionaries, the white element of the population was almost insignificant. Agriculture was practically unknown. Industry, at present a source of wealth, was altogether ignored.

The Catholic population was then composed of about two hundred in Durban and three hundred in Pietermaritzburg; it comprised only the white element, immigrants from England and especially from Ireland. The native population, scattered all over Natal, Zululand, and the Transkei, which districts formed also a portion of the Vicariate of Natal, was altogether uncivilized. The agents of the London Missionary Society had organized some missionary work for the civilization of natives. But they came out rather as officials of the Government, and therefore were not altogether ready to go through the hardships of missionary life. Besides the Europeans and natives, there was the scattered Dutch population. Natives and Dutch were not prepared to receive the Catholic faith. Among the former, superstitions, a sickening immorality, and polygamy, and among the latter, prejudices, and hatred against the Church of Rome, rendered for many years all the efforts of the missionaries apparently fruitless. However disheartening was the result of their work, the pioneers remained at their post. For seven years they had not the consolation of registering one soul for the Catholic Church, yet the intrepid and courageous Dr. Allard wanted to push further his expeditions against paganism. He founded a new mission exclusively for the natives, to whom the missionaries wished to devote themselves altogether, and he called the new mission St. Michael. Here they were destined to battle against many obstacles, privation of the necessaries of life, difficulty of communication, and poverty, which drove the missionaries to the verge of starvation.

The advent of new missionaries enabled Dr. Allard to found missions as far as Basutoland. Religious increase was slow, owing to the small number of missionaries and the degradation of the population. Communication was extremely slow and difficult, and was generally either by wagons drawn by oxen, or on horseback; during the rainy season travel was very dangerous, owing to the swollen rivers. Amid such hardships and privations Dr. Allard felt that his life was drawing to a close. He retired to Rome, where he died soon after. Under his successor, Rt. Rev. Dr. Charles Jolivet, O.M.I. appointed 30 Nov., 1874, the Vicariate of Natal has made rapid progress in the way of Christianity and civilization. New missions were founded all over this immense vicariate, and new chapels and schools for Europeans and natives were opened. Many obstacles which in the beginning had rendered the missionary work very difficult were removed. Communication became easier, owing to the new railways and roads laid out across the country by the Government of Natal. Missionary work has been of late years carried on amongst the natives on a very large scale, owing to the advent of some Trappists into the Colony of Natal, who afterwards were organized into the "Congregation of the Missionaries of Mariannhill". They have devoted themselves entirely to the evangelization of the natives, and as statistics show, their efforts and labours have been fully rewarded. The late Anglo-Boer war hampered much the missionary work in this vicariate, but the consequences of this war have practically disappeared. Through the treaty agreed to by the British and the Boers, the Districts of Utrecht, Vryheid, and Wakkerstroom were ceded to Natal and have been added to this vicariate, which now comprises the three above-mentioned districts, Natal proper, Transkei, Swaziland, and Zululand.

The present bishop (1910) is Rt. Rev. Henri Delalle, O.M.I., appointed in 1904. The white population of the vicariate is estimated to be about 100,000; natives, Indians, and Malays, 1,000,000; the Catholic population is 25,737 (whites, 7458; natives, 15,227; coloured, 3052). Priests: Oblates of Mary Immaculate, 38; Missionaries of Mariannhill, 46; secular priests: Europeans, 4, natives, 3. There is a seminary, with eleven theological students. Lay brothers: Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Europeans, 4, native, 1; Missionaries of Mariannhill, 305; Marist Brothers, 7. Number of churches, 59; missions, 49. Number of schools: for whites, 24, pupils, 653; for natives, 62, pupils, 1864; for coloured, 10, pupils, 472; most of the schools are conducted by nuns. Orders of women: Sisters of the Precious Blood, 324; Sisters of the Holy Cross, 55; Sisters of Nazareth, 12; Sisters of the Holy Family, 92; Dominicans, 138; Augustinians, 67; Franciscans, 12; Sisters of Kermaria, 18. Two schools for whites, 4 sanatoria for whites and natives, and 1 orphanage for coloured children are under the management of the Augustinian Sisters; and a house for orphans and aged is under the care of the Sisters of Nazareth House, with about 260 inmates. At the Bluff the Sisters of the Holy Family have an orphanage for European children; they have a novitiate at Bellair, with 10 novices. The Dominican Sisters have their mother-house at Oakford, and have also schools at Noodsberg, Genezzano, Dundee, and Newcastle. At Ladysmith and Pietermaritzburg, there are 2 hospitals, and 2 sanatoria of the Augustinian Sisters.

Besides the numerous boarding-schools established in different parts of the vicariate, there are many parochial schools, some of which are under the control of the Government, and receive a subsidy proportioned to the number of pupils.

Annales des Oblats de Marie Immaculée.

A. LANGOUET.

Natal Day.—Both the form *natalis* (sc. *dies*) and *natalicium* were used by the Romans to denote what we call a birthday, i. e. the anniversary of the day when a man was born. Also the Greek words γενέσια and γενέθλιος were similarly employed. But in both Greek and Latin a certain extension of this primitive use seems to have taken place even in pre-Christian times. In Latin *natalis* apparently came, at least sometimes, to mean little more than "anniversary" and it was used of the accession day of the emperor as well as of his birthday. Moreover we know that the games celebrated on an emperor's birthday during his life, were often continued after his apotheosis upon the anniversary of his birthday as if he were still living. In Greek γενέσια came to be frequently used in connexion with the annual commemoration of a dead person by sacrifices and other rites (cf. Herodotus IV, 26). This commemoration is said to have taken place not upon the anniversary of the day of death but upon the actual *birthday* of the defunct person (C. I. G. 3417, and Rhode, "Psyche", 4th ed., I, 235). When, therefore, the Christians of Smyrna about 150 A. D. write to describe how they took up the bones of St. Polycarp "which are more valuable than precious stones and finer than refined gold, and laid them in a suitable place, where the Lord will permit us to gather ourselves together, as we are able, in gladness and joy and to celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom" (ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ ἡμέραν γενέθλιον), it is not easy to say how far they were influenced by pre-existing pagan usages. This phrase "the birthday of his martyrdom" certainly seems to indicate the commemoration of the day on which he died, and all the subsequent history of the Church confirms the practice of keeping this as the usual feast of any saint or martyr. None the less, knowing as we do that the Greeks also commonly celebrated what they called νεκύσια, (commemorative sacrifices), on the anniversary of the death of parents, it would seem that the faithful of the early Church did little more than christianize a pagan custom. This they accomplished, first by offering the holy sacrifice of the Mass in honour of their deceased brethren instead of the blood or flesh of animal victims, and secondly by giving to this commemoration of a true believer's passage to another life the name γενέθλιος, or in Latin *natalis*, rather than to the day upon which he had been born into this world.

One cannot however entirely eliminate the doubt whether at the introduction of Christianity γενέθλιος and *natalis* had not already come to mean little more than "anniversary" or "commemoration rite". Tertullian says "oblationes pro defunctis pro nataliciis annua die facimus" (De Corona, cap. 3), which seems to mean "we offer Masses for the dead on their anniversary as a commemoration rite". Similarly the Chronographer of 354 notes in his calendar against 22 February, "VIII Kal. Martias Natale Petri de cathedra"; where *natale* clearly signifies anniversary rather than birthday. Indeed where we find the Fathers emphasizing the etymology of the word, their language rather suggests that they expected the primary meaning of "birthday" to pass unnoticed. In any case the sense of anniversary alone fits a wide range of phrases which meet us in the calendars and other documents of the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries. Avitus of Vienne (d. 518) and Eligius of Noyon (d. c. 650) both refer to Maundy Thursday under the name "natalis calicis" (the commemoration of the chalice), a reference, of course, to the institution of the Blessed Sacrament at the Last Supper, and the feast appears under the same name in the calendar of Polemius Silvius of 448. Again in the Leonian Sacramentary we have the phrase "in natali episcoporum", which the context shows to mean the anniversary of a bishop's consecration (cf. Probost, "Die ältesten röm. Sacramentarien", 124 and 247, and Paulinus of Nola, "Ep. 20"), while the Gelasian Sacramentary uses such expressions as "natale consecrationis diaconi", etc. So also in the Hieronymian Martyrologium (c. 590), besides the constantly recurring *natale* applied to the festivals of martyrs we have, e. g. on 2 Aug., "In Antiochia natalis reliquiarum Stephani protomartyris et diac." None the less a certain stress was often laid in Christian sermons and in mortuary inscriptions upon the idea that the day of a man's death was his birthday to a new life. Thus St. Ambrose (Serm. 57, de Depos. St. Eusebii) declares that "the day of our burial is called our birthday (*natalis*), because, being set free from the prison of our crimes, we are born to the liberty of the Saviour", and he goes on "wherefore this day is observed as a great celebration, for it is in truth a festival of the highest order to be dead to our vices and to live to righteousness alone." And we find such inscriptions as the following

PARENTE FILIO MERCURIO FECE
RUNT QUI VIXIT ANN V ET MENSES VIII
NATUS IN PACE ID FEBR

Where "natus in pace" clearly refers to eternal rest. So again Origen had evidently some similar thought before him when he insists that "of all the holy people in the Scriptures, no one is recorded to have kept a feast or held a great banquet on his birthday. It is only sinners (like Pharaoh and Herod) who make great rejoicings over the day on which they were born into this world below" (Origen, "in Levit.", "Hom. VIII", in Migne P. G., XII, 495). Naturally a certain amount of confusion resulted from this use of the same word *natalis* sometimes to signify natural birth, sometimes the passage to a better life. The former was consequently often distinguished as "natale genuinum", "natale de nativitate", the latter as "natale passionis" or "de passione", sometimes abbreviated as N. P.

Krieg in Kraus, *Realencyklopädie;* Kellner, *Heortology* (Eng. tr. London, 1907); Probst, *Kirch. Disciplin in den drei ersten Christ. Jahrhunderten* (Tübingen, 1873).

Herbert Thurston.

Natalis Alexander. See Alexander, Natalis.

Natchez, Diocese of (Natchesiensis) established 28 July, 1837, comprises the State of Mississippi. Catholic missionary work in this territory began with the expeditions of Marquette, La Salle, and Iberville. Iberville planted a colony in the home of the Natchez tribe, and erected there Fort Rosalie, on a site within the present city of Natchez. Capuchin, Jesuit, and secular priests laboured in this field, having missions at Biloxi, Natchez, and Yazoo. Early in the history of the missions, Fathers St. Cosme and Foucault, seculars, were martyred by the Indians, as were the Jesuits Du Poisson, Souart, and Senat. In 1787 three priests from Salamanca, Fathers McKenna, White, and Savage, settled at Natchez and erected promising missions there and in the vicinity. When the territory passed from Spain to the United States, these missions were practically abandoned. Much valuable property was lost to the Church, and the efforts made to recover it were in vain. For many years the Catholics of Natchez depended upon chance visits of priests.

The first Bishop of Natchez, John Mary Joseph Chanche, was b. 4 Oct., 1795, at Baltimore, whither his parents had fled from San Domingo. He joined the Sulpicians, and was president of Mount St. Mary's when appointed bishop. He was consecrated 14 March, 1841. Arriving at Natchez, he met there the only priest in the state, Father Brogard, who was there but temporarily. Taking up the rôle of a simple missionary, he began to collect the Catholics and organize a diocese. In 1842 he laid the corner stone of the present beautiful cathedral, and opened an acad-

emy for girls. In 1848 he invited the Sisters of Charity to Natchez. At the First Plenary Council, in 1852, Bishop Chanche was chief promoter. He died shortly after the sessions of the Council, at Frederick, Md., leaving his diocese with 11 priests, 11 churches erected, and 13 attendant missions. James Oliver Van de Velde was transferred from Chicago to Nachez, 29 July, 1853. He served the diocese but two years. On 23 Oct., 1853, he broke his leg, and a fever set in which quickly developed into yellow fever; he died 13 Nov., 1855. (See CHICAGO, ARCHDIOCESE OF.) Bishop Van de Velde was succeeded by William Henry Elder (q. v.). The next bishop, Francis Janssens, was b. at Tillburg, North Brabant, Holland, studied at Louvain, and was ordained 21 Dec, 1867. In 1870, he was rector of the cathedral at Richmond, Va., and later vicar-general of that diocese under Bishops Gibbons and Keane. He was consecrated Bishop of Natchez, 1 May, 1881, and promoted to be Archbishop of New Orleans, 7 August, 1888. Thomas Heslin was b. in County Longford, Ireland, 1847, and on the completion of his classical studies, came to America at the invitation of Archbishop Odin. He entered the seminary of Bouligny, New Orleans, was ordained in 1869, and was pastor of St. Michael's, New Orleans, when he received his appointment as Bishop of Natchez. He was consecrated in 1889.

The religious institutes represented (1910) in the diocese are: Lazarist Fathers; Josephite Fathers (three charges); Fathers of the Society of the Divine Word (three charges); Brothers of the Sacred Heart, (six charges); Sisters of Charity (Emmitsburg); Sisters of Charity (Nazareth); Sisters of the Perpetual Adoration; Sisters of St. Francis; Sisters of St. Joseph; Sisters of Mercy; School Sisters of Notre Dame; Sisters Marianites of the Holy Cross; Sisters of the Holy Ghost. There are 39 secular and 7 regular priests; 33 churches with resident priests, 42 missions, 31 stations, 18 chapels, 1 college for boys, 2 academies for girls, 32 parochial schools, 5 ecclesiastical students, 2 orphan asylums (158 inmates). Total of young people under Catholic care, 4,988; total Catholic population, 25,701.

Catholic Directory (1910); SHEA, *Defenders of Our Faith;* DE COURCY AND SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the U. S.*

BROTHER CHARLES.

Natchitoches, DIOCESE OF, former title of the present DIOCESE OF ALEXANDRIA (ALEXANDRINENSIS), which comprises all the northern part of Louisiana above 31° N. lat., with an area of 22,212 square miles. The Venerable Antonio Margil (q. v.), whose canonization is in process, was the first priest to minister within the territory now forming the diocese. From the Ays Indians, west of the Sabine river, Father Margil heard of the Adayes Indians, and in March, 1717, he located them near Spanish Lake, in what is now Sabine county, La. He founded the mission of San Miguel de Linares and built there probably the first church in Louisiana, for, according to the historian Martin, when Père Charlevoix reached New Orleans in 1721, he found there "about 100 cabins, two or three dwelling houses, and a miserable storehouse which had been at first occupied as a chapel, a shed being now used for that purpose". Leaving Father Gusman in charge, Father Margil journeyed on foot to Natchitoches to minister to the French Catholics there, and then went back to Texas. In 1718, during the brief war with Spain, St. Denis, the French Commandant at Natchitoches, invaded the Adayes mission, plundered it, and carried away the church vestments. Father Margil heard of it, and in 1721 came back, hunted up the Adayes who had taken refuge in the forests for fear of the French, rebuilt their church, which he dedicated to our Lady of the Pillar, the patroness of the expedition. For many years afterwards the Adayes mission was attended from San Antonio by the Franciscans, who attended also the missions of Nacogdoches and St. Augustin, Texas. In 1725 there were 50 Catholic families at Natchitoches. In 1728 Father Maximin, a Capuchin, was in charge.

There is no record to show how the eastern portion of the diocese was evangelized; the Catholic names, however, given to villages and lakes contiguous to the Mississippi, show that priests must have visited that country, probably the Jesuits, who in the eighteenth century had charge of the Indians along the Mississippi under the Bishop of Quebec. The records show that in 1829 Father Martin of Avoyelles attended the Catholics on the Red, Black, and Ouachita rivers; that, in 1840 and after, Father J. Timon, afterwards Bishop of Buffalo, made regular trips from Texas to attend the north Louisiana missions, and that Father O'Brien, a Dominican from Louisville, attended yearly the Catholics along the Mississippi. The Catholics located on the rivers of the state often drifted to New Orleans on barges to have their marriages blessed and their children baptized, and came back cordelling their boats.

In 1852 the Fathers of the First Council of Baltimore recommended to the Holy See the division of the Archdiocese of New Orleans, the formation of the Diocese of Natchitoches and the appointment of Father Martin, parish priest at Natchitoches, as first bishop. Consecrated in 1853, he had four priests in the new diocese, three of whom returned to New Orleans, to which diocese they belonged, and one remained.

Bishop AUGUSTUS M. MARTIN (1802–1875), born in Brittany, inherited the deep faith of the Bretons. A protégé of Abbé Jean-Marie de Lamennais, as a seminarian, he was employed at the great Almonry of France in Paris under Cardinal Prince de Troy and Vicar-General J.-M. de Lamennais. There he came in contact with Montalembert and other disciples of Félicité de Lamennais, and acquired the polished manners that never left him. In 1839, while chaplain of the royal college in Rennes, he met Bishop de la Haylandière of Vincennes, came to Indiana with him, and for six years was his vicar-general. His health failing, he came to Louisiana, and in 1852 was vicar-general of Mgr Blanc of New Orleans. Bishop Martin left a collection of unpublished letters that tell interestingly the history of his diocese, his struggles with poverty, his many trips to France to recruit his clergy. A fluent writer, his letters to the Propagation of the Faith were inserted in the "Annals"; the bishops of the Second Council of Baltimore and those of the provincial Council of New Orleans delegated him to write letters of thanks to the directors of the Propagation of the Faith for their generous contributions. Both letters were reproduced in "Les Missions Catholiques". Bishop Martin left an organized diocese with 20 priests, the Sisters of the Sacred Heart with one convent at Natchitoches, and the Daughters of the Cross with their mother-house and several convents in the diocese.

He was succeeded by Bishop F. X. LERAY, also a Breton, the hero of several yellow fever epidemics, and the founder of the Sisters of Mercy in the Diocese of Natchez. He remained in Natchitoches only two years, being selected as coadjutor to the Archbishop of New Orleans. He died in 1887.

Bishop ANTHONY DURIER succeeded him. Born near Lyons, France, he came to this country in 1855, was pastor in New Orleans for 26 years, and one of the theologians of the Second Council of Baltimore. Consecrated in 1885, he died in 1904, having finished the cathedral and built an episcopal residence at Natchitoches.

The present bishop is Right Rev. CORNELIUS VAN DE VEN, born at Oirschot, Holland, 16 June, 1865. He studied in the diocesan seminary of Bois-le-Duc, was ordained 31 May, 1890, and came to America the same year. After filling important posts in the Archdiocese of New Orleans, he was consecrated Bishop of

Natchitoches 30 Nov., 1904. The most important act of his administration has been the transferring of the see from the inaccessible town of Natchitoches to the progressive city of Alexandria, a railroad centre with a large Catholic population. He went to Rome in 1910 and requested Pius X for the removal of the see. In August, 1910, he received from the Consistorial Congregation the decree suppressing the See of Natchitoches and creating the See of Alexandria. The new See of Alexandria numbers 26 diocesan priests, 10 regulars (Jesuits and Marists), the Brothers of the Sacred Heart, the Daughters of the Cross with motherhouse at Shreveport, the Sisters of Divine Providence, and the Sisters of the Incarnate Word, with a Catholic population of about 32,431.

MARTIN, *History of Louisiana* (New Orleans, 1882); SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, I; CLARKE, *Lives of the Deceased Bishops* (New York, 1888); and the unpublished letters of Bishop Martin.

C. MAHÉ.

Nathan (נתן, God-given), name of several Israelites mentioned in the Old Testament.

(1) NATHAN, successor of Samuel and prophet in the times of David and Solomon. No indication is given as to his origin, and he appears in the narrative for the first time when David is contemplating the erection of a house to the Lord (II Kings, vii). He assures the monarch of the Lord's support and of the divinely ordained establishment of his kingdom for all time, but dissuades him from the idea of building the proposed temple, stating that this honour was reserved for his son and successor (II Kings, vii, 13; I Chron., xvii, 1–15). Nathan appears later to reproach David in the name of the Lord for his crime of adultery and murder narrated in II Kings, xi, and, after skilfully proposing the allegory of the poor man's little ewe lamb, surprises the king with the words: "Thou art the man". He then declares the anger of the Lord and the punishments that are to fall upon David, although in view of the latter's repentance his sin is pronounced forgiven, for his crimes had given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme (II Kings, xii, 1–15). The prophet next appears on the scene when it is question of securing to Solomon the succession to the throne of his father. Adonias, abetted by Joab and the high priest Abiathar, made an attempt to have himself proclaimed king. The plan was frustrated by Nathan who, first through Bethsabee and later in a personal interview, informed David as to the doings of Adonias, and persuaded the aged monarch to confirm his promise in favour of Solomon and have him proclaimed king at the fountain of Gihon (III Kings, i, 8–45). In this instance Nathan served the interests of the country as well as those of David and Solomon by averting a civil war. He is credited by the Chronicler with having written a part of the history of David, together with Samuel the seer and Gad the seer (I Chron., xxix, 29; II Chron., xxix, 25). The time of Nathan's death is not given, but his name is mentioned in Ecclus., xlvii, 1.

(2) NATHAN, son of David and Bethsabee (II Kings, v, 14; I Chron., iii, 5, xiv, 4). The name Nathan augmented by the theophorous prefix or suffix is borne by other members of the family of David. Thus one of his brothers was Nathanael (I Chron., ii, 14), and one of his nephews, Jonathan (II Kings, xxi, 21).

(3) NATHAN, father of Azarias and Zabud, important functionaries of the court of Solomon (III Kings, iv, 5). By some scholars he is identified with Nathan the prophet (1), and by others with Nathan the son of David (2). Both opinions are merely conjectural. His son Zabud is designated as priest (כהן), this being an indication, among many others, that the functions of the priesthood were not at that period exercised exclusively by the descendants of Aaron.

(4) NATHAN, son of Ethei and father of Zabad (I Chron., ii, 36), of the tribe of Juda and of the branch of Caleb. His grandfather Jeraa was an Egyptian slave to whom Sesan gave one of his daughters in marriage (I Chron., ii, 34–35).

(5) NATHAN, one of the prominent Jews of the time of the Captivity, chosen by Esdras together with several others to find levites for the temple service when the Jews were camped on the banks of the Ahava preparing to return to Palestine (I Esdr., viii, 16).

(6) NATHAN, one of the sons of Bani mentioned in I Esdr., x, 39. He was among those who, at the command of Esdras, put away the foreign wives they had married.

LESÊTRE in VIG., *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, s. v.; A LAPIDE, *Commentaria in Scrip. Sac.*, III (Paris, 1862), 461 sqq., 481 sqq., 547; X (Paris, 1868), 482; XVI (Paris, 1874), 96, 98; HUMMELAUER, *Commentarius in Libros Samuelis* (Paris, 1886), 316 sqq.; IDEM, *Commentarius in Librum Primum Paralipomenon* (Paris, 1905), 290 sqq.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

Nathanael, one of the first disciples of Jesus, to Whom he was brought by his friend Philip (John, i, 43–51). It is generally held that Nathanael is to be identified with the Apostle Bartholomew of the Synoptic writers. The latter make no mention of Nathanael, but in their lists of the Twelve, one, Bartholomew, is always designated by his family name Bar-Tolmai (son of Tolmai), and it is assumed that it is he whom the author of the Fourth Gospel designates by his personal name Nathanael. The main reasons on which this assumption rests are: (1) that the circumstances under which Nathanael was called do not differ in solemnity from those connected with the call of Peter, whence it is natural to expect that he as well as the latter was numbered among the Twelve; (2) Nathanael is mentioned as present with other Apostles after the Resurrection in the scene described in John, xxi; (3) Nathanael was brought to Jesus by Philip (John, i, 45), and thus it seems significant that Bartholomew is always mentioned next to Philip in the lists of the Twelve given by the Synoptists (Matt., x, 3; Mark, iii, 18; Luke, vi, 14).

LE CAMUS, *La vie de N.-S. Jésus-Christ* (Paris, 1883), I, 232 sqq., 378 sq.; II, 631—tr. HICKEY (3 vols., New York, 1906-08); A LAPIDE, *Commentaria in Scrip. Sac.*, XVI (Paris, 1874), 322 sqq.; TRENCH, *Studies in the Gospels* (New York, 1867), 66 sqq.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

Nathinites, or NATHINEANS (הנתינים, the given ones; LXX generally *οἱ Ναθεινίμ*, once [I Chron., ix, 2] *οἱ δεδομένοι*), an inferior class of Temple servants. The name occurs in seventeen passages of the O. T., and the Vulgate renders it always by the adapted transcription *Nathinæi*. Josephus (Ant. of the Jews, xi, i, 6) renders the Hebrew *Nethinim* by the equivalent *ἱερόδουλοι*, i. e. "sacred servants". The Nathinites appear under this title only in the post-Exilic writings, but if we are to credit the Jewish tradition reflected in the Talmud, their origin goes back to the time of Josue, viz.: that in the first organization of the Mosaic ritual no provision had been made for the menial services regularly deputed to slaves—all being performed by the levites. But after the defeat of the Madianites, Moses gave (נתן *nathan*) one out of every 50 of the 16,000 prisoners (320 in all) to the levites for the service of the Tabernacle at night (Num., xxxi, 47). Josue, however, it is claimed, was the first to officially depute a number of slaves for the exclusive service of the sanctuary. Out of respect for his oath he spared the lives of the Gabaonites (Jos., ix, 23, 26–27), but decreed that henceforth they must become hewers of wood and drawers of water in connexion with the Jewish worship. After the construction of the Temple and the consequent development of the ritual, the number of these slaves was increased. They were in all probability prisoners of war, who in the growing organization of the Temple worship were condemned to be the servants of the levites, even as the latter in the course of time had been differentiated from the priests.

Though not of the Jewish race, it is probable that the Nathineans learned and practised the Jewish religion. Nehemias (II Esd., x, 28) classes them with those who were separated from the people to serve the law of God, but according to the Talmud they were a despised class and were debarred from contracting marriage with Jewish women. They were carried into captivity with the others by Nabuchodonosor, and according to Esdras, 612 of them (including those called "the children of the servants of Solomon") returned to Palestine: 392 with Zorobabel (I Esd., ii, 43–58; II Esd., vii, 47–60), and 220 with Esdras eighty years later (I Esd., viii, 20). After the return the Nathineans lived most likely as they had previously under the monarchy, some in the levitical cities (I Esd., ii, 70; II Esd., vii, 73), during the periods when they were not detailed for service in the Temple, the others in Jerusalem, where, as Nehemias informs us (II Esd., iii, 26, xi, 21), they inhabited the Ophel quarter, i. e. in the southeast part of the city, and near the gate leading to the fountain now known as the fountain of the Virgin. From this they drew the water of which copious use was made in the sacrificial and other sacred functions. They had officers chiefly chosen from among their own ranks (II Esdr., xi, 21; cf. I Esd., ii, 43; II Esd., vii, 47). Like the priests and levites they were exempted from taxation by the Persian rulers (I Esd., vii, 24). No mention or trace of the Nathineans appears in the New Testament.

VIGOUROUX in *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v., *Nathinéens;* HUMMELAUER, *Commentarius in Librum primum Paralipomenon* (Paris, 1905), 350 sqq.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

National Union, CATHOLIC YOUNG MEN'S.—This association was organized on 22 February, 1875, at a meeting held in Newark, New Jersey, at the call of Very Rev. George H. Doane, who became its first president. It includes about one hundred organizations, representing an estimated aggregate of about 30,000 persons and extends as far west as Mankato, Minnesota. Its objects are the furtherance of practical unity, the spiritual, intellectual, moral, and physical advancement of Catholic youth, and the development of better citizens and Catholics. The means principally relied upon are: the conscientious practice and profession, individually and collectively, of the Catholic religion; the establishment and promotion of Catholic young men's associations, libraries, reading-rooms, and gymnasiums; fraternal unity between all organizations aiming in whatever way at the promotion of the Union's objects; mutual assistance and enlightenment; maintenance and conduct of an athletic league giving special attention to boys of the parochial schools; dissemination of selected courses in reading among Catholic literary circles; courses of lectures to Catholic young men's associations, and securing to organizations of the National Union the privilege of having their own members received as guests by the other organizations of the Union. Originally, delegates met annually, and did little in the interim but enlist the co-operation of other organizations in its work. At the present time, it is engaged in various works, which are conducted largely through diocesan unions performing the National Union's functions within their respective districts.

In 1878 the National Union inaugurated the movement for obtaining appointments of a greater number of Catholic chaplains to the army and navy—a movement which was entirely successful. At about the same time, it began the agitation to secure recognition of the religious rights of the Indians. At the convention of 1879, the establishment of coloured literary societies, free night-schools, the fostering of a more general activity among young men in teaching Sunday-school, and the establishment of a lecture bureau were among the questions discussed; by1883 much had been done along these lines. In 1883 the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, in the Pastoral Letter of the Bishops and Archbishops, says of the work of the National Union: "We consider as worthy of particular encouragement associations for the promotion of healthful social union among Catholics, and especially those whose aim is to guard our Catholic young men against dangerous influences, and to supply them with the means of innocent amusement and mental culture. And in order to acknowledge the great amount of good that the Catholic Young Men's National Union has already accomplished, to promote the growth of the Union, and to stimulate its members to greater efforts in the future, we cordially bless their aims and endeavours, and we recommend the Union to all our Catholic young men."

The Catholic Summer School at Plattsburg, New York, is a direct outgrowth of the National Union, plans for its establishment having been discussed and approved at the conventions, and carried into effect by Warren E. Mosher, the secretary of the National Union at the time, and the founder of the Summer School. The National Union has also furthered the cause of education by contributing to the endowment funds of the Catholic University of America.

At the convention of 1906, held in New York City, a committee was appointed to prepare a plan of reorganization, which plan was reported and adopted at the convention of 1907 held at Elizabeth, New Jersey. Under the original organization it had always been required that the president and first vice-president should be clergymen; this was now changed, the various departments of the Union were organized on a business basis, the athletic work was systematized by establishing the Catholic Amateur Athletic League, a branch of the National Union with complete control over all athletic affairs of the Union, and a complete and efficient literary and lecture system was instituted.

It was only in this year that a proper plan was devised for the continuation of the activity of the Union between conventions. The reorganization also created the office of the spiritual director, who is practically the senior officer of the National Union, and is supreme in all matters affecting faith and morals. The National Union has always been conducted by voluntary effort, but its activities have now grown to such an extent that they require an efficient salaried force, for which purpose an adequate endowment fund is now being raised.

W. C. SULLIVAN.

Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, FEAST OF THE.—The earliest document commemorating this feast comes from the sixth century. St. Romanus, the great ecclesiastical lyrist of the Greek Church, composed for it a hymn (Card. Pitra, "Hymnogr. Græca", Paris, 1876, 199) which is a poetical sketch of the apocryphal Gospel of St. James. St. Romanus was a native of Emesa in Syria, deacon of Berytus and later on at the Blachernæ church in Constantinople, and composed his hymns between 536–556 (P. Maas in "Byzant. Zeitschrift", 1906). The feast may have originated somewhere in Syria or Palestine in the beginning of the sixth century, when after the Council of Ephesus, under the influence of the "Apocrypha", the cult of the Mother of God was greatly intensified, especially in Syria. St. Andrew of Crete in the beginning of the eighth century preached several sermons on this feast (Lucius-Anrich, "Anfänge des Heiligenkultus", Tübingen, 1906, 468). Evidence is wanting to show why the eighth of September was chosen for its date. The Church of Rome adopted it in the seventh century from the East; it is found in the Gelasian (seventh cent.) and the Gregorian (eighth to ninth cent.) Sacramentaries. Sergius I (687–701) prescribed a litany and procession for this feast (P.

L., cxxviii, 897 sqq.). Since the story of Mary's Nativity is known only from apocryphal sources, the Latin Church was slow in accepting this oriental festival. It does not appear in many calendars which contain the Assumption, e. g. the Gotho-Gallican, that of Luxeuil, the Toledan Calendar of the tenth century, and the Mozarabic Calendar. The church of Angers in France claims that St. Maurilius instituted this feast at Angers in consequence of a revelation about 430. On the night of 8 Sept., a man heard the angels singing in heaven, and on asking the reason, they told him that they were rejoicing because the Virgin was born on that night (La fête angevine N. D. de France, IV, Paris, 1864, 188); but this tradition is not substantiated by historical proofs. The feast is found in the calendar of Sonnatius, Bishop of Reims, 614–31 (Kellner, "Heortology", 21). Still it cannot be said to have been generally celebrated in the eighth and ninth centuries. St. Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres (d. 1028), speaks of it as of recent institution (P. L., cxli, 320, sqq.); the three sermons he wrote are the oldest genuine Latin sermons for this festival (Kellner, "Heortology", London, 1908, 230). The octave was instituted by Innocent IV (a. 1243) in accordance with a vow made by the cardinals in the conclave of the autumn of 1241, when they were kept prisoners by Frederick II for three months. In the Greek Church the *apodosis* (solution) of the feast takes place 12 Sept., on account of the feast and the solemnity of the Exaltation of the Cross, 13 and 14 Sept. The Copts in Egypt and the Abyssinians celebrate Mary's Nativity on 1 May, and continue the feast under the name of "Seed of Jacob" 33 days (Anal. Juris Pont., xxi, 403); they also commemorate it on the first of every month (priv. letter from P. Baeteman, C. M., Alikiena). The Catholic Copts have adopted the Greek feast, but keep it 10 Sept. (Nilles, "Kal. man.", II, 696, 706).

Lucius-Anrich, *Anfänge des Heiligenkultus* (Tübingen, 1904); Holweck, *Fasti Mariani* (Freiburg, 1894), 118 sqq.

Frederick G. Holweck.

Naturalism is not so much a special system as a point of view or tendency common to a number of philosophical and religious systems; not so much a well-defined set of positive and negative doctrines as an attitude or spirit pervading and influencing many doctrines. As the name implies, this tendency consists essentially in looking upon nature as the one original and fundamental source of all that exists, and hence in attempting to explain everything in terms of nature. Either the limits of nature are also the limits of existing reality, or at least the first cause, if its existence is found necessary, has nothing to do with the working of natural agencies. All events, therefore, find their adequate explanation within nature itself. But, as the terms *nature* (q. v.) and *natural* are themselves used in more than one sense, the term *naturalism* is also far from having one fixed meaning. (I) If nature is understood in the restricted sense of physical, or material, nature, naturalism will be the tendency to look upon the material universe as the only reality, to reduce all laws to mechanical uniformities, and to deny the dualism of spirit and matter. Mental and moral processes will be but special manifestations of matter rigorously governed by its laws. (II) The dualism of mind and matter may be admitted, but only as a dualism of modes or appearances of the same identical substance. Nature includes manifold phenomena and a common substratum of the phenomena, but for its actual course and for its ultimate explanation, it requires no principle distinct from itself. In this supposition, naturalism denies the existence of a transcendent cause of the world and endeavours to give a full account of all processes by the unfolding of potencies essential to the universe under laws that are necessary and eternal. (III) Finally, if the existence of a transcendent First Cause, or personal God, is admitted as the only satisfactory explanation of the world, Naturalism claims that the laws governing the activity and development of irrational and of rational beings are never interfered with. It denies the possibility, or at least the fact, of any transitory intervention of God in nature, and of any revelation and permanent supernatural order for man.

These three forms are not mutually exclusive; what the third denies the first and the second, a fortiori, also deny; all agree in rejecting every explanation which would have recourse to causes outside of nature. The reasons of this denial—i. e., the philosophical views of nature on which it is based—and, in consequence, the extent to which explanations within nature itself are held to suffice, vary greatly and constitute essential differences between these three tendencies.

I. Materialistic Naturalism asserts that matter is the only reality, and that all the laws of the universe are reducible to mechanical laws. What theory may be held concerning the essence of matter makes little difference here. Whether matter be considered as continuous or as composed of atoms distant from one another, as being exclusively extension or as also endowed with an internal principle of activity, or even as being only an aggregate of centres of energy without any real extension (see Atomism; Dynamism; Mechanism), the attitude of Naturalism is the same. It claims that all realities in the world, including the processes of consciousness from the lowest to the highest, are but manifestations of what we call matter, and obey the same necessary laws. While some may limit their materialistic account to nature itself, and admit the existence of a Creator of the world, or at least leave this question open, the general tendency of Materialism is towards Atheism and exclusive Naturalism. Early Greek philosophers endeavoured to reduce nature to unity by pointing to a primordial element out of which all things were composed. Their views were, implicitly at least, Animistic or Hylozoistic rather than Materialistic, and the vague formative function attributed to the *Nous*, or rational principle, by Anaxagoras was but an exception to the prevailing naturalism. Pure mechanism was developed by the Atomists (Democritus, Epicurus, Lucretius), and the soul itself was held to be composed of special, more subtile, atoms. In the Christian era materialism in its exclusive form is represented especially by the French school of the latter half of the eighteenth century and the German school of the latter half of the nineteenth century. Since matter is the only reality, whatever takes place in the world is the result of material causes and must be explained by physical antecedents without any teleology. Life is but a complex problem of physics and chemistry; consciousness is a property of matter; rational thought is reduced to sensation, and will to instinct. The mind is a powerless accompaniment or epiphenomenon of certain forms or groupings of matter, and, were it suppressed altogether, the whole world would still proceed in exactly the same way. Man is a conscious automaton whose whole activity, mental as well as physiological, is determined by material antecedents. What we call the human person is but a transitory phase in the special arrangement of material elements giving rise to special mental results; and it goes without saying that in such a system there is no room for freedom, responsibility, or personal immortality.

II. Pantheism in its various forms asserts that God, the First Reality, World-Ground, or Absolute, is not transcendent and personal, but immanent in the world, and that the phenomena of nature are only manifestations of this one common substance. For the Stoics, He is the immanent reason, the soul of the world, communicating everywhere activity and life. According to Scotus Eriugena, "God is the essence of all things, for He alone truly is" (De divisione naturæ, III); nature includes the totality of beings and is divided into (1) uncreated and creating nature, i. e., God

as the origin of all things, unknowable even to Himself; (2) created and creating nature, i. e., God as containing the types and exemplars of all things; (3) created and not-creating nature, i. e., the world of phenomena in space and time, all of which are participations of the Divine being and also *theophaniæ*, or manifestations of God; (4) neither created nor creating nature, i. e., God as the end of all things to whom all things ultimately return. Giordano Bruno also professes that God and nature are identical, and that the world of phenomena is but the manifestation of the Divine substance which works in nature and animates it. According to Spinoza, God is the one substance which unfolds itself through attributes, two of which, extension and thought, are known to us. These attributes manifest themselves through a number of modes which are the finite determinations of the infinite substance. As absolute substance, God is *natura naturans;* as manifesting himself through the various modes of phenomena, he is *natura naturata*. To-day Monism reproduces essentially the same theories. Mind is not reduced to a property, or epiphenomenon, of matter, but both matter and mind are like parallels; they proceed together as phenomena or aspects of the same ultimate reality. What is this reality? By some, explicitly or implicitly, it is rather conceived as material, and we fall back into Materialism; by others it is claimed to be nearer to mind than to matter, and hence result various idealistic systems and tendencies; by others, finally, it is declared to be strictly unknown and unknowable, and thus Monistic Naturalism comes into close contact with Agnosticism (q. v.).

Whatever it may be ultimately, nature is substantially one; it requires nothing outside of itself, but finds within itself its adequate explanation. Either the human mind is incapable of any knowledge bearing on the question of origins, or this question itself is meaningless, since both nature and its processes of development are eternal. The simultaneous or successive changes which occur in the world result necessarily from the essential laws of nature, for nature is infinitely rich in potencies whose progressive actualization constitutes the endless process of inorganic, organic, and mental evolution. The evolution and differentiation of the one substance according to its own laws and without the guiding agency of a transcendent intelligence is one of the basic assumptions of Monistic and Agnostic Naturalism. Nor is it possible to see how this form of Naturalism can consistently escape the consequences of Materialistic Naturalism. The supernatural is impossible; at no stage can there be any freedom or responsibility; man is but a special manifestation or mode of the common substance, including in himself the twofold aspect of matter and consciousness. Moreover, since God, or rather "the divine", as some say, is to be found in nature, with which it is identified, religion can only be reduced to certain feelings of admiration, awe, reverence, fear, etc., caused in man by the consideration of nature, its laws, beauties, energies, and mysteries. Thus, among the feelings belonging to "natural religion", Haeckel mentions "the astonishment with which we gaze upon the starry heavens and the microscopic life in a drop of water, the awe with which we trace the marvellous working of energy in the motion of matter, the reverence with which we grasp the universal dominance of the law of substance throughout the universe" ("Die Welträthsel", Bonn, 1899, V, xviii, 396–97; tr. McCabe, New York, 1900, 344).

III. For those who admit the existence of a transcendent First Cause of the universe, naturalism consists essentially in an undue limitation of God's activity in the world. God is only Creator, not Providence; He cannot, or may not, interfere with the natural course of events, or He never did so, or, at least, the fact of His ever doing so cannot be established. Even if the soul of man is regarded as spiritual and immortal, and if, among human activities, some are exempted from the determinism of physical agents and recognized to be free, all this is within nature, which includes the laws governing spirits as well as those governing matter. But these laws are sufficient to account for everything that happens in the world of matter or of mind. This form of naturalism stands in close relation with Rationalism and Deism. Once established by God, the order of nature is unchangeable, and man is endowed by nature with all that is required even for his religious and moral development. The consequences are clear: miracles, that is, effects produced by God himself and transcending the forces of nature, must be rejected. Prophecies and so-called miraculous events either are explainable by the known, or hitherto unknown, laws of nature or, if they are not thus explainable, their happening itself must be denied, and the belief in their reality attributed to faulty observation. Since, for religious and moral, as well as for scientific truths, human reason is the only source of knowledge, the fact of a Divine Revelation is rejected, and the contents of such supposed revelation can be accepted only in so far as they are rational; to believe in mysteries is absurd. Having no supernatural destiny, man needs no supernatural means—neither sanctifying grace as a permanent principle to give his actions a supernatural value nor actual grace to enlighten his mind and strengthen his will. The Fall of Man, the mysteries of the Incarnation and the Redemption, with their implications and consequences, can find no place in a Naturalistic creed. Prayers and sacraments have only natural results explainable on psychological grounds by the confidence with which they inspire those who use them. If man must have a religion at all, it is only that which his reason dictates. Naturalism is directly opposed to the Christian Religion. But even within the fold of Christianity, among those who admit a Divine Revelation and a supernatural order, several naturalistic tendencies are found. Such are those of the Pelagians and Semipelagians, who minimize the necessity and functions of Divine grace; of Baius, who asserts that the elevation of man was an exigency of his nature; of many sects, especially among Liberal Protestants, who fall into more or less radical Rationalism; and of others who endeavour to restrict within too narrow limits the divine agency in the universe.

IV. General Considerations.—From the fundamental principles of Naturalism are derived some important consequences in æsthetical, political, and ethical sciences. In æsthetics Naturalism rests on the assumption that art must imitate nature without any idealization, and without any regard for the laws of morality. Social and political Naturalism teaches that "the best interests of public society and civil progress require that in the constitution and government of human society no more attention should be given to religion than if there were no religion at all, or at least that no distinction should be made between true and false religion" (Pius IX, Encycl., "Quanta cura", 8 Dec., 1864). Leo XIII lays it down that "the integral profession of the Catholic Faith is in no way consistent with naturalistic and rationalistic opinions, the sum and the substance of which is to do away altogether with Christian institutions, and, disregarding the rights of God, to attribute to man the supreme authority in society" (Encycl., "Immortale Dei", 1 Nov., 1885). Moreover, like individual organisms, social organisms obey fatal laws of development; all events are the necessary results of complex antecedents, and the task of the historian is to record them and to trace the laws of their sequences, which are as strict as those of sequences in the physical world.

In ethics, the vague assumption that nature is the supreme guide of human actions may be applied in many different ways. Already the principle of the

Stoics, formulated first by Zeno, that we must live consistently or harmoniously (τὸ ὁμολογουμένως ζῆν), and stated more explicitly by Cleanthes as the obligation to live in conformity with nature (τὸ ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ζῆν) gave rise to several interpretations, some understanding nature exclusively as human nature, others chiefly as the whole universe. Moreover as man has many natural tendencies, desires, and appetites, it may be asked whether it is moral to follow all indiscriminately; and when they are conflicting or mutually exclusive, so that a choice is to be made, on what ground must certain activities be given the preference over the others? Before the Stoics, the Cynics, both in theory and in practice, had based their rules of conduct on the principle that nothing natural can be morally wrong. Opposing customs, conventions, refinement, and culture, they endeavoured to return to the pure state of nature. Rousseau, likewise, looks upon the social organization as a necessary evil which contributes towards developing conventional standards of morality. Man, according to him, is naturally good, but becomes depraved by education and by contact with other men. This same theme of the opposition of nature and culture, and the superiority of the former, is a favourite one with Tolstoi. According to Nietzsche, the current standards of virtue are against nature, and, because they favour the poor, the weak, the suffering, the miserable, by commending such feelings as charity, compassion, pity, humility, etc., they are obstacles in the way of true progress. For the progress of mankind and the development of the "Superman", it is essential to return to the primitive and natural standard of morality, which is energy, activity, strength, and superiority; the most powerful are also the best.

If ethical naturalism is considered in its relation with the three philosophical views explained above, it sometimes means only the rejection of any duties based on a Divine Revelation, and the assumption that the only source of right and wrong is human reason. Generally, however, it means the more radical tendency to treat moral science in the same manner as natural science. There is freedom nowhere, but absolute necessity everywhere. All human actions, as well as physical events, are necessary results of antecedents that are themselves necessary. The moral law, with its essential distinction of right and wrong conduct, is, not an objective norm, but a mere subjective result of associations and instincts evolved from the experience of the useful and agreeable, or of the harmful and painful, consequences of certain actions. It is, nevertheless, a motive that prompts to act in certain directions, but the effectiveness of which is strictly determined by the degree of its intensity in a given individual compared with the resistance it encounters on the part of antagonistic ideas. Thus, the science of ethics is not normative: it does not deal with laws existing antecedently to human actions, and which these ought to obey. It is genetic, and endeavours to do for human actions what natural science does for physical phenomena, that is, to discover, through an inference from the facts of human conduct, the laws to which it happens to conform.

It is impossible to state in detail the attitude of the Catholic Church towards the assumptions, implications, and consequences of Naturalism. Naturalism is such a wide and far-reaching tendency, it touches upon so many points, its roots and ramifications extend in so many directions, that the reader must be referred to the cognate topics treated in other articles. In general it can only be said that Naturalism contradicts the most vital doctrines of the Church, which rest essentially on Supernaturalism. The existence of a personal God and of Divine Providence, the spirituality and immortality of the soul, human freedom and responsibility, the fact of a Divine Revelation, the existence of a supernatural order for man, are so many fundamental teachings of the Church, which, while recognizing all the rights and exigencies of nature, rises higher, to the Author and Supreme Ruler of nature.

BALFOUR, *The Foundations of Belief* (New York, 1895); LLOYD MORGAN, *Naturalism* in *Monist*, VI (1895–96), 76; WARD, *Naturalism and Agnosticism* (New York, 1899); RADEMACHER, *Gnade und Natur* (1908); SCHAZLER, *Natur und Uebernatur* (Mainz, 1865); SCHEEBEN, *Natur und Gnade* (Mainz, 1861); SCHRADER, *De triplici ordine, naturali, supernaturali et præternaturali* (Vienna, 1864); BALDWIN, *Diction. of Philos. and Psychol.* (New York and London, 1901); EISLER, *Worterbuch der philosophischen Begriffe.* See also GRACE, MIRACLE, etc.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Natural Law. See LAW, NATURAL.

Natural Right. See RIGHT.

Nature etymologically (Latin *natura* from *nasci*, to be born, like the corresponding Greek φύσις from φύειν, to bring forth) has reference to the production of things, and hence generally includes in its connotation the ideas of energy and activity. It will be convenient to reduce to two classes the various meanings of the term nature according as it applies to the natures of individual beings or to nature in general.

I. In an individual being, especially if its constitutive elements and its activities are manifold and complex, the term nature is sometimes applied to the collection of distinctive features, original or acquired, by which such an individual is characterized and distinguished from others. Thus it may be said it is the nature of one man to be taller, stronger, more intelligent, or more sociable than another. This meaning, however, is superficial; in philosophical terminology and even in ordinary language, nature refers to something deeper and more fundamental. These features are manifestations of a man's nature; they are not his nature. Nature properly signifies that which is primitive and original, or, according to etymology, that which a thing is at birth, as opposed to that which is acquired or added from external sources. But the line that divides the natural from the artificial cannot be drawn with precision. Inorganic beings never change except under the influence of external agencies, and in the same circumstances, their mode of activity is uniform and constant. Organisms present a greater complexity of structure, power of adaptation, and variety of function. For their development out of a primitive germ they require the co-operation of many external factors, yet they have within themselves the principle of activity by which external substances are elaborated and assimilated. In any being the changes due to necessary causes are called natural, whereas those produced by intentional human activity are called artifical. But it is clear that art supposes nature and is but a special adaptation of natural aptitudes, capacities, or activities for certain æsthetic or useful purposes. Stars, rivers, forests, are works of nature; parks, canals, gardens, and machines are works of art. If necessary conditions are realized, where the seed falls a plant will grow naturally. But the seed may be placed purposely amid certain surroundings, the growth of the plant may be hastened, its shape altered, and, in general, the result to be expected from natural activities may be modified. By training the aptitudes of an animal are utilized and its instincts adapted for specific ends. In such cases the final result is more or less natural or artificial according to the mode and amount of human intervention.

In scholastic philosophy, nature, essence, and substance are closely related terms. Both essence and substance imply a static point of view and refer to constituents or mode of existence, while nature implies a dynamic point of view and refers to innate tendencies. Moreover, substance is opposed to accidents, whereas we may speak of the nature and essence not only of substances but also of accidents like colour, sound, intelligence, and of abstract ideals like virtue or duty. But when applied to the same

substantial being, the terms substance, essence, and nature in reality stand only for different aspects of the same thing, and the distinction between them is a mental one. Substance denotes the thing as requiring no support, but as being itself the necessary support of accidents; essence properly denotes the intrinsic constitutive elements by which a thing is what it is and is distinguished from every other; nature denotes the substance or essence considered as the source of activities. "Nature properly speaking is the essence (or substance) of things which have in themselves as such a principle of activity (Aristotle, "Metaphysics", 1015a, 13). By a process of abstraction the mind arises from individual and concrete natures to those of species and genera.

A few special remarks must be added concerning human nature. This expression may mean something concrete, more or less different in various individuals, or more generally something common to all men, i. e., the abstract human nature by which mankind as a whole is distinguished from other classes of living beings. In both cases it is conceived as including primitive and fundamental characteristics, and as referring to the source of all activities. Hence nature, as the internal principle of action, is opposed in the first place to violence and coercion which are external principles of action and prevent the normal play of human faculties. It is opposed also, but less strictly, to education and culture which at times may be the checking of natural tendencies, at times also their development and perfection. Education, physical and mental, is not a primitive endowment; it must be acquired and is built upon nature as on its foundation. In this sense habit has been termed a second nature. But although education is due largely to external causes and influences acting on the mind and the organism, from another point of view it is also the unfolding of innate aptitudes, and hence partly natural.

As between nature in general and art, so between human nature and education there is no clear dividing line. Natural is also frequently contrasted with conventional; language, style, gestures, expressions of feelings, etc., are called more or less natural. This opposition becomes more acute in the theories of Hobbes and Rousseau who lay stress on the antithesis between the primitive or natural state of man and the present social condition due to the contract by which men agreed to surrender their rights into the hands of the common authority.

From the theological point of view the distinctions between nature and person and between the natural and the supernatural orders are of primary importance. The former arose from the dogma of the Trinity, i. e., of one Divine Nature in three persons, and chiefly from that of the Incarnation i. e., of the two Natures, Divine and human, in the one Divine Person in Christ. The Human Nature in Christ is complete and perfect as nature, yet it lacks that which would make it a person, whether this be something negative, as Scotists hold, namely the mere fact that a nature is not assumed by a higher person, or, as Thomists assert, some positive reality distinct from nature and making it incommunicable.

The faculties of man are capable of development and perfection, and, no matter what external influences may be at work, this is but the unfolding of natural capacities. Even artificial productions are governed by the laws of nature, and, in man, natural activities, after they are perfected differ not in kind but only in degree, from those that are less developed. The supernatural order is above the exigencies and capacities of all human nature. It consists of an end to be reached, namely, the intuitive vision of God in heaven—not the mere discursive and imperfect knowledge which is acquired by the light of reason—and of the means to attain such an end, namely, a principle which must be added to natural faculties so as to uplift them and make them capable of knowing and reaching this higher destiny. More specifically it includes an enlightenment of the intellect by a positive revelation of God manifesting man's supernatural end and the conditions for obtaining it; it also implies for every individual the indispensable help of Divine grace both actual, by which God illumines and strengthens human faculties, and sanctifying, by which human nature is elevated to a higher mode of activity. Hence theologians oppose the state of pure nature in which God could have placed man, to the supernatural state to which in fact man was raised.

II. Nature is frequently taken for the totality of concrete natures and their laws. But here again a narrower and a broader meaning must be distinguished. Nature refers especially to the world of matter, in time and space, governed by blind and necessary laws, and thus excludes the mental world. Works of nature, opposed to works of art, result from physical causes, not from the actual adaptation by human intelligence. This signification is found in such expressions as natural history, natural philosophy, and in general, natural science, which deal only with the constitution, production, properties, and laws of material substances. Sometimes also nature is all-inclusive, embracing mind as well as matter; it is our whole world of experience, internal as well as external. And frequently nature is looked upon as a personified abstraction, as the one cause of whatever takes place in the universe, endowed with qualities, tendencies, efforts, and will, and with aims and purposes which it strives to realize.

The problems to which the philosophical study of nature has given rise are numerous. All however centre around the question of the unity of nature: Can all the beings of the world be reduced to one common principle, and if so what is this principle? The first Greek philosophers, who were almost exclusively philosophers of nature, endeavoured to find some primitive element out of which all things were made; air, water, fire, and earth were in turn or all together supposed to be this common principle. The problem has persisted through all ages and received many answers. Aristotle's primary matter, for instance, is of the same nature in all things; and to-day ether, or some other substance or energy is advocated by many as the common substratum of all material substances. After static unity, dynamic unity is looked for, that is, all the changes that take place in the universe are referred to the same principle. Dynamism (q. v.) admits forces of various kinds which, however, it tries to reduce to as small a number as possible, if not to only one form of energy manifesting itself in different ways. Mechanism (q. v.) holds that everything is explainable by the sole assumption of movement communicated from one substance to another. Teleological views give to final causes a greater importance, and look upon the ends of various beings as subordinated to the one end which the universe tends to realize.

If nature includes both mental and physical phenomena what are the relations between these two classes? On this point also the history of philosophy offers many attempts to substitute some form of Monism for the Dualism of mind and matter, by reducing mind to a special function of matter, or matter to a special appearance of mind, or both to a common substratum.

Finally, is nature as a whole self-sufficient, or does it require a transcendent ground as its cause and principle? Is the *natura naturans* one and the same with the *natura naturata?* By some these expressions are used in a pantheistic sense, the same substance underlies all phenomena; by others the *natura naturans*, as first cause, is held to be really distinct from the *natura naturata*, as effect. This is the question of the existence

and nature of God and of his distinction from the world. Here the question of the possibility of miracles is suggested. If nature alone exists, and if all its changes are absolutely necessary, everything takes place according to a strict determinism. If, on the contrary, God exists as a transcendent, intelligent, and free cause of nature and its laws, not only nature in all its details depends ultimately on God's will, but its ordinary course may be suspended by a miraculous intervention of the First Cause. (See ARTS; NATURALISM; SUPERNATURAL; GRACE.)

EISLER, *Worterbuch der philos. Begriffe;* RICKABY, *General Metaphysics* (New York, 1900); GUTBERLET, *Naturphilosophie* (Münster, 1894); HARPER, *Metaphysics of the School* (London, 1879–84); MERCIER, *Ontologie* (Louvain, 1902); NYS, *Cosmologie* (Louvain, 1906), and literature under NATURALISM.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Naturism, the term proposed by Réville to designate the worship of nature. It differs from Naturalism, which is not a religion, but a system of atheistic philosophy, and from natural religion, which sets forth those truths about God and man attainable by the native power of human reason and forming the prolegomena to Revelation, e. g., the existence of God, the spiritual and immortal nature of the human soul, the moral order. As a theory of religion Naturism exhibits three phases: I. Ethnographic Naturism. II. Philosophic Naturism. III. Science-Naturism.

I. ETHNOGRAPHIC NATURISM.—According to Réville, Naturism is the primitive form of religion, the basis and source of all existing forms. This is the thesis of comparative mythology, which is said to reveal a primitive nature worship. Its foundation is a twofold assumption: (1) the philosophic assumption of evolution, which maintains that man is a development by slow and successive stages from the animal; hence the corollary advanced by Spencer and Thomas as the first principle in the evolutionary history of religion, viz., that primitive man was a creature of emotion, not of intelligence which is the product of more advanced culture; (2) the ethnographic assumption that primitive man existed in the savage state, a condition and mode of life akin to that prevailing among the non-civilized races of to-day, e. g., Tylor, Lubbock, Tiele, Réville, and Spencer.

The core and essence of nature-worship is that nature is animated throughout. In the conception of animated nature, Réville is in touch with de Brosses and Comte, who claim that Fetishism is the primitive religion and by Fetishism understand the primitive tendency to conceive external objects as animated by a life analogous to that of man. He differs from Tylor, who specifies the cause of the animation, e. g., spirits or souls, and from Comte in holding that the primitive animation in its initial stage is not Fetishism, but becomes so when in process of development the spirit or soul is distinguished from the object. Thus with Réville, the Animism of Tylor and Spencer is the intermediate link between Naturism and Fetishism. Tylor, however, considers nature-worship as the connecting bond between Fetishism and Polytheism, yet admits that the stages of this process defy any more accurate definition. Giddings follows Tylor in holding that religious ideas are of two groups: animistic interpretation of the finite, and animistic interpretation of the infinite ("Induct. Sociol.", New York, 1901). In like manner Blackmar teaches that nature-worship was nothing more than spirit-worship localized in the various objects of nature (Elem. of Sociology, New York, 1905). On the other hand Guyan calls Naturism, Physiolatry, of which zoolatry, i. e., worship of animals, is a department (The Non-Religion of the Future, New York, 1907). Hadden holds that primitive folk do not draw a sharp distinction between things animate and inaminate (The Study of Man, New York, 1898). Jastrow says that the savage and primitive man does not differentiate between such an object of nature as the sun and its personification as a being possessing life in some form, and teaches that it is an axiom of primitive man's science to ascribe life to all things (The Study of Religion, London, 1902). Schrader says the common basis of the ancient Indo-European religion was a worship of nature, and appeals to linguistics which shows that the ancient Aryans designated objects perceived as doing something, e. g., the rain rains, the fire burns ("Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples", tr. by Jevons, London, 1890). Hence the discovery of the soul or spirit as distinct from the object is the origin of Animism. This theory is sometimes called personification of natural forces, but only in the sense that nature is conceived as living, as vital with creative and preservative powers. Personification, in the strict sense of investing material things with the attributes of a person is far above the power of early man and appears only in later forms of developed belief. Hence, according to Réville, there is first the naïve cult of natural objects as possessing life and in some way supposed to influence man; this is followed by Animism and Fetishism; and finally a third stage known as the natural mythologies founded on the dramatization of nature, e. g., the historic polytheisms of China, Egypt, Babylonia, of the Teutonic, Greek, Latin, and Vedic races.

Primitive man faces the world about him in childlike wonder. The succession of the seasons, of night and day, of storm and cloud, the growth of living things, exhibit nature in constant and varied changes. He views natural phenomena as the effects of causes beyond his comprehension and control. Conscious of his own agency, though unable yet to distinguish soul from the parts of the body, he attributes agency like his own to the objects which surround him. Awe and delight possess him. Having no idea at all of God, writes Keary, he makes the things themselves gods by worshipping them ("Early Relig. Develop." in Nineteenth Cent., Aug., 1878). Hence Brinton writes that nature is known to man only as a force which manifests itself in change (The Religious Sentiment, New York, 1876). Ratzel explains this craving for causality in an animistic sense as tending to vivify all the higher phenomena of nature by attributing to them a soul, and applies the word Polytheism to all religions of the lower grades ("Hist. of Mankind", tr. Butler, London, 1896). With Crawley the phenomena of change exhibits a vital principle analogous to man's own and this principle of life vaguely conceived by primitive man but strongly felt is the origin of religion; in a later stage of development Vitalism passes into Animism (The Tree of Life, London, 1905). Shaw says the difference between Naturism and Spiritism is largely a difference of emphasis, because neither can be excluded from the interpretation of a primitive which as yet has made no sharp separation between subject and object. Hence the worshipper of nature seems to ally himself with external objects which, as he surveys them anthropopatically, serve as a support and mirror of his own fleeting fancies. These natural objects are further conceived by primitive man as either friendly or inimical to him. In the particular view of Fetishism the physical and psychical further appears. Thus Shaw in the primitive Naturism resulting from the contact of man with the phenomena of the external world, attempts to reconcile the psychological theories of fear as set forth by Hume, Clodd, Tiele, Deinker, and of desire either natural with Brinton or morbid by Feuerbach.

Pfleidner holds that nature is animated throughout, that this view was just as natural for the childlike fancy of the primitive man as it is still to-day for children and poets. According to him this animation of nature is not to be explained by saying that the primitive man only compared natural phenomena

with living beings or even that he thought of them as a domicile or operation of spirits of human origin. Such a view would suppose a definite distinguishing of the sense element and of the supersensible element; but this distinction only appeared later, whereas, for the original mythological notion, the sense element and the subject that was active in it was still conceived as one. He says the real sources of religion are external nature and the soul of man; for the prehistoric belief in spirits, out of which developed the belief in God, cannot yet be properly called religion; it only contained the germs of religion. Tylor teaches animation of nature, but, as with him the soul or spirit animates material objects, nature-worship is ranged under the concept of Fetishism. De la Saussaye objects to this view on the ground that nature-worship bears the strongest impress of originality, and therefore is not a phase of Fetishism, which is not original. Darwin seems to combine the ascription of life to natural objects, dreams, and fears (Descent of Man, I, p. 65). Thomas says that, while theoretically separable, magic religion, belief in ghosts and in nature-worship practically run into one another and become inseparably mingled; therefore it is idle to attempt to establish a priority in favour of any one of them (Social Origins, Chicago, 1909).

De la Saussaye confesses that it is equally difficult to determine the limits of nature-worship in the opposite direction. The classification of religions shows how wide an area it covers. Thus Tiele divides the religions of the world into nature-religions and ethical religions, and holds that the latter developed from the former. Caird keeps the same division, but uses the terms "objective" and "subjective", and says they unite in Christianity. Jastrow objects to the classification of Tiele, that the higher nature-religions contain ethical elements. Hegel holds the primitive religion was an immediate nature-religion, which betrays its features in various primitive peoples and in a more advanced form in Chinese, Pali, and Sanscrit cults. The transition from the lowest stage to the next higher, according to him, is effected by means of the Persian dualism, the Phœnician religion of pain, and the Egyptian religion of mystery. De la Grassière (Des religions comparées, Paris, 1899) says Naturism is at the origin of religions. He distinguishes a lesser Naturism and a greater Naturism. The lesser Naturism passes into Animism, which in turn develops into Fetishism, Idolatry, and Anthropomorphism. With its earlier forms the object is adored in its concrete reality; at a later period, the soul or spirit is separated from the object and becomes the real object of worship. Lesser Naturism embraces the primitive gods, e. g., those which personify the woods, mountains, and rivers. It has many forms, e. g., worship of animals as in Greek and Egyptian mythology, worship of trees, e. g., laurels of Apollo, myrtle of Venus, worship of groves as with Druids, worship of stones, water, springs, lakes, mountains, the elements. Hence it embraces the mythologic naiads, fauns, dryads, fairies, and sirens.

Greater Naturism refers to vast gatherings of objects and especially heavenly bodies, e. g., sun, moon, stars. This he says is the basis of the Vedic religion, e. g., Varuna, i. e., heaven at night, Mitri, i. e., heaven at day, Indra, i. e., rain, Agni, i. e., fire, and survives in Sabæism. This Naturism is at the origin of Greek and Latin mythology, e. g., Zeus, i. e., the Heaven, Aurora, i. e., the dawn, Apollo, i. e., light, Hephæstos, i. e., fire, and the worship of mother earth. Tiele holds that the religions of the Redskins and negroes are just as much nature religions as the Babylonian, the Vedic, and Greek, though he admits a great difference exists between the former and the latter. Von Hartmann designates the lowest stage of religion as "naturalistic henotheism". Jastrow holds that man's consciousness of his own weakness in the contemplation of the overwhelming strength of nature furnishes the motive for seeking support from certain powers of nature and to accomplish this he must make them favourably disposed to him. He says this theory can be variously put, hence can furnish a starting point for pessimistic views, e. g., Von Hartmann, and of optimistic views of man's position in the universe, and it appeals to minds in sympathy with religion as to those, e. g., Feuerbach, who regard religion as an illusion.

Thus Naturism teaches that man originally was destitute of religion, and that ignorant awe in face of natural forces was the cause of his earliest faith. But this theory cannot be accepted. (1) Its basis, viz., that man has evolved from an animal state, is false. "We know now", writes Max Müller "that savage and primitive are very far indeed from meaning the same thing" (Anthrop. Relig., 150). Talcott Williams shows the necessity of revising and limiting the confidence with which the modern savage has been used to explain a nobler past (Smithsonian Report of 1896). Müller and Kuhn refute Mannhardt and Meyer by showing that popular beliefs of modern folk-lore are fragments of a higher mythology. (2) It does not explain how man gained the predicate *God*, which is the real problem of religion. Jastrow says mere personification of nature lacks a certain spiritual element which appears to be essential to the rise of a genuine religious feeling in man. Hence, he adds, Müller postulated "the preception of the Infinite" (Hibbert Lectures, 1878), and Tiele appeals to "man's original unconscious innate sense of infinity" (Elem. of the Scien. of Rel., II, 233). Thus Fairbairn says, "the constitutive element is what mind brings to nature, not what nature brings to mind" (Studies in the Philos. of History and Religion, New York, 1876).

(3) The theory is defective, for it does not explain all the facts of early religious consciousness. If nature were the only source of religion, man would express his ideas of God in terms drawn from nature alone. Now the science of language shows that primitive man expresses his idea of God: (a) In terms drawn from physical nature, e. g., Dyaus Pitar of the Indo-Europeans; Zeus pater of the Greeks; Jupiter of the Latins; Tieu, i. e., heaven, of the Chinese; the Persian Dæva; the Celtic Dia from the Sanscrit root Div., i. e., to shine. (b) By moral and metaphysical concepts: thus, e. g., Jahweh, i. e., the one who is; Ahura, i. e., the living one; El, i. e., the powerful shown in Elohim, Allah, Babylonia; Shaddai, i. e., the mighty; Bel, i. e., the lord; Molech, i. e., king; Adonai, i. e., lord. Such concepts are found with barbarous peoples, e. g., Unkululu of the Zulus, i. e., father; Papang of the Australian, i. e., father; the Mongolian Teng-ri and Hunnish Tang-li, i. e., lord of the sky. Futhermore the earliest Indo-European conception of God is Dyaus Pitar, i. e., the heaven-father. Hence the idea of paternity is characteristic of their primitive consciousness. Such a concept is too sublime and elevated to be explained on the principles of Naturism; which is utterly unable to account for the second class of terms. (4) The main support for the theory of Naturism is the Vedic religion. It is true that traces of nature-religion are found in the Vedas. But to say that the Vedic gods are nothing more than nature personified or that nature-worship is the primitive type of Indian religion is to betray the superficial observer. The moral and spiritual conceptions are older than the physical faith. That the ancient Aryans viewed nature as active is not ground to hold that for this reason they worshipped nature. We express ourselves after this fashion in ordinary conversation. The great truth shown by the Vedas is the fact of degeneracy.

II. Philosophic Naturism.—This phase is based on the philosophic unity of animated nature. The ancient cosmogonies represent the efforts of the hu-

man mind to attain a unity amid the multiplicity of external things. In the Stoic conception of God as the soul of the world is set forth a Naturism which satisfies the intellectual craving for unity and gives scope to the exercise of the religious emotions. Hence it was that these philosophers could look with indulgent tolerance upon the religious practices of the common people. The basic principle with both was the same, e. g., the worship of animated nature. To the cultured Roman this principle was conceived as a philosophic unity; to the ordinary mind it was viewed in manifold forms and activities which were the source and explanation of their countless nature-deities. Pantheism in its various forms exhibits the same thought. This is especially true of modern Pantheistic theories. The substance of Spinoza, the synthesis of Fichte, the identity of Schelling, the absolute idea of Hegel is at basis the same conception. Its religious significance is twofold: (a) the more spiritual and metaphysical form appears in Neo-Hegelianism which teaches the unity of human and Divine consciousness. This reflects the nature-philosophy of Hegel which exhibits the idea, i. e., God in its finitude. (b) The idealistic Naturism is shown in the writings of the Romantic school, e. g., Goethe, Shelley, Wordsworth, Coleridge, and attains its full expression in Transcendentalism. To Emerson as to Goethe, God was the soul of the world. Emerson seems to consider religion as the delight which springs from a harmony of man and nature. Emerson taught that the universe is composed of nature and the soul, and by nature means all the *not me*, i. e., physical nature; art, other man, and his own body. Hence in germ the worship of humanity is contained in Emerson's teaching, just as it is latent in Neo-Hegelianism, and appears in the Hegelian evolution of the idea, i. e., the Absolute or God, when viewed from its human side, i. e., as a human process.

III. Science-Naturism.—This is the religion of the science-philosophy and appears under two forms: (a) The religion of humanity was first presented in systematic form by Comte, and contains the principles of the humanitarian theories so prevalent a generation ago. God does not exist or at least cannot be known, therefore mankind calls forth the sole and supreme expression of our veneration and service. (b) Cosmic religion, a title invented by Fiske, and designated the homage of reason to forces of nature or the awe of phenomena which suggest mysterious and destructive power. Spencer speaks of the emotion resulting from the contemplation of the unknowable into which as into a mystery all cosmical questions resolve. Fiske develops this thought and makes the essence of religious emotion very largely consist in the sense of mystery. To Fiske the unknowable manifests itself in a world of law and is yet conceived to be in itself something beyond these manifestations. Hence worship is ever the dark side of the shield of which knowledge is the bright side. Thus Matthew Arnold's definition of religion as morality touched by emotion becomes with Tyndall poetry and emotion in face of matter instinct with mind. Cosmism, according to Fiske, is, however, more than a mere sentiment. He says the fundamental principle of religion is obedience to the entire requirements of nature. This is righteousness, just as sin is a wilful violation of nature's laws.

Science-Naturism finds its most complete delineation in Seeley's "Natural Religion". He uses the term "Natural Religion" in contrast with the supernatural. In rejecting supernaturalism and submitting to science is presented a theology to which, he says, all men do actually agree, viz., nature in God, and God a mere synonym for nature. Hence there is no power beyond or superior to nature nor anything like a cause of nature. Whether we say God or prefer to say nature, the important thing is that our minds are filled with the sense of a power, to all appearance infinite and eternal, a power to which our own being is inseparably connected, in the knowledge of whose ways alone is safety and well-being, in the contemplation of which we find a beatific vision. Religion begins with nature-worship which in its essence is admiration of natural objects and forces. But natural mythology has given place to science, which sees mechanism where will, purpose, and love had been suspected before and drops the name of God, to take up instead the less awful name of Nature. Nature is a name comprehending all the uniform laws of the universe as known in our experience. It is the residuum that is left after the elimination of everything supernatural, and comprehends man with all his thoughts and aspirations not less than the forms of the material world.

Here, according to Seeley, we have the kernel of Christianity and the purified worship of natural forms, i. e., the higher paganism. He holds that this is not Pantheism, for not the individual forms of nature are the objects of worship, but nature considered as a unity. Art and science as well as morality, form the substance of religion, hence culture is the essence of religion and its fruit is the higher life. Thus religion, in his view, in the individual is identified with culture, in its public aspect is identified with civilization. For Seeley the Church is the atmosphere of thought, feeling, and belief that surrounds the State; it is in fact its civilization made more or less tangible and visible. His universal Church is universal civilization. And as culture is a threefold devotion to beauty, goodness, and truth, so the term civilization expresses the same threefold religion, shown on a larger scale in the characters, institutions, and customs of nations. (Cf. Animism; Deity; Fetishism; Totemism; Transcendentalism.)

Pfleidner, *Philosophy and Development of Religion* (Edinburgh, 1894); Shaw, *Precinct of Religion* (New York, 1908); De la Grassière, *Des religions comparées* (Paris, 1899); Guyan, *The Non-Religion of the Future* (New York, 1907); Tiele, *Elements of the Science of Religion* (New York, 1897); Jastrow, *The Study of Religion* (London, 1902); Deniker, *The Races of Men* (New York, 1900); Keane, *Ethnology* (Cambridge, 1896); Thomas, *Social Origin* (Chicago, 1909); De la Saussaye, *Manual of the Science of Religion* (New York, 1891); Driscoll, *Christian Philosophy, God* (New York, 1905); Müller, *Origin and Growth of Religion* (London, 1878); Fiske, *Outlines of Cosmic Philosophy* (Boston, 1905); *Natural Religion* in *Quarterly Review* (Oct., 1882); Thompson, *What is Religion* in *British Quarterly Review* (October, 1879); Réville, *Prolegomena to the History of Religions*, tr. Squires (London, 1884); Idem, *The Native Religions of Mexico and Peru* (tr., London, 1884).

John T. Driscoll.

Nausea (latinized from the German Grau), Frederic, Bishop of Vienna, b. c. 1480 at Waischenfeld (*Blancicampium*) in Franconia; d. 6 Feb., 1552, at Trent. He was the son of a wagonmaker and received his early education at Bamberg and probably at Nuremberg under John Cochlæus; with Paul of Schwartzenberg, canon of Bamberg, he pursued humanistic, juristic, and theological studies at Pavia, Padua, and later at Siena, there obtaining degrees in Law and Divinity. Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggio, Archbishop of Bologna and papal legate in Germany, employed him as secretary and as such Nausea was at the Diet of Nuremberg (1524), at the convention of Ratisbon, at the Diet of Ofen, and for a time at Rome. In 1525 he accepted the parish of St. Bartholomew at Frankfort-on-the-Main and the dignity of canon, but was soon obliged to leave on account of the intrigues of the Lutherans who even excited popular riots against him. He came to Aschaffenburg and (1526) to Mainz as preacher of the cathedral. He attended the Diet of Speier (1529) and was chosen counsellor and preacher (1534) at the court of King Ferdinand. On 5 Feb., 1538, he was named coadjutor to John Faber, Bishop of Vienna, succeeding him in 1541. Nausea laboured zealously for the reunion of the Lutherans with the Catholics, and together with other prelates, asked Rome to permit the clergy to marry and the laity to

use the communion cup. He also advised Cologne or Ratisbon as the place for holding the General Council. He was prevented from being present at the opening of the Council of Trent by contrary orders from the king, but met Paul III at Parma (1546) and there gave to him his "Sylvæ Synodales". When the Council was reopened at Trent in 1551 Nausea was present, taking an active part in its deliberations, especially on the Sacraments. Only a short attendance was granted him, for he died there of a fever. His body was brought to Vienna and buried in the cathedral. In the Acts of the Council Nausea is praised for his great knowledge, his exemplary virtues, and his ecclesiastical convictions (Theiner, "Acta genuina Conc. Trid.", I, Zagreb, 1874, 652). Among his writings are: "Distichs" on the works of Lactantius; "Ars Poetica"; sermons and homilies on evangelical virtues, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the life of a true Christian; "Catechismus cath." (Cologne, 1543); "Pastoralium inquisitionum elenchi tres" (Vienna, 1547); "On the Resurrection of Christ and of the dead" (Vienna, 1551); etc. For full list see Metzner.

METZNER, *Fr. Nausea aus Weissenfels* (Ratisbon, 1884); *Kirchenlex.; Allg. d. Biogr.*, XXIII, 321; PASTOR, *Gesch. der Papste*, V (Freiburg, 1909), passim; MAHER in TRIENT, *Hist. Jahrb.*, I (1887).

FRANCIS MERSHMAN.

Navajo Indians, numbering about 20,000, constitute the largest group of Indians belonging to the Athapaskan or Déné stock. Other groups of the same stock are the Apaches (Ndé), Lipanes (Lipa Ndé), Hupas of California, and various Déné tribe inhabiting British Columbia and Alaska (see DÉNÉS). This points to a migration of the Navajos, centuries ago, from the extreme north. They themselves have a vague tradition of "Diné Nahodloni", i. e., "other Navajos", living far away. According to their myths they emerged from lower worlds somewhere in the San Juan Mountains in south-western Colorado. At present they occupy an extensive reservation in the north-east corner of Arizona and the north-west corner of New Mexico; but many of them live beyond its borders, especially towards the south. Formerly their habitat extended somewhat farther to the north-east.

They are first mentioned in the writings of Zarate-Salmerón in 1626, as Apaches de Nabaju. In 1630, a Franciscan, Alonzo Benavides, in his Memorial to the King of Spain mentions the "Province of the Apaches of Navajo" and adds that "these of Navajo are very great farmers, for that is what *Navajo* signifies—great planted fields". Consequently the word "Navajo" may be derived from the Spanish *nava* meaning "plain, or field". The Navajos call themselves Diné, that is, people. Benavides then mentions the treaty of peace he concluded between the Navajo and Pueblo Indians at Santa Clara in 1630. Previous to this date, as Benavides states, and subsequently, till 1862, an almost continuous guerilla warfare existed between the Navajo and the Pueblo Indians and Mexicans. The number of Navajo captives in Mexican families in 1862 has been estimated at between 1500 and 3000. In 1846 Colonel Doniphan made an expedition into the Navajo country, in 1849 Colonel Washington, in 1854 General Sumner. In 1859 war again broke out, and in 1860 the Navajos attacked Fort Defiance. Colonel Miles and Colonel Bonneville and General Canby made campaigns against them. When the Rebellion broke out and the Texans made their invasion, all the troops were withdrawn from the Navajo country, whereupon the Navajos rode over the country rough-shod. In 1862 General Carleton sent Colonel Kit Carson with a force against the Navajos. He subdued them, and, mainly by killing their stock and destroying their crops, forced them through starvation to surrender, whereupon about 7300 were transferred to Fort Sumner in south-eastern New Mexico. About 1500 never surrendered; about 400 fled from Fort Sumner to their old homes. On 1 June, 1868, General Sherman concluded a treaty with them by which they were permitted to return.

Ever since they are a peaceful, pastoral people, living by, with, and off their flocks of sheep and goats. Though the arid character of their country—good for grazing purposes only—forces them to lead a nomadic life, yet most of the families have one abode for their main home, generally in a well-watered valley, where they raise corn, beans, potatoes, melons, oats, alfalfa, etc. The Navajo women weave the renowned Navajo blankets, noted for their durability, beauty and variety of design, and careful execution, whilst a number of the men are clever silversmiths, making silver necklaces, belts, bracelets, wristlets, rings, buttons, etc., of rare beauty, out of Mexican silver dollars. They have always been self-supporting. They have little of the sullen, reticent disposition attributed to Indians generally; and are cheerful, friendly, hospitable, and industrious. Their government is democratic; there is no chief of the whole tribe, and their local chiefs are men of temporary and ill-defined authority, whose power depends largely upon their personal influence, their eloquence, and their reputation for wisdom and justice. The tribe is divided into about 58 clans or *gentes*, grouped under several original or nuclear clans. Exogamous marriages with Mexicans, Utes, Apaches, but more especially with the neighbouring Pueblo Indians, captured or enslaved and eventually adopted into the tribe, are responsible for a number of clans. In consequence there is nothing like a pronounced or a prevailing Navajo type. Every variety of form and figure can be found among them. Marriage is contracted early in life. Polygamy and divorce are still prevalent. Their marriage ceremony is only permissible at the marriage of a virgin. The vices of abortion, infanticide, race suicide, are practically unknown among them.

The elaborate system of pagan worship, expressed in chants, sacrifices, sand paintings, dances, ceremonies, some of which last nine days, make the Navajo appear intensely religious. Though they have no conception of one supreme being, their anthropomorphous deities are numerous and strikingly democratic. The ideas of heaven and hell being unknown to them, they believe in a hereafter consisting in a life of happiness with the peoples of the lower worlds. They are firm believers in witchcraft and charms. Their pathology is largely mythological. Diseases are attributed to evil beings, to malign influences of enemies, and to various occult agencies. Their remedies are largely magical and constitute an integral part of their religion. The superstitions, ceremonies, and customs are diligently kept alive by an extraordinary large number of medicine-men who wield a powerful influence among them. Though Protestant missionaries have been among the Navajos since the early eighties, and have at present (1910) eleven different missions, an hospital, and three small schools, the number of their adherents is very insignificant.

After the unsuccessful attempt of Fray Benavides in 1630 to Christianize the Navajos, Padre Menchero, in 1746, induced several hundred to settle at Cebolleta, now a Mexican town north of Laguna; but the enterprise soon came to an end. In 1749 Padre Menchero made another attempt, re-establishing the Ceboeleta mission and founding another at Encinal, now a Laguna village; but on 24 June, 1750, the Indians abandoned them to return to their wilderness. On 13 October, 1897, the Franciscans of Cincinnati, Ohio, accepted the Navajo mission at the request of Mgr. Stephan, Director of the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions, and of Mother Drexel. The missionaries took charge at St. Michael's, Arizona, on 7

October, 1898. On 3 December, 1902, an industrial boarding-school for the Navajos, erected by Mother Drexel, was opened at St. Michael's, and has since been conducted by her community, the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament. At present (1910) the school is attended by 150 Navajo pupils. A branch mission was established at Chin Lee, Arizona, in 1905, and a chapel built at Lukachukai, Arizona. 231 children and adults have been baptized at St. Michael's, and 78 have made their first Holy Communion. The way has been prepared; the Navajos are well-disposed towards the Catholic missionaries and give founded hopes for an abundant harvest of souls.

Much attention has been given by the Franciscans to the study and construction of the Navajo language. In 1910 they published "An Ethnologic Dictionary of the Navajo Language", and also "A Navajo English Catechism of Christian Doctrine for the Use of Navajo Children"; other works are in preparation.

MATTHEWS, *Navajo Legends* (Boston, 1897); IDEM, *The Mountain Chant* in *Fifth Ann. Rep. of the Bur. of Ethnol.* (Washington, 1887); IDEM, *The Night Chant, a Navajo Ceremony* in *Memoirs of the American Museum of Natural History*, VI (New York, 1902); FRANCISCAN FATHERS, *An Ethnologic Dictionary of the Navajo Language* (St. Michael's, Arizona, 1910); MENDILEFF, *Navajo Houses* in *Seventh Ann. Rep. of the Bur. of Ethnol.* (Washington, 1898); STEVENSON, *Ceremonial of Hasjelti Dailjis, etc.* in *Eighth Annual Rep. of the Bur. of Ethnol.* (Washington, 1891); SIMPSON, *Report on the Navajo Country* (1850); CULIN, *Games of North American Indians* in *Twenty-fourth Ann. Rep. of the Bur. of Ethnol.* (Washington, 1902); BENAVIDES, *Memorial, 1630* in *Land of Sunshine*, XIII (1900).

ANSELM WEBER.

Navarre.—The territory formerly known as Navarre now belongs to two nations, Spain and France, according as it lies south or north of the Western Pyrenees. Spanish Navarre is bounded on the north by French Navarre, on the north-east by the Province of Huesca, on the east and south-east by the Province of Saragossa, on the south by the province of Logroño, and on the west by the Basque Provinces of Guipuzcoa and Alava. It lies partly in the mountainous region of the Pyrenees and partly on the banks of the Ebro; in the mountains dwell the Basques; in the south, the Spaniards. It is made up of 269 communes in the five districts of Pamplona, Aoiz, Estella, Tafalla, and Tudela, Pamplona being the capital. French, or Lower, Navarre (Basse-Navarre) belongs to the Department of Basses-Pyrenées, and forms the western part of the Arrondissement of Mauléon and the Cantons of Hasparren and Labastide-Clairence in the Arrondissement of Bayonne. It borders on Béarn to the north, on Soule to the east, on the Pyrenees to the south and south-west, on Labourd to the west and north-west, and extends over the districts of Arberoue, Mixe, Ostabarés, Ossés, Baigorry, Cize. The principal city, Donajouna, or St.-Jean-Pied-de-Port, stands on the River Nive, in the Arrondissement of Mauléon.

HISTORY.—The history of the two divisions of the country is identical until the year 1512, when Spanish Navarre was conquered by Ferdinand the Catholic, the northern part remaining French. Little is known of the earliest history of the country, but it is certain that neither the Romans nor the Visigoths nor the Arabs ever succeeded in permanently subjugating the inhabitants of the Western Pyrenees, who had always retained their own language. The capture of Pamplona by Charlemagne in 778 was not a lasting victory: in the same year the Basques and Navarrese defeated him at the Pass of Roncesvalles. In 806 and 812, Pamplona seems to have been again taken by the Franks. When, however, the Frankish emperors, on account of difficulties at home, were no longer able to give their attention to the outlying borderlands of their empire, the country, little by little, entirely withdrew from their allegiance, and about this time began the formation of a dynasty which soon became very powerful. The first King of Pamplona of this dynasty was Eneco Arista (839), his elder brother, García Semen, having received as a dukedom Vasconia, the original Navarre. After the death of Eneco Arista (852), the two territories were united and Semen García, the eldest son of the Count of Alavaris, was chosen king. In 860, the united Pamplonese and Navarrese gave the Crown to the son of Arista, García II Eneco, who zealously defended his country against the encroachments of Islam, but was killed at Aybar (882) in a battle against the Emir of Cordova. He was succeeded by his eldest son Fortun García, who was held a prisoner for fifteen years by the infidels, and who, after a reign of twenty-two years, became a monk at Leyra, the oldest convent in Navarre, to which no less than seventy-two other convents were subject.

The choice of the Navarrese now fell upon his son Sancho García I, surnamed Abarca (905–925), who fought against the Moors with repeated success and joined Ultra-Puertos, or Basse-Navarre, to his own dominions, extending its territory as far as Najera. As a thank-offering for his victories, he founded, in 924, the convent of Albelda. Before his death, all Moors had been driven from the country. His successor, García Sanchez (925–70), surnamed El Temblón (the Trembler), who had the support of his energetic and diplomatic mother Teuda, likewise engaged in a number of conflicts with the Moors. Under the sway of his son, Sancho el Mayor (the Great—970–1033), the country attained the greatest prosperity in its history. He seized the country of the Pisuerga and the Céa, which belonged to the Kingdom of Leon, conquered Castile, and ruled from the boundaries of Galicia to those of Barcelona. At his death, he unfortunately divided his possessions among his four sons, so that the eldest, García, received Navarre, Guipuzcoa, Vizcaya, and small portions of Béarn and Bigorre; Castile and the lands between the Pisuerga and the Céa went to Fernando; to Gonzalo were given Sobrarbe and Ribagorza; the Countship of Aragon was allotted to the youngest son Ramiro. The country was never again united: Castile was permanently joined to Leon, Aragon enlarged its territory, annexing Catalonia, while Navarre could no longer extend its dominions, and became in a measure dependent upon its powerful neighbours. García III (1035–54) was succeeded by Sancho III (1054–76), who was murdered by his brothers.

In this period of independence the ecclesiastical affairs of the country reached a high state of development. Sancho the Great was brought up at Leyra, which was also for a short time the capital of the Diocese of Pamplona. Beside this see, there existed the Bishopric of Oca, which was united in 1079 to that of Burgos. In 1035 Sancho the Great re-established the See of Palencia, which had been laid waste at the time of the Moorish invasion. When, in 1045, the city of Calahorra was wrested from the Moors, under whose dominion it had been for more than three hundred years, a see was also founded here, which in the same year absorbed that of Najera and, in 1088, that of Alaba, the jurisdiction of which covered about the same ground as that of the present diocese of Vitoria. To Sancho the Great, also, the See of Pamplona owed its re-establishment, the king having, for this purpose, convoked a synod at Leyra in 1022 and one at Pamplona in 1023. These synods likewise instituted a reform of ecclesiastical life with the above-named convent as a centre.

After the murder of Sancho III (1076), Alfonso VI, King of Castile, and Sancho Ramirez of Aragon, ruled jointly in Navarre; the towns south of the Ebro together with the Basque Provinces fell to Castile, the remainder to Aragon, which retained them until 1134. Sancho Ramirez (1076–94) and his son Pedro Sanchez (1094–1104) conquered Huesca; Alfonso el Batallador (the Fighter—1104–1134), brother of Pedro Sanchez,

secured for the country its greatest territorial expansion. He wrested Tudela from the Moors (1114), reconquered the entire country of Bureba, which had been lost to Navarre in 1042, and advanced into the Province of Burgos; in addition, Roja, Najera, Logroño, Calahorra, and Alfaro were subject to him, and, for a short time, Bayonne, while his ships-of-war lay in the harbour of Guipuzcoa. As he died without issue (1134), Navarre and Aragon separated. In Aragon, Alfonso's brother Ramiro became king; in Navarre, García Ramirez, a grandson of Sancho the Great, who was obliged to surrender Rioja to Castile in 1136, and Taragona to Aragon in 1157, and to declare himself a vassal of King Alfonso VII of Castile. He was utterly incompetent, and at various times was dependent upon the revenues of churches and convents. His son, Sancho García el Sabio (the Wise—1150–94), a patron of learning, as well as an accomplished statesman, fortified Navarre within and without, gave charters (*fueros*) to a number of towns, and was never defeated in battle. The reign of his successor, the last king of the race of Sancho the Great (1194–1234), Sancho el Fuerte (the Strong), was more troubled. He appropriated the revenues of churches and convents, granting them instead important privileges; in 1198 he presented to the See of Pamplona his palaces and possessions in that city, this gift being confirmed by Pope Innocent III on 29 January, 1199. While he was absent in Africa, whither he had been induced to go on an adventurous expedition, the Kings of Castile and Aragon invaded Navarre, and as a consequence, the Provinces of Alava and Guipuzcoa were lost to him.

The greatest glory of Sancho el Fuerte was the part he took in the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa (1212), where, through his valour, the victory of the Christians over the Calif En-Nasir was made decisive. When in 1234 he died in retirement (*el Encerrado*), the Navarrese chose to succeed him Thibault de Champagne, son of Sancho's sister Blanca, who, from 1234 to 1253, made of his Court a centre where the poetry of the Troubadours was welcomed and fostered, and whose reign was peaceful. His son, Theobald II (1253–70), married Isabel, the second daughter of St. Louis of France, and accompanied the saint upon his crusade to Tunis. On the homeward journey, he died at Trapani in Sicily, and was succeeded by his brother, Henry I, who had already assumed the reins of government during his absence, but reigned only three years (1271–74). His daughter Juana not yet being of age, the country was once more invaded from all sides, and the queen mother, Blanca, sought refuge with her daughter at the court of Philip the Bold of France, whose son, Philip the Fair, had already married Juana in 1284. In 1276, at the time of the negotiations for this marriage, Navarre passed under French dominion, and, until 1328, was subject to Kings Philip the Fair (d. 1314), Louis X Hutin (1314–16), his brother, Philip the Tall (1316–22), and Charles the Fair (1322–28). As Charles died without male issue, and Philip of Valois became King of France, the Navarrese declared themselves independent and called to the throne Joanna II, daughter of Louis Hutin, and her husband Philip of Evreux (1328–1343), surnamed the Wise. Joanna waived all claim to the throne of France and accepted for the counties of Champagne and Brie those of Angoulême, Longueville, and Mortain.

Philip devoted himself to the improvement of the laws of the country, and joined King Alfonso XI of Castile in battle against the Moors (1343). After the death of his mother (1349), Charles II assumed the reins of government (1349–87), and, on account of his deceit and cruelty received the surname of the Wicked. His eldest son, on the other hand, Charles III, surnamed the Noble, gave the land once more a peaceful and happy government (1387–1425), exerted his strength to the utmost to lift the country from its degenerate condition, reformed the government, built canals, and made navigable the tributaries of the Ebro flowing through Navarre. As he outlived his sons, he was succeeded by his daughter Blanca (1425–42) and her husband John II (1429–79), son of Ferdinand I of Aragon. As John II ruled Aragon in the name of his brother, Alfonso V, he left his son, Don Carlos (Charles), in Navarre, only with the rank of governor, whereas Blanca had designed that Charles should be king. In 1450, John II himself repaired to Navarre, and, urged on by his ambitious second wife, Juana Enriquez of Castile, endeavoured to obtain the succession for their son Fernando (1452). As a result a violent civil war broke out, in which the powerful family of the Agramontes supported the king and queen, and that of the Beaumonts, called after their leader, the chancellor, John of Beaumont, espoused the cause of Charles; the highlands were on the side of the prince, the plains on that of the king. The unhappy prince was defeated by his father at Aybar, in 1451, and held a prisoner for two years, during which he wrote his famous Chronicle of Navarre, the source of our present knowledge of this subject. After his release, he sought in vain the assistance of King Charles VII of France and of his uncle Alfonso V of Naples; in 1460 he was again imprisoned at the instigation of his step-mother, but the Catalonians rose in revolt at this injustice, and he was again liberated and named governor of Catalonia. He died in 1461, without having been able to reconquer his kingdom; he named as his heir his sister Blanca, who was, however, immediately imprisoned by John II, and died in 1464.

Her claim descended to her sister Leonor, Countess of Foix and Béarn, and, after her death and that of John II, which occurred almost simultaneously, to her grandson, Francis Phœbus (1479–83). His daughter Catharine, who, as a minor, remained under the guardianship of her mother, Madeleine of France, was sought by Ferdinand the Catholic as a bride for his eldest son; but she gave her hand (1494) to the French Count of Perigord, Jean d'Albret, a man of vast possessions. Nevertheless, Ferdinand the Catholic did not relinquish his long-cherished designs on Navarre. As Navarre refused to join the Holy League against France, declared itself neutral, and would have prevented the passage through the country of Ferdinand's troops, the latter sent his general Don Fabrique de Toledo to invade Navarre in 1512. Jean d'Albret fled, and Pamplona, Estella, Olita, Sanguessa, and Tudela were taken. As the royal House of Navarre and all opponents of the Holy League were under the ban of the Church, the Navarrese declared for Ferdinand, who took possession of the kingdom on 15 June, 1515. Lower Navarre—the part of the country lying north of the Pyrenees—he generously left to his enemies.

Lower, or French, Navarre, received from Henry, the son of Jean d'Albret, a representative assembly, the clergy being represented by the Bishops of Bayonne and Dax, their vicars-general, the parish priest of St-Jean-Pied-de-Port, and the priors of Saint-Palais, d'Utziat and Haramples. When, in 1589, its administration was united with that of France, it was still called a kingdom. After Henry IV, the kings of France bore also the title King of Navarre. The Basque language is still spoken in most of the provinces.

In the field of historical research, the most distinguished investigators have been, for Spanish Navarre, Moret and other Jesuit scholars, one of their pupils, Ferreras, and the Augustinian M. Risco; for French Navarre, the Benedictines, de Marca, and others. CHAPPUYS, *Histoire du royaume de Navarre* (Paris, 1590; 1616); FAVYN, *Histoire de Navarre* (Paris, 1612); GALLAND, *Mémoires sur la Navarre* (Paris, 1648); DE MARCA, *Histoire de Béarn* (Paris, 1640); OIHÉNART, *Notitia utriusque Vasconiæ* (Paris, 1656); MORET, *Investigationes historicas del reino de Navarra* (Pamplona, 1655); IDEM, *Annales del reino de Navarra* (5 vols., Pamplona, 1684–95; 12 vols., Tolosa, 1890–92); FERRERAS, *La Historia de España* (Madrid, 1700–27); RISCO, *La Vasconia* in *España Sa-*

grada, XXXII (Madrid, 1779); YANGUAS Y MIRANDA, *Crónica de los reyes de Navarra* (Pamplona, 1843); IDEM, *Historia compendiada del reino de Navarra* (S. Sebastian, 1832); IDEM, *Diccionario de las antigüedades de Navarra* (Pamplona, 1840–43); BASCLE DE LAGRÈZE, *La Navarre française* (Paris, 1881); BLADÉ, *Les Vascons espagnols* (Agen, 1891); BOISSONADE, *Histoire de la réunion de la Navarre à la Castille* (Paris, 1893); JAURGAIN, *La Vasconie* (Pau, 1898—); RUANO PRIETO, *Anexión del Reino de Navarra en tiempo del Rey Católico* (Madrid, 1899); *Arigita y Lasa, Colección de documentos para la historia de Navarra* (Pamplona, 1900).

OTTO HARTIG.

Navarre, ANDREW L. See NEW GUINEA, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF.

Navarrete, DOMINGO FERNÁNDEZ, Dominican missionary and archbishop, b. c. 1610 at Peñafiel in Old Castile; d. 1689 at Santo Domingo. He received the religious habit about 1630 and on completing his studies was offered the chair of Thomistic theology in several Spanish universities. He preferred, however, to devote his life to the conversion of the heathen, and in 1646 with twenty-seven of his brethren left his native land and proceeding by way of Mexico, arrived in the Philippine Islands, 23 June, 1648. He taught theology in the Dominican University of St. Thomas, Manila. In 1657 with several of his brethren he went to China and, after learning the language, took up missionary labour chiefly in the province of Fo-kien. The persecution which broke out in 1665 brought disaster to the missions. Forbidden to preach, he occupied himself with writing, hoping by this means to spread and confirm the faith. Being hampered too much he went in 1673 as prefect of the Dominican mission to Rome to lay before the authorities there the question of Chinese Rites which had reached an acute stage between the Jesuits on one side and the Dominicans and Franciscans on the other (see CHINA). He was highly esteemed by Innocent XI, who wished to make him bishop of the Chinese missions. He refused the honour, but on his return to Spain in 1677 the pope, at the suggestion of Charles II, forced him to accept the Archbishopric of Santo Domingo, where he laboured with zeal and fidelity till his death. While on the question of Chinese Rites he was opposed to the Jesuits, sometimes attacking them very severely; in his diocese he entertained the highest regard for them. In his letters to the viceroy and to the king, requesting them to permit the fathers of the Society to establish a college in his residential city, he pays them a glowing tribute.

Among his principal works may be mentioned "Tratados históricos, políticos, éticos y religiosos de la monarquía de China" (Madrid, 1676); "Catechismus, lingua sinica", 2 vols; "De mirabilibus Dei nominibus, lingua sinica," 2 vols.; "Præceptor ethnicus ex optimis quibusque Sinensium libris extractus, et ex eorumdem sententiis concinnatus, lingua sinica."

QUÉTIF-ECHARD, *SS. Ord. Præd.*, II, 720–23; TOURON, *Hom. Ill. de l'ordre de S. Dominique*, V, 627–38.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

Navarrete, JUAN FERNÁNDEZ, a Spanish painter, b. at Logroño, 1526 and died at Segovia, 1579 (at Toledo, February, 1579 or 28 March, 1579?). He is called *el Mudo* (the mute) because he lost his hearing when a child of three and, in consequence, his power of speech. His parents, who were well to do and perhaps of noble birth placed him with the Hieronymite monks of Estrella where Fray Vicente, a gifted brother, was his first teacher in art. Navarrete's talents were early discovered because he made all his wants known through rapid and vigorous black and white sketches. He may have been a pupil of Becerra, Spain's great fresco painter, but it is certain that he went when a youth to the great Italian centres of art and under Titian in Venice acquired that technique and knowledge of colour which earned him the name of "the Spanish Titian". He returned to Spain a painter of repute, and travelled extensively in his native country, leaving works from his hand in her important cities. In 1568 he was made painter to Philip II, received a salary of two hundred ducats, "besides just payment for his work", and was commissioned to decorate the Escorial. In 1575 he completed a "Nativity" wherein are three dominant lights; one from St. Joseph's candle, one from the glory above, and the most radiant of all from the divine Child as in Correggio's "Notte". In one "Holy Family" he painted such strange accessories, a cat, a dog, and a partridge, that the king made him promise never again to put "such indecorous things in a holy picture". Though called the Spanish Titian, Navarrete was not an imitator of any Italian; he was an original and he painted rapidly, freely, and spontaneously. His composition, especially in groups of figutes, was masterly and was excelled only by that of Velásquez. "He spoke by his pencil with the *bravura* of Rubens without his coarseness". Navarrete's work greatly influenced the development of Spanish art and after his death Lope de Vega wrote: "No countenance he painted was dumb". Despite the artists's infirmity he was an agreeable companion, pláyed cards, read, and wrote much, was broad-minded and generous. When his patron ordered Titian's "Last Supper" to be cut because it was too large for a place in the refectory of the Escorial, it was el Mudo who protested most. In the refectory at Estrella, where he received his first instruction in painting are some of Navarrete's best picturcs. The following works may be mentioned: "Holy Family", at Weimar; "St. John in Prison", at St. Petersburg; "St. Jerome", in the Escorial; "Holy Family", in the Escorial.

STIRLING-MAXWELL, *Annals of the Artists of Spain* (London, 1891); VIARDOT, *Les Musées d'Espagne, d'Angleterre et de Belgique* (Paris, 1843); FORD, *Handbook for Travelers in Spain* (London, 1847).

LEIGH HUNT.

Navarrete, MARTÍN FERNÁNDEZ DE, a Spanish navigator and writer, b. at Avalos (Logroño), 8 November, 1765; d. at Madrid, 8 October, 1844. He received his early education partly in his native town and partly at the seminary of Vergara. At the age of fifteen he entered the navy and a little later in 1782 served with distinction in the unsuccessful operations against Gibraltar. Through overwork, he became broken down in health and was compelled to withdraw from active service for a time; but during this period of enforced rest, he devoted himself to historical research and in 1789 was commissioned by the Minister of Marine to search the national archives and to gather all documents and data in connexion with the maritime history of Spain. He devoted three years to this work, and among the documents he discovered were the diaries of the first and third voyages of Columbus. War having been declared between Spain and France, he rejoined the navy in 1792 and took part in the siege of Toulon. Shortly after this he was promoted to the grade of captain in the navy. He was then placed under the orders of Captain General Langara of the Department of Cádiz with whom he afterwards served in various capacities when the latter was made Minister of Marine. While in the Marine Office, he brought about many improvements and reforms, among them the planning and organizing of the hydrographical office of which he afterwards became the head (1823). In 1808, he resigned his government charges and retired from public life rather than recognize the claims of Joseph Bonaparte who had been seated upon the Spanish throne. In 1814, he was made secretary of the Academy of St. Ferdinand, and from 1824 until his death, was a director of the Academy of History. Several times he was elected to represent his province as senator, but his career in the senate was not a brilliant one. Most of Navarrete's writing is historical. His best work, and the one which gives him his reputation, is "Colección de

los viajes y descubrimientos que hicieron por mar los españoles desde el fin del siglo XV" (Madrid, 1825–37). This was published at government expense, and has been widely read and quoted. Among his other works is an excellent life of Cervantes, published in 1819 in connexion with an edition of "Don Quijote" brought out by the Spanish Academy; "Colección de documentos inéditos" written in collaboration with others; "Disertación sobre la historia de la náutica;" and "Biblioteca marítima española". The last two were published after his death, in 1846 and 1851 respectively.

VENTURA FUENTES.

Nave, architecturally the central, open space of a church, west of the choir or chancel, and separated therefrom by a low wall or screen. It is divided from the side aisles by columns, shafts, or piers, is roofed with timber or vaulted in masonry, and usually rises above the level of the aisle roofs to provide high windows for lighting. Colloquially, the term is used to indicate that portion of a church reserved for worshippers, and including the central and side aisles, crossing transepts. The name is derived from the Latin *navis*, a ship, possibly with some reference to the "ship of St. Peter" or the Ark of Noah. The norm of all subsequent developments, whether early Christian, Byzantine, Norman, Medieval, or Renaissance, is to be found in the Roman basilica, with its wide, central area, and its aisles and galleries separated therefrom by columns and arches supporting the upper walls, pierced by windows, and the timber roof. During the third and fourth centuries the apse, which in the classical examples immediately terminated the central open space, was pushed back and separated from the nave proper by a transverse nave or transept; later the junction of nave, transept, and apse (now prolonged into a deep choir or chancel) was surmounted by a dome, or tower, the space below being called the crossing, while the simple system of equal supports equally spaced was for a time abandoned for the alternating system. Simultaneously the upper walls were increased in height, the aisles vaulted in masonry, then the nave itself; the solids were reduced to a minimum in favour of windows that tended ever to increase in size, the space above the aisle vaults and their sloping roofs was arcaded and thrown open to the nave, a complete system of buttresses was devised and perfected, and the complete Gothic nave came into existence (see GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE). Except in the smallest churches the nave was flanked by an aisle on each side, sometimes (e. g. in Bourges Cathedral) by double aisles. Occasionally, as in the Jacobean churches of the thirteenth century, there were two naves side by side, of equal dimensions and separated by screens; occasionally also, particularly in Germany and Flanders, nave and aisles were of equal height. The standard type, however, was that of the lofty nave with arcade, triforium, and clerestory, flanked by a comparatively low aisle on each side.

In early Christian basilicas the sanctuary was hardly more than a semicircular apse, the transept or transverse nave serving for clergy and choir: little by little the chancel was deepened to accommodate the increasing number of clerics, but the transept and crossing were still shut off from the people's nave. As monasticism developed, more and more of this portion of the church was enclosed, until in many Cistercian abbey churches the entire central space from east to west was reserved. In the south of Europe the enclosed choir still frequently projects far to the west of the crossing; but in France, in the great cathedrals of the Middle Ages, nave, transepts, and crossing were cleared, the choir screen being fixed at the eastern side of the crossing, and this arrangement is, in modern times, almost universal. During the Middle Ages also, the great development of preaching necessitated an even greater space for the congregation, and as a result the medieval nave increased to vast proportions and was capable of holding crowds that often numbered tens of thousands. Nor were these vast auditoriums reserved exclusively for religious services; in many cases they were unconsecrated, and were used not only for miracle plays, but for many strictly secular purposes. The line between chancel and nave was always very clearly drawn: in England, for example, the parish priest had full authority in the former, and was bound to keep it in repair at his own expense, while the parish itself was responsible for the care and maintenance of the nave.

RALPH ADAMS CRAM.

Navigators' Islands. See SAMOA.

Naxos, ARCHDIOCESE OF. See CYCLADES.

Nazarene (*Ναζαρηνός, Nazarenus*).—As a name applied to Christ, the word Nazarene occurs only once in the Douai Version, viz. in Matt., ii, 23, where the Vulgate reading is *Nazaræus* (*Ναζωραῖος*). Elsewhere (Matt., xxvi, 71; Mark, i, 24; x, 47; xiv, 67; Luke, iv, 34; John, xviii, 5; Acts, ii, 22 etc.) *Jesus Nazarenus* is uniformly translated "Jesus of Nazareth". In Acts, xxiv, 5 the Christians are spoken of by Tertullus as "the sect of the Nazarenes". The name has obvious reference to Nazareth, the early home of the Saviour, and it is applied to Him in the Gospels only by those who are outside the circle of His intimate friends. In the Acts, however, it is employed by St. Peter and St. Paul, and by the risen Lord Himself, according to Paul's account of his conversion given to the multitude of angry Jews who had attacked him in the Temple (Acts, xxii, 8). In Matt., ii, 23 we read that "coming he dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was said by the prophets: That he shall be called a Nazarene". No explicit prediction to this effect is found in the recorded O. T. prophecies, and various theories have been advanced to explain the reference. Some would connect the passage with the *netzer* (flower) of Is., xi, 1; others with the *netzure* (dregs, Douai) of Is., xlix, 6, but these interpretations seem far-fetched, to say nothing of other difficulties. That the quality of Nazarite is alluded to by the Evangelist is disproved by the fact that Christ was not a Nazarite, nor is the theory that reference is here made to some lost or merely traditional prophecy supported by any positive proof. No more plausible explanation has been found than the one given by St. Jerome in his "Commentary on St. Matthew", viz. that the mention of the "prophets" in the plural precludes reference to any single passage, and points rather to the general predictions that the Messias would be despised (cf. John, i, 46).

VIGOUROUX, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, s. v. *Nazarêen;* A LAPIDE, *Commentaria in Scrip. Sac.*, XV (Paris, 1874), 90 sqq.; KNABENBAUER, *Commentarius in Evangelium secundum S. Matthæum*, I (Paris, 1903), 119 sqq.; LE CAMUS, *La vie de N.-S. Jésus-Christ*, I (Paris, s. d.).

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

Nazarenes. See EBIONITES; JUDAIZERS.

Nazareth, SISTERS OF CHARITY OF, founded Dec., 1812, by the Rev. B. J. M. David (see LOUISVILLE, DIOCESE OF). Father David, while establishing his seminary on the farm of St. Thomas, near Bardstown, Nelson County, Kentucky, took charge of the missions among the surrounding Catholic population. Here he found children without instructors, sick, aged, and poor without care. The need of devoted religious women was felt. He found a few young girls willing to consecrate their lives to the service of God and their neighbour. The first to offer herself was Teresa Carrico; Catherine Spalding, her assistant, Harriet Gardiner, and others followed. Very soon six were assembled, and the number continued to in-

crease. All were daughters of pioneer settlers (see KENTUCKY, *Religion*); their zeal and capacity for good works formed their only dower. They taught the children, spun wool or flax, and wove it into cloth out of which they fashioned garments for themselves and for Father David's seminarians, who, on their side, found time in the intervals of study to fell trees, hew logs, and build the seminary and convent. The first log house occupied by the sisters received from Father David the name of Nazareth. This name the mother-house has preserved, and thence the sisters are popularly called "Sisters of Nazareth", being thus distinguished from other Sisters of Charity.

Mother Seton could not spare sisters from Emmittsburg to train the new community, as Bishop Flaget had requested, but she sent him the same copy of the Rule of St. Vincent de Paul which he himself had brought her from France, and Father David carefully attended to the training of the novices. In February, 1816, he found the first sisters sufficiently prepared to take the vows. The little body was fairly organized, and its work was fast extending. Miss Eleanor O'Connell (Sister Ellen), a scholarly woman and experienced teacher, came to them from Baltimore, and to her the early success of the educational work of Nazareth is largely due. The reputation of Nazareth Academy was soon established, and students, even from a distance, crowded the classrooms, although it was not until 1829 that the Legislature of Kentucky granted its charter to the "Nazareth Literary and Benevolent Institution". Sister Ellen prepared others to assist her, establishing what was virtually a normal school for the sisters, which has been zealously maintained ever since. In 1822 the mother-house was removed to a farm purchased for the purpose near Bardstown. Both the convent church and the academy building were completed in 1825. The sisters, at the same time, never lost sight of their primary work of succouring the sick and the poor. In each of their houses destitute children were cared for. St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum was opened in Louisville, after the cholera epidemic, in 1834. Thenceforth schools, hospitals, and asylums grew apace.

ST. MARY'S WELL, NAZARETH

Besides the mother-house, the congregation now has sixteen branch academies and high schools modelled upon it. The sisters teach about 15,000 children in parochial schools, and care for more than 5000 sick in their hospitals and infirmaries. On petition of the present superior, Mother Eutropia McMahon, the congregation received the formal approbation of the Holy See, 5 September, 1910, nearly 98 years after its first foundation.

Besides the historical works referred to under KENTUCKY and LOUISVILLE, see SPALDING, *Sketches of Kentucky* (1844); BARTON, *Angels of the Battlefield* (1897); *Annals of the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth; A Brief Historical Sketch of the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, Kentucky* (1908).

MARIE MENARD.

Nazareth, the town of Galilee where the Blessed Virgin dwelt when the Archangel announced to her the Incarnation of the Word, and where Christ lived until the age of thirty years, unknown, and obedient to Mary and Joseph. In the manuscripts of the New Testament, the name occurs in a great orthographical variety, such as Ναζαρέτ, Ναζαρέθ, Ναζαρά, Ναζαράτ, and the like. In the time of Eusebius and St. Jerome (Onomasticon), its name was Nazara (in modern Arabic, *en Nâsirah*), which therefore, seems to be the correct name: in the New Testament we find its derivatives written Ναζαρηνός, or Ναζωραῖος, but never Ναζαρεταῖος. The etymology of *Nazara* is *nêser*, which means "a shoot". The Vulgate renders this word by *flos*, "flower", in the Prophecy of Isaias (xi, 1), which is applied to the Saviour. St. Jerome (Epist., xlvi, "Ad Marcellam") gives the same interpretation to the name of the town.

Nazareth is situated in the most southerly hills of the Lebanon range, just before it drops abruptly down to the plain of Esdrælon. The town lies in a hollow plateau about 1200 feet above the level of the Mediterranean, between hills which rise to an altitude of 1610 feet. The ancient Nazareth occupied the triangular hillock that extends from the mountain on the north, having its point turned to the south. Its northwestern boundary is marked by numerous Jewish tombs which have been discovered on the slope of Jebel es Likh. The southeastern limit is the small valley that descends from the beautiful spring called St. Mary's Well, which was, no doubt, the chief attraction for the first settlers. In the last fifty years the population has increased rapidly, and amounts at the present day to more than 7000 souls. The modern houses, white and clean, run up all along the hillsides, especially on the north. Spread out in the shape of an amphitheatre, set in a green framework of vegetation, Nazareth offers to the eye a very attractive picture.

HISTORY.—The town is not mentioned in the Old Testament, nor even in the works of Josephus. Yet, it was not such an insignificant hamlet as is generally believed. We know, first, that it possessed a synagogue. Neubauer (La géographie du Talmud, p. 190) quotes, moreover, an elegy on the destruction of Jerusalem, taken from ancient Midrashim now lost, and according to this document, Nazareth was a home for the priests who went by turns to Jerusalem, for service in the Temple. Up to the time of Constantine, it remained exclusively a Jewish town. St. Epiphanius (Adv. Hæreses, I, ii, hær., 19) relates that in 339 Joseph, Count of Tiberias, told him that, by a special order of the emperor, "he built churches to Christ in the towns of the Jews, in which there were none, for the reason that neither Greeks, Samaritans, nor Christians were allowed to settle there, viz., at Tiberias, at Diocæsarea, or Sepphoris, at Nazareth, and at Capharnaum". St. Paula and St. Sylvia of Aquitaine visited the shrines of Nazareth towards the end of the fourth century, as well as Theodosius about 530; but their short accounts contain no description of its monuments. The Pilgrim of Piacenza saw

there about 570, besides "the dwelling of Mary converted into a basilica", the "ancient synagogue". A little treatise of the same century, entitled "Liber nominum locorum ex Actis", speaks of the church of the Annunciation and of another erected on the site of the house "where our Lord was brought up". In 670 Arculf gave Adamnan an interesting description of the basilica of the Annunciation and of the church of the "Nutrition of Jesus".



Interior, Church of the Annunciation, Nazareth

The toleration which the Moslems showed towards the Christians, after conquering the country in 637, did not last long. Willibald, who visited Nazareth about 725, found only the basilica of the Annunciation, "which the Christians", he says, "often redeemed from the Saracens, when they threatened to destroy it". However, in 808 the author of the "Commemoratorium de casis Dei" found twelve monks at the basilica, and eight at the Precipice, "a mile away from the town". The Greek emperor, John Zimisces, reconquered Galilee from the Arabs in 920, but, five years afterwards, he was poisoned by his eunuchs, and his soldiers abandoned the country. The basilica, finally ruined under the reign of the Calif Hakem (1010), was rebuilt by the crusaders in 1101, as well as the church of the Nutrition, or St. Joseph's House. At the same time the Greeks erected the church of St. Gabriel near the Virgin's Well. The archiepiscopal See of Scythopolis was also transferred to Nazareth. After the disastrous battle of Hattin (1187), the crusaders, with the European clergy, were compelled to leave the town. On 25 March, 1254, St. Louis and Queen Marguerite celebrated the feast of the Annunciation at Nazareth; but nine years later, the Sultan Bibars completely destroyed all the Christian buildings, and Nazareth soon dwindled down to a poor village. In the fourteenth century, a few Franciscan Friars established themselves there, among the ruins of the basilica. They had much to suffer during their stay, and many of them were even put to death, especially in 1385, in 1448, and in 1548, when all the friars were driven out of the country. In 1620 Fakher ed Dîn, Emir of the Druses, allowed them to build a church over the Grotto of the Annunciation; but it was ruined some years later by the Bedouins. The Franciscans nevertheless remained near the sanctuary, and in 1730 the powerful Sheikh Dhaher el Amer authorized them to erect the church which is still to be seen.



Plan of the ancient and of the present
CHURCH OF THE ANNUNCIATION
AT NAZARETH

Foundations of the ancient church
Plan of the present church

Sites.—In the fourth century, local tradition indicated the house of the Virgin at the top of the southern point of the hill, which rises some 30 feet over the plain. The dwelling consisted of a little building with a grotto in the rear. Even now, other dwellings like this are to be found in Nazareth. Explorations made in 1909, beneath and around the present church, brought to light the whole plan of the ancient basilica of Constantine. It was built from west to east, divided into three naves by two rows of syenite columns, and the grotto was in the north nave. The crusaders followed the same plan, and even kept the two rows of columns; they only added new pillars and gave to the façade, as well as to the apse, the appearance and solidity of a fortress. The Franciscans erected their church across the ancient building, so as to bring the grotto beneath the choir at the end of the central nave. The crypt was always three or four feet below the pavement of the church. Since 1730 there have been fifteen steps leading down to the Chapel of the Angel, and two more to the Grotto itself. The chapel is the traditional site of the house, properly so-called, of the Virgin; at the north end of it, the mosaic pavement is well preserved, and is adorned with an inscription in Greek letters which undoubtedly dates from the sixth century. A beautiful altar dedicated to the mystery of the Annunciation occupies the Grotto. On the left are two columns of porphyry, certainly placed there in the fourth century.

About 300 paces northeast of the basilica of the Annunciation, "the church of the Nutrition" marked the traditional site of St. Joseph's dwelling, where, after the warning of the Angel (Matt., i, 20), he received Mary his spouse with the ceremonial prescribed by the law for matrimony. After his return from Egypt, Joseph came back to Nazareth and, with the Virgin and the Divine Child, again occupied his own house. There Jesus was brought up and dwelt till he left the town at the beginning of His public life. Two documents of the fourth century allude to this place, and two others of the sixth and seventh mention the church of the Nutrition, built over it. Excavations made in 1909 brought to light the lower layers of a fine church of the twelfth century, from which a staircase hewn in the rock descends to an irregular grotto excavated beneath the sanctuary. Several interesting details answer to the description given by Arculf in 670. The Franciscans are about to rebuild this sanctuary.

The mountain "whereon the city is built" ends in a row of hills that overlook the town. On the south,

one mile and a half away, the chain of hills terminates abruptly in two precipitous peaks separated by a deep, wild gorge. The western peak is called Jebel el Qafsah, "Mount of the Leap", or "of the Precipice". A monastery built on this mountain, where the Jews would have cast Christ down headlong, was still occupied by eight monks at the beginning of the ninth century. The ruins now to be seen there belong to the convent of the time of the Crusades.

Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs, I (London, 1881), 275–79 and 328; GUÉRIN, *La Galilée*, I (Paris, 1880), 83–102; VIAUD, *Nazareth et ses églises d'après les fouilles récentes* (Paris, 1910); MEISTERMANN, *New Guide to the Holy Land* (London, 1907), 382–401.

BARNABAS MEISTERMANN.

Nazareth. See TARNI AND BARLETTA, DIOCESE OF.

Nazarite (נזיר, נזיר אלהים, consecrated to God), the name given by the Hebrews to a person set apart and especially consecrated to the Lord. Although Nazarites are not unknown to early Hebrew history, the only specific reference to them in the Law is in Num. (vi, 1–21), a legal section of late origin, and embodying doubtless a codification of a long-standing usage. The regulations here laid down refer only to persons consecrating themselves to God for a specified time in virtue of a temporary vow, but there were also Nazarites for life, and there are even indications pointing to the consecration of children to that state by their parents.

According to the law in Num. (vi, 1–21) Nazarites might be of either sex. They were bound to abstain during the period of their consecration from wine and all intoxicating drink, and even from all products of the vineyard in any form. During the same period the hair must be allowed to grow as a mark of holiness. The Nazarite was forbidden to approach any corpse, even that of his nearest relatives, under pain of defilement and consequent forfeiture of his consecration. If through accident he finds himself defiled by the presence of a corpse, he must shave "the head of his consecration" and repeat the operation on the seventh day. On the eighth day he must present himself at the sanctuary with two turtle doves or young pigeons, one of which was offered as a holocaust and the other for sin, and furthermore, in order to renew the lost consecration, it was necessary to present a yearling lamb for a sin offering. At the expiration of the period determined by the vow the Nazarite brought to the sanctuary various offerings, and with symbolical ceremonies including the shaving of the head and the burning of the hair with the fire of the peace offering, he was restored by the priest to his former liberty (Num., vi, 13–21). The meaning symbolized by these different rites and regulations was in part negative, separation from things worldly, and partly positive, viz. a greater fulness of life and holiness indicated by the growth of the hair and the importance attached to ceremonial defilement.

The existence of a class of perpetual Nazarites is known to us through occasional mention of them in the Old Testament writings, but these references are so few and vague that it is impossible to determine the origin of the institution or its specific regulations, which in some respects at least must have differed from those specified in Num. (vi, 1–21). Thus of Samson who is called a "Nazarite of God from his mother's womb" (Judges, xiii, 5), it is merely said that "no razor shall touch his head". No mention is made of abstention from wine etc., though it has been plausibly assumed by many commentators, since that restriction is enjoined upon the mother during the time of her pregnancy. That his quality of Nazarite was considered to be independent of defilement through contact with the dead is plain from the account of his subsequent career and the famous exploits attributed to him. The prophet Samuel is generally reckoned among the Nazarites for life, but nothing is known of him in that connexion beyond what is inferred from the promise of his mother: "I will give him to the Lord all the days of his life, and no razor shall come upon his head" (I Kings, i, 11). It has likewise been inferred from Jer. (xxxv; cf. IV Kings, x, 15 sqq.) that the Rechabites were consecrated to the Lord by the Nazarite vow, but in view of the context, the protest against drinking wine which forms the basis of the assumption is probably but a manifestation on the part of the clan of their general preference for the simplicity of the nomadic as opposed to the settled life. In a passage of Amos (ii, 11, 12) the Nazarites are expressly mentioned together with the Prophets, as young men raised up by the Lord, and the children of Israel are reproached for giving them wine to drink in violation of their vow. The latest Old Testament reference is in I Mach. (iii, 49, 50), where mention is made of a number of "Nazarites that had fulfilled their days." In the prophecy of Jacob (Gen., xlix, 26), according to the Douay Version, Joseph is called a "Nazarite among his brethren", but here the original word *nazir* should be translated "chief" or "leader" —Nazarite being the equivalent of the defective rendering *nazaræus* in the Vulgate. The same remark applies to the parallel passage in Deuteronomy (xxxiii, 16), and also to Lam. (iv, 7), where "Nazarites" (Heb. *nezerim*) stands for "princes" or "nobles".

Nazarites appear in New Testament times, and reference is made to them for that period not only in the Gospel and Acts, but also in the works of Josephus (cf. "Ant. Jud.", XX, vi, 1, and "Bell. Jud.", II, xv, 1) and in the Talmud (cf. "Mishna", *Nazir*, iii, 6). Foremost among them is generally reckoned John the Baptist, of whom the angel announced that he should "drink no wine nor strong drink". He is not explicitly called a Nazarite, nor is there any mention of the unshaven hair, but the severe austerity of his life agrees with the supposed asceticism of the Nazarites. From Acts (xxi, 23 sqq.) we learn that the early Jewish Christians occasionally took the temporary Nazarite vow, and it is probable that the vow of St. Paul mentioned in Acts, xviii, 18, was of a similar nature, although the shaving of his head in Cenchræ, outside of Palestine, was not in conformity with the rules laid down in the sixth chapter of Numbers, nor with the interpretation of them by the Rabbinical schools of that period. (See Eaton in Hastings, Dict. of the Bible, s. v. Nazarites.) If we are to believe the legend of Hegesippus quoted by Eusebius ("Hist. Eccl.", II, xxiii), St. James the Less, Bishop of Jerusalem, was a Nazarite, and performed with rigorous exactness all the ascetic practices enjoined by that rule of life.

MEINHARD, *De Naziræis* (Jena, 1676); LESÊTRE, *Nazaréat* in VIG., *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Nazaréat;* FOUARD, *Saint Paul, ses missions* (Paris, 1892), p. 268; KNABENBAUER, *Actus Apostolorum* (Paris, 1899), 317 sqq.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

Nazarius, SAINT, fourteenth abbot of the monastery of Lerins, probably sometime during the reign of the Merovingian Clotaire II, 584–629. He successfully attacked the remnants of heathendom on the southern coast of France, overthrew a sanctuary of Venus near Cannes, and founded on its site a convent for women, which was destroyed by the Saracens in the eighth century. His name is inscribed on the calendar of saints of the French Church, on 18 November.

Dict. of Christ. Biog., s. v.; *Gallia Christiana*, ed. PIOLIN, III (Paris, 1876), 1193.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Nazarius, JOHN PAUL, Dominican theologian, b. in 1556 at Cremona; d. in 1645 or 1646 at Bologna. He entered the order at an early age in his native

town and from the beginning was noted for his spirituality and love of study. It is most probable that he studied philosophy and theology at the University of Bologna. He taught with great success in various schools of his order in Italy. In 1592 he was sent by Clement VIII and the General of the Dominicans, Beccaria, to accompany the Apostolic Nuncio to Prague to combat the prevailing heresies. There he spent three years teaching in the *Studium Generale* of the province, lecturing on theology in the university, preaching, and defending the Faith against the errors of the innovators. Returning to Italy in 1596 he became regent of studies in the convent at Milan. The following year the pope appointed him to defend in a public disputation at Chiavenna the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass against Calvinistic preachers. His learning and eloquence won for him such a triumph that his services were sought in other parts of the country. In 1620 the citizens of Milan chose him as ambassador to the Court of Philip III of Spain to adjust certain matters of importance to Milan; in May, 1622 he represented as definitor the province of Lombardy at the general chapter held at Milan. He spent the close of his life at Bologna where he occupied himself with teaching and writing. Of his works the following are the most important: "Commentaria et Controversiæ in primam partem Summæ S. Thomæ" (Bologna, 1620) and "in tertiam partem Summæ S. Thomæ" (Bologna, 1625); "Opuscula varia theologica et philosophica" (Bologna, 1630) in which are contained the acts of the above mentioned disputation; "De SS. Patrum et doctorum Ecclesiæ auctoritate in doctrina theologica" (Bologna, 1633).

QUÉTIF-ÉCHARD, *SS. Ord. Præd.*, II, 544; TOURON, *Hom. Ill. de l'ordre de S. Dom.*, V, 258–68.

JOSEPH SCHROEDER.

Nazarius and Celsus, SAINTS, Martyrs. — The only historical information which we possess regarding these two saints is the discovery of their bodies by St. Ambrose. Paulinus relates (Vita Ambrosii, xxxii-xxxiii) that Ambrose, at some time within the last three years of his life, after the death of the Emperor Theodosius (d. 395), discovered in a garden outside the walls of Milan the body of St. Nazarius, with severed head and still stained with blood, and that he caused it to be carried to the Basilica of the Apostles. In the same garden Ambrose likewise discovered the body of St. Celsus, which he caused to be transported to the same basilica. Obviously a tradition regarding these martyrs was extant in the Christian community of Milan which led to the finding of the two bodies. A later legend, without historical foundation, places the martyrdom of these witnesses to the faith during the persecution of Nero, and describes with many details the supposed journeyings of St. Nazarius through Gaul and Italy. He is also brought into relation with the two martyrs Gervasius and Protasius. Paulinus says distinctly (l. c.) that the date on which Nazarius suffered martyrdom is unknown. The discourse eulogizing the two saints, attributed to St. Ambrose (Sermo lv, in P. L., XVII, 715 sqq.), is not genuine. St. Paulinus of Nola speaks in praise of St. Nazarius in his Poema xxvii (P. L., LXI, 658). A magnificent silver reliquary with interesting figures, dating from the fourth century, was found in the church of San Nazaro in Milan (Venturi, "Storia dell' arte italiana", I, Milan, 1901, fig. 445-49). The feast of the two martyrs, with that of Sts. Victor and Innocent, is on 28 July.

MOMBRITIUS, *Sanctuarium*, II, fol. 179 v–184 v; *Acta SS., Julii*, VI, 503–533; *Analecta Bollandiana*, II (1883), 302–307; *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina*, II, 881–882; DUFOURCQ, *Etude sur les 'Gesta Martyrum' romains*, II (Paris, 1907), 61 sqq.; SAVIO, in *Ambrosiana* (Milan, 1897); PURICELLI, *De ss. martyribus Nazario et Celso, ac Protasio et Gervasio, Mediolani sub Nerone cæsis, deque basilicis in quibus eorum corpora quiescunt* (Milan, 1656).

J. P. KIRSCH.

Nazarius and Companions, SAINTS. In the Roman Martyrology and that of Bede for 12 June mention is made of four Roman martyrs, Basilides, Cyrinus, Nabor, and Nazarius, who suffered death under Diocletian. Their names were taken from the "Martyrologium Hieronyanum", in the Berne MS. of which (ed. De Rossi-Duschesne, Acta SS., Nov. II [77]) we read: Romæ, via Aurelia miliario V, Basiledis, Tribuli, Nagesi, Magdaletis, Zabini, Aureli, Cirini, Nabori, Nazari, Donatellæ, Secundæ. The second name in the list, Tribulus, is derived from a place-name, Tripoli, as is evident from the Echternach MS., and those following it have also an African origin. In an ancient itinerary to the graves of the Roman martyrs (De Rossi, "Roma Sotterranea", I, 183) mention is made of a mortuary chapel of a martyr Basilides on the Via Aurelia; he is another Roman saint whose feast is on 10 June. The group of three Roman saints, Cyrinus, Nabor, Nazarius, to which was added later Basilides, has in the "Sacramentarium Gelasianum" (ed. Wilson, Oxford, 1894, 174–5) its special form of invocation in the Canon of the Mass. The date and the circumstances of the deaths of these Roman martyrs are unknown. The bones of Saint Nazarius and Nabor were transferred by Bishop Chrodegang of Metz to his diocese (Mon. Germ. Hist., Script., II, 268).

Acta SS., June, II, 511 sqq.; QUENTIN, *Les martyrologes hist. du moyen-âge* (Paris, 1908), 51, 325, 373, etc.; URBAIN, *Ein Martyrolog. der christl. Gemeinde zu Rom* (Leipzig, 1901), 156 sq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Nazianzus, titular metropolitan see of Cappadocia Tertia. Nazianzus was a small town the history of which is completely unknown. It is the modern village of Nenizi east of Ak-Serai (formerly Archelais), in the villayet of Koniah, but has sometimes been wrongly identified with Diocæsarea. At the beginning of the fourth century Nazianzus was suffragan to Cæsarea; under Valens it formed part of Cappadocia Secunda, the metropolis of which was Tyana. Later it depended on Cappadocia Tertia and on Mocessus, and finally became a metropolitan see under the Emperor Diogenes. In 1370 it was united to the metropolitan See of Cæsarea. Up to the year 1200, fourteen of its bishops are known. Its name is inseparably connected with its illustrious doctor and poet-bishop, St. Gregory.

SMITH, *Dict. Greek and Roman Geog.*, s. vv: *Diocæsarea, Nazianzus;* RAMSAY, *Asia Minor*, 285; LE QUIEN, *Oriens christ.* (1740), I, 409; MIKLOSICH AND MULLER, *Acta patriarchatus Constantinop.*, I (Vienna, 1860), 468, 536; see MULLER'S notes to *Ptolemy*, ed. DIDOT, I, 878.

S. PÉTRIDÈS.

Neale, LEONARD, second Archbishop of Baltimore, b. near Port Tobacco, Charles County, Maryland, 15 Oct., 1746; d. at Georgetown, D. C., 18 June, 1817. He was a descendant of Captain James Neale, the founder of the family in America, who settled in Maryland as early as 1642. At twelve Leonard was sent to the Jesuit College at St. Omers in French Flanders. Thence he went to Bruges, and later to Liège, where he was ordained a Jesuit priest. On the suppression of the Society of Jesus, Father Neale, together with the English Jesuits, repaired to England, where he engaged in pastoral work for four years, but in response to his petition for a foreign mission, he was assigned to Demarara, in British Guiana, South America, where he laboured from 1779–83. Discouraged by the slow improvement of the people, and with health impaired by the climate, he set sail for America in January, 1783, arriving in Maryland in April, associating himself with his former Jesuit brethren of the Society of Jesus, among them the Rev. John Carroll. During the yellow fever epidemic in Philadelphia, in 1793, the two priests of that city were stricken, and Father Neale gladly took their place. For nearly six years he remained there, acting as vicar-general to the then

Bishop Carroll of Baltimore. During the second visitation of the yellow fever to Philadelphia in 1797–8, he was overtaken by the dread disease.

In 1798 Bishop Carroll called Father Neale from Philadelphia to succeed Rev. Dr. Dubourg in the presidency of the college at Georgetown. He acted in the dual capacity of president and tutor for several years and under his guidance the institution was developed from an academy into a college in 1801. The venerable Bishop Carroll had some time previous to this applied to Rome to name Father Neale as his coadjutor. He was consecrated by Bishop Carroll in 1800, but remained as President of Georgetown until 1806 when he was succeeded by the Rev. Father Molyneux.

Upon the death of Archbishop Carroll on 3 December, 1815, Bishop Neale succeeded him and received the pallium from Pius VII the following year. Already nearly seventy years old, he lived most of the time at Georgetown in quiet and retirement, but when his duties as the highest dignitary of the Church in the United States called him to Baltimore, he was remarkably energetic for one of his age and feeble health. While in Philadelphia, Father Neale had made the acquaintance of Miss Alice Lalor, through whose aid he started a small school conducted by three ladies, which was destined to be the seed of a great religious order of female teachers in America. This school was broken up by the ravages of yellow fever, but the project was revived by Bishop Neale who requested Miss Lalor with another lady from Philadelphia to come to Georgetown. They associated themselves with the Order of St. Clare, or Poor Clares. In 1805, on the death of their Abbess, the Poor Clares returned to Europe, selling their convent property to Bishop Neale, who conveyed it to Miss Lalor and her associates, whom he permitted to enter into simple vows in 1813. After his accession to the See of Baltimore, the archbishop petitioned Pius VII for the regular establishment of a monastery of the Order of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary at Georgetown, which request was readily granted.

His health failing, Archbishop Neale applied to Rome to have Bishop Cheverus of Boston associated with him in governing the Diocese of Baltimore with right of succession. But Bishop Cheverus objected, proposing instead that a coadjutor be appointed with right of succession. To this the archbishop agreed, and Rev. Ambrose Maréchal was selected by Archbishop Neale, who proposed his name to the Holy See. By a brief of Pius VII, dated 24 July, 1817, Father Maréchal was appointed coadjutor with right of succession, under the title of Bishop of Stauropolis *in partibus infidelium*, but before the arrival of the brief the venerable archbishop had already died.

CLARKE, *Lives of the deceased Bishops*, I (New York, 1872); SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in U. S.* (New York, 1890); SCHARF, *Chronicles of Baltimore* (Baltimore, 1874), p. 386.

J. PRESTON W. MCNEAL.

Nebo, MOUNT (Heb. הר־נבו; LXX.: Ναβαύ), a mountain of the Abarim (q. v.) range east of Jordan and the Dead Sea, from which Moses surveyed the Promised Land (Deut., xxxii, 49), and where he died (ibid., xxxiv, 1, 5). The same is probably mentioned in the wanderings in Num., xxxiii, 47: "And departing from Helmondeblathaim, they came to the mountains of Abarim over against Nabo" (Heb. Nebo), though here the reference may be to the town (see NABO). The location of Mount Nebo is doubtful. A comparison of Deut., iii, 27 (cf. Num., xxvii, 12) with Deut., xxxii, 49 indicates that the "top of Phasga" and Nebo were variant names referring to the same spot. Difficulty arises in that from no point of the Abarim range does it seem possible to behold all the territory mentioned in Deut., xxxiv, 1–3, especially if the "furthermost sea" means the Mediterranean, as in Deut., xi, 24. By some Nebo is identified with the modern Jebel Neba, an oblong ridge on an elevated plateau five miles south-west of Hesebon, 2700 feet above sea level.

HUMMELAUER, *Comment. in Deut.* (Paris, 1901), 211,533,560 sqq.; GEIKIE, *Hours with the Bible*, VI (New York, 1899), 150; DRIVER in *Internat. Crit. Comment.* (New York, 1895), *Deuteronomy, Chap. xxxiv.*

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

Nebraska, meaning in English, "shallow water", occupies geographically a central location among the states of the Union and is a part of the Louisiana territory, purchased from France in 1803. It is bounded on the north by South Dakota; on the east by the Missouri River, which separates it from Iowa, and the north-west corner of Missouri; on the south by Kansas and Colorado; and on the west by Colorado and Wyoming. It has an area of 76,840 square miles. The surface of the state is mainly an undulating plain with a gradual upgrade from south-east to north-west of about 2300 feet. It is drained by several streams, the principal being the Platte, which is formed by the junction of two forks rising in the Rocky Mountains and flowing east through the centre of the state to the Missouri, and receives many tributaries in its course. The Niobrara flows north to the Missouri, and the Republican in the south empties into the Kansas River. Except at certain seasons, all these rivers are shallow. The population by the census of 1910 is 1,192,214. The climate is exceptionally fine. The mountain breezes sweep over the plains and owing to the splendid drainage, the atmosphere, purged of all malaria, is dry and exhilarating. The annual mean temperature is about 48° Fahrenheit; in winter, 22° and in mid-summer, 75°. The winters are comparatively short and the summers free from excessive heat and humidity.

SEAL OF NEBRASKA

RESOURCES.—Nebraska may be described as altogether an agricultural state, being practically without minerals. Deposits of coal have been discovered only in very small quantities. Building stone of the limestone varieties is also found, but not extensively. Excepting in the north-west where there is a barren tract, known as the Bad Lands, rich in fossil remains, the soil is a deep, rich loam, exceedingly fertile. Professor Aughey in "Nebraska, Its Advantages, Resources," etc., says "One of the most remarkable deposits, and most valuable for agricultural purposes, in the world, prevails over three fourths of the surface of Nebraska. It is known as the lacustrine or loess deposit". Beneath this there is a porous subsoil which enables Nebraska to stand a drought much longer than any of the bordering states. The report of the monetary value of Nebraska's farm output for 1909 is extraordinary, when we recollect how recently this territory was part of the desert and so designated on the maps. The accompanying table is taken from the carefully prepared report of H. M. Bushnell's Trade Review, published in Lincoln.

The report covering the manufactures of Nebraska for 1908, issued in August, 1909, by the State Bureau of Labour and Statistics, gives the amount of capital invested as $90,593,659, and the year's output at $160,232,792. The total value of all deeded land, in 1909, embracing 34,419,471 acres, was $1,015,040,225. For 1909, the total valuation of all property in the state exclusive of railroads, was $1,722,197,270; the

valuation of railroads being $274,044,325. The means of communication is almost exclusively by railroads, of which there are 6105 miles in operation.

Corn	169,179,137 bushels	$93,048,450
Wheat	50,313,600 "	43,659,174
Oats	59,653,479 "	23,861,000
Hay	6,900,269 tons	59,258,812
Alfalfa	1,971,770 "	23,661,140
Horses	.....	24,513,530
Cattle	.....	26,375,812
Hogs	.....	33,179,177
Barley, rye, and cane	4,047,964 bushels	3,796,977
Potatoes	7,386,497 "	5,096,977
Poultry products	.....	18,732,436
Dairy products	.....	36,745,600
Minor crops, beets, fruit, etc.	.....	10,650,000
Total		$402,579,085

Education and Religion.—Educational facilities are exceptionally good. The State University, founded 15 February, 1869, enjoys a high reputation as an institute of learning, especially in all technical branches of science. The professors and teaching staff number 250 persons, with an attendance of 3611 students. The appropriation for actual expenses for the two years ending 31 March, 1911, amounts to $1,238,000. There are 6930 public schools, of which 103 are normal training high schools. The total expenditure for schools for year ending 13 July, 1908, was $6,416,342. Of this amount, $4,032,610, was divided in salaries among 10,355 teachers. Catholic education is well provided for. Besides Creighton University, there are one college for boys, fifteen convent boarding schools for girls, and, including some district schools, practically Catholic, there are one hundred and four parochial schools with an attendance of 10,714 pupils. Of these, nine are accredited to the State University, and three are recognized by the state for normal training work. Of non-Catholic educational institutions, the principal are: Wesleyan University (Methodist), and Cotner University (Christian), both near Lincoln; Bellevue College (Presbyterian) near Omaha; Doane College (Congregational) at Crete; Brownell College (Episcopalian) at Omaha. Other institutions under state control include one penitentiary, one reform school, two industrial homes, three insane asylums, one Home for the Friendless, one institute for the feeble-minded, one hospital for crippled and deformed children, one institute for the blind, one for the deaf and dumb, two homes for soldiers and sailors. Catholic institutions include four hospitals (Omaha, Lincoln, Columbus, and Grand Island), managed by the Sisters of St. Francis; two orphan asylums, containing 210 inmates; a reformatory for women, managed by the Sisters of the Good Shepherd; one Industrial and Reform school. The Methodists and Presbyterians have each a hospital at Omaha.

The Constitution of Nebraska guarantees complete freedom of worship and equal rights to men of every creed, but recognition is given to the pre-eminence of Christianity. While there is no law specially directed against blasphemy, there is a statute against profanity which imposes a fine of twenty-five cents for each offence on all over fourteen years who profanely swear by the name of God, Jesus Christ, or the Holy Ghost (sec. 242, Proc. Crim. Code Neb.). The observance of Sunday by abstention from all unnecessary labour is enforced by state and local ordinances with reasonable strictness, an exemption being made in favour of those who, by a precept of their religion, observe the seventh instead of the first day of the week. Oaths are administered by raising the right hand and calling God to witness; where conscientious convictions interpose, an affirmation can be made instead. Both houses of the legislature are opened with prayer by a chaplain, appointed to hold office during the session. Statutory law exempts the priest from revealing communications made under seal of the confessional without the consent of the informant (sec. 328, Civil Code, Neb.). Christmas Day is the only religious holiday recognized as such by law.

Ecclesiastical property, by diocesan statute, is vested in the bishop as trustee, but there is no civil statute so ordaining. Under secs. 4193–4, "Corporations, 1909, Nebraska Civil Code", each parish can organize and incorporate in the manner provided: "The chief, or presiding or executive officer of the religious bodies, sects, and denominations mentioned in the first section of this act, may, at such place in this state as he may appoint for the purpose, convene a meeting of himself and some other officer subordinate to himself, but having general jurisdiction throughout the state or part of the state aforesaid, and the priest, minister or clergyman of the proposed church, parish or society, and at least two laymen, residents within the limits thereof, of which the said chief, etc. shall be president and one of the other persons present shall be secretary." These five persons shall then adopt articles of incorporation and shall have power to name the church or parish, decide the manner in which it shall contract and be bound for debts, or convey, encumber or charge the property, regulate succession of members, fill vacancies, name time corporation is to last and decide by what officers its affairs shall be conducted. Under this last clause the diocesan regulation can be adopted as the rule under which the affairs of the parish shall be conducted. If the five persons neglect to file articles of incorporation for the parish, the diocesan regulation investing the property in the bishop, as trustee, has no recognition from the civil law, and without a supplementary action in amendment, a transfer of the property by the bishop, as trustee, will be defective in title. If the five persons, at the time of the organization of the parish, adopted the diocesan rule and then filed articles of incorporation, the action of the bishop, as trustee, would be legal. Otherwise, the neglect to incorporate obstructs the operation of the diocesan statute. Churches, parochial schools, and charitable institutions are exempt from taxation, and clergymen are also exempt from personal taxes and are not liable to military or jury service. Catholic priests have free access to all state institutions and their courteous treatment has been a rule without exception.

The status of the Bible in the public schools has been the subject of contention, but the decisions of the Supreme Court are not very clear and seem contradictory. In 1899, a teacher in a Gage County school obtained permission from the local school board to have religious exercises during school hours. The reading of the Bible was a feature of the exercises. One Daniel Freeman, a free-thinker, whose children attended the school, objected. The question was referred to the state superintendent who decided against Freeman. In the meantime Freeman began an action at law in the Gage County District Court; the decision was against him. The case was appealed to the Supreme Court and the judgment of the lower court was reversed. Commissioner Ames decided that the reading of the Bible in the public schools was a breach of the Constitution. In this opinion, Commissioners Duffie and Albert coincided. Judge Sedgwick coincided on the ground that the instruction was sectarian. Judge Holcomb also coincided as to the particular case, but held that, excepting its use for sectarian purposes, the reading of the Bible was discretionary with the school authorities (State of Nebraska, *ex rel.* Daniel Freeman *v.* John Scheve, *et al.*, Vol. LXV, page 853). A motion for rehearing was filed 21 January, 1903, and Chief-Justice Sullivan, while overruling the motion for a rehearing, gave the opinion, that "The section of the Constitution which provided that no sectarian instruction shall be allowed in any school or institution supported in whole or in part by the public

funds set apart for educational purposes cannot, under any canon of construction with which we are acquainted, be held to mean that neither the Bible nor any part of it, from Genesis to Revelation, may be read in the educational institutions fostered by the state. We do not wish to be understood as either countenancing or discountenancing the reading of the Bible in the public schools. Even where it is an irritant element, the question, whether its legitimate use shall be continued or discontinued, is an administrative and not a judicial question; it belongs to the school authorities and not the courts. The motion for a rehearing is overruled and the judgment heretofore rendered is adhered to" (ibid., p. 887).

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.—Subject to procuring a civil licence, marriage can be legally performed by every judge and justice of the peace and every preacher of the Gospel authorized by the usages of the Church to which he belongs. Decrees of divorce are given for the following causes: adultery; imprisonment for three years or more; wilful desertion for two years; habitual drunkenness; extreme cruelty; wanton neglect to support wife. The state was getting an unenviable notoriety for the facility of securing divorces, and many outsiders were taking advantage of it. To stop this, amendatory enactments were passed by the legislature of 1909. At present, no divorce can be granted for any cause unless petitioner has had one year's actual residence in the state immediately before bringing suit and shall then have a *bona-fide* intention of making his or her permanent home in Nebraska—unless the marriage was solemnized in the state and the parties shall have resided therein from the time of marriage to the filing of petition. No person shall be entitled to a divorce for any cause arising outside of the state unless petitioner or defendant shall have resided within the state at least two years next before bringing suit for divorce, with a *bona-fide* intention of making his or her permanent home in Nebraska. No divorce shall be granted where collusion seems to have existed between the parties or where both have been guilty of the same misconduct. No person shall be entitled to a divorce unless defendant shall have been personally served with a process, if within the state, or with personal notice duly proved and appearing of record, if outside the state. After three months of reasonable search after filing petition, court may authorize notice by publication. Decree becomes operative and final only at expiration of six months. In 1909 there were 1807 divorces. In the same period there were 10982 marriages.

LIQUOR LAWS.—Liquor laws are strict and well enforced. The manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquor is forbidden in many of the smaller towns and cities, and notably in Lincoln, the capital. Where the trade is licensed, it is under the system known as high licence and subject to the operation of the Slocomb Law, the most effective law ever passed for a severe regulation of the liquor traffic under the licence system. Under its provisions, treating is a misdemeanour subject to fine; selling to minors is punished by severe penalties, and the saloon-keeper and those on his bond are liable to a maximum of $5,000 damages at the suit of any woman whose husband has been allowed to become a habitual drunkard by frequenting the saloon-keeper's place of business. By statute passed during the legislature of 1909, saloons can sell liquor only between the hours of 7 A. M. and 8 P. M. on week days. Sunday trading is forbidden and the law rigidly enforced.

HISTORY.—(1) *Civil.*—Up to 1541 the history of Nebraska is a blank. In that year it is claimed that Francisco Vasquez de Coronado led a party of Spaniards in search for the fabled Kingdom of Quivera, supposed to be a land of boundless wealth. It is claimed that he reached 40° N. Lat., which is the south boundary line of Nebraska. This is disputed and critics claim that he did not come further north than a point in Kansas, near Junction City. In 1662 another attempt to reach Quivera is said to have been made under command of Don Diego, Count of Penelosa, and accompanied by Father Nicholas de Freytas who wrote an elaborate and detailed account of the expedition. It is claimed Penelosa reached the Platte, where he found a very populous city belonging to Quivera. As it was burned in one night, it could have been but a large Indian village. Penelosa returned to Mexico in June, 1662. Not much credence is given to the story of Penelosa. In 1673 Spain claimed all the trans-Mississippi region, but ten years later La Salle asserted the sovereignty of France. In 1762 the French relinquished all this territory to Spain, but it was receded to France in 1800; finally in 1803 under the name of Louisiana Territory, it passed by purchase into the possession of the United States. In many American works the statement is made, that the first white men to visit and give a description of Nebraska were Lewis and Clark. This is incorrect. The sixth volume of Pierre Margry's "Découvertes et Etablissements des Français dans l'Amérique" (Paris, 1856), now in the library of the State Historical Society, contains the records of several expeditions to the regions between the Mississippi and the Missouri and further west. Among them is the original report of the journey of Pierre and Paul Mallet and their companions across Nebraska on a mission to Santa Fé to open up trade facilities with the Spaniards of New Mexico. The Mallets were French Canadians and their companions were Phillipe Robitaille, Louis Morin, Michel Beslot, Joseph Bellecourt, also Canadians, and Jean David, a native of France.

The report reads: "To understand the route taken by these Canadians to discover New Mexico, it is well to know that it is 100 leagues from the village of the Illinois [Indians] to those of the Missouris on the river of that name; 80 leagues from there to the Canzes [Kansas]; 100 leagues from the Kansas to the Octoctates [Otoes] and 60 from there to where the river of the Panimahas [Omahas] empties into the Missouri [Omaha Creek in the north-east of Nebraska]". This nation is located at the mouth of the river of their name and it was there the discoverers took their starting-point, 29 May, 1739. All who had hitherto attempted to reach New Mexico thought they could find it at the sources of the Missouri, and with that idea had gone up as far as the Ricaras [Indians], more than 150 leagues above the Panis [Pawnees], with whom they confound or include the Omahas or Panimahas. The discoverers, on the advice of some of the aborigines, took an entirely different direction and leaving the Pawnees took a route across the country, retracing their steps almost parallel with the Missouri. On 2 June, they met with a river which they called the Plate [Platte] and seeing that it did not diverge from the route they had mapped out, they followed up its right bank for about 25 leagues when they found it made a fork with the river of the Padocas which empties itself at this point. Three days after that, on 13 June, they crossed to the left bank of said river. On the fifteenth and sixteenth they continued across the country and on the seventeenth they fell upon another river which they named Des Costes Blanches. During these three days, they crossed a country of plains where they found barely enough wood to make fires and it appears from their Journal that these plains extended all the way to the mountains near Santa Fé. On the sixteenth they camped on the banks of another river which they crossed and named Rivière Aimable. On the nineteenth they crossed another river which they called Rivière des Soucis. On the twentieth they struck the Rivière des Cances. This river was probably not the Kansas but the Arkansas River. In any case, both are south of the Nebraska state line, making it clear that these French Canadian Catholics,

Pierre and Paul Mallet, crossed Nebraska in a south-westerly direction in 1739 on their way to Santa Fé and gave an authentic account of the territory sixty-five years before Lewis and Clark visited it.

Subsequent to that date, many French Canadians and French creoles of Louisiana made their homes in Nebraska; they were hunters and trappers connected with the fur-trading expeditions, who married Indian women and lived under the protection of the tribes with which they had become related. When allotting land to the Indians, the government set aside a tract in the south-east part of the state called the "Half-Breed Tract", the French Canadians who had married squaws settled on this land. Among these were Charles Rouleau, Henry Fontenelle, and Michel Barada, who had towns named after them. Sarpy county is also called after a French creole, named Louis Sarpy. As late as 1846, Nebraska had practically no other population than the Omahas, Otoes, Poncas, Pawnees, and Sioux. In that year occurred the Mormon *hegira* and a temporary settlement in the desert was made by them at Florence, near Omaha, lasting for about a year, until they moved on to Utah. The first permanent white settlers came in the train of the '49 rush to California, and on 30 May, 1854, Nebraska was organized as a territory with an area of 351,558 square miles, reaching from 40° N. lat. to the British boundary line, and west from the Missouri to the Rocky Mountains. This was finally cut down to the present area of the state. The creation of the Kansas and Nebraska territories was the cause of the bitter quarrel between the slavery and anti-slavery parties and ultimately led to the secession of the southern states. On 1 March, 1867, President Johnson proclaimed Nebraska a state of the Union, adding the thirty-seventh star to the American flag. After the Civil War, many of the discharged soldiers secured grants of Nebraska land under the Homestead Law. They were followed by men who worked in the construction of the Union Pacific and Burlington railroads and who bought up the land donated to the railroad companies. There was a steady inflow of immigrants and land-seekers until the visitation of the grasshopper plague in 1874, when many settlers became discouraged and left the state. But the rush for land was on, the grasshoppers were forgotten, and an increasing stream of immigration poured in. There are no statistics to indicate the nationality of foreign-born immigrants, but the Germans are the most numerous, followed by the Scandinavians, Irish, Bohemians, and British in the order named. In late years Italians have become an immigrating element, but not to any considerable extent. Although the first to enter the state, French Canadian immigrants are not numerous.

Catholic Immigration.—While many Catholics were among the immigrants subsequent to 1849, there was no attempt at Catholic colonization until 1855, when Father Tracy induced a number of Irish families to settle in Dakota County, where their descendants constitute the wealthiest and most prominent people in that section. In 1874 General O'Neill, with eighteen Irish Catholics from Boston, colonized a tract in Holt County; they were followed by others, and a town was laid out which they named O'Neill. O'Neill is now one of the most progressive cities north of the Platte and the centre of a prosperous Catholic community. In 1877 some of those who went to Holt County with General O'Neill, dissatisfied with the outlook there, took up land in Greeley County. In compliment to Bishop James O'Connor of Omaha, General O'Neill named his first town site, O'Connor. The town was subsequently moved to where the church and convent of O'Connor now stand, while the present county seat, Greeley Center, was built half a mile north of the original site. A colonization company was formed and a tract of land was secured by Bishop O'Connor, John Fitzgerald, William Quan, and William J. Onahan of Chicago, and others, and sold at $2 per acre to Irish colonists from Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. This is now a very prosperous Catholic section embracing the thriving towns of Greeley Center, Spalding, and Scotia, and comprising a wealthy farming population. Land purchased by the colonists at $2 per acre is appraised in 1910 at from $60 to $100 per acre. Besides these organized colonies, many Irish Catholic families drifted into Nebraska during the years preceding 1874. During that period there was also a comparatively large immigration of German Catholics, but without any regular effort at colonization. The Germans followed in the wake of the Catholic priest. Platte County is almost entirely populated by German Catholics, the immigration being largely due to the efforts of Father Ambrose, O.F.M., the first Franciscan pastor in that section. In Cedar County, there are eight large parishes of German Catholics, who were induced to settle in that district during the same period by the late Father Daxascher, the first pastor of St. Helena in that county. South of the Platte there are also several well-to-do German settlements, but no distinct colonies. There is an Austrian settlement at Bellwood in Buffalo County. Bohemian Catholics are quite numerous north and south of the Platte. The Catholic immigrants of all nationalities who settled on the land have prospered in a measure beyond their most sanguine expectations. A pleasing feature in regard to Catholic settlement in Nebraska is the frequent intermarriages between the young people of different races, especially between the Irish and German elements.

Catholics hold prominent positions in the political, social, and industrial life of the community, though Nebraska has not yet had a Catholic Governor. Prominent among the benefactors and builders of the state have been Edward and John Creighton, founders of Creighton University and other beneficial institutions in Omaha. John Fitzgerald of Lincoln was also a generous benefactor to Catholic works, religious and educational, in this and other cities. John A. McShane represented the then First Nebraska district in Congress in 1886 and in 1888 was the unsuccessful candidate for governor in opposition to General John M. Thayer. Constantine J. Smythe was attorney-general of the state from 1897 to 1901. The present state treasurer is Lawson G. Brian. Many Catholics have represented congressional districts; the first district, which includes the capital, is now (1910) represented by John A. Maguire. In all cases where Catholics have held public offices, their records have been most creditable.

(2) *Ecclesiastical History.* — Ecclesiastically, Nebraska was first under the jurisdiction of the Franciscan Bernard Boil, Provincial of the Franciscans in Spain, according to the Bull of Alexander VI, dated 25 June, 1493. Theoretically, it became part of the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Spain until 1682, when it passed over to the spiritual domain of the Bishop of Quebec. In 1776 it became subject to the Diocese of Havana, Cuba. After the recession of the Louisiana territory to France, the French exercised jurisdiction until 1805, when the territories embraced in the Louisiana Purchase passed to the spiritual rule of Bishop Carroll of Baltimore. In 1815 the region was transferred to the Bishop of New Orleans, and in 1827 to the Bishop of St. Louis. In 1850 the territory became part of the "Vicariate Apostolic of the territory east of the Rocky Mountains"; this vicariate embraced all the territory from the Missouri River to the Rocky Mountains and from the south boundary of Kansas to the British line. Rt. Rev. John B. Miege, S. J., was appointed vicar-Apostolic. In 1857 Kansas was cut off and the Vicariate of Nebraska was erected. This vicariate was further reduced to the territories of Nebraska and Wyoming, and in 1885 the

State of Nebraska became the Diocese of Omaha, with the then vicar-Apostolic, Rt. Rev. James O'Connor, as its first bishop. In 1887 all that part of Nebraska, south of the Platte and of the south fork of the Platte, was erected into the Diocese of Lincoln, with Rt. Rev. Thomas Bonacum as its first bishop. The Catholic population of Nebraska is estimated at a slight increase over 117,058, the figures given in Wiltzius's Directory for 1910. The coloured and Indian Catholics included are too few to be worthy of special enumeration. For the last week in September, 1909, the following figures were given as the numerical strength of the various non-Catholic denominations in Nebraska: Methodists, 64,352; Lutherans, 59,485; Presbyterians, 23,862; Disciples (Christians), 19,613; Baptists, 17,939; Congregationalists, 16,629; Episcopalians, 6,903 (communicants); United Brethren, 6,086; all other Protestants, 19,657.

CURLEY, *Neb. Its Advantages etc.* (New York, 1875); BUSHNELL, *Lincoln Trade Review* (Lincoln, 1910); *State Bureau Labor and Industrial Statistics* (Lincoln, 1909); *Nebraska Educational Directory* (Lincoln, 1910); WILTZIUS, *Directory* (1910); *Reports Neb. State Historical Society;* MARGRY, *Découvertes et Etablissements des Français dans l'Amérique* (Paris, 1856); SHINE, *The Morton History of Nebraska* (Lincoln, 1906).

JOHN P. SUTTON.

Nebuchadnezzar. See NABUCHODONOSOR.

Necessity, in a general way denotes a strict connexion between different beings, or the different elements of a being, or between a being and its existence. It is therefore a primary and fundamental notion, and it is important to determine its various meanings and applications in philosophy and theology.

In Logic, the Schoolmen, studying the mutual relations of concepts which form the matter of our judgments, divided the judgments or propositions into judgments in necessary matter (*in materia necessaria*), and judgments in contingent matter (*in materia contingenti*). (Cf. S. Thom., I Perihermen. lect. xiii.) The judgments in necessary matter were known as *propositiones per se;* they are called by modern philosophers "analytic", "rational", "pure", or "a priori" judgments. The *propositio per se* is defined by the Schoolmen as one the predicate of which is either a constitutive element or a natural property of the subject. Such is the case with primary truths, metaphysical, and mathematical principles. (Cf. S. Thom., "In I Anal.", lect. x and xxxv; "de Anima", II, lect. xiv.) It is by ignoring the last part of this definition and arbitrarily restricting the concept of analytic judgments to those of which the predicate is a constitutive element of the subject, that Kant invented the false notion of synthetic-a priori judgments.

Considered under its metaphysical aspect, being in its relation to existence is divided into *necessary* and *contingent.* A necessary being is one of which the existence is included in and identical with its very essence. The different beings which we observe in our daily experience are subject to beginning, to change, to perfection, and to destruction; existence is not essential to them and they have not in themselves the reason of their existence; they are contingent. Their existence comes to them from an external efficient cause. It is from the real existence of contingent beings that we arrive at the notion and prove the existence of a necessary being—one that produces them but is not produced, one whose existence is its own essence and nature, that is at the same time eternal, all-perfect, infinite, viz., God (see CONTINGENCY). And so in relation to existence, God alone is absolutely necessary; all other beings are contingent.

When we consider the divers beings, not from the point of view of existence, but in relation to their constitution and activity, necessity may be classified as *metaphysical, physical,* and *moral. Metaphysical necessity* implies that a thing is what it is, viz., it has the elements essential to its specific nature. It is a metaphysical necessity for God to be infinite, man rational, an animal a living being. Metaphysical necessity is absolute. *Physical necessity* exists in connexion with the activity of the material beings which constitute the universe. While they are contingent as to their existence, contingent also as to their actual relations (for God could have created another order than the present one), they are, however, necessarily determined in their activity, both as to its exercise and its specific character. But this determination is dependent upon certain conditions, the presence of which is required, the absence of one or the other of them preventing altogether the exercise or normal exercise of this activity. The laws of nature should always be understood with that limitation: all conditions being realized. The laws of nature, therefore, being subject to physical necessity are neither absolutely necessary, as materialistic Mechanism asserts, nor merely contingent, as the partisans of the philosophy of contingency declare; but they are conditionally or hypothetically necessary. This hypothetical necessity is also called by some *consequent necessity. Moral necessity* is necessity as applied to the activity of free beings. We know that men under certain circumstances, although they are free, will act in such and such a way. It is morally necessary that such a man in such circumstances act honestly; it is morally necessary that several historians, relating certain facts, should tell the truth concerning them. This moral necessity is the basis of moral certitude in historical and moral sciences. The term is also used with reference to freedom of the will to denote any undue physical or moral influence that might prevent the will from freely choosing to act or not act, to choose one thing in preference to another. The derivatives, necessitation and necessarianism, in their philosophical signification express the doctrine that the will in all its activity is invariably determined by physical or psychical antecedent conditions (see DETERMINISM; FREE WILL).

In theology the notion of necessity is sometimes applied with special meaning. Theologians divide necessity into *absolute* and *moral.* A thing is said to be absolutely necessary when without it a certain end cannot possibly be reached. Thus revelation is absolutely necessary for man to know the mysteries of faith, and grace to perform any supernatural act. Something is said to be morally necessary when a certain end could, absolutely speaking, be reached without it, but cannot actually and properly be reached without it, under existing conditions. Thus, we may say that, absolutely speaking, man as such is able to know all the truths of the natural order or to observe all the precepts of the natural law; but considering the concrete circumstances of human life in the present order, men as a whole cannot actually do so without revelation or grace. Revelation and grace are morally necessary to man to know sufficiently all the truths of the natural law (cf. S. Thom., "Sum. Theol.", P. Ia., Q. 1, a 1; "Contra Gentil.", I, iv).

Again, in relation to the means necessary to salvation theologians divide necessity into *necessity of means* and *necessity of precept.* In the first case the means is so necessary to salvation that without it (absolute necessity) or its substitute (relative necessity), even if the omission is guiltless, the end cannot be reached. Thus faith and baptism of water are necessary by a necessity of means, the former absolutely, the latter relatively, for salvation. In the second case, necessity is based on a positive precept, commanding something the omission of which, unless culpable, does not absolutely prevent the reaching of the end.

MERCIER, *Ontologie* (Louvain, 1902), ii, 3; RICKABY, *First Principles of Knowledge* (London, 1902), I, v; IDEM, *General Metaphysics* (London, 1901), I, iv.

GEORGE M. SAUVAGE.

Neckam (NECHAM), ALEXANDER OF, English scholar; b. in Hertfordshire, 1157; d. at Kempsey, Worcestershire, 1217. His first studies were in the abbey school of St. Albans; his higher courses began in Paris, in the school of Petit Pons. In 1180 he commenced his career as teacher with great success, his comprehensive knowledge of philosophy and of theology, and his Latin style, both in prose and verse, attracting many students to his lectures. Returning to England in 1186, he was first appointed teacher at Dunstable, and afterwards at St. Albans. After joining the Augustinian Order, he was chosen, in 1213, Abbot of Cirencester.

Neckam was a prolific writer on various subjects, but his works are, for the most part, still in manuscript. He wrote a grammar, commentaries on Scripture and the works of Aristotle, theological treatises, and sermons. He also translated the Fables of Æsop into elegiac verse. Only two of his works, however, have been printed: the "De naturis rerum" and the poem "De laudibus divinæ sapientiæ" (ed. Th. Wright in Rolls Series). In the former he discusses the heavens, the stars, the atmosphere, the earth, water, and living organisms. Neckam is the first European author to mention the mariners' compass.

HUNT in *Dict. of Nat. Biogr.*, s. v.; FÉRET, *La faculté de théologie de l'université de Paris . . . moyen âge*, I (Paris, 1894), 268–76; HURTER, *Nomenclator*, II (Innsbruck, 1906), 224–25; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XVIII (Paris, 1835), 521–23.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Necrologies, or, as they are more frequently called in France, *obituaires*, are the registers in which religious communities were accustomed to enter the names of the dead—notably their own deceased members, their associates, and their principal benefactors—with a view to the offering of prayers for their souls. The institutions which maintained such necrologies differed almost as much as the form in which the entries were made. There are necrologies connected with cathedral chapters, others (and those the most numerous) belonging to monasteries and religious houses, others to colleges, such as, e. g. the Sorbonne (in Molinier et Longnon, "Obituaires", I, 737–52), others to collegiate churches, others again to parishes, while, as for the registers themselves, some are drawn up in the form of marginal entries in martyrologies or calendars, others form a book apart, but arranged according to the days of the month, others again are mere disorderly lists of names, which seem to have been written down just as they were sent in, or as occasion arose. Not less diversified are the names by which these registers were known. Perhaps the commonest was *martyrologium*, because they often took the form of mere additions to the martyrologium, or list of martyrs and saints commemorated on each day. We find also *necrologium*, *memoriale mortuorum*, or *memoriale fratrum*, *mortuologium*, *liber obituum*, and, more rarely, *obituarius*, sometimes, owing to its connexion with the calendar, *calendarium*, sometimes, because the monastic rule was commonly bound up in the same book, *liber regulæ* or simply *regula*, sometimes, from the occasion when it was read aloud, *liber capituli* (chapter book), sometimes, in reference to the entries of the names of benefactors, *liber fundationum*, or *liber benefactorum*. Also, although Molinier seems to contest this usage ("Les Obituaires français", p. 22), such a collection of names, consisting largely of benefactors, was occasionally called *liber vitæ* (book of life).

No better description of the purposes served by these lists and of the spirit which animated the whole institution of necrologies can be found than that contained in the preface to the Winchester book of the eleventh century known as the "Hyde Register". In spite of its length, it deserves to be quoted entire: "Behold, in the name of God Almighty and of our Lord Jesus Christ and of His most Holy Mother, the ever-stainless Virgin Mary, and also of the twelve holy Apostles by whose teaching the world is rendered glorious in the true faith, to whose honour this Minster, which is called the New Minster in distinction to the old monastery hard by, there are set down here in due order the names of brethren and monks, of members of the household also [*familiariorum* (sic)], or of benefactors living and dead, that by the perishable memorial of this writing they may be written in the page of the heavenly book, by the virtue of whose almsdeeds this same family, through Christ's bounty, is fed. And let also the names of all those who have commended themselves to its prayers and its fellowship be recorded here in general, in order that remembrance may be made of them daily in the sacred celebration of the Mass or in the harmonious chanting of psalms. And let the names themselves be presented daily by the subdeacon before the altar at the early or principal Mass, and as far as time shall allow let them be recited by him in the sight of the Most High. And after the oblation has been offered to God by the right hand of the cardinal priest who celebrates the Mass, let the names be laid upon the holy altar during the very mysteries of the sacred Mass and be commended most humbly to God Almighty; so that as remembrance is made of them upon earth [*sicut eorum memoria agitur in terris*—a phrase from the Ordinarium Missæ], so in the life to come, by His indulgence who alone knows how they stand or are hereafter to stand in His sight, the glory of those who are of greater merit may be augmented in Heaven and the account of those who are less worthy may be lightened in His secret judgments. Be ye glad and rejoice that your names are written in Heaven, through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with God the Eternal Father and the Holy Ghost, there remains all honour, power, and glory for ever and ever. Amen."

This account is particularly interesting, because, although the laying of the necrology upon the altar during Mass afterwards fell into disuse, and the names were read in chapter instead of in choir, still the extract clearly shows that the book of obituaries had its origin in the old "diptychs" (see DIPTYCH), or tablets, upon which were formerly entered the names which were read out by the priest at the Commemoration of the Living and the Commemoration of the Dead in the Canon of the Mass. So far as can be seen, the recitation of the names of the defunct bishops in the diptychs was later on represented by the reading of the martyrologium proper, while the commemoration of benefactors and other deceased was retained in the form of a necrology. It will be remembered that in the everyday Requiem Mass (*missa quotidiana defunctorum*) of our Missals, the priest is first directed to pray "pro defunctis episcopis seu sacerdotibus", next "pro fratribus, propinquis et benefactoribus", and lastly "pro omnibus fidelibus defunctis". This corresponds to the classification here, viz. of those included in the martyrologium, those named in the necrology, and those not specially mentioned at all. The entry of the names of the dead in the register of a monastery or other religious institution, and the consequent participation in the prayers and good works of all its members, was a privilege which, from the eighth century onward, was greatly coveted. Such mutual rights of the insertion of the names of deceased brethren in each other's necrologies was a constant subject of negotiation between different abbeys, etc., and at a somewhat later date it became the custom for monasteries to send messengers with "mortuary rolls" (*rotuli*) requesting the promise of prayers which were to be entered on the roll and engaging the senders to pray for the deceased brethren of the monasteries who rendered them this service. (But for this see ROTULI.)

Although the entries in the extant necrologies of monasteries and cathedrals are generally of the brief-

est possible character, only the day of the month, and not the year, being indicated, still in indirect ways these lists of names have been regarded as of considerable importance both for philological and historical purposes. A large number have been published in Germany, France, England, and other countries.

MOLINIER, *Les Obituaires Français au moyen âge* (Paris, 1890); EBNER, *Die klösterlichen Gebetsverbrüderungen bis zum Ausgange des karolingischen Zeitalters* (Ratisbon, 1890), 130–54; DELISLE, *Rouleaux des Morts du IX^e au XV^e siècle* (Paris, 1866). Several volumes of Necrologies have been printed in the quarto series of the *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, and four or more volumes of French Necrologies have been issued in the *Recueil des Historiens de la France* by LONGNON AND MOLINIER (Paris, 1902—). The first volume of the last-named collection contains an excellent bibliography of printed French Necrologies, pp. xxxvii to lxxxvi. A bibliography of German necrologies will be found in the sixth edition of WATTENBACH, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen.*

HERBERT THURSTON.

Necromancy (*νεκρός*, "dead", and *μαντεία*, "divination") is a special mode of divination (q. v.) by the evocation of the dead. Understood as nigromancy (*niger*, black), which is the Italian, Spanish, and old French form, the term suggests "black" magic or "black" art, in which marvellous results are due to the agency of evil spirits, while in "white" magic they are due to human dexterity and trickery. The practice of necromancy supposes belief in the survival of the soul after death, the possession of a superior knowledge by the disembodied spirit, and the possibility of communication between the living and the dead. The circumstances and conditions of this communication—such as time, place, and rites to be followed—depend on the various conceptions which were entertained concerning the nature of the departed soul, its abode, its relations with the earth and with the body in which it previously resided. As divinities frequently were but human heroes raised to the rank of gods, necromancy, mythology, and demonology are in close relation, and the oracles of the dead are not always easily distinguished from the oracles of the gods.

I. NECROMANCY IN PAGAN COUNTRIES.—Along with other forms of divination and magic, necromancy is found in every nation of antiquity, and is a practice common to paganism at all times and in all countries, but nothing certain can be said as to the place of its origin. Strabo (Geogr., XVI, ii, 39) says that it was the characteristic form of divination among the Persians. It was also found in Chaldea, Babylonia, and Etruria (Clemens Alex., "Protrepticum", II, in Migne, P. G., VIII, 69; Theodoret, "Græcarum affectionum curatio", X, in P. G., LXXXIII, 1076). Isaias (xix, 3) refers to its practice in Egypt, and Moses (Deuter., xviii, 9–12) warns the Israelites against imitating the Chanaanite abominations, among which seeking the truth from the dead is mentioned. In Greece and Rome the evocation of the dead took place especially in caverns, or in volcanic regions, or near rivers and lakes, where the communication with the abodes of the dead was thought to be easier. Among these, *νεκρομαντεία*, *ψυχομαντεία*, or *ψυχοπομπεία*, the most celebrated were the oracle in Thesprotia near the River Acheron, which was supposed to be one of the rivers of hell, another in Laconia near the promontory of Tænarus, in a large and deep cavern from which a black and unwholesome vapour issued, and which was considered as one of the entrances of hell, others at Aornos in Epirus and Heraclea on the Propontis. In Italy the oracle of Cumæ, in a cavern near Lake Avernus in Campania, was one of the most famous.

The oldest mention of necromancy is the narrative of Ulysses' voyage to Hades (Odyssey, XI) and of his evocation of souls by means of the various rites indicated by Circe. It is noteworthy that, in this instance, although Ulysses' purpose was to consult the shade of Tiresias, he seems unable to evoke it alone; a number of others also appear, together or successively. As parallel to this passage of Homer may be mentioned the sixth book of Virgil's Æneid, which relates the descent of Æneas into the infernal regions. But here there is no true evocation, and the hero himself goes through the abodes of the souls. Besides these poetical and mythological narratives, several instances of necromantic practices are recorded by historians. At Cape Tænarus Callondas evoked the soul of Archilochus, whom he had killed (Plutarch, "De sera numinis vindicta", xvii). Periander, tyrant of Corinth, and one of the seven wise men of Greece, sent messengers to the oracle on the River Acheron to ask his dead wife, Melissa, in what place she had laid a stranger's deposit. Her phantom appeared twice and, at the second appearance, gave the required information (Herodotus, V, xcii). Pausanias, King of Sparta, had killed Cleonice, whom he had mistaken for an enemy during the night, and in consequence he could find neither rest nor peace, but his mind was filled with strange fears. After trying many purifications and expiations, he went to the *psychopompeion* of Phigalia, or Heraclea, evoked her soul, and received the assurance that his dreams and fears would cease as soon as he should have returned to Sparta. Upon his arrival there he died (Pausanias III, xvii, 8, 9; Plutarch, "De sera num. vind.", x; "Vita Cimonis", vi). After his death, the Spartans sent to Italy for psychagogues to evoke and appease his manes (Plutarch, "Desera num. vind.", xvii). Necromancy is mixed with oneiromancy in the case of Elysius of Terina in Italy, who desired to know if his son's sudden death was due to poisoning. He went to the oracle of the dead and, while sleeping in the temple, had a vision of both his father and his son who gave him the desired information (Plutarch, "Consolatio ad Apollonium", xiv).

Among the Romans, Horace several times alludes to the evocation of the dead (see especially Satires, I, viii, 25 sq.). Cicero testifies that his friend Appius practised necromancy (Tuscul. quæst., I, xvi), and that Vatinius called up souls from the netherworld (in Vatin., vi). The same is asserted of the Emperors Drusus (Tacitus, "Annal.", II, xxviii), Nero (Suetonius, "Nero", xxxiv; Pliny, "Hist. nat.", XXX, v), and Caracalla (Dio Cassius, LXXVII, xv). The grammarian Apion pretended to have conjured up the soul of Homer, whose country and parents he wished to ascertain (Pliny, "Hist. nat.", XXX, vi), and Sextus Pompeius consulted the famous Thessalian magician Erichto to learn from the dead the issue of the struggle between his father and Cæsar (Lucan, "Pharsalia", VI). Nothing certain can be said concerning the rites or incantations which were used; they seem to have been very complex, and to have varied in almost every instance. In the Odyssey, Ulysses digs a trench, pours libations around it, and sacrifices black sheep whose blood the shades drink before speaking to him. Lucan (Pharsalia, VI) describes at length many incantations, and speaks of warm blood poured into the veins of a corpse as if to restore it to life. Cicero (In Vatin., VI) relates that Vatinius, in connexion with the evocation of the dead, offered to the manes the entrails of children, and St. Gregory Nazianzen mentions that boys and virgins were sacrificed and dissected for conjuring up the dead and divining (Orat. I contra Julianum, xcii, in P. G., XXV, 624).

II. NECROMANCY IN THE BIBLE.—In the Bible necromancy is mentioned chiefly in order to forbid it or to reprove those who have recourse to it. The Hebrew term *'ôbôth* (sing., *'ôbh*) denotes primarily the spirits of the dead, or "pythons", as the Vulgate calls them (Deut., xviii, 11; Isa., xix, 3), who were consulted in order to learn the future (Deut., xviii, 10, 11; I Kings, xxviii, 8), and gave their answers through certain persons in whom they resided (Levit., xx, 27; I Kings, xxviii, 7), but is also applied to the persons themselves who were supposed to foretell events under

the guidance of these "divining" or "pythonic" spirits (Levit., xx, 6; I Kings, xxviii, 3, 9; Isa., xix, 3). The term *yidde 'onim* (from *yada*, "to know"), which is also used, but always in conjunction with *'obôth*, refers either to knowing spirits and persons through whom they spoke, or to spirits who were known and familiar to the wizards. The term *'obh* signifies both "a diviner" and "a leathern bag for holding water" (Job—xxxii, 19—uses it in the latter sense), but scholars are not agreed whether we have two disparate words, or whether it is the same word with two related meanings. Many maintain that it is the same in both instances, as the diviner was supposed to be the recipient and the container of the spirit. The Septuagint translates *'obôth*, as diviners, by "ventriloquists" (ἐγγαστριμῦθοι), either because the translators thought that the diviner's alleged communication with the spirit was but a deception, or rather because of the belief common in antiquity that ventriloquism was not a natural faculty, but due to the presence of a spirit. Perhaps, also, the two meanings may be connected on account of the peculiarity of the voice of the ventriloquist, which was weak and indistinct, as if it came from a cavity. Isaias (viii, 19) says that necromancers "mutter" and makes the following prediction concerning Jerusalem: "Thou shalt speak out of the earth, and thy speech shall be heard out of the ground, and thy voice shall be from the earth like that of the python, and out of the ground thy speech shall mutter" (xxix, 4). Profane authors also attribute a distinctive sound to the voice of the spirits or shades, although they do not agree in characterizing it. Homer (Iliad, XXIII, 101; Od., XXIV, 5, 9) uses the verb τρίζειν, and Statius (Thebais, VII, 770) *stridere*, both of which mean "to utter a shrill cry"; Horace qualifies their voice as *triste et acutum* (Sat., I, viii, 40); Virgil speaks of their *vox exigua* (Æneid, VI, 492) and of the *gemitus lacrymabilis* which is heard from the grave (op. cit., III, 39); and in a similar way Shakespeare says that "the sheeted dead did squeak and gibber in the Roman streets" (Hamlet, I, i).

The Moasic Law forbids necromancy (Levit., xix, 31; xx, 6), declares that to seek the truth from the dead is abhorred by God (Deut., xviii, 11, 12), and even makes it punishable by death (Levit., xx, 27; cf. I Kings, xxviii, 9). Nevertheless, owing especially to the contact of the Hebrews with pagan nations, we find it practised in the time of Saul (I Kings, xxviii, 7, 9), of Isaias, who strongly reproves the Hebrews on this ground (viii, 19; xix, 3; xxix, 4, etc.), and of Manasses (IV Kings, xxi, 6; II Par., xxxiii, 6). The best known case of necromancy in the Bible is the evocation of the soul of Samuel at Endor (I Kings, xxviii). King Saul was at war with the Philistines, whose army had gathered near that of Israel. He "was afraid and his heart was very much dismayed. And he consulted the Lord, and he answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by priests, nor by prophets" (5, 6). Then he went to Endor, to a woman who had "a divining spirit", and persuaded her to call the soul of Samuel. The woman alone saw the prophet, and Saul recognized him from the description she gave of him. But Saul himself spoke and heard the prediction that, as the Lord had abandoned him on account of his disobedience, he would be defeated and killed. This narrative has given rise to several interpretations. Some deny the reality of the apparition and claim that the witch deceived Saul; thus St. Jerome (In Is., iii, vii, 11, in P. L., XXIV, 108; in Ezech., xiii, 17, in P. L., XXV, 119) and Theodoret, who, however, adds that the prophecy came from God (In I Reg., xxviii, QQ. LXIII, LXIV, in P. G., LXXX, 589). Others attribute it to the devil, who took Samuel's appearance; thus St. Basil (In Is., viii, 218, in P. G., XXX, 497), St. Gregory of Nyssa ("De pythonissa, ad Theodos, episc. epist.", in P. G., XLV, 107–14), and Tertullian (De anima, LVII, in P. L., II, 794). Others, finally, look upon Samuel's apparition as real; thus Josephus (Antiq. Jud., VI, xiv, 2), St. Justin (Dialogus cum Tryphone Judæo, 105, in P. G., VI, 721), Origen (In I Reg., xxviii, "De Engastrimytho", in P. G., XII, 1011–1028), St. Ambrose (In Luc., i, 33, in P. L., XV, 1547), and St. Augustine, who finally adopted this view after having held the others (De diversis quæst. ad Simplicianum, III, in P. L., XL, 142–44; De octo Dulcitii quæst., VI, in P. L., XL, 162–65; De cura pro mortuis, xv, in P. L., XL, 606; De doctrina christiana, II, xxiii, in P. L., XXXIV, 52). St. Thomas (Summa, II-II, Q. clxxiv, a. 5, ad 4 um) does not pronounce. The last interpretation of the reality of Samuel's apparition is favoured both by the details of the narrative and by another Biblical text which convinced St. Augustine: "After this, he [Samuel] slept, and he made known to the king, and showed him the end of his life, and he lifted up his voice from the earth in prophecy to blot out the wickedness of the nation" (Ecclus., xlvi, 23).

III. Necromancy in the Christian Era.—In the first centuries of the Christian era the practice of necromancy was common among pagans, as the Fathers frequently testify (see, e. g., Tertullian, "Apol.", xxiii, P. L., I, 470; "De anima", LVI, LVII, in P. L., II, 790 sqq.; Lactantius, "Divinæ institutiones", IV, xxvii, in P. L., VI, 531). It was associated with other magical arts and other forms of demoniacal practices, and Christians were warned against such observances "in which the demons represent themselves as the souls of the dead" (Tertullian, De anima, LVII, in P. L., II, 793). Nevertheless, even Christians converted from paganism sometimes indulged in them. The efforts of Church authorities, popes, and councils, and the severe laws of Christian emperors, especially Constantine, Constantius, Valentinian, Valens, Theodosius, were not directed specifically against necromancy, but in general against pagan magic, divination, and superstition. In fact, little by little the term necromancy lost its strict meaning and was applied to all forms of black art, becoming closely associated with alchemy, witchcraft, and magic. Notwithstanding all efforts, it survived in some form or other during the Middle Ages, but was given a new impetus at the time of the Renaissance by the revival of the neo-Platonic doctrine of demons. In his memoirs (translated by Roscoe, New York, 1851, ch. xiii) Benvenuto Cellini shows how vague the meaning of necromancy had become when he relates that he assisted at "necromantic" evocations in which multitudes of "devils" appeared and answered his questions. Cornelius Agrippa ("De occulta philosophia", Cologne, 1510, tr. by J. F., London, 1651) indicates the magical rites by which souls are evoked. In recent times, necromancy, as a distinct belief and practice, reappears under the name of spiritism, or spiritualism (see Spiritism).

The Church does not deny that, with a special permission of God, the souls of the departed may appear to the living, and even manifest things unknown to the latter. But, understood as the art or science of evoking the dead, necromancy is held by theologians to be due to the agency of evil spirits, for the means taken are inadequate to produce the expected results. In pretended evocations of the dead, there may be many things explainable naturally or due to fraud; how much is real, and how much must be attributed to imagination and deception, cannot be determined, but real facts of necromancy, with the use of incantations and magical rites, are looked upon by theologians, after St. Thomas, II-II, Q. xcv, aa. iii, iv, as special modes of divination, due to demoniacal intervention, and divination itself is a form of superstition.

Lenormant, *La magie chez les Chaldéens* (Paris, 1875); Idem, *La divination et la science des présages chez les Chaldéens* (Paris, 1875); Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité* (Paris, 1879–82); Tylor, *Researches into the Early History of Man-*

kind (London, 1865); DÖLLINGER, *Heidenthum und Judenthum* (Ratisbon, 1857); FRÉRET, *Observations sur les Oracles rendus par les âmes des morts* in *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, XXIII (1756), 174; KÖHLER, *De origine et progressu necyomanticæ sive manium evocatione apud veteres tum Græcos tum Romanos* (Liegnitz, 1829); RHODE, *Psyche* (Freiburg im Br., 1898); WAITE, *The Mysteries of Magic* (London, 1897), 181; HOLMES in *Kitto's Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature*, s. v. *Divination;* WHITEHOUSE in HASTINGS, *Dict. of the Bible*, s. v. *Sorcery;* LESÊTRE in *Dict. de la Bible*, s. v. *Evocation des morts;* SCHANZ in *Kirchenlexicon*, s. v. *Todtenbeschwörung*.

C. A. DUBRAY.

Nectarius (Νεχτάριος), Patriarch of Constantinople, (381–397), d. 27 Sept., 397, eleventh bishop of that city since Metrophanes, and may be counted its first patriarch. He came from Tarsus of a senatorial family and was prætor at Constantinople at the time of the second general council (381). When St. Gregory Nazianzen resigned his occupation of that see the people called for Nectarius to succeed him and their choice was ratified by the Council (Socrates, "H. E." V), before August, 381. Sozomen (H. E., VII, 8) adds that Nectarius, about to return to Tarsus, asked Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus, if he could carry any letters for him. Diodorus, who saw that his visitor was the most suitable person to become Bishop of Constantinople, persuaded Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, to add his name to the list of candidates presented by the council to the emperor. The emperor then, to every one's surprise, chose Nectarius, who was not yet baptized, and in neophyte's robe he was consecrated bishop. Tillemont (Mémoires, IX, 486) doubts this story. Soon after Nectarius' election the Council passed the famous third canon giving Constantinople rank immediately after Rome. A man of no very great power, Nectarius had an uneventful reign with which St. Gregory was not altogether pleased ("Ep." 88, 91, 151, etc.; Tillemont, *op. cit.*, IX, 488). Suspected of concessions to the Novatians (Socrates, V, 10; Sozomen, VII, 12), he made none to the Arians, who in 388 burnt his house (Socrates, V, 13). Palsamon says that in 394 he held a synod at Constantinople which decreed that no bishop should be deposed without the consent of several other bishops of the same province (Harduin, I, 955). The most important event, however, is that, according to Socrates (V, 19) and Sozomen (VII, 16), as a result of a public scandal Nectarius abolished the discipline of public penance and the office of penitentiary hitherto held by a priest of his diocese. The incident is important for the history of Penance. Nectarius preached a sermon about the martyr Theodore still extant ("P. G." XXXIX, 1821–40; Nilles "Kalendarium manuale," II, 96–100). He was succeeded by St. John Chrysostom and appears as St. Nectarius in the Orthodox Menaion for 11 October (Nilles, *op. cit.* I, 300; "Acta SS." May, II, 421).

TILLEMONT, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique* (Paris, 1693–1713), IX, X; FABRICIUS-HARLES, *Bibliotheca Græca*, IX (Hamburg, 1804), 309; RAUSCHEN, *Jahrbücher der christlichen Kirche unter dem Kaiser Theodosius* (Freiburg, 1897).

ADRIAN FORTESCUE.

Negligence (Lat. *nec*, not, and *legere*, to pick out), the condition of not heeding. More specifically it is here considered as the omission, whether habitual or not, of the care required for the performance of duties, or at any rate, for their full and adequate discharge. In the teaching of St. Thomas, it is rated not only as a characteristic discernible in the commission of all sins, but also as a special sin in itself. Its particular deformity he judges to be the imputable lack of such solicitude as is here and now demanded for the satisfying of obligations. He therefore assigns prudence as the virtue to which it is directly opposed. What has been said applies also to actions which are not of precept, once it is resolved to undertake them. Negligence, according to St. Thomas, is initially at least a lack of promptness of will, and is quite distinguishable from torpor or slipshodness in execution. It is not commonly esteemed to be more than a venial sin. There are, however, two notable exceptions to this statement: (1) if a person is careless to the point of omitting something which is indispensable for salvation (*de necessitate salutis*), or (2) if the remissness of will be so great as totally to extinguish the love of God in the soul, then the sin committed is obviously grievous. Negligence is a factor to be reckoned with in determining the liability of one who has damaged another in any way. In the court of conscience the perpetrator of damage can only be held responsible and bound to restitution when his action has been attended with moral culpability, i. e. has been done freely and advertently. The civil law exacts the exercise of diligence whose measure is established according to the different subject matter involved. The absence of this degree of care on the part of an agent is assumed by the civil law to be culpable, and is punished with the penalties provided. Thus the common law generally distinguishes three classes of negligence as follows: gross negligence is the failure to employ even the smallest amount of care, such as any person, no matter how heedless, would use for the safeguarding of his own interests; ordinary negligence is the failure to exercise ordinary care, such as a person of ordinary capacity and capable of governing a family would take of his own affairs; slight negligence is the failure to bring to bear a high degree of care, such as very thoughtful persons would maintain in looking after their own interests. The civil law may and does impose the obligation of reparation for harm wrought not only where ordinary and gross negligence are shown, but also at times when only slight negligence is proved to have existed. This obligation holds good likewise in conscience, once the decision of the judge decreeing it has been rendered.

SLATER, *A Manual of Moral Theology* (New York, 1908); ST. THOMAS, *Summa Theologica*, II—II, Q. liv; GENICOT, *Theologiæ Moralis Institutiones* (Louvain, 1898).

JOSEPH F. DELANY.

Negroes. See RACE, NEGRO.

Nehemias, BOOK OF, also called the second BOOK OF ESDRAS, is reckoned both in the Talmud and in the early Christian Church, at least until the time of Origen, as forming one single book with Esdras, and St. Jerome in his preface (*ad Dominionem et Rogatianum*), following the example of the Jews, still continues to treat it as making one with the Book of Esdras. The union of the two in a single book doubtless has its origin in the fact that the documents of which the Books of Esdras and Nehemias are composed, underwent compilation and redaction together at the hands probably, as most critics think, of the author of Paralipomenon about B. C. 300. The separation of the Book of Nehemias from that of Esdras, preserved in our editions, may in its turn be justified by the consideration that the former relates in a distinct manner the work accomplished by Nehemias, and is made up, at least in great part, from the authentic memoirs of the principal figure. The book comprises three sections: I, i-vi; II, vii-xiii, 3; III, xiii, 4–31. Sections I and III will be treated first, and section II, which raises special literary problems, will be discussed at the end.

SECTION I: i-vi, (1) comprises the account, written by Nehemias himself, of the restoration of the walls of Jerusalem. Already in the reign of Xerxes (B. C. 485–65), and especially during the first half of the reign of Artaxerxes I (B. C. 465–24), the Jews had attempted, but with only partial success, to rebuild the walls of their capital, a work, up to then, never sanctioned by the Persian kings (see I Esd., iv, 6–23). In consequence of the edict of Artaxerxes, given in I Esd., iv, 18–22, the enemies of the Jews at Jerusalem forcibly stopped the work (ibid., 23) and pulled down a part of what had already been accomplished. (2) With these events the beginning of the Book of Nehemias is con-

nected. Nehemias, the son of Helchias, relates how, at the court of Artaxerxes at Susa where he fulfilled the office of the king's cup-bearer, he received the news of this calamity in the twentieth year of the king (Neh., i), and how, thanks to his prudence, he succeeded in getting himself sent on a first mission to Jerusalem with full powers to rebuild the walls of the Jewish capital (Neh., ii, 1–8). This first mission lasted twelve years (v, 14; xiii, 6); he had the title of Pehah (v, 14; xii, 26) or Athersatha (viii, 9; x, 1). It had long been the opinion of most historians of Israel that the Artaxerxes of Nehemias was certainly the first of that name, and that consequently the first mission of Nehemias fell in the year B. C. 445. The Aramaic papyri of Elephantine, recently published by Sachau, put this date beyond the shadow of a doubt. For in the letter which they wrote to Bahohim, Governor of Judea, in the seventeenth year of Darius II (B. C. 408), the Jewish priests of Elephantine say that they have also made an application to the sons of Sanaballat at Samaria. Now Sanaballat was a contemporary of Nehemias, and the Artaxerxes of Nehemias, therefore, was the predecessor, and not the successor, of Darius II.

(3) On his arrival at Jerusalem, Nehemias lost no time; he inspected the state of the walls, and then took measures and gave orders for taking the work in hand (ii, 9–18). Chapter iii, a document of the highest importance for determining the area of Jerusalem in the middle of the fifth century B. C., contains a description of the work, carried out at all points at once under the direction of the zealous Jewish governor. The high priest Eliasib is named first among the fellow workers of Nehemias (iii, 1). To bring the undertaking to a successful termination the latter had to fight against all sorts of difficulties. (4) First of all, the foreign element had great influence in Judea. The Jews who had returned from captivity almost a century before, had found the country partly occupied by people belonging to the neighbouring races, and being unable to organize themselves politically, had seen themselves reduced, little by little, to a humiliating position in their own land. And so, at the time of Nehemias, we see certain foreigners taking an exceedingly arrogant attitude towards the Jewish governor and his work. Sanaballat the Horonite, chief of the Samaritans (iv, 1, 2), Tobias the Ammonite, Gossem the Arabian, claim to exercise constant control over Jewish affairs, and try by all means in their power, by calumny (ii, 19), scoffs (iv, 1 ff), threats of violence (iv, 7 ff), and craft (vi, 1 ff), to hinder Nehemias' work or ruin him. The reason of this was that the raising up again of the walls of Jerusalem was destined to bring about the overthrow of the moral domination, which for many years circumstances had secured for these foreigners.

(5) The cause of the foreigners was upheld by a party of Jews, traitors to their own nation. The prophet Noadias and other false prophets sought to terrify Nehemias (vi, 14); there were some who, like Samaia, allowed themselves to be hired by Tobias and Sanaballat to set snares for him (vi, 10–14). Many Jews sided with Tobias on account of the matrimonial alliances existing between his family and certain Jewish families. Nehemias, however, does not speak of the mixed marriages as if they had been actually forbidden. The father-in-law of Tobias' son, Mosollam, the son of Barachias, on the contrary, was a fellow worker of Nehemias (vi, 18; iii, 4). The law of Deuteronomy only forbade marriages between Jews and Chanaanites (Deut. vii, 1, 3). (6) Difficulties of a social nature, the result of the selfish treatment of the poor by the rich, who misused the common distress for their own ends, likewise called for the energetic intervention of Nehemias (v). On this occasion Nehemias recalls the fact that previous governors had practised extortion, while he was the first to show himself disinterested in the discharge of his duties (v, 15 ff). (7) In spite of all these difficulties the rebuilding of the wall made rapid progress. We learn from vii, 15, that the work was completely finished within fifty-one days. Josephus (Ant., V, 7, 8) says that it lasted two years and four months, but his testimony, often far from reliable, presents no plausible reason for setting aside the text. The relatively short duration of the work is explained, when we consider that Nehemias had only to repair the damage wrought after the prohibition of Artaxerxes (I Esd., iv, 23), and finish off the construction, which might at that moment have been already far advanced [see above (1)].

Section III: xiii, 4–31. After the expiration of his first mission, Nehemias had returned to Susa in the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes (B. C. 433; xiii, 6). Some time after, he was charged with a fresh mission to Judea, and it is with his doings during this second mission that xiii, 4–31 is concerned. The account at the beginning seems mutilated. Nehemias relates how, at the time of his second arrival at Jerusalem, he began by putting an end to the abuses which Tobias, the Ammonite, supported by the high priest Eliasib, was practising in the temple in the matter of the depository for the sacred offerings (xiii, 4–9). He severely blames the violation of the right of the Levites in the distribution of the tithes, and takes measures to prevent its occurrence in future (xiii, 10–14); he insists on the Sabbath being strictly respected even by the foreign merchants (xiii, 15–22). Finally he dealt severely with the Jews who were guilty of marriages with strange wives, and banished a grandson of Eliasib who had married a daughter of Sanaballat (xiii, 23–28). To this son-in-law of Sanaballat is generally attributed the inauguration of the worship in the temple of Garizim. It is plain that Nehemias' attitude during his second mission with regard to mixed marriages differs greatly from his attitude at the beginning of his first stay at Jerusalem [see section I, (5)].

Section II: vii-xiii, 3, (1) contains accounts or documents relating to the work of politico-social and religious organization effected by Nehemias, after the walls were finished. Here we no longer have Nehemias speaking in the first person, except in vii, 1–5, and in the account of the dedication of the walls (xii, 31, 37, 39). He relates how, after having rebuilt the walls, he had to proceed to erect houses, and take measures for bringing into the town a population more in proportion to its importance as the capital (vii, 1–5; cf. Ecclus., xlix, 15). (2) He gives (vii, 5 ff.) the list of the families who had returned from captivity with Zorobabel. This list is in I Esd., ii. It is remarkable that in the Book of Nehemias, following on the list we find reproduced (vii, 70 ff.) with variants, the remark of I Esd., ii, 68–70 about the gifts given towards the work of the temple by Zorobabel's companions, and the settlement of these latter in the country; and again that Neh., viii, 1 resumes the narrative in the very words of I Esd., iii. This dependence is probably due to the redactor, who in this place gave a new form to the notes supplied him by the Jewish governor's memoirs which also explains the latter's being spoken of in the third person, Neh., viii, 9. (3) There is a description of a great gathering held in the seventh month under the direction of Nehemias (viii, 9–12) at which Esdras reads the Law (viii, 13). They then kept the feast of Tabernacles (viii, 13–18). When this feast is over, the people gather together again on the twenty-fourth day of the seventh month (ix, 1 ff.) to praise God, confess their sins, and to bind themselves by a written covenant faithfully to observe their obligations. Chapter X after giving the list of the subscribers to the covenant, sets forth the obligations, which the people bind themselves to fulfil; in particular the prohibition of mixed marriages (verse 30); the keeping of the Sabbath, especially in their

treatment of foreign merchants (verse 31), the yearly tribute of a third part of a sicle for the Temple (verse 32), and other measures to ensure the regular celebration of sacrifices (verses 33–34), the offering of the first-fruits and of the first born (verses 35–37), and the payment and the distribution of the tithes (verses 35–39). After chapter x it is advisable to read xii, 43–xiii, 1–3; the appointment of a commission for the administration of things brought to the Temple, and the expulsion of foreigners from among the community. Chapter xi, 1, 2, recalls the measures taken to people Jerusalem; verses 3–36 give the census of Jerusalem and of the other towns as Nehemias' measures left it. In chapter xii, 27–43, we have the account of the solemn dedication of the walls of Jerusalem; Esdras the scribe is mentioned as being at the head of a group of singers (verse 35). The list in xii, 1–26, has no connexion whatever with the events of this epoch.

(4) The proceedings set forth in viii–x are closely connected with the other parts of the history of Nehemias. The obligations imposed by the covenant, described in x, have to do with just the very matters with which Nehemias concerned himself most during his second stay (see above, section III). The regulation concerning the providing of the wood for the altar (x, 34) is recalled by Nehemias in xiii, 31, and the very words used in x, 39 (end of verse), we find again in xiii, 11. The covenant entered into by the people during Nehemias' first mission was broken in his absence. At the time of his second mission he put down the abuses with severity. For instance, the attitude he takes towards mixed marriages is quite different from his attitude at the beginning of his first stay [see above section I (5); section III]. This change is explained precisely by the absolute prohibition pronounced against these marriages in the assembly described in ix–x. The view has been put forward that viii–x gives an account of events belonging to the period of the organization of worship under Zorobabel, the names of Nehemias (viii, 9; x, 1) and Esdras (viii, 1 ff.) having been added later. But there was certainly sufficient reason for the reorganization of worship in the time of Nehemias (cf. the Book of Malachias and Neh., xiii). Others on the contrary would regard Neh., viii–x, as the sequel to the narrative of I Esdras, ix–x, and they likewise hold that Nehemias' name has been interpolated in Neh., viii, 9, and x, 1. This theory is equally untenable. It is true that in the Third Book of Esdras (the Greek I Esdras) the narrative of Neh., viii, is reproduced immediately after that of Esdras, ix–x; but the author of the third Book of Esdras was led to do this by the fact that Neh., viii, presents his hero as reader of the Law. He has moreover preserved (III Esd., ix, 50) the information of Neh., viii, 9, about the intervention of the Athersatha (Nehemias), Esdras' superior, which clearly proves that this account does not refer to the epoch when Esdras had returned to Jerusalem entrusted by the king with full powers for the administration of the Jewish community. See, moreover, the following paragraph.

(5) According to our view the return of Esdras with his emigrants and the reform effected by him (I Esd., vii–x) ought, chronologically, to be placed after the history of Nehemias, and the Artaxerxes, in the seventh year of whose reign Esdras returned to Jerusalem, is Artaxerxes II (B. C. 405–358). As a matter of fact, Esdras finds the wall of Jerusalem rebuilt (I Esd., ix, 9), Jerusalem well populated (x, 1 ff.), the Temple treasure under proper management (viii, 29 ff.), Jonathan, son of Eliasib, high priest (x, 6; cf. Neh., xii, 23, Hebrew text), and the unlawfulness of mixed marriages recognized by every one (ix, 1 ff.). The radical reform, which Esdras introduced in this matter without being troubled by foreigners who still held the upper hand at the time of Nehemias' first coming, definitively put an end to the abuse in question which had proved rebellious to all preventive measures (x). The political and social situation described in the first six chapters of Nehemias [see above, section I (4), (5), (6)], the religious situation to which the proceedings of the gathering in Neh., x, bear witness [see above, section II (3)], do not admit of being explained as immediately following after the mission of Esdras, who particularly, in virtue of the king's edict, disposed of very valuable resources for the celebration of worship (I Esd., vii, viii, 25 ff.). Esdras is again entirely unnoticed in Neh., i–vi, and in the list of the subscribers to the covenant (x, 1 ff.). He is mentioned in Neh., viii, 1 ff., and in xii, 35, as fulfilling subordinate functions. Considering the singular number of the verbs in Neh., viii, 9, 10, it is probable that in the former of these two verses "Esdras and the Levites" being named as part of the subject of the phrase is due to a later hand. At the epoch of Nehemias, therefore, Esdras was at the beginning of his career, and must have gone a little later to Babylonia, whence he returned at the head of a band of emigrants in the seventh year of Artaxerxes II (B. C. 398). (6) Many critics have maintained that in Neh., viii, we have the history of the first promulgation of the "Priestly Code" by Esdras, but the narrative in question does not authorize such an interpretation. Esdras was probably still a very young man at this time, and all he does is to read the Law before the assembled people. It is quite true that in I Esd., vii, there is made mention in the royal edict of the Law of his God which Esdras has in mind (verse 14), but besides the fact that we hold the events related in I Esd., vii, to be posterior to Neh., viii [see above (5)], these words must not be understood literally of a new document of which Esdras was the bearer. In the same terms mention is made of the wisdom of his God which Esdras has in mind (verse 25), and in this same passage it is supposed that Esdras' compatriots already know the Law of their God.

RAWLINSON, *Ezra and Nehemiah; their lives and times* (London, 1890); RYLE, *The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah* (Cambridge, 1896); WITTON DAVIES, *Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther* (Edinburgh, The Century Bible); BERTHEAU, *Die Bücher Ezra, Nehemia und Ester*, ed. RYSSEL (Leipzig, 1887); SCHLATTER, *zur Topographie und Geschichte Palästina* (Calw and Stuttgart, 1893); NIKEL, *Die Wiederherstellung des Jüdischen Gemeinwesens nach dem babylonischen Exil* (Freiburg, 1900); VAN HOONACKER, *Néhémie et Esdras* (Louvain, 1890); IDEM, *Néhémie en l'an 20 d'Artaxerxes I, Esdras en l'an 7 d'Artaxerxes II* (Gand and Leipzig, 1892); IDEM, *Nouvelles études sur la Restauration juive après l'exil de Babylone* (Paris and Louvain, 1896); IDEM, *Notes sur l'histoire de la Restauration juive après l'exil de Babylone* in *Revue biblique* (Paris, January–April, 1901).

A. VAN HOONACKER.

Neher, STEPHAN JAKOB, church historian; b. at Ebnat, 24 July, 1829; d. at Nordhausen, 7 Oct., 1902. His family were country people of Ebnat, a village in the district of Neresheim in Würtemberg, and upon the conclusion of his studies in the gymnasium Neher devoted himself to the study of theology in the University of Tübingen. After his ordination, he laboured as pastor of Dorfmerkingen, then of Zöbingen, and finally of Nordhausen (in the district of Ellwangen, Würtemberg). In addition, Neher devoted himself throughout his life to intellectual pursuits, principally to canon law and church history, giving his attention, in the latter study, chiefly to the two branch sciences of ecclesiastical geography and ecclesiastical statistics, in which he accomplished great results. In his first considerable work, which appeared in 1861, he deals with the topic of the privileged Altar (*altare privilegiatum*). In 1864 he published the first volume of his great and carefully planned work, "Kirchliche Geographie und Statistik", which comprises three volumes (Ratisbon, 1864–68). It was, for that day, a most important work, indispensable to historians. Its author was one of the first in modern times to recognize the importance of this branch of church history, collecting with great care material often very difficult to procure, and arranging it systematically. His book on the celebration of two Masses by a priest

on the same day pertains to canon law, and it bears the title: "Die Bination nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung und nach dem heutigen Recht" (Ratisbon, 1874). After 1878 Neher edited the statistical "Personalkatalog" of his own diocese of Rottenburg, and was one of the principal contributors to the second edition of the Kirchenlexikon of Wetzer and Welte. For this work he wrote no fewer than 235 articles, or greater parts of articles. Their content is chiefly matter relating to church history, or to ecclesiastical statistics; his best articles are those relating to the latter subject; those of purely historical interest are often imperfect.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Nélaton, AUGUSTE, famous French surgeon; born in Paris, 17 June, 1807, d. there 21 Sept., 1873. He made his medical studies in Paris, graduating in 1836 with a thesis on tuberculous affections of bones. All his subsequent university career was passed at Paris. After the publication of his "Traité des tumeurs de la mamelle" he became *agrégé* in 1839. In 1851 he became professor of clinical surgery with a thesis which attracted wide attention and was translated into German the following year. As a member of the surgical staff of the St. Louis Hospital, he devised a number of original surgical procedures and operations, was the first to suggest the ligature of both ends of arteries in primary and secondary hemorrhage, and developed several phases of plastic surgery. The Nélaton probe with the porcelain knob, which he invented, was successfully used by him in Garibaldi's case, in 1862, to locate a bullet in the ankle joint. Some of his suggestions with regard to operations were important advances in abdominal and pelvic surgery. He was, lastly, noted as a great teacher of surgery and a consummate operator.

Pagel, the German historian of medicine, in his "Biographical Dictionary of Prominent Physicians of the Nineteenth Century", says of Nélaton: "He was a man of very clear judgment, of ripe experience, of solid wisdom, and deservedly occupies a place as one of the greatest of French surgeons of the nineteenth century." In 1863 he was elected a member of the Paris Academy of Medicine and in 1867 of the French Institute of Science, and became Senator of the French Empire in 1868. His fame as a writer on surgery rests upon his "Elements of Surgical Pathology" (5 vols., Paris, 1854–60). The last volume was completed with the collaboration of A. Jamain. In 1867 Nélaton had an important share in preparing the "Report on The Progress of Surgery in France".

GUYON in *Bulletins et Mémoires de la Soc. de Chir.* (1876); BÉCLARD in *Mémoires de l'Académie de Méd.*, XXXII; GURLT, *Biogr. Lex. der hervorrag. Aerzt.*

J. J. WALSH.

Nemore, JORDANUS (JORDANIS) DE, the name given in MSS. of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries to a mathematician who in the Renaissance period was called Jordanus Nemorarius. A number of his works are extant, but nothing is known of his life. It is customary to place him early in the thirteenth century. Emile Chasles, the geometrician, concluded from a study of the "Algorismus Jordani" that its author lived not later than the twelfth century. In the fourteenth century the English Dominican Nicolas Triveth, in a chronicle of his order, attributed the "De ponderibus Jordani" and the "De lineis datis Jordani" to Jordanus Saxo, who, in 1222, succeeded St. Dominic as master general of the Friars Preachers. Since then, the identity of Jordanus Saxo with Jordanus Nemorarius has been accepted by a great many authors; it seems difficult to maintain this opinion, however, as the Dominican superior general never adds *de Nemore* to his name, and the mathematician never calls himself Saxo. The literal translation of *Jordanus de Nemore* (Giordano of Nemi) would indicate that he was an Italian. Jordanus had a great vogue during the Middle Ages. In the "Opus Majus", under "De communibus naturæ", Roger Bacon quotes his "De ponderibus", as well as a commentary which had been written on it at that period. Thomas Bradwardine and the logicians who succeeded him in the school of Oxford likewise make a great deal of use of the writings of Jordanus. During the Renaissance his "De ponderibus" powerfully influenced the development of the science of statics.

The treatises composed by Jordanus de Nemore are: (1) "Algorismus", a theory of the elementary operations of arithmetic. An "Algorithmus demonstratus Jordani" was printed at Nuremberg in 1534, by Petreius for Johannes Schöner. The "Algorithmus" reproduced an anonymous MS. found among the papers of Regiomontanus. It was erroneously attributed to Jordanus, and had really been composed in the thirteenth century by a certain Magister Gernardus (Duhem in "Bibliotheca mathematica", 3rd series, VI, 1905, p. 9). The genuine "Demonstrato Algorismi" of Jordanus, which E. Chasles had already examined, has been rediscovered by M. A. A. Bjornbö (G. Eneström in "Bibliotheca mathematica", 3rd series, VII, 1906, p. 24), but is still unpublished. (2) "Elementa Arismeticæ": this treatise on arithmetic, divided into *distinctiones*, was printed at Paris in 1496 and in 1514, to the order of Lefèvre d'Etaples, who added various propositions to it. (3) "De numeris datis", published in 1879 by Treutlein ("Zeitschr. Math. Phys.", XXIV, supplem., pp. 127–66) and again in 1891 by Maximilian Curtze (ibid., XXXVI, "Histor. liter. Abtheilung", pp. 1–23, 41–63, 81–95, 121–138). (4) "De triangulis".—Jordanus himself gave this treatise the name of Philotechnes (Duhem in "Bibliotheca mathematica", 3rd series, V, 1905, p. 321; "Archiv für die Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften und der Technik", I, 1909, p. 88). It was published by M. Curtze ("Mittheil. der Copernicusvereins für Wissenschaft und Kunst", VI—Thorn, 1887). (5) "Planispherium".—This work on mapdrawing gives, for the first time, the theorem: The stereographic projection of a circle is a circle. It was printed by Valderus, at Basle, in 1536, in a collection containing the cosmographical works of Ziegler, Proclus, Berosius, and Theon of Alexandria, and the "Planisphere" of Ptolemy. (6) "De Speculis", a treatise on catoptics, still unedited. (7) "De ponderibus", or better, "Elementa super demonstrationem ponderis", a treatise on statics, in nine propositions, still unpublished, seems to have been composed as an introduction to a fragment on the Roman balance attributed to one Charistion, contemporary and friend of Philo of Byzantium (second century, B. C.). This fragment has survived under two forms: (a) a Latin version directly from the Greek, entitled "De canonio"; (b) a ninth-century commentary by the Arab mathematician Thâbit ibn Kurrah, translated into Latin by Gerard of Cremona.

Most of the propositions of the "De ponderibus Jordani" are gravely erroneous. But the last offers a remarkable demonstration of the principle of the lever, introducing the method of virtual work for the first time in mathematical history. Towards the end of the fourteenth century, or the beginning of the fifteenth, an anonymous author expanded the demonstrations in Jordanus's treatise; in this enlarged form, the treatise, combined with the "De canonio", is found in many MSS. under the title "Liber Euclidis de ponderibus". There is also an anonymous commentary on the "De ponderibus", based on ideas apparently borrowed from Aristotle's "Quæstiones mechanicæ". This Aristotelean commentary is mentioned by Roger Bacon in his "Opus majus"; together with an enlarged edition of the "Liber Euclidis de ponderibus", it was printed at Nuremberg, in 1533, by

Johannes Petreius, under the direction of Petrus Apianus, under the title "Liber Jordani Nemorarii, viri clarissimi, de ponderibus". In the thirteenth century an anonymous author undertook to write a preamble to a fragment on mechanics, this fragment being of Hellenic origin, and, apparently, later than Hero of Alexandria. For this purpose he resumed Jordanus's work, correcting, however, its errors in mechanics. The method of virtual work, employed by Jordanus to justify the law of equilibrium of the straight lever, supplies this anonymous writer with some admirable demonstrations for the law of equilibrium of the bent lever and for the apparent weight of a heavy body on an inclined plane. This preamble is found in many manuscripts, with the Hellenic fragment. In 1554 it was cynically plagiarized by Nicolò Tartaglia in his "Quesiti et inventioni diverse"; the manuscript text, found in Tartaglia's papers, was published at Venice, in 1565, by Antius Trojanus, under the title: "Jordani Opusculum de ponderositate, Nicolai Tartaleæ studio correctum" (A Brief Work of Jordanus, on Ponderosity, carefully corrected by Nicolò Tartaglia).

CANTOR, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Mathematik*, II (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1900), 53–86; DUHEM, *Les origines de la Statique*, I (Paris, 1906), 98–155; IDEM, *Etudes sur Léonard de Vinci, ceux qu'il a lus et ceux qui l'ont lu*, 1st series (Paris, 1906), 310–16.

PIERRE DUHEM.

Nemrod, or NIMROD (נמרד of uncertain signification, LXX Νεβρώδ), the name of a descendant of Chus (Cush), son of Cham (Ham), represented in Gen., x, 8–12, as the founder of the Babylonian empire and as a mighty hunter before the Lord. This last may be taken in the strict sense—hunter of wild beasts, for such we know the Babylonian princes to have been; or in the sense of warrior, the original word *gibbor* having the meaning "hero". The name of Nemrod has not yet been discovered among those found in the cuneiform inscriptions, and the attempts made by Assyriologists to identify him with historical or legendary personages known to us through these sources rest on more or less plausible conjectures. Thus by some scholars (Delitsch, Hommel, P. Haupt, etc.) he is identified with Gilgamesh, the hero of the Babylonian epic. The latter, whose name appears frequently in the inscriptions, and who is often represented in the act of strangling a lion, is described in the poem as a powerful prince who subdues the monster ox-faced man Eabani and makes him his companion, after which he triumphs over the tyrant Humbaba, and slays a monster sent against him by the deities, Anu and Ishtar. Like the Biblical Nemrod he reigns over the city of Erech (Douai, Arach), but the texts fail to mention the other towns enumerated in Gen., x, 10, namely: Babylon, Achad, and Chalanne (Calneh). For the philological reasons underlying this hypothesis see Vigouroux, s. v., and Hastings, s. v. Nimrod. Sayce less plausibly identifies Nemrod with the Kassite king, Nazi-Murutas, and T. Pinches (in Hastings) considers him to be the same as Marduk, the great Babylonian deity. In Genesis, x, 11, we read: "Out of that land came forth Assur, and built Ninive . . ." This rendering of the Vulgate seems preferable to that of the Revised Version: "Out of that land he (Nimrod) went forth into Assyria and builded Nineveh." Be that as it may, we know from other sources that Assyria with its capital Nineveh was at first a Babylonian colony, and it may be said to have been founded by Nemrod in the sense that it was a development of the power and civilization of Chaldea. A great number of Oriental legends grew up around the meagre Biblical data concerning Nemrod. Thus with probable reference to the supposed root of the name (מרד *marad*, "he revolted"), he is credited with having instigated the building of the tower of Babel and of being the author of Babylonian idolatry. Another legend is to the effect that Abraham having refused to worship the statue of Nemrod was cast into a fiery furnace. A trace of this legend appears in II Esd., ix, 7, where the translator of the Vulgate renders the original "Ur of the Chaldees" (from which the Lord called Abraham), by "fire of the Chaldeans". It was only natural that the renown of Nemrod as a builder should have caused his name to be connected with nearly all of the principal mounds and ruins to be found in Mesopotamia.

HETZENAUER, *Commentarius in librum Genesis* (Graz and Vienna, 1910), 190 sqq.; HUMMELAUER, *Commentarius in Genesim* (Paris, 1908), 317 sqq.; A LAPIDE, *Commentaria in Scrip. Sac.* I (Paris, 1869), 166 sqq.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

Neocæsarea, a titular see, suffragan of Hierapolis in the Patriarchate of Antioch, sometimes called Cæsarea, as in "Georgii Cyprii Descriptio orbis romani" (ed. Gelzer, 1882). Among its bishops were Paul, whose hands were burned by order of Licinius and who attended the Council of Nicæa in 325 (Theodoret, "Hist. eccl.", I, VII); Meletius, opposed to the Council of Ephesus in 431; Patricius (451) and John (553). In the sixth-century "Notitia episcopatuum" of Anastasius (Echos d'Orient, Paris, X, 145) this see is mentioned as a suffragan of Hierapolis. According to Procopius (De Ædificiis II, 9), Justinian accomplished great things there. Neocæsarea was a fort on the Euphrates, not far from Zeugma. Chabot thinks its site was the actual ruins of Balkiz (La frontière de l'Euphrate de Pompée à la conquête arabe, Paris, 1907, 278 sq.).

LE QUIEN, *Oriens christianus*, II (Paris, 1741), 947; GELZER, *Georgii Cyprii Descriptio orbis romani* (Leipzig), 151; CHABOT, *Journal asiatique*, II (Paris, 1900), 279 sq.

S. VAILHÉ.

Neocæsarea, a titular see of Pontus Polemoniacus, at first called Cabira, one of the favourite residences of Mithridates the Great, who built a palace there, and later of King Polemon and his successors. Pompey made it a city and gave it the name of Diopolis, while Pythodoris, widow of Polemon, made it her capital and called it Sebaste. It is not known precisely when it assumed the name of Neocæsarea mentioned for the first time in Pliny, "Hist. Nat.", VI, III, 1, but judging from its coins, one might suppose that it was during the reign of Tiberius. It became the civil and religious metropolis of Pontus. We know that about 240, when Gregory Thaumaturgus was consecrated bishop of his native city, Neocæsarea had but seventeen Christians and that at his death (270) it counted only seventeen pagans. In 315 a great council was held there, the acts of which are still extant. In 344 the city was completely destroyed by an earthquake (Hieronymus, "Chron.", anno 2362), meeting a similar fate in 499 (Theodorus Lector, II, 54). During the Middle Ages the Mussulmans and Christians disputed the possession of Neocæsarea, and in 1068 a Seljuk general, Melik-Ghazi, whose tomb is still visible, captured and pillaged it; later, in 1397, it passed, together with the whole district, under the sway of the Ottomans. Being early placed at the head of an ecclesiastical province, Neocæsarea had four suffragan sees about 640 ("Ecthesis" of pseudo-Epiphanius, ed. Gelzer, 539), retaining them until the tenth century, when Trebizond obtained its independence and, by degrees, the other three suffragans were suppressed. In 1391 the Archdiocese of Neocæsarea was confided to the metropolitan of Trebizond (Miklosich and Müller, "Acta", II, 154). About 1400 there was, however, a regular metropolitan (op. cit., II, 312) and there is still, but he resides at Ordou. Among the twenty-seven bishops of this city mentioned by Le Quien, the most noted are St. Gregory Thaumaturgus and St. Thomas, a martyr of the ninth century. Neocæsarea, now called Niksar, is a small city of 4000 inhabitants in the sanjak of Tokat and the vilayet of

Sivas, with a Greek and an Armenian church, both of which are schismatic.

SMITH, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography* (London, 1870), I, 462, II, 418, s. v. *Cabira et Neocæsareia;* LE QUIEN, *Oriens christianus*, I (Paris, 1741), 499–508; CUINET, *La Turquie d'Asie*, I (Paris, 1892), 733–35; CUMONT, *Studia Pontica* (Brussels, 1906), 259–273.

S. VAILHÉ.

Neophyte (*νεόφυτοι*, the newly planted, i. e. incorporated with the mystic Body of Christ), a term applied in theology to all those who have lately entered upon a new and higher state or condition of life, e. g. those who have begun the ecclesiastical life, or have joined a religious order. More particularly is it used of those who, lately converted from heathenism, have, by the sacrament of Baptism, been transplanted into the higher life of the Church. From very early times there have been prohibitions against neophytes in this last sense being promoted too quickly to Holy Orders and to positions of responsibility in the Church. Thus the Council of Nicæa in its second canon lays down rules on this subject, on the ground that some time is necessary for the state of a Catechumen and for fuller probation after baptism; for the Apostolic decree is clear which says, "Not a neophyte, lest being puffed up with pride, he fall into the judgment of the devil" (I Tim., iii, 6). The period which should elapse after conversion before promotion is not fixed but (Bened. XIV, "De syn.", vii, 65–6) is left to the discretion of the bishop and will vary with the individual case. (See DIVORCE, sub-title *Pauline Privilege.*)

BENEDICT XIV, *De Syn. Dioc.*, Lib. XIII, cap. xl; FERRARIS, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, s. v.; MIGNE, *Dictionnaire de Discipline Ecclésiastique*, s. v.; *Corpus Juris Canon.*, and in general the Manuals of Moral Theology.

ARTHUR S. BARNES.

Neo-Platonism, a system of idealistic, spiritualistic philosophy, tending towards mysticism, which flourished in the pagan world of Greece and Rome during the first centuries of the Christian era. It is of interest and importance, not merely because it is the last attempt of Greek thought to rehabilitate itself and restore its exhausted vitality by recourse to Oriental religious ideas, but also because it definitely entered the service of pagan polytheism and was used as a weapon against Christianity. It derives its name from the fact that its first representatives drew their inspiration from Plato's doctrines, although it is well known that many of the treatises on which they relied are not genuine works of Plato. It originated in Egypt, a circumstance which would, of itself, indicate that while the system was a characteristic product of the Hellenic spirit, it was largely influenced by the religious ideals and mystic tendencies of Oriental thought.

To understand the neo-Platonic system in itself, as well as to appreciate the attitude of Christianity towards it, it is necessary to explain the two-fold purpose which actuated its founders. On the one hand, philosophical thought in the Hellenic world had proved itself inadequate to the task of moral and religious regeneration. Stoicism, Epicureanism, Eclecticism and even Scepticism had each been set the task of "making men happy", and each had in turn failed. Then came the thought that Plato's idealism and the religious forces of the Orient might well be united in one philosophical movement which would give definiteness, homogeneity, and unity of purpose to all the efforts of the pagan world to rescue itself from impending ruin. On the other hand, the strength and, from the pagan point of view, the aggressiveness of Christianity began to be realized. It became necessary, in the intellectual world, to impose on the Christians by showing that Paganism was not entirely bankrupt, and, in the political world, to rehabilitate the official polytheism of the State by furnishing an interpretation of it, that should be acceptable in philosophy. Speculative Stoicism had reduced the gods to personifications of natural forces; Aristotle had definitely denied their existence; Plato had sneered at them. It was time, therefore, that the growing prestige of Christianity should be offset by a philosophy which, claiming the authority of Plato, whom the Christians revered, should not only retain the gods but make them an essential part of a philosophical system. Such was the origin of neo-Platonism. It should, however, be added that, while the philosophy which sprang from these sources was Platonic, it did not disdain to appropriate to itself elements of Aristoteleanism and even Epicureanism, which it articulated into a Syncretic system.

I. FORERUNNERS OF NEO-PLATONISM.—Among the more or less eclectic Platonists who are regarded as forerunners of the neo-Platonic school, the most important are Plutarch, Maximus, Apuleius, Ænesidemus, Numenius. The last-mentioned, who flourished towards the end of the second century of the Christian era, had a direct and immediate influence on Plotinus, the first systematic neo-Platonist. He taught that there are three gods, the Father, the Maker (Demiurgos), and the World. Philo the Jew (see PHILO JUDÆUS), who flourished in the middle of the first century, was also a forerunner of neo-Platonism, although it is difficult to say whether his doctrine of the mediation of the Logos had a direct influence on Plotinus.

II. *Ammonius Saccas*, a porter on the docks at Alexandria, is regarded as the founder of the neo-Platonic school. Since he left no writings, it is impossible to say what his doctrines were. We know, however, that he had an extraordinary influence over men like Plotinus and Origen, who willingly abandoned the professional teachers of philosophy to listen to his discourses on wisdom. According to Eusebius, he was born of Christian parents, but reverted to paganism. The date of his birth is given as 242.

III. *Plotinus*, a native of Lycopolis in Egypt, who lived from 205 to 270 was the first systematic philosopher of the school. When he was twenty-eight years old he was taken by a friend to hear Ammonius, and thenceforth for eleven years he continued to profit by the lectures of the porter. At the end of the first discourse which he heard, he exclaimed: "This man is the man of whom I was in search." In 242 he accompanied the Emperor Gordian to Mesopotamia, intending to go to Persia. In 244 he went to Rome, where, for ten years, he taught philosophy, counting among his hearers and admirers the Emperor Gallienus and his wife Salonina. In 263 he retired to Campania with some of his disciples, including Porphyry, and there he died in 270. His works, consisting of fifty-four treatises, were edited by Porphyry in six groups of nine. Hence they are known as the "Enneads". The "Enneads" were first published in a Latin translation by Marsilius Ficinus (Florence, 1492); of recent editions the best are Breuzer and Moser's (Oxford, 1855), and Kirchoff's (Leipzig, 1856). Parts of the "Enneads" are translated into English by Taylor (London, 1787–1817).

Plotinus' starting-point is that of the idealist. He meets what he considers the paradox of materialism, the assertion, namely, that matter alone exists, by an emphatic assertion of the existence of spirit. If the soul is spirit, it follows that it cannot have originated from the body or an aggregation of bodies. The true source of reality is above us, not beneath us. It is the One, the Absolute, the Infinite. It is God. God exceeds all the categories of finite thought. It is not correct to say that He is a Being, or a Mind. He is over-Being, over-Mind. The only attributes which may be appropriately applied to Him are Good and One. If God were only One, He should remain forever in His undifferentiated unity, and there should be nothing but God. He is, however, good; and goodness, like light, tends to diffuse itself. Thus, from the One, there emanates in the first place Intellect (*Noûs*), which is the image of the One, and at the same time a

partially differentiated derivative, because it is the world of ideas, in which are the multiple archetypes of things. From the intellect emanates an image in which there is a tendency to dynamic differentiation, namely the World-Soul, which is the abode of forces, as the Intellect is the abode of Ideas. From the World-Soul emanate the Forces (one of which is the human soul), which by a series of successive degradations towards nothing become finally Matter, the non-existent, the antithesis of God. All this process is called an emanation, or flowing. It is described in figurative language, and thus its precise philosophical value is not determined. Similarly the One, God, is described as light, and Matter is said to be darkness. Matter, is, in fact, for Plotinus, essentially the opposite of the Good; it is evil, and the source of all evil. It is unreality and wherever it is present, there is not only a lack of goodness but also a lack of reality. God alone is free from Matter; He alone is Light; He alone is fully real. Everywhere there is partial differentiation, partial darkness, partial unreality; in the Intellect, in the World-Soul, in Souls, in the material universe. God, the reality, the spiritual, is, therefore, contrasted with the world, the unreal, the material. God is noumenon, everything else is appearance, or phenomenon.

Man, being composed of body and soul, is partly, like God, spiritual, and partly like matter, the opposite of spiritual. It is his duty to aim at returning to God by eliminating from his being, his thoughts, and his actions, everything that is material and, therefore, tends to separate him from God. The soul came from God. It existed before its union with the body; its survival after death is, therefore, hardly in need of proof. It will return to God by way of knowledge, because that which separates it from God is matter and material conditions, which are only illusions or deceptive appearances. The first step, therefore, in the return of the soul to God is the act by which the soul, withdrawing from the world of sense by a process of purification (*κάθαρσις*), frees itself from the trammels of matter. Next, having retired within itself, the soul contemplates within itself the indwelling intellect. From the contemplation of the Intellect within, it rises to a contemplation of the Intellect above, and from that to the contemplation of the One. It cannot, however, reach this final stage except by revelation, that is, by the free act of God, Who, shedding around Him the light of His own greatness, sends into the soul of the philosopher and saint a special light which enables it to see God Himself. This intuition of the One so fills the soul that it excludes all consciousness and feeling, reduces the mind to a state of utter passivity, and renders possible the union of man with God. The ecstasy (*ἔκστασις*) by which this union is attained is man's supreme happiness, the goal of all his endeavour, the fulfilment of his destiny. It is a happiness which receives no increase by continuance of time. Once the philosopher-saint has attained it, he becomes confirmed, so to speak, in grace. Henceforth forever, he is a spiritual being, a man of God, a prophet, and a wonder-worker. He commands all the powers of nature, and even bends to his will the demons themselves. He sees into the future, and in a sense shares the vision, as he shares the life, of God.

IV. *Porphyry*, who in beauty and lucidity of style excels all the other followers of Plotinus, and who is distinguished also by the bitterness of his opposition to Christianity, was born A. D. 233, probably at Tyre. After having studied at Athens, he visited Rome and there became a devoted disciple of Plotinus, whom he accompanied to Campania in 263. He died about the year 303. Of his work "Against the Christians" only a few fragments, preserved in the works of the Christian Apologists, have come down to us. From these it appears that he directed his attack along the lines of what we should now call historical criticism of the Old Testament and the comparative study of religions. His work "De Antro Nympharum" is an elaborate allegorical interpretation and defence of pagan mythology. His *Ἀφορμαί* (Sentences) is an exposition of Plotinus's philosophy. His biographical writings included "Lives" of Pythagoras and Plotinus in which he strove to show that these "god-sent" men were not only models of philosophic sanctity but also *θαυματουργοί*, or "wonder-workers", endowed with theurgic powers. The best known of all his works is a logical treatise entitled *εἰσαγωγή*, or "Introduction to the Categories of Aristotle". In a Latin translation made by Boethius, this work was very widely used in the early Middle Ages, and exerted considerable influence on the growth of Scholasticism. It is, as is well known, a passage in this "Isagoge" that is said to have given occasion to the celebrated controversy concerning universals in the eleventh and twelth centuries. In his expository works on the philosophy of Plotinus, Porphyry lays great stress on the importance of theurgic practices. He holds, of course, that the practices of asceticism are the starting-point on the road to perfection. One must begin the process of perfection by "thinning out the veil of matter" (the body), which stands between the soul and spiritual things. Then, as a means of further advancement, one must cultivate self-contemplation. Once the stage of self-contemplation is attained, further progress towards perfection is dependent on the consultation of oracles, divination, bloodless sacrifices to the superior gods and bloody sacrifices to demons, or inferior powers.

V. *Iamblichus*, a native of Syria, who was a pupil of Porphyry in Italy, and died about the year 330, while inferior to his teacher in power of exposition, seemed to have a firmer grasp of the speculative principles of neo-Platonism and modified more profoundly the metaphysical doctrines of the school. His works bear the comprehensive title "Summary of Pythagorean Doctrines". Whether he or a disciple of his is the author of the treatise "De Mysteriis Ægyptiorum" (first pub. by Gale, Oxford, 1678, and afterwards by Parthey, Berlin, 1857), the book is a product of his school and proves that he, like Porphyry, emphasized the magic, or theurgic, factor in the neo-Platonic scheme of salvation. As regards the speculative side of Plotinus's system, he devoted attention to the doctrine of emanation, which he modified in the direction of completeness and greater consistency. The precise nature of the modification is not clear. It is safe, however, to say that, in a general way, he forestalled the effort of Proclus to distinguish three subordinate "moments", or stages, in the process of emanation.

While these philosophical defenders of neo-Platonism were directing their attacks against Christianity, representatives of the school in the more practical walks of life, and even in high places of authority, carried on a more effective warfare in the name of the school. Hierocles, pro-consul of Bithynia during the reign of Diocletian (284–305), not only persecuted the Christians of his province, but wrote a work, now lost, entitled "The discourse of a Lover of Truth, against the Christians", setting up the rival claims of neo-Platonic philosophy. He, like Julian the Apostate, Celsus (q.v.), and others, was roused to activity chiefly by the claim which Christianity made to be, not a national religion like Judaism, but a world-wide, or universal, religion. Julian sums up the case of philosophy against Christianity thus: "Divine Government is not through a special society (such as the Christian Church) teaching an authoritative doctrine, but through the order of the visible universe and all the variety of civic and national institutions. The underlying harmony of these is to be sought out by free examination, which is philosophy" (Whittaker, "Neo-Platonists", p. 155). It is in the light of this principle of public policy that we must view the attempt of Iamblichus to furnish a

systematic defence of Polytheism. Above the One, he says, is the Absolutely First. From the One, which is thus itself a derivative, comes intellect, which, as the Intellectual and the Intelligible, is essentially dual. Both the Intellectual and the Intelligible are divided into triads, which are the superterrestrial gods. Beneath these and subordinate to them, are the terrestrial gods whom he subdivides into three hundred and sixty celestial beings, seventy-two orders of sub-celestial gods, and forty-two orders of natural gods. Next to these are the semi-divine heroes of mythology and the philosopher-saints such as Pythagoras and Plotinus. From this it is evident that neo-Platonism had by this time ceased to be a purely academic question. It had entered very vigorously into the contest waged against Christianity. At the same time, it had not ceased to be the one force which could claim to unify the surviving remnants of pagan culture. As such, it appealed to the woman-philosopher Hypatia, whose fate at the hands of a Christian mob at Alexandria, in the year 422, was cast up as a reproach to the Christians (see CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA). Among the contemporaries of Hypatia at Alexandria was another Hierocles, author of a commentary on the Pythagorean "Golden Verses".

VI. *Proclus*, the most systematic of all the neo-Platonists, and for that reason known as "the scholastic of neo-Platonism," is the principal representative of a phase of philosophic thought which developed at Athens during the fifth century, and lasted down to the year 529, when, by an edict of Justinian, the philosophical schools at Athens were closed. The founder of the Athenian school was Plutarch, surnamed the Great (not Plutarch of Chæronea, author of the "Lives of Illustrious men"), who died in 431. His most distinguished scholar was Proclus, who was born at Constantinople in 410, studied Aristotelean logic at Alexandria, and about the year 430 became a pupil of Plutarch at Athens. He died at Athens in 485. He is the author of several Commentaries on Plato, of a collection of hymns to the gods, of many works on mathematics, and of philosophical treatises, the most important of which are: "Theological Elements," *στοιχείωσις θεολογική*, printed in the Paris ed. of Plotinus's works); "Platonic Theology" (printed, 1618, in a Latin translation by Æmilius Portus); shorter treatises on Fate, on Evil, on Providence, etc., which exist only in a Latin translation made by William of Moerbeka in the thirteenth century. These are collected in Cousin's edition, "Procli Opera", Paris, 1820–25. Proclus attempted to systematize and synthesize the various elements of neo-Platonism by means of Aristotelean logic. The cardinal principle on which his attempt rests is the doctrine, already foreshadowed by Iamblichus and others, that in the process of emanation there are always three subordinate stages, or moments, namely the original (*μονή*), emergence from the original (*πρόοδος*), and return to the original (*ἐπιστροφή*). The reason of this principle is enunciated as follows: the derived is at once unlike the original and like it; its unlikeness is the cause of its derivation, and its likeness is the cause, or reason, of the tendency to return. All emanation is, therefore, serial. It constitutes a "chain" from the One down to the antithesis of the One, which is matter. By the first emanation from the One come the "henades", the supreme gods who exercise providence over worldly affairs; from the henades comes the "triad", intelligible, intelligible-intellectual, and intellectual, corresponding to being, life, and thought; each of these is, in turn, the origin of a "hebdomad", a series corresponding to the chief divinities of the pagan pantheon: from these are derived "forces", or "souls", which alone are operative in nature, although, since they are the lowest derivatives, their efficacy is least. Matter, the antithesis of the One, is inert, dead, and can be the cause of nothing except imperfection, error, and moral evil. The birth of a human being is the descent of a soul into matter. The soul, however, may ascend, and redescend in another birth. The ascension of the soul is brought about by asceticism, contemplation, and the invocation of the superior powers by magic, divination, oracles, miracles, etc.

VII. *The Last Neo-Platonists.*—Proclus was the last great representative of neo-Platonism. His disciple, Marinus, was the teacher of Damascius, who represented the school at the time of its suppression by Justinian in 529. Damascius was accompanied in his exile to Persia by Simplicius, celebrated as a neo-Platonic commentator. About the middle of the sixth century John Philoponus and Olympiodorus flourished at Alexandria as exponents of neo-Platonism. They were, like Simplicius, commentators. When they became Christians, the career of the School of Plato came to an end. The name of Olympiodorus is the last in the long line of scholarchs which began with Speusippus, the disciple and nephew of Plato.

VIII. *Influence of Neo-Platonism.*—Christian thinkers, almost from the beginning of Christian speculation, found in the spiritualism of Plato a powerful aid in defending and maintaining a conception of the human soul which pagan materialism rejected, but to which the Christian Church was irrevocably committed. All the early refutations of psychological materialism are Platonic. So, too, when the ideas of Plotinus began to prevail, the Christian writers took advantage of the support thus lent to the doctrine that there is a spiritual world more real than the world of matter. Later, there were Christian philosophers, like Nemesius (flourished c. 450), who took over the entire system of neo-Platonism so far as it was considered consonant with Christian dogma. The same may be said of Synesius (Bishop of Ptolemais, c. 410), except that he, having been a pagan, did not, even after his conversion, give up the notion that neo-Platonism had value as a force which unified the various factors in pagan culture. At the same time there were elements in neo-Platonism which appealed very strongly to the heretics, especially to the Gnostics, and these elements were more and more strongly accentuated in heretical systems; so that St. Augustine, who knew the writings of Plotinus in a Latin translation, was obliged to exclude from his interpretation of Platonism many of the tenets which characterized the neo-Platonic school. In this way, he came to profess a Platonism which in many respects is nearer to the doctrine of Plato's "Dialogues" than is the philosophy of Plotinus and Proclus. The Christian writer whose neo-Platonism had the widest influence in later times, and who also reproduced most faithfully the doctrines of the school, is the Pseudo-Dionysius (see DIONYSIUS, THE PSEUDO-AREOPAGITE). The works "De Divinis Nominibus", "De hierarchia cœlesti", etc., are now admitted to have been written at the end of the fifth, or during the first decades of the sixth, century. They are from the pen of a Christian Platonist, a disciple of Proclus, probably an immediate pupil of that teacher, as is clear from the fact that they embody, not only Proclus's ideas, but even lengthy passages from his writings. The author, whether intentionally on his part, or by some mistake on the part of his readers, came to be identified with Dionysius who is mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles as a convert of St. Paul. Later, especially in France, he was further identified with Dionysius the first Bishop of Paris. Thus it came about that the works of the Pseudo-Areopagite, after having been used in the East, first by the Monophysites and later by the Catholics, became known in the West and exerted a widespread influence all through the Middle Ages. They were translated into Latin by John Scotus Eriugena about the middle of the ninth century, and in this form were studied and commented on, not only by mystic writers, such as the Victorines, but also by the typical representatives of

Scholasticism, such as St. Thomas Aquinas. None of the later scholastics, however, went the full length of adopting the metaphysics of the Pseudo-Areopagite in its essential principles, as did John Scotus Eriugena in his "De divisione naturæ".

After the suppression of the Athenian school of philosophy by Justinian in 529, the representatives of neo-Platonism went, as we have seen, to Persia. They did not remain long in that country. Another exodus, however, had more permanent consequences. A number of Greek neo-Platonists who settled in Syria carried with them the works of Plato and Aristotle, which, having been translated into Syriac, were afterwards translated into Arabic, Hebrew, and Latin, and thus, towards the middle of the twelfth century, began to re-enter Christian Europe through Moorish Spain. These translations were accompanied by commentaries which continued the neo-Platonic tradition commenced by Simplicius. At the same time a number of anonymous philosophical works, written for the most part under the influence of the school of Proclus, some of which were ascribed to Aristotle, began to be known in Christian Europe, and were not without influence on Scholasticism. Again, works like the "Fons vitæ" of Avicebrol, which were known to be of Jewish or Arabian origin, were neo-Platonic, and helped to determine the doctrines of the scholastics. For example, Scotus's doctrine of *materia primo-prima* is acknowledged by Scotus himself to be derived from Avicebrol. Notwithstanding all these facts, Scholastic philosophy was in spirit and in method Aristotelean; it explicitly rejected many of the neo-Platonic interpretations, such as the unity of the Active Intellect. For this reason all unprejudiced critics agree that it is an exaggeration to describe the whole Scholastic movement as merely an episode in the history of neo-Platonism. In recent times this exaggerated view has been defended by M. Picavet in his "Esquisse d'une histoire comparée des philosophies médiévales" (Paris, 1907).

The neo-Platonic elements in Dante's "Paradiso" have their origin in his interpretation of the scholastics. It was not until the rise of Humanism in the fifteenth century that the works of Plotinus and Proclus were translated and studied with that zeal which characterized the Platonists of the Renaissance. It was then, too, that the theurgic, or magic, elements in neo-Platonism were made popular. The same tendency is found in Bruno's "Eroici Furori", interpreting Plotinus in the direction of materialistic Pantheism. The active rejection of Materialism by the Cambridge Platonists in the seventeenth century carried with it a revival of interest in the neo-Platonists. An echo of this appears in Berkeley's "Siris", the last phase of his opposition to materialism. Whatever neo-Platonic elements are recognizable in the transcendentalists, such as Schelling and Hegel, can hardly be cited as survivals of philosophical principles. They are rather inspirational influences, such as we find in Platonizing poets like Spenser and Shelley.

Creuzer and Moser, edd., *Plotini opera* (Oxford, 1835), tr. Taylor (London, 1794–1817); Johnson (tr.), *Three Treatises of Plotinus* (Osceola, Missouri, 1880); Cousin, *Procli Opera* (Paris, 1864), tr. Taylor (London, 1789 and 1825); Nauck ed., *Porphyrii Opuscula* (Leipzig, 1860 and 1886), tr. Taylor; Idem, tr. (London, 1823); Whittaker, *The Neo-Platonists* (Cambridge, 1901); Bigg, *The Christian Neo-Platonists of Alexandria* (Oxford, 1886); *Neo-Platonism* (London, 1895); Vacherot, *L'Ecole d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1846–1851); Simon, *Histoire de l'école d'Alexandrie* (Paris, 1843–45); Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, III (4th ed., Leipzig, 1903), 2,468 sqq.; Turner, *History of Philosophy* (Boston, 1903), 205 sqq.

William Turner.

Neo-Pythagorean Philosophy.—The ethico-religious society founded by Pythagoras, which flourished especially in Magna Græcia in the fifth century B. C., disappears completely from history during the fourth century, when philosophy reached the zenith of its perfection at Athens. Here and there, however, there appears a philosopher who reverts to the Pythagorean doctrine of numbers, and in a general way manifests the tendency of the school towards religious ethics and the practices of asceticism. Beginning with the middle of the first century B. C., a more systematic attempt was made to restore the speculative philosophy of the Pythagoreans and combine it with the practice of astrology and sorcery. The first of these systematic neo-Pythagoreans was Figulus, a Roman philosopher who lived at Alexandria about the middle of the first century B. C., and was a friend of Cicero. Other Romans also contributed to the movement, the chief of whom were Vatinius and the Sextians. It was, however, at Alexandria that the most influential of the neo-Pythagoreans taught. In the second and third centuries of the Christian era, the philosophers of the school became, so to speak, apostles of the cult, and travelled throughout the Roman Empire. The names most prominently associated with this active philosophical campaign are those of Moderatus of Gades, Apollonius of Tyana, Nicomachus of Gerasa, Numenius, and Philostratus. Like the neo-Platonists (see Neo-Platonism), the neo-Pythagoreans definitely placed their philosophy at the disposal of the pagan opponents of Christianity. Their original aim—to save the pagan world from moral and social ruin by the introduction of the religious element into philosophy and into conduct—was, of course, conceived without any reference to the claims of Christianity. But as soon as the Christian religion came to be recognized as a factor in the intellectual and political life of the Roman Empire, philosophy, in the form of Neo-Pythagoreanism, made active campaign against the Christians, proclaimed its own system of spiritual regeneration, and set up in opposition to Christ and the Saints the heroes of philosophical tradition and legend, especially Pythagoras and Apollonius of Tyana.

Speculative System.—The neo-Pythagoreans were methodical eclectics. They admitted into their speculative system not only the traditional teachings of the Pythagorean school but also elements of Platonism, Aristoteleanism, and Stoicism. Besides, they derived from Oriental religions with which they were in contact at Rome as well as at Alexandria, a highly spiritual notion of God. There was, naturally, very little coherence in a system developed from principles so divergent. Neither was there agreement in the school even in respect of fundamental tenets. Nevertheless, it may, in general, be said that the school placed God, the supremely spiritual One, at the head of all reality. This, of course, was Oriental in its origin. Next, they interpreted the Pythagorean doctrine in a Platonic sense, when they taught that numbers are the thoughts of God. Thirdly, borrowing from Stoicism, they went on to maintain that numbers, emanating as forces from the divine thoughts, are, not indeed the substance of things, but the forms according to which things are fashioned. From Aristotle they borrowed the doctrine that the world is eternal and that there is a distinction between terrestrial and celestial matter. Their cosmology, in spite of this Aristotelean influence, is dominated to a great extent by the belief that the stars are deities and that the powers of air, earth, and sky are demons.

Ethics and Religion.—In their theory of conduct the neo-Pythagoreans attach great importance to personal asceticism, contemplation, and the worship of a purely spiritual deity. At the same time, it is an essential part of their ethical system that freedom from the trammels of matter and final union with God are to be obtained only by invoking the aid of friendly spirits and God-sent men and by thwarting the efforts of malign demons. This latter principle led to the practice of magic and sorcery and eventually to a good deal of charlatanry. The principle that the friendly spirits and the souls of God's special messengers aid

men in the struggle for spiritual perfection led to the practice of honouring and even deifying the heroes of antiquity and the representatives of wisdom such as Pythagoras and Apollonius. With this purpose in view the philosophers of this school wrote "Lives" of Pythagoras which are full of fabulous tales, stories in which more than natural wisdom, skill, and sanctity are attributed to the hero. They did not hesitate to invent where exaggeration failed to accomplish their aim, so that they gave only too much justification to the modern critic's description of their biographical activity as representing the "Golden Age of Apocryphal literature". In this spirit and with this purpose in view Philostratus, about the year A. D. 220, wrote a "Life of Apollonius" which is of special importance because, while it is not a professed imitation of the Gospels, it was evidently written with a view of rivalling the gospel narrative. Apollonius was born at Tyana in Cappadocia four years before the Christian era. At an early age he devoted himself under various masters, to the study of philosophy and the practice of asceticism. After the five years of silence imposed by the rule of Pythagoras, he began his journeys. Throughout Asia Minor he travelled from city to city teaching the doctrines of the sect. Then he journeyed to the far East in search of the wisdom of the magi and the brahmans, and, after his return, took up once more the task of teaching. Later he went to Greece, and thence to Rome, where he lived for a time under the emperor Nero. In 69 he was at Alexandria, where he attracted the attention of Vespasian. Summoned to Rome by Domitian, he was cast into prison, but escaped to Greece, and died two years later. The place of his death is variously given as Ephesus, Rhodes, and Crete. Into the framework of these facts Philostratus weaves a tissue of alleged miraculous events, prophecies, visions, and prodigies of various kinds. It is important to remark in criticism of Philostratus's narrative, that he lived one hundred years after the events which he describes. Moreover, according to Philostratus's own account, Apollonius did not lay claim to divine prerogatives. He believed that the "virtue" which he possessed was to be attributed to his knowledge of Pythagorean philosophy and his observance of its prescriptions. He held as a general principle that anyone who attained the same degree of wisdom and asceticism could acquire the same power. The parallel, therefore, which was drawn between his extraordinary deeds and the miracles narrated in the Gospels does not stand the verdict of criticism. Our Lord claimed to be God, and appealed to His miracles as a proof of His divinity. Apollonius regarded his own powers as natural. Finally, it should be remembered that the Pythagorean biographers openly acknowledged "the principle of permitting exaggeration and deceit in the cause of philosophy" (Newman). The "Lives" of Pythagoras and Apollonius are to be judged by the standards of fiction and not by the canons of historical criticism. Among those who, overlooking this distinction, have tried to make capital against Christianity out of this class of Pythagorean literature are Lord Herbert and Blount, mentioned in Newman's essay on Apollonius, and Jean de Castillon, who was instigated by Frederick the Great.

Philostratus's *Life of Apollonius*, and the *Letters* ascribed to the latter were published in PHILOSTRATUS, *Opera Omnia* (Leipzig, ed. OLEARIUS, 1709); *Ibid.* (ed. KAYSER, 1870–71); the works of NICOMACHUS OF GERASA are included in IAMBLICHUS, *Theologumena Arithmeticæ* (ed. AST, Leipzig, 1817); ZELLER, *Philosophie der Griechen*, III, 2 (3rd ed., Leipzig, 1881), 79 ff.; NEWMAN, *Historical Sketches*, I (London, 1882), 301 ff.; TURNER, *History of Philosophy* (Boston, 1903), 204 ff.

WILLIAM TURNER.

Neo-Scholasticism.—THE NAME AND ITS MEANING.—Neo-Scholasticism is the development of the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages during the latter half of the nineteenth century. It is not merely the resuscitation of a philosophy long since defunct, but rather a restatement in our own day of the *philosophia perennis* which, elaborated by the Greeks and brought to perfection by the great medieval teachers, has never ceased to exist even in modern times. It has sometimes been called neo-Thomism partly because St. Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century gave to Scholasticism among the Latins its final form, partly because the idea has gained ground that only Thomism can infuse vitality into twentieth century scholasticism. But Thomism is too narrow a term; the system itself is too large and comprehensive to be expressed by the name of any single exponent.

This article will deal with the elements which neo-Scholasticism takes over from the past; the modifications which adapt it to the present; the welcome accorded it by contemporary thought and the outlook for its future; its leading representatives and centres; its bibliography.

I. TRADITIONAL ELEMENTS. — Neo-Scholasticism seeks to restore the fundamental organic doctrines embodied in the Scholasticism of the thirteenth century. It claims that philosophy does not vary with each passing phase of history; that the truth of seven hundred years ago is still true to-day, and that if the great medieval thinkers—Aquinas, Bonaventure, and Duns Scotus—succeeded in constructing a sound philosophical system on the data supplied by the Greeks, especially by Aristotle, it must be possible, in our own day, to gather from the speculation of the Middle Ages the soul of truth which it contains. These essential conceptions may be summarized as follows:

(1) God, pure actuality and absolute perfection, is substantially distinct from every finite thing: He alone can create and preserve all beings other than Himself. His infinite knowledge includes all that has been, is, or shall be, and likewise all that is possible.

(2) As to our knowledge of the material world: whatever exists is itself, an incommunicable, individual substance. To the core of self-sustaining reality, in the oak-tree for instance, other realities (accidents) are added—size, form, roughness, and so on. All oak-trees are alike, indeed are identical in respect of certain constituent elements. Considering this likeness and even identity, our human intelligence groups them into one species and again, in view of their common characteristics, it ranges various species under one genus. Such is the Aristotelean solution of the problem of universals (q. v.). Each substance is in its nature fixed and determined; and nothing is farther from the spirit of Scholasticism than a theory of evolution which would regard even the essences of things as products of change.

But this statism requires as its complement a moderate dynamism, and this is supplied by the central concepts of act and potency. Whatsoever changes is, just for that reason, limited. The oak-tree passes through a process of growth, of becoming: whatever is actually in it now was potentially in it from the beginning. Its vital functions go on unceasingly (accidental change); but the tree itself will die, and out of its decayed trunk other substances will come forth (substantial change). The theory of matter and form is simply an interpretation of the substantial changes which bodies undergo. The union of matter and form constitutes the essence of concrete being, and this essence is endowed with *existence*. Throughout all change and becoming there runs a rhythm of finality; the activities of the countless substances of the universe converge towards an end which is known to God; finality, in a word, involves optimism.

(3) Man, a compound of body (matter) and of soul (form), puts forth activities of a higher order—knowledge and volition. Through his senses he perceives concrete objects, e. g. *this* oak; through his intellect he knows the abstract and universal (*the* oak). All our intellectual activity rests on sensory function; but

through the active intellect (*intellectus agens*) an abstract representation of the sensible object is provided for the *intellectus possibilis*. Hence the characteristic of the idea, its non-materiality, and on this is based the principal argument for the spirituality and immortality of the soul. Here, too, is the foundation of logic and of the theory of knowledge, the justification of our judgments and syllogisms.

Upon knowledge follows the appetitive process, sensory or intellectual according to the sort of knowledge. The will (*appetitus intellectualis*) in certain conditions is free, and thanks to this liberty man is the master of his destiny. Like all other beings, we have an end to attain and we are morally obliged, though not compelled, to attain it.

Natural happiness would result from the full development of our powers of knowing and loving. We should find and possess God in this world since the corporeal world is the proper object of our intelligence. But above nature is the order of grace and our supernatural happiness will consist in the direct intuition of God, the beatific vision. Here philosophy ends and theology begins.

II. Adaptation to Modern Needs.—The neo-Scholastic programme includes, in the next place, the adaptation of medieval principles and doctrines to our present intellectual needs. Complete immobility is no less incompatible with progress than out-and-out relativism. *Vita in motu.* To make Scholasticism rigid and stationary would be fatal to it. The doctrines revived by the new movement are like an inherited fortune; to refuse it would be folly, but to manage it without regard to actual conditions would be worse. With Dr. Ehrhard one may say: "Aquinas should be our beacon, not our boundary" ("Der Katholicismus und das zwanzigste Jahrh. im Lichte der Kirchlichen Entwicklung der Neuzeit", Stuttgart, 1902, 252). We have now to pass in review the various factors in the situation and to see in what respect the new Scholasticism differs from the old and how far it adapts itself to our age.

(1) *Elimination of False or Useless Notions.*—Neo-Scholasticism rejects the theories of physics, celestial and terrestrial, which the Middle Ages grafted on the principles, otherwise sound enough, of cosmology and metaphysics; e. g. the perfection and superiority of astral substance, the "incorruptibility" of the heavenly bodies, their external connexion with "motor spirits", the influence of the stars on the generation of earthly beings, the four "simple" bodies, etc. It further rejects those philosophical theories which are disproved by the results of investigation; e. g. the diffusion of sensible "species" throughout a medium and their introduction into the organs of sense. Even the Scholastic ideas that have been retained are not all of equal importance; criticism and personal conviction may retrench or modify them considerably, without injury to fundamental principles.

(2) *Study of the History of Philosophy.*—The medieval scholars cultivated the history of philosophy solely with a view to its utility, i. e. as a means of gathering the deposit of truth contained in the writings of the ancients and, especially, for the purpose of refuting error and thus emphasizing the value of their own doctrine. Modern students, on the contrary, regard every human fact and achievement as in itself significant, and accordingly they treat the history of philosophy in a spirit that is more disinterested. With this new attitude, neo-Scholasticism is in full sympathy; it does its share in the work of historical reconstruction by employing critical methods; it does not attempt to condense the opinions of others into a syllogism and refute them with a phrase, nor does it commend the practice of putting whole systems into a paragraph or two in order to annihilate them with epithet or invective. Neo-Scholasticism, however, does not confine its interest to ancient and medieval philosophy; its chief concern is with present-day systems. It takes issue with them and offsets their theories of the world by a synthesis of its own. It is only by keeping in touch with actual living thought that it can claim a place in the twentieth century and command the attention of its opponents. And it has everything to gain from a discussion in which it encounters Positivism, Kantism, and other forms or tendencies of modern speculation.

(3) *Cultivation of the Sciences.*—The need of a philosophy based on science is recognized to-day by every school. Neo-Scholasticism simply follows the example of the Aristotelean and medieval philosophy in taking the data of research as the groundwork of its speculation. That there are profound differences between the Middle Ages and modern times from the scientific point of view, is obvious. One has only to consider the multiplication of the sciences in special lines, the autonomy which science as a whole has acquired, and the clear demarcation established between popular views of nature and their scientific interpretation. But it is equally plain that neo-Scholasticism must follow up each avenue of investigation, since it undertakes, as Aristotle and Aquinas did, to provide a synthetic explanation of phenomena by referring them to their ultimate causes and determining their place in the universal order of things; and this undertaking, if the synthesis is to be deep and comprehensive, presupposes a knowledge of the details furnished by each science. It is not possible to explain the world of phenomena while neglecting the phenomena that make up the world. "All that exists, as contemplated by the human mind, forms one large system or complex fact. . . . Like a short-sighted reader, its eye pores closely, and travels slowly, over the awful volume which lies open for its inspection. . . . These various partial views or abstractions . . . are called sciences . . . they proceed on the principle of a division of labour. . . . And further the comprehension of the bearings of one science on another, and the use of each to each, and the location of them all, with one another, this belongs, I conceive, to a sort of science distinct from all of them, and in some sense, a science of sciences, which is my own conception of what is meant by philosophy" (Newman, "Idea of a University", Discourse III, iii, iv, 44 sqq.).

There is, of course, the pedagogical problem; how shall philosophy maintain its control over the ever-widening field of the various sciences? In reply, we may cite the words of Cardinal Mercier, a prominent leader in the neo-Scholastic movement: "As a matter of fact", he declares, "the difficulty is a serious one, and one may say in general terms, that it is not going to be solved by any one man. As the domain of fact and observation grows larger and larger, individual effort becomes less competent to survey and master it all: hence the necessity of co-operative effort to supply what is lacking in the work of isolated investigators; hence too the need of union between the synthetic mind and the analytic, in order to secure, by daily contact and joint action, the harmonious development of philosophy and science". ("La philosophie néo-scholastique" in "Revue néo-scholastique", 1894, 17).

(4) *Innovations in Doctrinal Matters.*—Once it turned its attention to modern fashions of thought, neo-Scholasticism found itself face to face with problems of which medieval philosophy had not the slightest suspicion or at any rate did not furnish a solution. It had to bear the brunt of conflict between its own principles and those of the systems in vogue, especially of Positivism and Criticism. And it had to take up, from its own point of view, the questions which are favourite topics of discussion in the schools of our time. How far then, one may ask, has neo-Scholasticism been affected by modern thought? First of all, as to metaphysics: in the Middle Ages its claim to va-

lidity met with no challenge, whereas, in the twentieth century, its very possibility is at stake and, to defend it against the concerted attack of Hume and Kant and Comte, the true significance of such concepts as being, substance, absolute, cause, potency, and act must be explained and upheld. It is further needful to show that, in a very real sense, God is not unknowable; to rebut the charges preferred by Herbert Spencer against the traditional proofs of God's existence; to deal with the materials furnished by ethnography and the history of religions; and to study the various forms which monism and immanentism nowadays assume.

Cosmology can well afford to insist on the tradirional theory of matter and form, provided it pay due attention to the findings of physics, chemistry, crystallography, and mineralogy, and meet the objections of atomism and dynamism, theories which, in the opinion of scientific authority, are less satisfactory as explanations of natural phenomena than the hylomorphism (q. v.) of the Scholastics. The theory also of qualities, once the subject of ridicule, is nowadays endorsed by some of the most prominent scientists. In psychology especially the progressive spirit of neo-Scholasticism makes itself felt. The theory of the substantial union of body and soul, as an interpretation of biological, psychical, and psycho-physiological facts, is far more serviceable than the extreme spiritualism of Descartes on the one hand and the Positivism of modern thinkers on the other. As Wundt admits, the results of investigation in physiological psychology do not square either with materialism or with dualism whether of the Platonic or of the Cartesian type; it is only Aristotelean animism, which brings psychology into connexion with biology, that can offer a satisfactory metaphysical interpretation of experimental psychology ("Grundzüge d. physiol. Psychologie", II, 540). So vigorous indeed has been the growth of psychology that each of its offshoots is developing in its own way: such is the case with criteriology, æsthetics, didactics, pedagogy, and the numerous ramifications of applied psychology. Along these various lines, unknown to medieval philosophy, neo-Scholasticism is working energetically and successfully. Its criteriology is altogether new: the older Scholasticism handled the problem of certitude from the deductive point of view; God could not have misshaped the faculties with which He endowed the mind in order that it might attain to knowledge. Neo-Scholasticism, on the other hand, proceeds by analysis and introspection; it states the problem in the terms which, since Kant's day, are the only admissible terms, but as against the Kantian criticism it finds the solution in a rational dogmatism. Its æsthetics holds a middle course between the extreme subjectivism of many modern thinkers who would reduce the beautiful to a mere impression, and the no less extreme objectivism which the Greeks of old maintained. It is equally at home in the field of experimental psychology which investigates the correlation between conscious phenomena and their physiological accompaniments; in fact, its theory of the substantial union of body and soul implies as its corollary a "bodily resonance" corresponding to each psychical process.

The laws and principles which the modern science of education has drawn from experience find their adequate explanation in neo-Scholastic doctrine; thus, the intuitive method, so largely accepted at present as an essential element in education, is based on the Scholastic theory that nothing enters the intellect save through the avenue of sense. In the study of ethical problems, neo-Scholasticism holds fast to the vital teachings that prevailed in the thirteenth century, but at the same time it takes into account the historical and sociological data which explain the varying application of principles in successive ages. In view of contemporary systems which, on a purely experimental basis, attempt to set aside all moral imperatives and ideas of value, it is necessary to insist on the older concepts of good and evil, of finality and obligation—a need which is easily supplied by neo-Scholastic ethics. As to logic, the most perfect part of Aristotle's great constructive work and therefore that which has been least modified in the course of time, its positions still call for defence against the objections of writers like Mill, who regard the syllogism as a "solemn farce". Accordingly, with due consideration for modern modes of thinking, neo-Scholasticism adapts the teaching of the Middle Ages to actual conditions. Even as regards the relations between philosophy and religion, there are important changes to note. For the medieval mind in the Western world, philosophy and theology were identical until about the twelfth century. In the thirteenth the line of demarcation was clearly drawn, but philosophy was still treated as the preliminary training for theology. This is no longer the case; neo-Scholasticism assigns to philosophy a value of its own as a rational explanation of the world, on a par in this respect with Positivism and other systems; and it welcomes all who are bent on honest research, whether their aim be purely philosophical or apologetic.

Parallel with these modifications are those which affect the pedagogical phase of the movement. The methods of teaching philosophy in the thirteenth century were too closely dependent on the culture of that age; hence they have been replaced by modern procedures, curricula, and means of propagation. It would be ill-advised to wrap neo-Scholastic doctrine in medieval envelopes, e. g. to write books on the plan of the theological "Summæ" or the "Quodlibetal Questions" that were current in the thirteenth century. Without at all lessening its force, syllogistic demonstration gains in attractiveness when its essential characteristics are retained and clothed about with modern forms of presentation. In this connexion, the use of living languages as a means of exposition has obvious advantages and finds favour with many of those who are best qualified to judge.

III. Appreciation.—By interesting itself in modern questions, interpreting the results of scientific research and setting forth its principles for thorough discussion, neo-Scholasticism has compelled attention: it has to be reckoned with. Among non-Catholics, many leaders of thought have frankly acknowledged that its methods and doctrines deserve to be examined anew. Men like Boutroux admit that Aristotle's system may well serve as an offset to Kantism and evolution (Aristote, Etudes d'histoire et de philosophie, Paris, 1901, 202). Paulsen ("Kant der Philosoph des Protestantismus" in "Kantstudien", 1899) and Eucken ("Thomas von Aquino u. Kant, Ein Kampf zweier Welten", loc. cit., 1901) declare that neo-Thomism is the rival of Kantism and that the conflict between them is the "clash of two worlds". Harnack ("Lehrbuch d. Dogmengesch.", III, 3rd. ed., 327), Seeberg ("Realencyklopädie f. Prot. Theol." s. v. "Scholastik") and others protest against those who underrate the value of scholastic doctrine.

Among Catholics, Neo-Scholasticism gains ground day by day. It is doing away with Ontologism, Traditionalism, the Dualism of Günther, and the exaggerated Spiritualism of Descartes. It is free from the weaknesses of Pragmatism and Voluntarism, systems in which some thinkers have vainly sought the reconciliation of their philosophy and their faith. Neo-Scholasticism has a character of permanence as truth itself has; but it is destined in its development to keep up with scientific progress. Like everything that lives, it must advance; arrested growth would mean decay.

IV. The Leaders and their Work.—The Neo-Scholastic movement was inaugurated by such writers as Sanseverino (1811–65) and Cornoldi (1822–92) in Italy; Gonzalez (1831–92) in Spain; Kleutgen (1811–83) and Stöckl (1823–95) in Germany; de San (1832–

1904), Dupont, and Lepidi in Belgium; Farges and Dormet de Vorges (1910) in France, who with other scholars carried on the work of restoration before the Holy See gave it solemn approval and encouragement. Pius IX, it is true, in various letters, recognized its importance; but it was the encyclical "Æterni Patris" of Leo XIII (4 Aug., 1879) that imparted to neo-Scholasticism its definitive character and quickened its development. This document sets forth the principles by which the movement is to be guided in a progressive spirit, and by which the medieval doctrine is to take on new life in its modern environment. "If," says the pope, "there be anything that the Scholastic doctors treated with excessive subtlety or with insufficient consideration, or that is at variance with well founded teachings of later date, or is otherwise improbable, we by no means intend that it shall be proposed to our age for imitation. . . . We certainly do not blame those learned and energetic men who turn to the profit of philosophy their own assiduous labours and erudition as well as the results of modern investigation; for we are fully aware that all this goes to the advancement of knowledge."

In Italy, the movement was vigorous from the start. The Accademia di San Tommaso, founded in 1874, published, up to 1891, a review entitled "La Scienza Italiana". Numerous works were produced by Zigliara (1833–93), Satolli (1839–1909), Liberatore (1810–92), Barberis (1847–96), Schiffini (1841–1906), de Maria, Talamo, Lorenzelli, Ballerini, Matussi, and others. The Italian writers at first laid special emphasis on the metaphysical features of Scholasticism, without paying sufficient attention to the sciences or to the history of philosophy. Recently, however, this situation has undergone a change which promises excellent results.

From Italy the movement spread into the other European countries and found supporters in Germany such as Kleutgen, Stöckl, the authors of the "Philosophia Lacensis", published at Maria Laach by the Jesuits (Pesch, Hontheim, Cathrein), Gutberlet, Commer, Willmann, Kaufmann, Glossner, Grabmann, and Schneid. These scholars have made valuable contributions to the history of philosophy, especially that of the Middle Ages. Stöckl led the way with his "Geschichte d. Philosophie des Mittelalters" (Mainz, 1864–66). Ehrle and Denifle (q. v.) founded in 1885 the "Archiv für Literatur u. Kirchengesch. d. Mittelalters", and the latter edited the monumental "Chartularium" of the University of Paris. In 1891, Von Hertling and Bäumker began the publication of their "Beiträge zur Gesch. d. Phil. des Mittelalters".

Belgium has been particularly favoured. Leo XIII established (1891) at Louvain the "Institut de philosophie" for the special purpose of teaching the doctrine of St. Thomas together with history and the natural sciences. The Institute was placed in charge of Mgr (now Cardinal) Mercier whose "Cours de philosophie" has been translated into the principal languages of Europe.

In France, besides those already mentioned, Vallet, Gardair, Fonsegrive, and Piat have taken a prominent part in the movement; in Holland (Amsterdam) de Groot; in Switzerland (Freiburg), Mandonnet; in Spain, Orti y Lara, Urráburu, Gomez Izquierdo; in Mexico, Garcia; in Brazil, Santroul; in Hungary, Kiss and Pecsi; in England, Clarke, Maher, John Rickaby, Joseph Rickaby, Boedder (Stonyhurst Series); in the United States, Coppens, Poland, Brother Chrysostom, and the professors at the Catholic University (Shanahan, Turner, and Pace).

Neo-Scholasticism has been endorsed by four Catholic Congresses: Paris (1891); Brussels (1895); Freiburg (1897); Munich (1900). A considerable number of reviews have served as its exponents: "Divus Thomas" (1879–1903); "Rivista Italiana di filosofia neo-scolastica" (Florence, since 1909); "Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne" (Paris, since 1830); "Revue néo-scolastique de Philosophie" (Louvain, since 1894); "Revue de Philosophie" (Paris, since 1900); "Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques" (Kain, Belgium, since 1907); "Revue Thomiste" (Paris, since 1893); "Philosophisches Jahrbuch für Philosophie und spekulative Theologie" (Paderborn, since 1887); "St. Thomas Blätter" (Ratisbon, since 1888); Bölcseleti-Folyóirat (Budapest, since 1886); "Revista Lulliana" (Barcelona, since 1901); "Cienza Tomista" (Madrid, since 1910). In addition to these, various periodical publications not specially devoted to philosophy have given neo-Scholasticism their cordial support.

Various commentaries on the Encyclical *Æterni Patris:* Van Weddingen, *L'Encyclique de S.S. Leo XIII et la restauration de la philosophie chrétienne* (Brussels, 1880); Schneid, *Die Philosophie des hl. Thomas und ihre Bedeutung für die Gegenwart* (Würzburg, 1881); Royce, *Pope Leo's philosophical movement and its relations to modern thought* in *Rev. Cath. Pedag.* (1903); Mercier, *Les origines de la psychologie contemporaine* (2nd ed., Louvain, 1908); De Wulf, *Scholasticism old and new, an introduction to scholastic philosophy, medieval and modern*, tr. Coffey (Dublin, 1907); Idem, *Introduction à la philosophie néo-scolastique* (Louvain and Paris, 1904); Perrier, *The Revival of Scholastic Philosophy in the Nineteenth Century* (New York, 1909); *Le mouvement néo-thomiste*, periodical bulletin published in *Revue néo-scolastique de Philosophie* (Louvain); Santroul, *Was ist neu-scholastische Philosophie* (Münster, 1909); Garcia, *Tomismo y neo thomismo* (San Luis Potosi, 1905); Talamo, *Il rinnovamento del pensiero tomistico e la scienza moderna* (Siena, 1878); Frischkopf, *Die Psychologie der neuen Löwener Schule* (Lucerne, 1908); Besse, *Deux centres du mouvement thomiste, Rome et Louvain* (Louvain, 1902); Telzer, *L'Institut supérieur de philosophie 1890–1904* (Louvain, 1904); Habrich, *Die neu-scholastische Philosophie der Loewener Schule*, introduction to German tr. of Mercier, *Psychologie* (Kempten, 1906); Coffey, *Philosophy and the Sciences at Louvain*, Appendix to De Wulf's *Scholasticism Old and New;* Arnaiz Marcelliuo, *El Instituto superior de filosofia en la universidad católica de Lovaina* (Madrid, 1901); Van Becelaere, *La philosophie en Amérique depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours* (New York, 1904); Blanc, *Histoire de la philosophie et particulièrement de la philosophie contemporaine*, III (Lyons, 1896); Eucken, *Neuthomismus und die neuere Wissenschaft* in *Philosoph. Monatshefte* (1888); Idem, *Thomas von Aquino und Kant. Ein Kampf zweier Welten* in *Kantstudien* (1901); Idem, *Das Wissenschaftliches Centurum des heutigen Thomismus* (Munich, 1904); Gómez Izquierdo in *Rivista di Aragon* (1903); Conde, *Una excursión filosófica por España* in *Revista ibero-americana* (1902); Mercier, *Discours d'ouverture du cours de philosophie de S. Thomas* (Louvain, 1882); Pace, *St. Thomas and Modern Thought* in *Cath. Univ. Bulletin* (1896); Picavet, *Le mouvement néo-thomiste* in *Revue Philosophique* (1892; 1896; 1902); Viel, *Le mouvement thomiste au XIX^e siècle* in *Revue Thomiste* (1909 and 1910); *The Value of Scholastic Philosophy, Judgment of a special Committee of the Privy council of Ireland after Pleadings and evidence learned on October 13–15, 1909* (Dublin, 1909); Maher, *Psychology* (London and New York, 1905); Joyce, *Principles of Logic* (London and New York, 1908).

M. De Wulf.

Nephtali (A. V., Naphtali), sixth son of Jacob and Bala (Gen., xxx, 8). The name is explained (ibid.) by a paranomasia which causes no small perplexity to commentators. Modern interpreters, following Simonis and Gesenius, translate it "Wrestlings of God have I wrestled [D. V., "God hath compared me"] with my sister, and I have prevailed." According to this rendering, *Nephtalia* would mean "my wrestling", or simply "wrestling". Pseudo-Jonathan, commenting on Gen., xlix, 21, tells us Nephtali was the first to announce to Jacob that Joseph was alive; in another passage of the same Targum, Nephtali is mentioned among the five whom Joseph presented to Pharaoh (Gen., xlvii, 2). According to the apocryphal "Testament of the twelve Patriarchs", he died in his one hundred and thirty-second year and was buried in Egypt. These details, however, are unreliable; in point of fact, we know nothing with certainty beyond the fact that he had four sons: Jaziel, Guni, Jeser, and Sallem (Gen., xlvi, 24; Num., xxvi, 48 sqq.; I Par., vii, 13).

The Tribe of Nephtali counted 53,400 men "able to go forth to war" (Num., i, 42), being thus the sixth in importance among the tribes of Israel. The second census brought it down to the eighth place, and reported only 45,400 warriors (Num., xxvi, 48–50). During the wanderings of the Israelites in the desert, the tribe of Nephtali, under the command first of

Ahira, and later on of Phedael, was always united with the tribes of Dan and Aser. When spies were sent from the desert of Pharan to view the land of Chanaan, Nahabi, the son of Vapsi, represented the tribe in the expedition (Num., xiii, 15). The territory allotted to Nephtali in Chanaan lay to the extreme north of Palestine, and was bounded (Jos., xix, 33-34) on the north by the River Leontes (*Nahr el-Qasimiyeh*), on the east by the course of the Jordan as far as 12 miles south of the Sea of Galilee, on the west by the tribes of Aser and Zabulon; and on the south by that of Issachar. Including some of the finest land in Palestine, "it invites the most slothful to take pains to cultivate it" (Joseph., "Bell. Jud.", III, iii, 2). Naturally, the Chanaanites of that district were most unwilling to give up their rich possessions; the Book of Judges possibly even implies that the Hebrews could not overcome the natives (i, 33); in fact, foreigners were at all times numerous in that neighbourhood, called on that account "Galilee of the Gentiles" (Isa., ix, 1; IV Kings, xv, 29). Finally, they banded together under Jabin and Sisara to drive the Israelites out of the land. How this confederacy was defeated by Barac, a man of Cedes, with the warriors of Zabulon and of his own tribe, called together by Debora, to the glory of Nephtali, needs not be recounted here (Judges, iv, v). Again, with Gedeon, warriors of Nephtali took part in the pursuit of the Madianites (Judges, vii, 23), and sent to David at Hebron a contingent of 1000 captains and 37,000 men "furnished with shield and spear" (I Par., xii, 34). And the men of Nephtali, according to Josephus, guarding the "Entrance of Emath", the key to northern Palestine, were "inured to war from their infancy" ("Bell. Jud.", loc. cit.).

JOSEPHUS, *Judean Wars*, III, iii; *Commentaries on Gen., Jos., and Deut.*; MERRILL, *Galilee in the Time of Christ* (Boston, 1881); THOMSON, *The Land and the Book*, II (London, 1881); DHORME, *Les pays bibliques et l'Assyrie* in *Revue Biblique* (Apr., 1910), 195, 197; LAGRANGE, *La Prophétie de Jacob* in *Revue Biblique* (1898), 534.

CHARLES L. SOUVAY.

Nepi and Sutri (NEPESIN ET SUTRIN), united sees of the province of Rome, central Italy, in the Ciminian region. Nepi is situated on a hill of tufa, and is surrounded by great walls; its cathedral, which occupies the site of an ancient temple of Jupiter, contains paintings by Titian, Perugino, and Zuccari; the communal palace was begun by Vignola, and the fort was built by Peter Louis Farnese. There still exist at Nepi the ruins of an amphitheatre and of ancient baths, from which several statues in the Vatican museum were taken, among these the one in basalt of King Nectanabis I, with an Egyptian inscription. Nepete and Sutrium, as these cities were called, belonged to the Faliscans, who called the Romans to their assistance when the Etruscans invaded them; the invaders (389, 311, 310), after twice defeating the Romans, went beyond the Ciminian forest to attack the Etruscans in Etruscan territory; wherefore, Livy calls these towns "claustra Etruriæ"; in 382, they became Latin colonies. In the Gothic War Nepi was one of the last strongholds of the Goths. The town was sacked by the Lombards in 569, and then fell into decadence. In the eighth century, however, it became the seat of Tuto, a Lombard *dux*, known for his interference in the papal election of 768. In the struggle between the emperors and the popes, Nepi was imperialist during the reigns of Alexander II, Nicholas II, Gregory VII, and Innocent II; on the other hand, in 1160, it fought against the commune of Rome, and in 1244, was besieged by Frederick II. A feudal possession, first of the prefects of Vico, and then of the Orsinis, of the Colonnas, and of Cæsar Borgia, from 1537 to 1545, it was erected into a duchy in favour of Peter Louis Farnese; and when the latter was transferred to Parma, Nepi returned to immediate dependence on the Holy See. In 1798 the French set fire to the cathedral and to the episcopal palace, in which last edifice valuable archives were lost. The existence of an early Christian cemetery witnesses the great antiquity of the Church of Nepi, which venerates, as its evangelizer, St. Ptolemæus, who, it is claimed, was a disciple of the Apostles. In 419, Eulalius, competitor of Pope St. Boniface I, was made Bishop of Nepi; Bishop Paulus was sent as visitor to Naples by St. Gregory the Great; Bishop Stephanus, in 868, was one of the presidents and papal legates of the Council of Constantinople against Photius. The sees of Nepi and Sutri were united in 1435.

Sutri is placed, like a hanging garden, upon a steep hill on the Cassian Way; the ancient town occupied two hills connected by a bridge, and its walls, built of great tufa rocks, are yet to be seen. In the neighbourhood, there are many Etruscan tombs; the ancient amphitheatre, hewn out of the solid rock, is a remarkable work. The cathedral is of the thirteenth century, modernized by frequent alterations. Santa Maria della Grotta is an interesting church. The history of Sutri in antiquity resembles that of Nepi, for Sutri also was taken by the Lombards in 569, but was retaken by the exarch Romanus; Luitprand likewise took the town in 726, but in the following year restored it to "St. Peter". As the city is on the Cassian Way not far from Rome, it was, as a rule, the last halting-place of the German emperors on their way to the city, and sometimes they received there the papal legate. Two famous synods were held at Sutri, one in 1046, at which Sylvester II was deposed, and resigned the tiara; the other in 1059, was held against Benedict IX. Here also the agreement of 1111 between Paschal II and the emperor Henry V was concluded. In 1120, the antipope Gregory VIII withdrew to Sutri, and was besieged there by Calixtus II; he was finally delivered up to the pope by the Sutrians (1121). After this, the possession of the city was frequently contested by the Guelph counts of Anguillara and the Ghibelline prefects of Vico, especially in 1264. Sutri was contained in the Duchy of Nepi. This town also has an ancient Christian cemetery where the body of St. Romanus was found, who is the patron of the city; the cathedral possesses a statue of him by Bernini. Among the martyrs of Sutri is St. Felix (about 275). The first bishop of known date was Eusebius (465); other bishops were Martinus, or Marinus, who was sent as ambassador to Otho I in 963; Benedictus, who, in 975, became Pope Benedict VII; the famous Bishop Bonitho (Bonizo), historian of the Gregorian epoch, who was driven from his diocese by the anti-papal faction and later was made Bishop of Piacenza. The diocese was united to Nepi under Bishop Luke de Tartaris (1345); under Pomponius Cesi (1519), who became a cardinal, the cemetery of St. Savinilla was discovered; Michael Ghislieri (1556) became Pope St. Pius V; Joseph Chianti (1701) founded the seminary; Camillus Simeoni (1782) was exiled by the French and became a cardinal. In the territory of this diocese is the city of Braciano on the lake of the same name (*lacus Sabazius*); it is believed by some to be the ancient *Forum Claudii*, the bishop of which was at the council of Pope Melchiades in 303; others identify the *Forum Claudii* with Oriolo, which is in the Diocese of Viterbo. The united sees of Nepi and Sutri are immediately dependent upon Rome; they have 31 parishes, with 42,000 inhabitants, 13 religious houses of men, and 13 of women, 10 of which maintain schools.

CAPPELLETTI, *Le Chiese d'Italia*, V; RANCHIASCI, *Memorie storiche della città di Nepi, etc.* (Todi, 1845–47); NISPI-LANDI, *L'antica città di Sutri* (Rome, 1887).

U. BENIGNI.

Nepveu, FRANCIS, writer on ascetical subjects, b. at St. Malo, 29 April, 1639; entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus 12 October, 1654, when but fifteen years old. Successively professor of Grammar, of Humanities and Rhetoric for six years, and of Philos-

ophy for eight years, he was afterwards employed in the government. In 1679 he was made superior at Nantes; in 1684 rector at Vannes; in 1694 and 1700 rector at Orleans; in 1697 at Rouen; in 1704 at Rennes where he was director of retreats until his death, 17 February, 1708. Father Nepveu, described as a man of great zeal and intelligence, wrote voluminously on ascetical subjects, and some of his works have gone through many editions, having been translated into various languages. Among his more important works are numbered the following: "De l'amour de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ, et des Moyens de l'acquérir" (Nantes, 1684), has gone through no less than fourteen editions in France, selections from it were printed in the "Petite Bibliothèque Chrétienne", issued by A. Vromont, Brussels, 1893, and it has been translated into German, Italian (six editions), Spanish, Flemish, Polish, and English, ed. by the Rev. Henry J. Coleridge, S.J. and issued by Burns and Oates, 1869; "Retraite selon l'esprit et la méthode de Saint Ignace" (Paris, 1677, 514 pp.), also numbers fourteen editions of the original and translations have been made into German, Spanish, Flemish, Italian, and six editions in Latin; "Méthode facile d'oraison, réduite en pratique" (Nantes), went through more than twelve editions in French and was several times issued in Spanish; "Pensées et Réflections Chrétiennes pour tous les jours de l'année" (4 vols., Paris, 1695), had eighteen French editions, the latest by Guyot, Paris, 1850, 640 pp., and went through some eleven editions in foreign languages; "L'esprit du Christianisme ou la Conformité du Chrétien avec Jésus-Christ" (Paris, 1700, 380 pp.), went through twenty-four editions, and three editions of extracts therefrom appeared in Belgium, also translated into foreign languages, ten editions coming out in Italian. A full list of Father Nepveu's works, which numbered nearly a score, may be had in the authorities cited below.

Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, V, 1626; De Backer, *Bibliothèque des Ecrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus*, first series, 509.

Edward F. Garesché.

Nereus and Achilleus, Domitilla and Pancratius, Saints and Martyrs.—The commemoration of these four Roman saints is made by the Church on 12 May, in common, and all four are named in the Proper of the Mass as martyrs. The old Roman lists, of the fifth century, and which passed over into the Martyrologium Hieronymianum, contained the names of the two martyrs Nereus and Achilleus, whose grave was in the Catacomb of Domitilla on the Via Ardeatina; in the same calendar was found the name of St. Pancratius, whose body rested in a catacomb of the Via Aurelia. The notice in the more complete version given by the Berne Codex, runs as follows: "IIII id. Maii, Romæ in cœmeterio Prætextati natale Nerei et Achillei fratrum, et natale sci. Pancrati via Aurelia miliario secundo" (On 12 May at Rome in the cemetery of Prætextatus [an evident error for Domitilla] the natal day of Nereus and Achilleus, and the natal day of St. Pancratius, on the Aurelian Way at the second milestone"; ed. de Rossi-Duchesne, Acta SS., Nov., II, [59]). In the invocation of the Mass for their feast, in the "Sacramentarium Gelasianum", the names of Nereus and Achilleus alone are mentioned, and this is because only their invocation in the Mass was entered in the collection, the feast of St. Pancratius being celebrated in the church built over his grave on the Via Aurelia. In the Mass of his festival, the formula of which is unknown to us, his name, without doubt, was alone mentioned. In the fourth and following centuries there was celebrated on 12 May in both places, at the grave of Saints Nereus and Achilleus on the Via Ardeatina, and at that of St. Pancratius on the Via Aurelia, a special votive Mass. The Itineraries of the graves of the Roman martyrs, written in the seventh century, are unanimous in their indication of the resting-place of these saints (de Rossi, "Roma sotterranea", I, 180–83). The church which was erected in the fourth century over the grave of St. Pancratius, stands today in somewhat altered style. The legend describing the martyrdom of the saint is of later origin, and not reliable historically; it is probable that he was put to death in the persecution of Valerian (257–58) or in that of Diocletian (304–06).

The church built over the grave of Sts. Nereus and Achilleus in the Via Ardeatina, is of the latter part of the fourth century; it is a three-naved basilica, and was discovered by de Rossi in the Catacomb of Domitilla. Amongst the numerous objects found in the ruins were two pillars which had supported the *giborium* ornamented with sculptures representing the death of the two saints by decapitation; one of these pillars is perfectly preserved, and the name of Achilleus is carved upon it. There was also found a large fragment of a marble slab, with an inscription composed by Pope Damasus, the text of which is well-known from an ancient copy. This oldest historical mention of the two saints (Weyman, "Vier Epigramme des hl. Papstes Damasus", Munich, 1905; de Rossi, "Inscriptiones christianæ", II, 31; Ihm, "Damasi epigrammata", Leipzig, 1895, 12, no. 8) tells how Nereus and Achilleus as soldiers were obedient to the tyrant, but suddenly being converted to Christianity, joyfully resigned their commission, and died the martyr's death; as to the date of their glorious confession we can make no inference. The acts of these martyrs, legendary even to a romantic degree, have no historical value for their life and death; they bring no fewer than thirteen different Roman martyrs into relation, amongst them even Simon Magus, according to the apocryphal Petrine Acts, and place their death in the end of the first and beginning of the second centuries. These Acts were written in Greek and Latin; according to Achelis (see below) the Greek was the original text, and written in Rome in the sixth century; Schaefer (see below) on the other hand holds the Latin to have been the older version, and seeks to prove that it emanated from the first half of the fifth century; so remote a date is improbable, and the sixth century is to be preferred as the source of the Acts. According to these legends Nereus and Achilleus were eunuchs and chamberlains of Flavia Domitilla, a niece of the Emperor Domitian; with the Christian virgin they had been banished to the island of Pontia, and later on beheaded in Terracina. The graves of these two martyrs were on an estate of the Lady Domitilla near the Via Ardeatina, close to that of St. Petronilla.

The author of this legend places the two saints quite differently from Pope Damasus, in his poem: as Nereus and Achilleus were buried in a very ancient part of the catacomb of Domitilla, built as far back as the beginning of the second century, we may conclude that they are among the most ancient martyrs of the Roman Church, and stand in very near relation to the Flavian family, of which Domitilla, the foundress of the catacomb, was a member. In the Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul mentions a Nereus with his sister, to whom he sends greetings (Rom., xvi, 15), perhaps even the martyr was a descendant of this disciple of the Apostle of the Gentiles. Owing to the purely legendary character of these Acts, we cannot use them as an argument to aid in the controversy as to whether there were two Christians of the name of Domitilla in the family of the Christian Flavian, or only one, the wife of the Consul Flavius Clemens (see Flavia Domitilla). As to other martyrs of the name Nereus, who are especially noted in the old martyrologies as martyrs of the faith in Africa, or as being natives of that country (e. g., in the Martyrologium Hieronymianum, 11 May, 15 or 16 October, 16 Nov.) though there is one of the name in the present Roman Martyrology under date of 16 Oct., nothing more is known.

On Sts. Nereus and Achilleus: *Acta SS.*, May, III, 6–13; Mombritius, *Sanctuarium*, I, 238–40; II, 159 sqq., 201; *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina*, II, 883 sqq.; *Bibliotheca hag. græca*, 2nd ed., 185; Wirth, *Acta SS. Nerei et Achillei* (Leipzig, 1890); Achelis, *Acta SS. Nerei et Achillei* in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, XI, 2 (Leipzig, 1892); Schaefer, *Die Akten der hl. Nereus und Achilleus* in *Römische Quartalschrift* (1894), 89–119; Dufourcq, *Les Gesta Martyrum Romains*, I (Paris, 1900), 251–55, 305–07; Urbain, *Ein Martyrologium der christl. Gemeinde zu Rom* (Leipzig, 1901), 143–44; Allard, *Histoire des persécutions*, I (2nd ed., Paris, 1892), 168 sq.; de Rossi in *Bullettino di archeologia cristiana* (1874), 5 sqq., 68 sqq., 122 sqq. (1875), 5 sqq.; Marucchi, *Guide des catacombes romaines* (Rome, 1903), 97 sq. On St. Pancratius: *Acta SS.*, May, III, 21; *Analecta Bollandiana*, X, 53–56; Dufourcq, *Gesta Martyrum Romains*, I, 235–37; Marucchi, *Guide des catacombes romaines*, 43–46.

J. P. Kirsch.

Neri, Antonio, Florentine chemist, b. in Florence in the sixteenth century; d. 1614, place unknown. We have but few details of his life; Dr. Merret, an English physician, who translated his work only fifty years after its first publication, states in his preface that he could find no account whatever of the author. It is known however that he was a priest and devoted to the study of chemistry: he travelled somewhat extensively in Italy and Holland, and during these journeys gained a great deal of information concerning the manufacture of glass and its treatment for various purposes. This knowledge he gave to the world in his book "L'Arte Vetraria", which for a long time formed the basis of most other works on this subject. It is a book rich in detail, giving the then known methods of making glass, of colouring it, and of imitating precious stones. The original work has appeared in three editions: Florence, 1612; Florence, 1661; and Milan, 1817. In 1662 Merret translated it into Latin, adding to it notes and a commentary of his own: this was published at Amsterdam in 1668 and again in 1681. It was translated into German by Johann Kunckel, who published a revised and enlarged edition of it in 1689. About a century later there appeared the French edition, "Art de la Verrerie de Neri, Merret et Kunckel", etc., "Traduits de l'Allemand par M. D * * *" (Paris, 1752).

Brunet, *Manuel du Libraire*, IV (Paris, 1863); Poggendorff, *Handwörterbuch zur Geschichte der exacten Wissenschaften*, II (Leipzig, 1863); prefaces to the various translations mentioned above.

Edward C. Phillips.

Nerinckx, Charles, missionary priest in Kentucky, founder of the Sisters of Loretto at the Foot of the Cross, b. in Herffelingen, Belgium, 2 Oct., 1761; d. at Ste. Genevieve, Mo., 12 August, 1824. He was the eldest of the fourteen children of Dr. Sebastian Nerinckx and Petronilla Langendries. He studied at Enghien and Gheel, made his philosophy at Louvain, and entered the theological seminary of Mechlin in 1781. Ordained in 1785, he became vicar at the cathedral of Mechlin, where he was noted for his zeal among the working classes. In 1794 he obtained the pastoral charge of Everberg-Meerbeke, where the devotion to the spiritual interest of his people developed that deep love for children which later characterized his missionary labours in America. During his incumbency he wrote several theological treatises the manuscripts of which are still preserved in the parish archives. The French Directoire resented his activity and ordered his arrest, but he eluded the *gens d'armes* (1797) and for four years was in hiding at the Hospital of Dendermonde, where he continued his ministry amid continual dangers. He came to America in 1804, Bishop Carroll assigning him to Kentucky in 1805. The district given to his charge was over two hundred miles in length and covered nearly half the State. He lived in the saddle; every year of his apostolate was marked by the organization of a new congregation or the building of a church. Of all the missionaries who worked in that field none deserves so well the title of "Apostle of Kentucky". His direction of souls was so efficient and enlightened that to this very day the grandchildren of his penitents are still prominently known for the earnestness of their faith and the solidity of their virtue. His well-deserved fame reached Baltimore and Bishop Carroll induced the Holy See to appoint him Bishop of New Orleans, but Father Nerinckx refused the honour. The Catholic education of children was his most cherished work and to secure its permanency he founded the Congregation of the Sisters of Loretto in 1812. He crossed the ocean twice to secure help and labourers for the missions; he thus became instrumental in bringing from Belgium the first Jesuits who settled in the West, notably Father De Smet and Bishop Van de Velde. He brought to America a number of paintings which are to this day the most valuable art treasures of the Diocese of Louisville. Persecution was not wanting to him, and for the sake of peace he went to Missouri in 1824, intending to consecrate the last years of his life to the Indians, but death overtook him at Ste. Genevieve. His mortal remains were brought back to Loretto. The Sisters erected a marble statue of their founder at the mother-house in 1910.

Spalding, *Sketches of Kentucky* (Louisville, 1844); Webb, *Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky* (Louisville, 1884); Maes, *Life of Rev. Charles Nerinckx* (Cincinnati, 1880); *MSS. of the Bollandist Library* (Brussels).

Camillus P. Maes.

Nero, 54–68, the last Roman emperor of the Julian-Claudian line, was the son of Domitius Ahenobarbus and Julia Agrippina, niece of Emperor Claudius. After the violent death of his first wife, Valeria Messalina, Emperor Claudius married Julia, adopted her son Nero and gave him in marriage his own daughter, Octavia. Nero's mother had a mind to commit any crime to put him on the throne, and to prepare him for this station she had L. Annæus Seneca appointed his tutor, and caused the freedman Afranius Burrus, a rough but experienced soldier, to be made commander of the Prætorian guard. These men were the advisers and chief supporters of Nero on his becoming emperor, after the sudden death of Claudius. Nero was born in Antium on 15 December, A. D. 37, and was seventeen years old when he became emperor. He believed himself to be a great singer and poet. All the better dispositions of his nature had been stifled by his sensuality and moral perversity. Agrippina had expected to be a partner of her son in the government, but owing to her autocratic character, this lasted only a short time. The first years of Nero's reign, under the direction of Burrus and Seneca, the real holders of power, were auspicious in every way. A series of regulations either abrogated or lessened the hardships of direct taxation, the arbitrariness of legislation and provincial administration, so that Rome and the empire were delighted, and the first five years of Nero's government were accounted the happiest of all time, regarded by Trajan as the best of the imperial era.

Under Claudius, the Armenians and Parthians had revolted, and the proconsul had been unable to uphold the prestige of the Roman arms. Seneca advised Nero to assert his rights over Armenia, and Domitius Corbulo was recalled from Germany and Britain to go with fresh troops to Cappadocia and Galatia, where he stormed the two Armenian capitals, Artaxata and Tigranocerta in A. D. 59 and made his headquarters in the city of Nisibis. King Tividates was dethroned, and Tigranes, Nero's favourite, made vassal in his stead. But the position of Tigranes was insecure, and Vologeses, King of the Parthians, who had previously retired from Armenia and given hostages to the Romans, rekindled the war, defeated the new proconsul Patus, and forced him to capitulate. Corbulo again took command and recognized Tividates as king on condition that he should lay down his crown before the image of Nero, and acknowledge his lordship over Armenia as granted by Nero; this so flattered the

emperor that, ascending the rostrum in the Forum Romanum, he himself placed the crown on the head of Tividates. At the same time a dangerous war broke out in Britain. Strong camps and forts had been built there in the first years of Nero's reign, and the proconsul, Suetonius Paulinus, had undertaken here, as had Corbulo in the past, to extend the frontiers of the Roman conquests. With the native population complaining of excessive taxation, conscription, the avarice of Roman officials, came suddenly the summons of the heroic Queen of the Iceni, Boadicea, bidding her tribes to free themselves from Roman tyranny (A. D. 61). The procurator, Decianus Catus, had driven this noble woman to despair by his odious and cruel greed; and when this oppression and the shame of her own and her daughter's violation became known to her people and the neighbouring tribes, their wrath and hopes for revenge alone beset them. The Roman camps were destroyed, the troops surprised and slain, and more than 70,000 colonists paid the penalty of their oppression by the loss of home and life. London was burned to the ground, and the proconsul, Suetonius Paulinus, came but slowly to the help of the remaining colonists from his incursion upon the island of Mona. On his arrival was fought the battle of Deva (Dee), in which Britain succumbed to Roman discipline, and was again subjugated with the aid of fresh troops from Germany.

After the death of Claudius, Agrippina had caused to be poisoned her old enemy Narcissus, the protector of Britannicus, and Junius Silanus, because of his Julian kinship. Pallas, the powerful finance minister, and her most valiant adherent, was deprived of his office, and her personal influence in the government constantly lessened. That she might regain her power, she courted the neglected Octavia, and sought to make the impotent Britannicus a rival of her son; this induced Nero to order the murder of Britannicus, who was poisoned at a banquet amidst his own family and friends, Burrus and Seneca both consenting to the crime. When Nero had seduced Poppæa Sabina, the wife of his friend Salvius Otho, she resented playing the rôle of concubine and aspired to that of empress. This brought about a crisis between son and mother, for with all her vices Agrippina had never lacked a certain external dignity, and had expressed in her conduct the sentiment of imperial power. Now when through hatred of Poppæa she undertook to protect the interests of Octavia, to whom indeed Nero owed his throne, the son determined to rid himself of his mother. He invited her to a pleasure party at Baiæ, and the ship which was to convey her out to sea was so constructed as to sink at a given order. This attempt having miscarried, he ordered that she should be clubbed to death in her country house, by his freedmen (A. D. 59). The report was then spread abroad that Agrippina had sought the life of her son, and Seneca so dishonoured his pen as to write to the senate a brief condemning the mother. One man alone of all the Senate had the courage to leave his seat when this letter was read, Thrasea Pætus the philosopher. Burrus dying in A. D. 62, left Seneca no longer able to withstand the influence of Poppæa and of Sophonius Tigellinus, Prefect of the Prætorian guards. He retired into private life, and new crimes were conceived and effected.

Sulla and Plautus, great-nephews of Augustus, being in exile, were beheaded by Nero's command, and his marriage with Octavia being annulled, she was banished to Campania. The populace resented deeply the maltreatment of Octavia, and the tumults which occurred in consequence served only to increase the fear and hatred of Poppæa. Octavia was sent to the island of Pandataria, and there beheaded. Poppæa now assumed the title of Augusta, her image was stamped upon the coin of the Roman State, and her opponents were murdered by dagger or poison. Nero with his mates rioted by night through the city, attacking men, assaulting women, and filled the vacant positions at the imperial Court from the dregs of the city. In the civic administration extravagance was unbounded, in the court luxury unbridled. Financial deficits grew over night; the fortunes of those who had been condemned at law, of freedmen, of all pretenders by birth filled the depleted exchequer, and the coin was deliberately debased. All efforts to stem these disasters were vain, and the general misery had reached its highest, when in A. D. 64 occurred the terrible conflagration which burnt entirely three, and partly seven, of the fourteen districts into which Rome was divided. The older authors, Tacitus and Suetonius, say clearly, and the testimony of all later heathen and Christian writers concurs with them, that Nero himself gave the order to set the capital on fire, and that the people at large believed this report. Nero was in Antium when he heard that Rome was in flames, he hastened thither, and is said to have ascended the tower of Mæcenas, and looking upon the sea of flame in which Rome lay engulfed, to have sung on his lyre the song of the ruin of Ilium.

Emperor Nero
Vatican Museum, Rome

In place of the old city with its narrow and crooked streets, Nero planned a new residential city, to be called Neronia. For six days the fire ravaged the closely built quarters, and many thousands perished in the flames; countless great works of art were lost in the ruins. Informers, bribed for the purpose, declared that the Christians had set Rome on fire. Their doctrine of the nothingness of earthly joys in comparison with the delights of immortal souls in heaven was an enduring reproof to the dissolute emperor. There began a fierce persecution throughout the empire, and through robbery and confiscation the Christians were forced to pay in great part for the building of the new Rome. In this persecution Saints Peter and Paul were martyred in Rome in A. D. 67. Broad streets and plazas were planned by the imperial architects; houses of stone arose where before stood those of lime and wood; the *Domus aurea*, enclosed in wonderful gardens and parks, in extent greater than a whole former town-quarter astonished men by its splendour and beauty. In order to compass the colossal expenditures for these vast undertakings, the temples were stripped of their works of art, of their gold and silver votive offerings, and justly or unjustly the fortunes of the great families confiscated. The universal discontent thus aroused resulted in the conspiracy of Calpurnius Piso. The plot was discovered, and the conspirators and their families and friends condemned to death. Amongst the most noted of them were Seneca, Lucan, Petronius, and the Stoic Thrasea Pætus, of whom Tacitus said that he was virtue incarnate, and one of the few whose courage and justice had never been concealed in presence of the murderous Cæsar. Poppæa too, who had been brutally kicked by her husband, died, with her unborn child soon after. Finally the emperor started on a

pleasure tour through lower Italy and Greece; as actor, singer, and harp player he gained the scorn of the world; he heaped upon his triumphal chariots the victor-crowns of the great Grecian games, and so dishonoured the dignity of Rome that Tacitus through respect for the mighty ancestors of the Cæsar would not once mention his name.

Outbreaks in the provinces and in Rome itself now presaged the approaching overthrow of the Neronian tyranny. Julius Vindex, Proconsul of Gallia Lugdunensis, with the intent of giving Gaul an independent and worthy government, raised the banner of revolt, and sought an alliance with the Proconsuls of Spain and the Rhine Provinces. Sulpicius Galba, Proconsul of Hispania Tarraconensis, who was ready for the change, agreed to the plans presented to him, declared his fealty to Nero ended, and was proclaimed emperor by his own army. L. Verginius Rufus, Proconsul of Upper Germany, was offered the principate by his troops, and led them against the usurper Vindex. In a battle at Vesontio (Besançon) Vindex was defeated, and fell by his own sword. In Rome the prætorians dazzled by the exploits of Galba deserted Nero, the Senate declared him the enemy of his country, and sentenced him to the death of a common murderer. Outlawed and forsaken, he committed suicide in the house of one of his freedmen, June, A. D. 68. At once and everywhere Sulpicius Galba was accepted as emperor. The sudden disappearance of Nero, whose enemies had spread the report that he had fled to the East, gave rise to the later legend that he was still living, and would return to sit again upon the imperial throne.

SCHILLER, *Gesch. der röm. Kaiser*, I (Gotha, 1883); STIGLMAYER, *Tacitus über den Brand von Rom* in *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, LXXVIII (Freiburg, 1910), 2; VON DOMASZEWISICI, *Gesch. der röm. Kaiser*, II (Leipzig, 1909).

KARL HOEBER.

Nerses I-IV, Armenian patriarchs.—NERSES I, surnamed the Great, d. 373. Born of the royal stock, he spent his youth in Cæsarea where he married Sanducht, a Mamikonian princess. After the death of his wife, he was appointed chamberlain to King Arshak of Armenia. A few years later, having entered the ecclesiastical state, he was elected *catholicos*, or patriarch, in 353. His patriarchate marks a new era in Armenian history. Till then the Church had been more or less identified with the royal family and the nobles; Nerses brought it into closer connexion with the people. At the Council of Ashtishat he promulgated numerous laws on marriage, fast days, and Divine worship. He built schools and hospitals, and sent monks throughout the land to preach the Gospel. Some of these reforms drew upon him the king's displeasure, and he was exiled, probably to Edessa. Upon the accession of King Bab (369) he returned to his see. Bab proved a dissolute and unworthy ruler and Nerses forbade him entrance to the church. Under the pretence of seeking a reconciliation, Bab having invited Nerses to his table poisoned him.

NERSES II, said to have been born at Aschdarag in Bagrevand, was patriarch from 548 to 557. He was a Jacobite Monophysite (cf. Ter-Minassiantz, 163–64). Under him was held the Second Council of Tvin or Dovin (554).

NERSES III of Ischkan, surnamed Schinogh, "the church builder", was elected patriarch in 641; d. 661. He lived in days of political turmoil. The Armenians had to choose between the Greeks and the Persians, and their new conquerors, the Arabs. Nerses remained friendly to the Greeks, whilst the military chiefs sided with the Arabs. Constans II (642–48) hastened into Armenia to punish the rebels and subject them to the Greek Church. Nerses and a number of bishops went forth to meet him, and declared they accepted the Council of Chalcedon. Disagreement with the satrap Theodorus compelled Nerses to withdraw from the administration of the patriarchate from 652 to 658.

NERSES IV surnamed Klaientsi from the place of his birth, and Schnorkhali, "the Gracious", from the elegance of his writings, b. at Hromcla, Cilicia; d. 1173. He was educated by his grand uncle, Patriarch Gregory Vkaiaser and afterwards by the *vartabed*, or doctor of theology, Stephen Manuk. Having been consecrated bishop by his brother, Patriarch Gregory III, he was sent to preach throughout Armenia. He was present at the Latin Council of Antioch in 1141 and was elected patriarch in 1166. Nerses, together with Emperor Manuel Comnenus, laboured hard to unite the Greek and Armenian Churches. The union, however, was never consummated, the majority of the bishops remaining obstinate. Nerses is regarded as one of the greatest Armenian writers. His prose works include: "Prayers for every hour of the day" (Venice, 1822); his "Synodal letter" and five "Letters" to Manuel Comnenus (tr. Latin by Capelleti, Venice, 1833). He wrote in verse: "Iesu Orti", a Bible history; an "elegy" on the capture of Edessa; a "History of Armenia"; two "Homilies", and many hymns. In the "Iesu Orti", the elegy on Edessa, and the first letter to Manuel Comnenus, we find testimonies to the primacy of the Bishop of Rome.

LANGLOIS, *Collection des historiens de l'Arménie*, II (Paris, 1869); ORMANIAN, *L'église arménienne, son histoire, sa doctrine, son régime, sa dicipline, sa liturgie, sa littérature, son présent* (Paris, 1910); HEFELE, *Hist. of the Councils of the Church*, IV (tr. CLARE, Edinburgh, 1895); SUKIAS SOMAL, *Quadro della storia letteraria di Armenia* (Venice, 1829); WEBER, *Die kathol. Kirche in Armenien* (Freiburg, 1903); TER-MINASSIANTZ, *Die armenische Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zu den syrischen Kirchen bis zum Ende des 13 Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1904); NEUMANN, *Versuch einer Gesch. der armen. Litter.* (Leipzig, 1836); FINK, *Gesch. der armen. Litter.* in *Gesch. der christl. Litter. des Orients* (Leipzig, 1907); AZARIAN, *Ecclesiæ Armeniæ traditio de Romani Pontificis primatu iurisdictionis et inerrabili magisterio* (Rome, 1870); CHAMICH, *Hist. of Armenia*, (Calcutta, 1827).

A. A. VASCHALDE.

Nerses of Lambron, b. 1153 at Lambron, Cilicia; d. 1198; son of Oschin II, prince of Lambron and nephew of the patriarch, Nerses IV. Nerses was well versed in sacred and profane sciences and had an excellent knowledge of Greek, Latin, Syriac, and probably Coptic. Ordained in 1169, he was consecrated Archbishop of Tarsus in 1176 and became a zealous advocate of the union of the Greek and Armenian Churches. In 1179 he attended the Council of Hromcla, in which the terms of the union were discussed; his address at this council is considered a masterpiece of eloquence and style. The union was decided upon but never consummated owing to the death of Emperor Manuel Comnenus in 1180. Manuel's successors abandoned the negotiations and persecuted the Armenians, who dissatisfied with the Greeks now turned to the Latins. Leo II, Prince of Cilicia, desirous to secure for himself the title of King of Armenia, sought the support of Celestine III and of Emperor Henry VI. The pope received his request favourably, but made the granting of it dependent upon the union of Cilicia to the Church of Rome. He sent Conrad, Archbishop of Mayence, to Tarsus, and the terms of union having been signed by Leo and twelve of the bishops, among whom was Nerses, Leo was crowned King of Armenia, 6 January, 1198. Nerses died six months afterwards, 17 July. Nerses is justly regarded as one of the greatest writers in Armenian literature. He deserves fame as poet, prose writer, and translator. He wrote an elegy on the death of his uncle, Nerses IV, and many hymns. His prose works include his oration at the Council of Hromcla (tr. Italian by Aucher, Venice, 1812; tr. German by Neumann, Leipzig, 1834); Commentaries on the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, and the Minor Prophets; an explanation of the liturgy; a letter to Leo II and another to Uskan, a monk of Antioch; and two homilies. He translated into Armenian the Rule of St. Benedict; the "Dialogues" of Gregory the Great; a life of this saint; and the letters of Lucius III and Clement III to the patriarch, Gregory. From the Syriac he trans-

lated the "Homilies" of Jacob of Serugh and, probably from the Coptic, the "Life of the Fathers of the Desert". Some writers ascribe to him an Armenian version of a commentary of Andreas of Cæsarea on the Apocalypse. Nerses in his original writings frequently refers to the primacy and infallibility of the pope.

CONYBEARE, *The Armenian Version of Revelation* (London, 1907); see also NERSES I–IV.

A. A. VASCHALDE.

Nesqually. See SEATTLE, DIOCESE OF.

Nestorius and Nestorianism.—I. THE HERESIARCH.—Nestorius, who gave his name to the Nestorian heresy, was b. at Germanicia, in Syria Euphoratensis (date unknown); d. in the Thebaid, Egypt, c. 451. He was living as a priest and monk in the monastery of Euprepius near the walls, when he was chosen by the Emperor Theodosius II to be Patriarch of Constantinople in succession to Sisinnius. He had a high reputation for eloquence, and the popularity of St. Chrysostom's memory among the people of the imperial city may have influenced the Emperor's choice of another priest from Antioch to be court bishop. He was consecrated in April, 428, and seems to have made an excellent impression. He lost no time in showing his zeal against heretics. Within a few days of his consecration Nestorius had an Arian chapel destroyed, and he persuaded Theodosius to issue a severe edict against heresy in the following month. He had the churches of the Macedonians in the Hellespont seized, and took measures against the Quartodecimans who remained in Asia Minor. He also attacked the Novatians, in spite of the good reputation of their bishop. Pelagian refugees from the West, however, he did not expel, not being well acquainted with their condemnation ten years earlier. He twice wrote to Pope St. Celestine I for information on the subject. He received no reply, but Marius Mercator, a disciple of St. Augustine, published a memoir on the subject at Constantinople, and presented it to the emperor, who duly proscribed the heretics. At the end of 428, or at latest in the early part of 429, Nestorius preached the first of his famous sermons against the word *Theotokos*, and detailed his Antiochian doctrine of the Incarnation. The first to raise his voice against it was Eusebius, a layman, afterwards Bishop of Dorylæum and the accuser of Eutyches. Two priests of the city, Philip and Proclus, who had both been unsuccessful candidates for the patriarchate, preached against Nestorius. Philip, known as Sidetes, from Side, his birthplace, author of a vast and discursive history now lost, accused the patriarch of heresy. Proclus (who was to succeed later in his candidature) preached a flowery, but perfectly orthodox, sermon, yet extant, to which Nestorius replied in an extempore discourse, which we also possess. All this naturally caused great excitement at Constantinople, especially among the the clergy, who were clearly not well disposed towards the stranger from Antioch. St. Celestine immediately condemned the doctrine. Nestorius had arranged with the emperor in the summer of 430 for the assembling of a council. He now hastened it on, and the summons had been issued to patriarchs and metropolitans on 19 Nov., before the pope's sentence, delivered through Cyril of Alexandria, had been served on Nestorius (6 Dec.). At the council Nestorius was condemned, and the emperor, after much delay and hesitation, ratified its finding. It was confirmed by Pope Sixtus III.

The lot of Nestorius was a hard one. He had been handed over by the pope to the tender mercies of his rival, Cyril; he had been summoned to accept within ten days under pain of deposition, not a papal definition, but a series of anathemas drawn up at Alexandria under the influence of Apollinarian forgeries. The whole council had not condemned him, but only a portion, which had not awaited the arrival of the bishops from Antioch. He had refused to recognize the jurisdiction of this incomplete number, and had consequently refused to appear or put in any defence. He was now thrust out of his see by a change of mind on the part of the feeble emperor. But Nestorius was proud: he showed no sign of yielding or of coming to terms; he put in no plea of appeal to Rome. He retired to his monastery at Antioch with dignity and apparent relief. His friends, John of Antioch and his party, deserted him, and at the wish of the Emperor, at the beginning of 433, joined hands with Cyril, and Theodoret later did the same. The bishops who were suspected of being favourable to Nestorius were deposed. An edict of Theodosius II, 30 July, 435, condemned his writings to be burnt. A few years later Nestorius was dragged from his retirement and banished to the Oasis. He was at one time carried off by the Nubians (not the Blemmyes) in a raid, and was restored to the Thebaid with his hand and one rib broken. He gave himself up to the governor in order not to be accused of having fled.

The recent discovery of a Syriac version of the (lost) Greek apology for Nestorius by himself has awakened new interest in the question of his personal orthodoxy. The (mutilated) manuscript, about 800 years old, known as the "Bazaar of Heraclides", and recently edited as the "Liber Heraclidis" by P. Bedjan (Paris, 1910), reveals the persistent odium attached to the name of Nestorius, since at the end of his life he was obliged to substitute for it a pseudonym. In this work he claims that his faith is that of the celebrated "Tome", or letter, of Leo the Great to Flavian, and excuses his failure to appeal to Rome by the general prejudice of which he was the victim. A fine passage on the Eucharistic Sacrifice which occurs in the "Bazaar" may be cited here: "There is something amiss with you which I want to put before you in a few words, in order to induce you to amend it, for you are quick to see what is seemly. What then is this fault? Presently the mysteries are set before the faithful like the mess granted to his soldiers by the king. Yet the army of the faithful is nowhere to be seen, but they are blown away together with the catechumens like chaff by the wind of indifference. And Christ is crucified in the symbol [*κατὰ τὸν τύπον*], sacrificed by the sword of the prayer of the Priest; but, as when He was upon the Cross, He finds His disciples have already fled. Terrible is this fault,—a betrayal of Christ when there is no persecution, a desertion by the faithful of their Master's Body when there is no war" (Loofs, "Nestoriana", Halls, 1905, p. 341).

The writings of Nestorius were originally very numerous. As stated above, the "Bazaar" has newly been published (Paris, 1910) in the Syriac translation in which alone it survives. The rest of the fragments of Nestorius have been most minutely examined, pieced together and edited by Loofs. His sermons show a real eloquence, but very little remains in the original Greek. The Latin translations by Marius Mercator are very poor in style and the text is ill preserved. Batiffol has attributed to Nestorius many sermons which have come down to us under the names of other authors: three of Athanasius, one of Hippolytus, three of Amphilochius, thirty-eight of Basil of Seleucia, seven of St. Chrysostom; but Loofs and Baker do not accept the ascription. Mercati has pointed out four fragments in a writing of Innocent, Bishop of Maronia (ed. Amelli in "Spicil. Cassin.", I, 1887), and Armenian fragments have been published by Lüdtke.

II. THE HERESY.—Nestorius was a disciple of the school of Antioch, and his Christology was essentially that of Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mopsuestia, both Cilician bishops and great opponents of Arianism. Both died in the Catholic Church. Dio-

dorus was a holy man, much venerated by St. John Chrysostom. Theodore, however, was condemned in person as well as in his writings by the Fifth General Council, in 553. In opposition to many of the Arians, who taught that in the Incarnation the Son of God assumed a human body in which His Divine Nature took the place of soul, and to the followers of Apollinarius of Laodicea, who held that the Divine Nature supplied the functions of the higher or intellectual soul, the Antiochenes insisted upon the completeness of the humanity which the Word assumed. Unfortunately, they represented this human nature as a complete man, and represented the Incarnation as the assumption of a man by the Word. The same way of speaking was common enough in Latin writers (*assumere hominem, homo assumptus*) and was meant by them in an orthodox sense; we still sing in the Te Deum: "Tu ad liberandum suscepturus hominem", where we must understand "ad liberandum hominem, humanam naturam suscepisti". But the Antiochene writers did not mean that the "man assumed" (ὁ ληφθεὶς ἄνθρωπος) was taken up into one hypostasis with the Second Person of the Holy Trinity. They preferred to speak of συναφεία, "junction", rather than ἕνωσις, "unification", and said that the two were one person in dignity and power, and must be worshipped together. The word *person* in its Greek form πρόσωπον might stand for a juridical or fictitious unity: it does not necessarily imply what the word *person* implies to us, that is, the unity of the subject of consciousness and of all the internal and external activities. Hence we are not surprised to find that Diodorus admitted two Sons, and that Theodore practically made two Christs, and yet that they cannot be proved to have really made two subjects in Christ. Two things are certain: first, that, whether or no they believed in the unity of subject in the Incarnate Word, at least they explained that unity wrongly; secondly, that they used most unfortunate and misleading language when they spoke of the union of the Manhood with the Godhead—language which is objectively heretical, even were the intention of its authors good.

Nestorius, as well as Theodore, repeatedly insisted that he did not admit two Christs or two Sons, and he frequently asserted the unity of the πρόσωπον. On arriving at Constantinople he came to the conclusion that the very different theology which he found rife there was a form of Arian or Apollinarian error. In this he was not wholly wrong, as the outbreak of Eutychianism twenty years later may be held to prove. In the first months of his pontificate he was implored by the Pelagian Julian of Eclanum and other expelled bishops of his party to recognize their orthodoxy and obtain their restoration. He wrote at least three letters to the pope, St. Celestine I, to inquire whether these petitioners had been duly condemned or not, but he received no reply, not (as has been too often repeated) because the pope imagined he did not respect the condemnation of the Pelagians by himself and by the Western emperor, but because he added in his letters, which are extant, denunciations of the supposed Arians and Apollinarians of Constantinople, and in so doing gave clear signs of the Antiochene errors soon to be known as Nestorian. In particular he denounced those who employed the word θεοτόκος, though he was ready to admit the use of it in a certain sense: "Ferri tamen potest hoc vocabulum propter ipsum considerationem, quod solum nominetur de virgine hoc verbum hoc propter inseparabile templum Dei Verbi ex ipsa, non quia mater sit Dei Verbi; nemo enim antiquiorem se parit." Such an admission is worse than useless, for it involves the whole error that the Blessed Virgin is not the mother of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity. It is therefore unfortunate that Loofs and others who defend Nestorius should appeal to the frequency with which he repeated that he could accept the θεοτόκος if only it was properly understood. In the same letter he speaks quite correctly of the "two Natures which are adored in the one Person of the Only-begotten by a perfect and unconfused conjunction", but this could not palliate his mistake that the Blessed Virgin is mother of one nature, not of the person (a son is necessarily a person not a nature), nor the fallacy: "No one can bring forth a son older than herself". The deacon Leo, who was twenty years later as pope to define the whole doctrine, gave these letters to John Cassian of Marseilles, who at once wrote against Nestorius his seven books, "De incarnatione Christi". Before he had completed the work he had further obtained some sermons by Nestorius, from which he quotes in the later books. He misunderstands and exaggerates the teaching of his opponent, but his treatise is important because it stereotyped once for all a doctrine which the Western world was to accept as Nestorianism. After explaining that the new heresy was a renewal of Pelagianism and Ebionitism, Cassian represents the Constantinoplitan patriarch as teaching that Christ is a mere man (*homo solitarius*) who merited union with the Divinity as the reward of His Passion. Cassian himself brings out quite clearly both the unity of person and the distinction of the two natures, yet the formula "Two Natures and one Person" is less plainly enunciated by him than by Nestorius himself, and the discussion is wanting in clear-cut distinctions and definitions.

Meanwhile Nestorius was being attacked by his own clergy and simultaneously by St. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, who first denounced him, though without giving a name, in an epistle to all the monks of Egypt, then remonstrated with him personally by letter, and finally wrote to the pope. Loofs is of the opinion that Nestorius would never have been disturbed but for St. Cyril. But there is no reason to connect St. Cyril with the opposition to the heresiarch at Constantinople and at Rome. His rivals Philip of Side and Proclus and the layman Eusebius (afterwards Bishop of Dorylæum), as well as the Roman Leo, seem to have acted without any impulse from Alexandria. It might have been expected that Pope Celestine would specify certain heresies of Nestorius and condemn them, or issue a definition of the traditional faith which was being endangered. Unfortunately, he did nothing of the kind. St. Cyril had sent to Rome his correspondence with Nestorius, a collection of that Patriarch's sermons, and a work of his own which he had just composed, consisting of five books "Contra Nestorium". The pope had them translated into Latin, and then, after assembling the customary council, contented himself with giving a general condemnation of Nestorius and a general approval of St. Cyril's conduct, whilst he delivered the execution of this vague decree to Cyril, who as Patriarch of Alexandria was the hereditary enemy both of the Antiochene theologian and the Constantinoplitan bishop. Nestorius was to be summoned to recant within ten days. The sentence was as harsh as can well be imagined. St. Cyril saw himself obliged to draw up a form for the recantation. With the help of an Egyptian council he formulated a set of twelve anathematisms which simply epitomize the errors he had pointed out in his five books "Against Nestorius", for the pope appeared to have agreed with the doctrine of that work. It is most important to notice that up to this point St. Cyril had not rested his case upon Apollinarian documents and had not adopted the Apollinarian formula μία φύσις σεσαρκωμένη from Pseudo-Athanasius. He does not teach in so many words "two natures after the union", but his work against Nestorius, with the depth and precision of St. Leo, is an admirable exposition of Catholic doctrine, worthy of a Doctor of the Church, and far surpassing the treatise of Cassian. The twelve anathematisms are less happy,

for St. Cyril was always a diffuse writer, and his solitary attempt at brevity needs to be read in connexion with the work which it summarizes.

The anathematisms were at once attacked, on behalf of John, Patriarch of Antioch, in defence of the Antiochene School, by Andrew of Samosata and the great Theodoret of Cyrus. The former wrote at Antioch; his objections were adopted by a synod held there, and were sent to Cyril as the official view of all the Oriental bishops. St. Cyril published separate replies to these two antagonists, treating Andrew with more respect than Theodoret, to whom he is comtemptuous and sarcastic. The latter was doubtless the superior of the Alexandrian in talent and learning, but at this time he was no match for him as a theologian. Both Andrew and Theodoret show themselves captious and unfair; at best they sometimes prove that St. Cyril's wording is ambiguous and ill-chosen. They uphold the objectionable Antiochene phraseology, and they reject the hypostatic union (*ἕνωσις καθ ὑπόστασιν*) as well as the *φυσικὴ ἕνωσις* as unorthodox and unscriptural. The latter expression is indeed unsuitable, and may be misleading. Cyril had to explain that he was not summarizing or defining the faith about the Incarnation, but simply putting together the principal errors of Nestorius in the heretic's own words. In his books against Nestorius he had occasionally misrepresented him, but in the twelve anathematisms he gave a perfectly faithful picture of Nestorius's view, for in fact Nestorius did not disown the propositions, nor did Andrew of Samosata or Theodoret refuse to patronize any of them. The anathematisms were certainly in a general way approved of by the Council of Ephesus, but they have never been formally adopted by the Church. Nestorius for his part replied by a set of twelve contra-anathematisms. Some of them are directed against St. Cyril's teaching, others attack errors which St. Cyril did not dream of teaching, for example that Christ's Human Nature became through the union uncreated and without beginning, a silly conclusion which was later ascribed to the sect of Monophysites called Actistetæ. On the whole, Nestorius's new programme emphasized his old position, as also did the violent sermons which he preached against St. Cyril on Saturday and Sunday, 13 and 14 December, 430. We have no difficulty in defining the doctrine of Nestorius so far as words are concerned: Mary did not bring forth the Godhead as such (true) nor the Word of God (false), but the organ, the temple of the Godhead. The man Jesus Christ is this temple, "the animated purple of the King", as he expresses it in a passage of sustained eloquence. The Incarnate God did not suffer nor die, but raised up from the dead him in whom He was incarnate. The Word and the Man are to be worshipped together, and he adds: *διὰ τὸν φοροῦντα τὸν φορούμενον σέβω* (Through Him that bears I worship Him Who is borne). If St. Paul speaks of the Lord of Glory being crucified, he means the man by "the Lord of Glory". There are two natures, he says, and one person; but the two natures are regularly spoken of as though they were two persons, and the sayings of Scripture about Christ are to be appropriated some to the Man, some to the Word. If Mary is called the Mother of God, she will be made into a goddess, and the Gentiles will be scandalized.

This is all bad enough as far as words go. But did not Nestorius mean better than his words? The Oriental bishops were certainly not all disbelievers in the unity of subject in the Incarnate Christ, and in fact St. Cyril made peace with them in 433. One may point to the fact that Nestorius emphatically declared that there is one Christ and one Son, and St. Cyril himself has preserved for us some passages from his sermons which the saint admits to be perfectly orthodox, and therefore wholly inconsistent with the rest. For example: "Great is the mystery of the gifts! For this visible infant, who seems so young, who needs swaddling clothes for His body, who in the substance which we see is newly born, is the Eternal Son, as it is written, the Son who is the Maker of all, the Son who binds together in the swathing-bands of His assisting power the whole creation which would otherwise be dissolved." And again: "Even the infant is the all-powerful God, so far, O Arius, is God the Word from being subject to God." And: "We recognize the humanity of the infant, and His Divinity; the unity of His Sonship we guard in the nature of humanity and divinity." It will probably be only just to Nestorius to admit that he fully intended to safeguard the unity of subject in Christ. But he gave wrong explanations as to the unity, and his teaching logically led to two Christs, though he would not have admitted the fact. Not only his words are misleading, but the doctrine which underlies his words is misleading, and tends to destroy the whole meaning of the Incarnation. It is impossible to deny that teaching as well as wording which leads to such consequences is heresy. He was therefore unavoidably condemned. He reiterated the same view twenty years later in the "Bazaar of Heraclides", which shows no real change of opinion, although he declares his adherence to the Tome of St. Leo.

After the council of 431 had been made into a law by the emperor, the Antiochene party would not at once give way. But the council was confirmed by Pope Sixtus III, who had succeeded St. Celestine, and it was received by the whole West. Antioch was thus isolated, and at the same time St. Cyril showed himself ready to make explanations. The Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria agreed upon a "creed of union" in 433 (see EUTYCHIANISM). Andrew of Samosata and some others would not accept it, but declared the word *θεοτόκος* to be heretical. Theodoret held a council at Zeugma which refused to anathematize Nestorius. But the prudent Bishop of Cyrus after a time perceived that in the "creed of union" Antioch gained more than did Alexandria; so he accepted the somewhat hollow compromise. He says himself that he commended the person of Nestorius whilst he anathematized his doctrine. A new state of things arose when the death of St. Cyril, in 444, took away his restraining hand from his intemperate followers. The friend of Nestorius, Count Irenæus, had become Bishop of Tyre, and he was persecuted by the Cyrillian party, as was Ibas, Bishop of Edessa (q. v.), who had been a great teacher in that city. These bishops, together with Theodoret and Domnus, the nephew and successor of John of Antioch, were deposed by Dioscorus of Alexandria in the Robber Council of Ephesus (449). Ibas was full of Antiochene theology, but in his famous letter to Maris the Persian he disapproves of Nestorius as well as of Cyril, and at the Council of Chalcedon he was willing to cry a thousand anathemas to Nestorius. He and Theodoret were both restored by that council, and both seem to have taken the view that St. Leo's Tome was a rehabilitation of the Antiochene theology. The same view was taken by the Monophysites, who looked upon St. Leo as the opponent of St. Cyril's teaching. Nestorius in his exile rejoiced at this reversal of Roman policy, as he thought it. Loofs, followed by many writers even among Catholics, is of the same opinion. But St. Leo himself believed that he was completing and not undoing the work of the Council of Ephesus, and as a fact his teaching is but a clearer form of St. Cyril's earlier doctrine as exposed in the five books against Nestorius. But it is true that St. Cyril's later phraseology, of which the two letters to Succensus are the type, is based upon the formula which he felt himself bound to adopt from an Apollinarian treatise believed to be by his great predecessor Athanasius: *μία φύσις τοῦ Θεοῦ Λόγου σεσαρκωμένη*. St. Cyril found this formula an awkward one, as his treatment of it shows,

and it became in fact the watchword of heresy. But St. Cyril does his best to understand it in a right sense, and goes out of his way to admit two natures even after the union ἐν θεωρίᾳ, an admission which was to save Severus himself from a good part of his heresy.

That Loofs or Harnack should fail to perceive the vital difference between the Antiochenes and St. Leo, is easily explicable by their not believing the Catholic doctrine of the two natures, and therefore not catching the perfectly simple explanation given by St. Leo. Just as some writers declare that the Monophysites always took φύσις in the sense of ὑπόστασις, so Loofs and others hold that Nestorius took ὑπόστασις always in the sense of φύσις, and meant no more by *two hypostases* than he meant by *two natures*. But the words seem to have had perfectly definite meanings with all the theologians of the period. That the Monophysites distinguished them, is probable (see MONOPHYSITES AND MONOPHYSITISM), and all admit they unquestionably meant by *hypostasis* a subsistent nature. That Nestorius cannot, on the contrary, have taken *nature* to mean the same as *hypostasis* and both to mean *essence* is obvious enough, for three plain reasons: first, he cannot have meant anything so absolutely opposed to the meaning given to the word *hypostasis* by the Monophysites; secondly, if he meant *nature* by ὑπόστασις he had no word at all left for "subsistence" (for he certainly used οὐσία to mean "essence" rather than "subsistence"); thirdly, the whole doctrine of Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Nestorius's own refusal to admit almost any form of the *communicatio idiomatum*, force us to take his "two natures" in the sense of subsistent natures.

The modern critics also consider that the orthodox doctrine of the Greeks against Monophysitism—in fact the Chalcedonian doctrine as defended for many years—was practically the Antiochene or Nestorian doctrine, until Leontius modified it in the direction of conciliation. This theory is wholly gratuitous, for from Chalcedon onwards there is no orthodox controversialist who has left us any considerable remains in Greek by which we might be enabled to judge how far Leontius was an innovator. At all events we know, from the attacks made by the Monophysites themselves, that, though they professed to regard their Catholic opponents as Crypto-Nestorians, in so doing they distinguished them from the true Nestorians who openly professed two hypostases and condemned the word θεοτόκος. In fact we may say that, after John of Antioch and Theodoret had made peace with St. Cyril, no more was heard in the Greek world of the Antiochene theology. The school had been distinguished, but small. In Antioch itself, in Syria, in Palestine, the monks, who were exceedingly influential, were Cyrillians, and a large proportion of them were to become Monophysites. It was beyond the Greek world that Nestorianism was to have its development. There was at Edessa a famous school for Persians, which had probably been founded in the days of St. Ephrem, when Nisibis had ceased to belong to the Roman Empire in 363. The Christians in Persia had suffered terrible persecution, and Roman Edessa had attracted Persians for peaceful study. Under the direction of Ibas the Persian school of Edessa imbibed the Antiochene theology. But the famous Bishop of Edessa, Rabbûla, though he had stood apart from St. Cyril's council at Ephesus together with the bishops of the Antiochene patriarchate, became after the council a convinced, and even a violent, Cyrillian, and he did his best against the school of the Persians. Ibas himself became his successor. But at the death of this protector, in 457, the Persians were driven out of Edessa by the Monophysites, who made themselves all-powerful. Syria then becomes Monophysite and produces its Philoxenus and many another writer. Persia simultaneously becomes Nestorian. Of the exiles from Edessa into their own country nine became bishops, including Barsumas, or Barsaûma, of Nisibis and Acacius of Beit Aramage. The school at Edessa was finally closed in 489.

At this time the Church in Persia was autonomous, having renounced all subjection to Antioch and the "Western" bishops at the Council of Seleucia in 410. The ecclesiastical superior of the whole was the Bishop of Seleucia-Ctesiphon, who had assumed the rank of catholicos. This prelate was Babæus or Babowai (457–84) at the time of the arrival of the Nestorian professors from Edessa. He appears to have received them with open arms. But Barsaûma, having become Bishop of Nisibis, the nearest great city to Edessa, broke with the weak catholicos, and, at a council which he held at Beit Lapat in April, 484, pronounced his deposition. In the same year Babowai was accused before the king of conspiring with Constantinople and cruelly put to death, being hung up by his ring-finger and also, it is said, crucified and scourged. There is not sufficient evidence for the story which makes Barsaûma his accuser. The Bishop of Nisibis was at all events in high favour with King Peroz (457–84) and had been able to persuade him that it would be a good thing for the Persian kingdom if the Christians in it were all of a different complexion from those of the Empire, and had no tendency to gravitate towards Antioch and Constantinople, which were now officially under the sway of the "Henoticon" of Zeno. Consequently all Christians who were not Nestorians were driven from Persia. But the story of this persecution as told in the letter of Simeon of Beit Arsam is not generally considered trustworthy, and the alleged number of 7700 Monophysite martyrs is quite incredible. The town of Tagrit alone remained Monophysite. But the Armenians were not gained over, and in 491 they condemned at Valarsapat the Council of Chalcedon, St. Leo, and Barsaûma. Peroz died in 484, soon after having murdered Babowai, and the energetic Bishop of Nisibis had evidently less to hope from his successor, Balash. Though Barsaûma at first opposed the new catholicos, Acacius, in August, 485, he had an interview with him, and made his submission, acknowledging the necessity for subjection to Seleucia. However, he excused himself from being present at Acacius's council in 484 at Seleucia, where twelve bishops were present. At this assembly, the Antiochene Christology was affirmed and a canon of Beit Lapat permitting the marriage of the clergy was repeated. The Synod declared that they despised vainglory, and felt bound to humble themselves in order to put an end to the horrible clerical scandals which disedified the Persian Magians as well as the faithful; they therefore enacted that the clergy should make a vow of chastity; deacons may marry, and for the future no one is to be ordained priest except a deacon who has a lawful wife and children. Though no permission is given to priests or bishops to marry (for this was contrary to the canons of the Eastern Church), yet the practice appears to have been winked at, possibly for the regularization of illicit unions. Barsaûma himself is said to have married a nun named Mamoé; but according to Mare, this was at the inspiration of King Peroz, and was only a nominal marriage, intended to ensure the preservation of the lady's fortune from confiscation.

The Persian Church was now organized, if not thoroughly united, and was formally committed to the theology of Antioch. But Acacius, when sent by the king as envoy to Constantinople, was obliged to accept the anathema against Nestorius in order to be received to Communion there. After his return he bitterly complained of being called a Nestorian by the Monophysite Philoxenus, declaring that he "knew nothing" of Nestorius. Nevertheless Nestorius has always been venerated as a saint by the Persian Church. One thing more was needed for the

Nestorian Church; it wanted theological schools of its own, in order that its clergy might be able to hold their own in theological argument, without being tempted to study in the orthodox centres of the East or in the numerous and brilliant schools which the Monophysites were now establishing. Barsaûma opened a school at Nisibis, which was to become more famous than its parent at Edessa. The rector was Narses the Leprous, a most prolific writer, of whom little has been preserved. This university consisted of a single college, with the regular life of a monastery. Its rules are still preserved (see NISIBIS). At one time we hear of 800 students. Their great doctor was Theodore of Mopsuestia. His commentaries were studied in the translation made by Ibas and were treated almost as infallible. Theodore's Canon of Scripture was adopted, as we learn from "De Partibus Divinæ Legis" of Junilius, (P. L., LXVIII, and ed. by Kihn), a work which is a translation and adaptation of the published lectures of a certain Paul, professor at Nisibis. The method is Aristotelean, and must be connected with the Aristotelean revival which in the Greek world is associated chiefly with the name of Philoponus, and in the West with that of Boethius. The fame of this theological seminary was so great that Pope Agapetus and Cassiodorus wished to found one in Italy of a similar kind. The attempt was impossible in those troublous times; but Cassiodorus's monastery at Vivarium was inspired by the example of Nisibis. There were other less important schools at Seleucia and elsewhere, even in small towns.

Barsaûma died between 492 and 495, Acacius in 496 or 497. Narses seems to have lived longer. The Nestorian Church which they founded, though cut off from the Catholic Church by political exigencies, never intended to do more than practise an autonomy like that of the Eastern patriarchates. Its heresy consisted mainly in its refusal to accept the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. It is interesting to note that neither Junilius nor Cassiodorus speaks of the school of Nisibis as heretical. They were probably aware that it was not quite orthodox, but the Persians who appeared at the Holy Places as pilgrims or at Constantinople must have seemed like Catholics on account of their hatred to the Monophysites, who were the great enemy in the East. The official teaching of the Nestorian Church in the time of King Chosroes (Khusran) II (died 628) is well presented to us in the treatise "De unione" composed by the energetic monk Babai the Great, preserved in a MS. from which Labourt has made extracts (pp. 280–87). Babai denies that *hypostasis* and *person* have the same meaning. A hypostasis is a singular essence (*οὐσία*) subsisting in its independent being, numerically one, separate from others by its accidents. A person is that property of a hypostasis which distinguishes it from others (this seems to be rather "personality" than "person") as being itself and no other, so that Peter is Peter and Paul is Paul. As hypostases Peter and Paul are not distinguished, for they have the same specific qualities, but they are distinguished by their particular qualities, their wisdom or otherwise, their height or their temperament, etc. And, as the singular property which the hypostasis possesses is not the hypostasis itself, the singular property which distinguishes it is called "person".

It would seem that Babai means that "a man" (*individuum vagum*) is the hypostasis, but not the person, until we add the individual characteristics by which he is known to be Peter or Paul. This is not by any means the same as the distinction between nature and hypostasis, nor can it be asserted that by *hypostasis* Babai meant what we should call *specific nature*, and by *person* what we should call *hypostasis*. The theory seems to be an unsuccessful attempt to justify the traditional Nestorian formula: two hypostases in one person. As to the nature of the union, Babai falls on the Antiochene saying that it is ineffable, and prefers the usual metaphors—assumption, in habitation, temple, vesture, junction—to any definition of the union. He rejects the *communicatio idiomatum* as involving confusion of the natures, but allows a certain "interchange of names", which he explains with great care.

The Persian Christians were called "Orientals", or "Nestorians", by their neighbours on the West. They gave to themselves the name of *Chaldeans;* but this denomination is usually reserved at the present day for the large portion of the existing remnant which has been united to the Catholic Church. The present condition of these Uniats, as well as of the branch in India known as "Malabar Christians", is described under CHALDEAN CHRISTIANS. The history of the Nestorian Church must be looked for under PERSIA. The Nestorians also penetrated into China and Mongolia and left behind them an inscribed stone, set up in Feb., 781, which describes the introduction of Christianity into China from Persia in the reign of T'ai-tsong (627–49). The stone is at Chou-Chih, fifty miles south-west of Si-an Fu, which was in the seventh century the capital of China. It is known as "the Nestorian Monument".

For bibliography see CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA; EPHESUS, COUNCIL OF; DIOSCURUS, BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA. Here may be added, on I: GARNIER, *Opera Marii Mercatoris*, II (Paris, 1673); *P. L.*, XLVIII, 669; TILLEMONT, *Mémoires*, XIV; ASSEMANI, *Bibliotheca Orient.*, III, pt. 2 (Rome, 1728); LOOFS in *Realencyklopädie*, s. v. *Nestorius;* FENDT, *Die Christologie des Nestorius* (Munich, 1910); BATIFFOL in *Revue Biblique*, IX (1900), 329–53; MERCATI in *Theolog. Revue*, VI (1907), 63; LÜDTKE in *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, XXIX (1908), 385.

On the early struggle with Nestorianism: ASSEMANI, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, III, parts 1 and 2 (Rome, 1728); DOUCIN, *Histoire du Nestorianisme* (1689).

On the Persian Nestorians: the Monophysite historians MICHAEL SYRUS, ed. CHABOT (Paris, 1899) and BARHEBRÆUS, edd. ABBELOOS AND LAMY (Paris, 1872–77); the Mohammedan SAHRASTANI, ed. CURETON (London, 1842); and especially the rich information in the Nestorian texts themselves; GISMONDI, *Maris Amri et Slibæ de patriarchis Nestorianis commentaria, e codd. Vat.;* the *Liber Turris* (Arabic and Latin, 4 parts, Rome, 1896–99); BEDJAN, *Histoire de Mar Jab-Alaha (1317), patriarche, et de Raban Sauma* (2nd ed., Paris, 1895); *Synodicon of Ebedjesu* in MAI, *Scriptorum vett. nova. coll.*, X (1838); BRAUN, *Das Buch der Synhados* (Stuttgart and Vienna, 1900); CHABOT, *Synodicon Orientale, ou recueil de Synodes Nestoriens* in *Notes et Extraits, Synhados* (Stuttgart and Vienna, 1900); CHABOT, *Synodicon Orientale, ou recueil de Synodes Nestoriens* in *Notes et Extraits*, XXXVII (Paris, 1902); GUIDI, *Ostsyrische bischöfe und Bischofsitze* in *Zeitschrift der Morgenländ. Gesellsch.*, (1889), XLIII, 388; IDEM, *Gli statuti della scuola di Nisibi* (Syriac text) in *Giornale della Soc. Asiatica Ital.*, IV; ADDAI SCHER, *Chronique de Séert, histoire Nestorienne* (Arabic and French), and *Cause de la fondation des écoles* (Edessa and Nisibis) in *Patrologia Orientalis*, IV (Paris, 1908) ; BUDGE ed., *The Book of Governors, by Thomas Bishop of Marga, 840* (Syriac and Eng.) (2 vols., London, 1893). The best general history is by LABOURT, *Le Christianisme dans l'Empire Perse* (Paris, 1904).—See also PETERMANN AND KESSLER in *Realencyklop.*, s. v. *Nestorianer;* FUNK in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v. *Nestorius und die Nestorianer;* DUCHESNE, *Hist. ancienne de l'Eglise*, III (Paris, 1910).—On the "Nestorian Monument", see PARKER in *Dublin Review*, CXXXI (1902), 2, p. 380; CARUS AND HOLM, *The Nestorian Monument* (London, 1910).

JOHN CHAPMAN.

Ne Temere. See CLANDESTINITY; MARRIAGE, MORAL AND CANONICAL ASPECT OF.

Netherlands (Germ. *Niederlande;* Fr. *Pays Bas*), THE.—The Netherlands, or Low Countries, as organized by Charles V, under whom the Burgundian era ended, comprised practically the territory now included in Holland and Belgium, thenceforth known as the Spanish Netherlands. For the previous history of this country see BURGUNDY and CHARLES V. Shorn of the northern provinces by the secession of Holland as the Commonwealth of the United Provinces (1579), the Spanish Netherlands, on their cession to Austria (1713–14) were reduced to the provinces now embraced in Belgium, subsequently called the Austrian Netherlands.

THE SPANISH NETHERLANDS.—When Philip II by the abdication of his father, Charles V (q. v.), became sovereign of the Low Countries and took up the government of the Seventeen Provinces, he found them at

the zenith of their prosperity, as is evident from the description given in 1567 by Luigi Guicciardini in his "Descrittione di tutti i Paesi Bassi" (Totius Belgii descriptio, Amsterdam, 1613).

Few countries were so well governed; none was richer. Antwerp had taken the place of Bruges as commercial metropolis; every day saw a fleet of 500 sea-going craft enter or leave its port. Of Ghent (Gand), his native town, Charles V used to say jocosely: *Je mettrais Paris dans mon Gand* [I could put Paris in my glove (*gant*)]. Luxury, however, corrupted the earlier good morals of the people, and humanism gradually undermined the faith of some in the upper classes. Protestantism too had already effected an entrance, Lutheranism through Antwerp and Calvinism from the French border. The Anabaptists also had adherents. In addition the more powerful of the nobility now hoped to play a more influential part in the government than they had done under Charles V, and were already planning for the realization of this ambition. The situation presented many difficulties, and unfortunately Philip II was not the man to cope with them. He had little in common with his Low-Country subjects. Their language was not his; and he was a stranger to their customs. From the day he quitted the Netherlands in 1559, he never set foot in them again, but governed from far-off Spain. He was despotic, severe, crafty, and desirous of keeping in his own hands all the reins of government, in minor details as well as in matters of more importance, thereby causing many unfortunate delays in affairs that demanded rapid transaction. He was on the whole a most unsuitable ruler in spite of his sincere desire to fulfil the duties of his royal office and the time and pains he consecrated to them.

It must be said in justice that from a religious point of view, he brought about one of the most important events in the history of the Netherlands when he caused the establishment of fourteen new dioceses. The want had long been recognized and the sovereigns, particularly Philip the Good and Charles V, had often thought of this measure. In all the seventeen provinces there were but four dioceses: Utrecht in the north; Tournai, Arras, and Cambrai in the West; and all of them were subject to foreign metropolitans, Utrecht to Cologne and the others to Reims. Moreover the greater part of the country was under the direct jurisdiction of foreign bishops: those of Liège, Trier, Metz, Verdun, etc. Hence arose great difficulties and endless conflicts. The Bull of Pope Paul IV (12 May, 1559) put an end to this situation by raising Utrecht and Cambrai to archiepiscopal rank, and by creating fourteen new sees, one of them, Mechlin, an archbishopric. The others were Antwerp, Ghent, Bruges, Ypres, St-Omer, Namur, Bois-le-Duc (Hertogenbosch), Roermond, Haarlem, Deventer, Leeuwarden, Groningen, and Middelburg. This act, excellent from a religious point of view, gave rise to many complaints. To endow the new sees it was found necessary to incorporate with them the richest abbeys in the country, and in certain provinces these carried the right of voting in the States-General. And this right being for the future exercised through the bishops, the result was that the king who nominated them gained a considerable influence in the Parliament, which had hitherto always acted as a check on the royal power. To aggravate matters, the Protestant faction spread a rumour that the erection of the new bishoprics was but a step towards introducing the Spanish Inquisition into the Netherlands. Lastly the abbeys began to complain of their lost autonomy—the place of the abbot being now occupied by the bishop.

The opposition of the nobles was led by two men, remarkable in different ways. On one hand was the Count of Egmont (see Egmont, Lamoral, Count of), the victor at St-Quentin and Gravelines, a brave man, frank and honest, a lover of popularity but weak in character and lacking in political shrewdness. On the other hand stood William of Nassau, Prince of Orange, surnamed "the Silent", a politician and diplomat of the first rank, filled with ambition which he well knew how to conceal, having no religious scruples, being Catholic, Lutheran, or Calvinist as it suited him, a man who had made the downfall of Spanish rule the one aim of his life. Grouped around these two chiefs were a number of nobles irritated with the Government, many of them deeply involved financially or morally corrupt like the too well-known Brederode. They kept up the agitation and demanded fresh concessions day by day. They insisted upon the recall of the Spanish soldiers, and the king yielded (1561). They demanded more moderate language in the public placard against heresy, and even sent the Count of Egmont to Spain to obtain it (1565); and Egmont, having been flattered and fêted at the Spanish Court, came back convinced that his mission had been successful. Soon, however, royal letters dated from the Forest of Segovia, 17 and 20 October, 1565, brought the king's formal refusal to abate one jot in the repression of heresy.

The irreconcilable attitude of the king created a situation of increasing difficulty for the government of Margaret of Parma. Heresy was spreading every day, and it was no longer confined to the cities but was obtaining a foothold in the smaller towns and even in country places. Protestant preachers, for the most part renegade monks or priests, like the famous Dathenus, assembled the people at "sermons" in which they were exhorted to open war on the Catholic religion. Calvinism, a sect better organized than Lutheranism, became the popular heresy in the Low Countries. It had supporters in every grade of society; and although its members continued to be a small minority, their daring and clever propaganda made them a most dangerous force in presence of the inaction and sluggishness of the Catholics. Stirred up by these Calvinist preachers, Catholic and Protestant nobles formed an alliance which was called *Le Compromis des Nobles*, with the object of obtaining the suppression of the Inquisition. A body of them numbering several hundred came to present a petition to that effect to the regent (5 April, 1566). It is related that as she showed signs of alarm at this demonstration Count de Berlaymont, member of the Council of State and a loyal supporter of the Government, said to her: "*Rassurez-vous, Madame, ce ne sont que des gueux*" (Courage, Madam, they are only beggars). The confederates at once took up the word as a party name, and thus this famous name made its entry into history.

Up to that time the Gueux meant to remain faithful to the king, *jusqu'à la besace* (to beggary), as one of their mottoes had it. They seemed to have been made up of Catholics and Protestants, indiscriminately, who were partisans of religious tolerance; and *Vive les Gueux* was originally the rally-cry of a sort of national party. This, however, was a delusion soon apparent. The Calvinist leaders held the movement in their hands, and did not hesitate when sure of their own strength to disclose its real fanatical opposition to the Catholic Church. Roused and excited by the impassioned appeals of the preachers, the rowdy element of the people perpetrated unheard-of excesses. In the latter part of August, 1566, bands of iconoclasts scoured the country, wrecking and pillaging churches, and in a few days they had plundered four hundred, among them the magnificent cathedral of Antwerp. These crimes opened the eyes of many who up to that time had been too lenient with the sectarians. Public opinion condemned the iconoclastic outrages and sided with the Government, which thus suddenly found its position greatly strengthened. Once more, unfortunately, Philip II was not equal to the occasion. Instead of skilfully profiting by this turn of events to

win back those who were shocked by the violence of the heretics, he looked on all his subjects in the Netherlands as equally guilty, and he swore by his father's soul that he would make an example of them. Against the advice of the regent, despite faithful Granvelle, in spite of the pope, who exhorted him to clemency, he dispatched the Duke of Alva to the Low Countries on a punitive expedition (1567). Straightway William of Orange and the more compromised nobles went into exile. Recklessly and trusting to his past services, the Count of Egmont had refused to follow them. His mistake cost him dear, for Alva caused him and Count de Hornes to be arrested and brought before a sort of court martial which he called the *Conseil des Troubles*, but known more more popularly as the *Conseil du Sang* (Blood Tribunal). The accused men, being members of the Golden Fleece, could be punished only by their order; but in spite of this privilege they were judged, condemned, and executed (1568).

When the two counts were arrested, Margaret of Parma resigned her office, and the Duke of Alva was appointed her successor; with him began a system of merciless repression. Blood flowed freely, and all the traditional rights of the people were disregarded; the Spaniard Juan Vargas, chief-justice of the Council of Troubles, replied to complaint of the University of Louvain that its privileges had been violated: *non curamus privilegios vestros.* (We are not concerned with your privileges.) Besides this, heavy taxes, 10 per cent on the sales of chattels, 5 per cent on the sale of real estate, and 1 per cent on all property, completed the popular discontent, and turned even a number of good Catholics against the Government. The Protestants, encouraged by these events, began military operations by land and sea, and the *gueux des bois* (Land-Beggars) and the *gueux de mer* (Water-Beggars) started a guerilla warfare and a campaign of pillage which were soon followed by the more serious attack of the Prince of Orange and his brother, Louis of Nassau. But the Duke of Alva frustrated all their efforts, and when he had repulsed Louis at Jemmingen, and prevented William from crossing the Geete, he caused a statue of himself to be set up at Antwerp representing him crushing under foot the hydra of anarchy. Then just as he thought he had mastered the rebellion, news was brought that on 1 April, 1572, the Water-Beggars had taken the port of Briel. Henceforth in the very heart of the Low Countries they had a point for rally or retreat, and their progress was rapid. In quick succession they captured many towns in Holland and Zealand. These Water-Beggars, under their leader, William de la Marck, Lord of Lummen, were for the most part ruffians devoid of all human feeling. When they took the town of Gorkum they put to death in a most barbarous manner nineteen priests and monks who refused to abjure their Catholic Faith. The Church venerates these brave victims on 9 July, under the title of the Martyrs of Gorkum. About the same time Louis of Nassau took Mons in Hainault, and William of Orange made a second descent on the country with an army of hirelings that committed frightful excesses. But he failed before the superior forces of the Duke of Alva. Mons was recaptured and William once more driven out. Alva then turned his arms against the provinces of the north; Zütphen, Naarden, and Haarlem fell successively into his hands and were treated most shamefully, but contrary to his hopes the rest of the rebel country did not submit.

At last Philip II realized that the duke's mission had failed. Yielding to the entreaty of his most faithful subjects—the bishops and the University of Louvain—he recalled Alva and appointed as his successor Don Luis of Requesens. During his brief regency (1573–75) Don Luis did not succeed in restoring royal authority in the revolted districts, although he showed greater humanity and an inclination to conciliate the disaffected. Nor was he more successful in capturing the town of Leyden which withstood one of the most heroic sieges in history. His death left the country in a state of anarchy.

The Council of State took over the reins of government pending the arrival of the new regent, Don John of Austria, brother of Philip II. It was a favourable moment for the ambitious schemes of William of Orange. Thanks to the intrigues of his agents, the members of the Council of State were arrested and did not regain their freedom till those most attached to the king's interests had been removed and others appointed in their places. This packed council was but a tool of the Prince of Orange, and its first act was to convene the States-General to deal with the affairs of the country, without any reference to the king. On the motion of the Prince of Orange the delegates met at Ghent the representatives of the rebel provinces of Holland and Zealand, where the authority of the prince was still unquestioned, and together they debated a scheme for securing tolerance for all forms of worship until such time as the States-General should have finally decided the matter, also for obtaining the removal of the Spanish troops. During the course of these deliberations an event happened which filled the whole country with fear and horror. The Spanish soldiers, who for a long time had received no pay, mutinied, seized the city of Antwerp, and pillaged it ruthlessly, seven thousand persons perishing during these disorders, which are usually referred to as the Spanish Fury. The provinces no longer hesitated, and their delegates signed the famous Pacification of Ghent on 8 November, 1576.

Thus triumphed the crafty and artful diplomacy of the Prince of Orange. He had succeeded in causing the loyal provinces to vote toleration of worship, while the provinces of Holland and Zealand of which he was master, formally refused to allow within their limits the practice of the Catholic religion. No doubt it was stipulated that this refusal was only provisional, and that the States-General of the seventeen provinces would finally settle the question; but meanwhile Protestantism gained an immense advantage in the Catholic provinces without giving anything in return. Furthermore the prince had taken the precaution to have it stipulated that he should remain admiral and regent of Holland and Zealand, and all these measures were passed in the name of the king whose authority they completely defied.

Such was the situation when the new regent arrived. On the advice of his best friends he ratified by his "Edit perpétuel de Marche en Famenne" (1577) the main clauses of the Pacification of Ghent, which rallied to him a majority of the people. Then he set about establishing his authority, no easy task in face of the unwearying effort of the Prince of Orange to prevent it. When, in order to obtain a reliable stronghold, he seized the citadel of Namur, the States-General, prompted by William of Orange, declared him an enemy of the State and called in as regent Archduke Matthias of Austria, to whom William succeeded in being made lieutenant-general. Don John defeated the army of the States-General at Gembloux, and William made a fresh appeal to foreign Protestants. From all the neighbouring countries adventurers flocked in to fight the Catholic Government. The Calvinists took some of the large cities, Brussels, Antwerp, Ghent, and held them in a state of terror. In the last-named town two of the leaders, Hembyze and Ryhove, gave themselves up to every excess, persecuted the Catholics, and endeavoured to set up a sort of Protestant republic as Calvin had done at Geneva. To crown all these misfortunes, the young regent was carried off by illness in 1578, and all seemed lost for the Catholic religion and the royal authority.

But the eyes of the Catholics were at last opened. Seeing that under pretext of freeing them from Span-

ish tyranny they were being enslaved under Protestantism, they turned from William's party and sought once more their lawful king, in spite of the just complaints they had against his government. This reactionary movement was most marked in the Walloon provinces: Artois, Hainault, and French Flanders in the van; Namur and Luxemburg joining them later. It began as a league among the nobles of these provinces, who styled themselves the Malcontents, and who broke with the States-General to recognize anew the authority of Philip II. It was they who prevented the realization of the great scheme of William of Orange to federate the seventeen provinces in a league of which he was to be the head, and which would ultimately cast off all allegiance to the king. When he saw his great ambition foiled, William contented himself with uniting the northern provinces in the Union of Utrecht (1579), under the name of the United Provinces, and with proclaiming the deposition of Philip II at least within these provinces. To the Malcontents, therefore, is due the credit of saving the royal authority and the Catholic religion in the Belgian provinces.

The new regent, Alessandro Farnese, son of the former regent, Margaret of Parma, grasped the situation admirably. He entered into negotiations with the Malcontents, and reconciled them with the king's government by redressing their grievances; then with their support he set about recovering by force of arms the towns that had fallen into the hands of the Protestants. One after the other they were recaptured, some, like Tournai and Antwerp, only after memorable sieges, till at last Ostend alone of all Belgium remained in Protestant hands. And now the popular regent was preparing for a campaign against the northern provinces, demoralized by the assassination of William of Orange in 1584, when once more Philip II's ill-advised policy ruined everything. Instead of allowing Farnese to continue his military success in the Netherlands, Philip used him as an instrument of wild projects against France and England. At one moment obliged to take part in maritime preparations against England, and at another to cross the frontier in support of the League against Henry IV, Farnese had to leave his task unfinished, and he died in 1592 of a wound received in one of his French expeditions. His death was the greater misfortune for Belgium because Maurice of Nassau, son of William of Orange, and one of the greatest war-captains of the age, was just then coming to the front.

Philip finally saw that a new policy must be tried. He bethought him of separating the Catholic Netherlands from Spain, and of giving the sovereignty to his daughter Isabella and her husband the Archduke Albert of Austria; in the event of their being childless the country was to revert to Spain (1598). This was one of the most important events in the history of Belgium, which thus became once more an independent nation, acquired a national dynasty, and might now hope for the return of former prosperity; that this hope was frustrated was the result of events which defeated the plans of statecraft and the wishes of the new sovereigns.

During the short space of their united reign (1598–1621) Albert and Isabella lavished benefits on the country. Ostend was recaptured from Holland after a three-years' siege which claimed the attention of all Europe, and a truce of twelve years (1609–21) made with the United Provinces was employed to the greatest advantage. The damage done by the religious wars was repaired; more than three hundred churches and religious houses were founded or restored; local customs were codified by the Perpetual Edict of 1611, which has been called the most splendid monument of Belgian law; public education was fostered in every way, and the new sovereigns brought about the founding of many colleges by the protection they extended to the religious teaching orders. Moreover they showed themselves generous patrons of science, literature, and art, and protected the interests of commerce and agriculture. Blameless in their private life and deeply pious, they gave an example of virtue on the throne not always to be found there. Unfortunately they died childless, Albert in 1621, Isabella in 1633, and their death put an end to the reviving prosperity of Belgium. Once more the country was drawn into endless wars by Spain, principally against France, and became the battle-field of numerous international conflicts. It was repeatedly despoiled of some of its provinces by Louis XIV, and cruelly plundered by all armies, friendly and hostile, that marched across its plains. The seventeenth century was the most calamitous of its history. Such then was the condition of Belgium until the peace of Utrecht (1713), which followed by that of Rastatt put an end to the long and bloody wars of the Spanish Succession which gave Spain to the Bourbons and handed over the Catholic Low Countries to the Hapsburgs of Austria.

It would be a mistake to suppose that all these calamities, domestic and foreign, had left Belgium entirely unfruitful from the point of view of civilization. Nothing could be more false; though it is a charge often made even in Belgium by writers whose prejudices would fain discover in Catholicism a retarding force for Belgium's progress. The University of Louvain with its forty-two colleges, where Erasmus, Bellarmine, and Justus Lipsius had taught, had always been the centre of orthodoxy, and did not cease even during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to manifest great activity, chiefly in the domains of theology and law, which were expounded there by a large number of eminent scholars. Side by side with Louvain stood the University of Douai founded in 1562 by Philip II as a breakwater against heresy, and it also sent forth many famous men. Among the new bishops were men whose fame for learning was only equalled by their well-known piety. It is no doubt true that the controversies of the day have left their mark on the religious life of that period. Thus, Michael Baius, a professor at Louvain, was condemned by Rome for his theories on free will, predestination, and justification, but he retracted in all humility. His teaching came up again in a more pronounced form in a pupil of one of his pupils, Cornelius Jansen, Bishop of Ypres, and it is well known how the "Augustinus", a posthumous work of this prelate, which appeared in 1640, gave rise to what is called Jansenism. Another manifestation of the intellectual and scientific activity of Belgium was the beginning of the celebrated collection known as the "Acta Sanctorum" by the Belgian Jesuits. Héribert Rosweyde drew up the plans for the undertaking, and Father Jan van Bolland began to carry them out, leaving the continuation to his successors, the Bollandists. Amongst these Henschen and Papebroch in the seventeenth century contributed brilliantly to the work which has not yet reached its conclusion.

If, apart altogether from the religious aspect, we would complete the picture of Belgium's culture in the seventeenth century, we have but to recall that art reached its apogee in the Flemish School, of which Rubens was the head, and Van Dyck, Teniers, and Jordæns the greatest masters after him. It would thus be easy to prove that the Catholic Low Countries, though caught as in a vise between powerful neighbours and ever in the throes of war, did not give way to despair, but in the days of direst calamity drew from their own bosom works of art and beauty which have served to adorn even our present day civilization.

THE AUSTRIAN NETHERLANDS.—The Treaty of Utrecht opened an era of comparative peace and prosperity for the Catholic Netherlands, but did not bring contentment. The Austrian régime under which the

country was now to exist was that of an absolute monarchy, which by continued encroachments on the traditional privileges of the people, drove them at length to rebellion. It was not merely its absolutism, it was the anti-religious atmosphere of the Government which really aroused the people. The actuating principle of the Government in its dealings with the Catholic Church was that the civil power was supreme and could make rules for the Church, even in purely religious matters. This policy, which is known as Josephinism, from Joseph II, its most thoroughgoing exponent, had prevailed at the Austrian Court from the beginning. It found a theorist of great authority in the famous canonist Van Espen (1646–1728), a professor at the University of Louvain, who justified beforehand all attacks on the liberty of the Church. The opposition between the tendencies of the Government, which threatened alike the national liberties and the rights of the Church, and the aspirations of the Belgian people, devoted alike to religion and liberty, gave rise during the Austrian occupation of the country to endless misunderstandings and unrest. The situation was not, however, uniformly the same. It varied under different reigns, each of which had its own peculiar characteristics.

Under the reign of Charles VI (1713–1740) Belgium quickly learned that she had gained nothing by the changing of her rulers. One of the clauses of the Peace of Utrecht obliged Austria to sign a treaty with the United Provinces, called the Treaty de la Barrière (the Frontier Treaty) entitling the United Provinces to garrison a number of Belgian towns on the French frontier as a protection against attacks from that quarter. This was a humiliation for the Belgians, and it was aggravated by the fact that these garrison troops, who were all Protestants and enjoyed the free exercise of their religion, had many religious quarrels with the Catholic people. Moreover, the United Provinces, controlling the estuary of the Scheldt, had closed the sea against the port of Antwerp since 1585; so that this port which had at one time been the foremost commercial city of the north was now depleted of its trade. This was a fresh injustice to the Catholic Low Countries. To all this must be added the oppressive and ill-advised policy of the Marquess de Prié, deputy for the absent governor-general, Prince Eugene of Savoy. Prié, like another Alva, treated the country with the utmost severity. When the labour guilds of Brussels protested vigorously against the government taxes and tried to assert their ancient privileges, Prié caused the aged François Anneessens, syndic or chairman of one of these guilds, to be arrested and put to death (1719). The citizens of Brussels have never forgotten to venerate the memory of their fellow-townsman as a martyr for public liberty. The Government compensated the nation by founding the East and West Indian Trading Company of Ostend in 1722. This company, which was enthusiastically hailed by the public, was of immense benefit in the beginning, and promised an era of commercial prosperity. Unfortunately the jealousy of England and of the United Provinces sealed its fate. To win the consent of these two powers to his Pragmatic Sanction, by which he hoped to secure the undisputed succession of his daughter Maria Theresa, the emperor agreed to suppress the Ostend company and once more to close the sea against Belgian trade. His cowardly concessions were of no avail, and at his death in 1740 his daughter was obliged to undertake a long and costly war to maintain her inheritance and Belgium, invaded and conquered by France in 1745, was not restored to the empress till the Peace of Aachen in 1748.

Under the reign of Maria Theresa (1740–80) the Government was in a position to occupy itself peacefully with the organization of the Belgian provinces. On the whole it fostered the material interests of the country, but the principles underlying its religious policy revealed themselves in measures more and more hostile to the Church. The empress herself was of the opinion that the Church ought to be subject to the State even in religious matters. "The authority of the priesthood", she wrote, "is by no means arbitrary and independent in matters of dogma, worship, and ecclesiastical discipline". The statesmen in her service, imbued as they were with the Voltairean spirit, were zealous in applying those principles. The more famous among them were the Prince of Kaunitz, the Count of Cobenzl, and Mac Neny. On the slightest pretext they constantly stirred up petty and at times ridiculous conflicts with the ecclesiastical authorities, such as forbidding assemblies of the bishops; trying to insist on the relaxing of the Lenten Fast; claiming censorship over breviaries and missals, and going so far as to mutilate copies of them containing the Office of St. Gregory VII; calling in question the jurisdiction of the Church in matrimonial affairs; hindering and interfering in every conceivable way with the work of the religious orders, even busying themselves with the dress worn by the clerics; in a word pursuing a most irritating and malicious policy wherever the Church was concerned. If in spite of all this the name of Maria Theresa is of kindly memory in Belgium, it is because her subjects knew the sincerity of her piety, and her undoubted good-will. They were grateful for this, and believing that for the most part she was unaware of most of the actions of her representatives, they did not place the blame at her door. Moreover the Governor-General of the Austrian Low Countries, Prince Charles of Lorraine, brother-in-law of the empress, was a man of infinite tact, who knew how to moderate what was unpopular in the action of the Government, and even cause it to be forgotten. It was personal esteem for these two royal personages which caused the policy of the Government to be tolerated as long as they lived.

But there came a great change as soon as Joseph II mounted the throne (1780). He was the son of Maria Theresa, a pupil of the philosophers, and, inspired by their teachings, was ever ready to defy and disregard the Church. As was not unusual in his day he held the opinion that the State was the source of all authority, and the source of all civilizing progress. He set himself without delay to apply his policy of "enlightened despotism". Forgetful of his coronation oath to observe the constitutions of the several Belgian provinces he began a career of reform which ended by overturning the existing state of affairs. His first act was to publish in 1781 an edict of toleration, by which Protestants were freed from all civil disabilities, a just measure in itself, and one that might well be praiseworthy, if it were not that, in the light of his subsequent actions it betrayed the dominant idea of his whole reign, namely, hostility to the Catholic Church. The Church, he thought, ought to be a creature of the State, subject to the control and supervision of the civil power. He undertook to realize this ideal by substituting for the Catholic Church governed by the pope a national Church subject to the State, along the lines laid down by Febronius, who had met with many supporters even within the ranks of the clergy. The measures he adopted to enslave the Church were endless. He forbade religious orders to correspond with superiors outside the country; he forbade the bishops to ask Rome for dispensations in matrimonial cases. He tried to gain control of the education of the clergy by erecting a central seminary to which he endeavoured to force the bishops to send their future priests. He interfered with the professors and the teaching of the University of Louvain because he considered them too orthodox. He suppressed as useless all convents of contemplative orders and all pious confraternities, and replaced them by one of his own invention which he grandiloquently called "The Confraternity of the Active Love of our Neighbour". He prohibited all

pilgrimages and the exposition of relics. He limited the number of processions and ordered that all parish festivals (*kermesses*) be kept on the same day. He interfered with the garb of religious and in liturgical questions, and even went so far as to forbid the making of coffins, so as to economize the wood supply. The dead, he thought, ought to be buried in sackcloth. At last his interference in and wanton meddling with ecclesiastical matters won for him the well-deserved sneer of Frederick II, King of Prussia, who called him "My brother, the sacristan".

All these measures had been carried into effect without meeting other opposition than the calm respectful protest of the clergy. But it was quite otherwise when Joseph II was so imprudent as to interfere with civil institutions and, in violation of the most solemn oaths, to lay hands on the liberties of the people. Then the country was thoroughly aroused, there were demonstrations in the public streets, and protests reached the Government from all parts (1787); but Joseph II was stiff-necked, and would not listen to reason. Convinced that force would overcome all opposition, he hurried Count d'Alton with an army into the Low Countries, with orders to restore authority by bloodshed if necessary. Then as a protest against the violence of d'Alton, the provincial states, availing themselves of the rights granted them by the Constitution, refused to vote subsidies for the expenses of the Government, and d'Alton was so ill-advised as to declare the proceedings null and the Constitution abolished. This was a signal for revolution, the only resource left to Belgian liberty. Two committees directed the movement along widely differing lines. The one, under the leadership of a lawyer named Van der Noot, had its headquarters at Breda in the United Provinces, the other under another lawyer, Vonck, at Hasselt in the neighbourhood of Liège. That under Van der Noot, a man of great popularity, looked to the foreign powers for help; the other relied on the Belgians to help themselves, and began recruiting a volunteer army. The one was conservative, almost reactionary, and aimed merely at restoring the *status quo;* the other was eager for reforms such as France was asking, but was faithful to the religion of its fathers and took as its motto *Pro aris et focis*. In their union lay their strength. The volunteer army defeated the Austrians at Turnhout (1789) and forced them step by step to evacuate the country. The bitterness of this defeat killed Joseph II.

The States-General of the country were convened at Brussels and voted that Belgium should be an independent federated republic under the name of the United States of Belgium. Unfortunately the heads of the new Government were novices in statecraft, and differences arose between the Van der Noot party and the followers of Vonck. So that in the following year Leopold II, who had succeeded his father, Joseph II, had the country once more under his authority. He was, however, wise enough to restore it all the privileges it enjoyed prior to the senseless reforms of Joseph II. The Belgians were therefore to all intents once more a free people, and they rejoiced in their freedom until the day when the French invaded their country under the pretext of emancipating them.

For the later history of this territory see BELGIUM.

THE SPANISH NETHERLANDS.—MOTLEY, *The Rise of the Dutch Republic* (3 vols., New York, 1856); JUSTE, *Histoire de la révolution des Pays Bas sous Philippe II* (2 vols., Brussels, 1863–67); NUYENS, *Geschiedenis des nederlandsche beroerten in de XVI^e Ieeuw.* (6 vols., Amsterdam, 1865–68); DE LETTENHOVE, *Les Huguenots et les Gueux* (6 vols., Brussels, 1882–85); PIRENNE, *Histoire de Belgique*, III (2nd ed., Brussels, 1907); BLOK, *Geschiedenis van het nederlandsche volk*, III, IV, V (Groningen, 1896–1902); GOSSART, *L'établissement du régime espagnol dans les Pays Bas et l'insurrection* (Brussels, 1905); IDEM, *La domination espagnole dans les Pays Bas à la fin du règne de Philippe II* (Brussels, 1906).

THE AUSTRIAN NETHERLANDS.—GACHARD, *Histoire de la Belgique au commencement du XVIII^e siècle* (Brussels, 1880); VAN RUCKELINGEN (L. MATHOT), *Geschiedenis der oostenrijksche Nederlanden* (5 vols., Antwerp, 1876–80); PIOT, *Le règne de Marie-Thérèse dans les Pays Bas autrichiens* (Louvain, 1874); DISCAILLES, *Les Pays Bas sous le règne de Marie-Thérèse* (Brussels, 1872); DELPLACE, *Joseph II et la révolution brabançonne* (Bruges, 1891); HUBERT, *Les garnisons de la Bavière dans les Pays Bas autrichiens* (Brussels, 1902); IDEM, *Le voyage de Joseph II au Pays Bas* (1781) (Brussels, 1890).

GODEFROID KURTH.

Netter, THOMAS, theologian and controversialist, b. at Saffron Walden, Essex, England, about 1375; d. at Rouen, France, 2 Nov., 1430; from his birthplace he was commonly called Waldensis. He entered the Carmelite Order in London, and pursued his studies partly there and partly at Oxford, where he took degrees, and spent a number of years in teaching, as may be gathered from the titles of his writings (the actual works being for the greater part lost), which embrace the whole of philosophy, Scripture, Canon Law, and theology, that is, a complete academical course. He was well read in the classics and the ecclesiastical writers known at the beginning of the fifteenth century, as is proved by numerous quotations in his own writings. Only the dates of his ordinations as acolyte and subdeacon are on record, 1394 and 1395. His public life began in 1409, when he was sent to the Council of Pisa, where he is said to have upheld the rights of the council. Back in England he took a prominent part in the prosecution of Wycliffites and Lollards, assisting at the trials of William Tailor (1410), Sir John Oldcastle (1413), William White (1428), preaching at St. Paul's Cross against Lollardism, and writing copiously on the questions in dispute ("De religione perfectorum", "De paupertate Christi", "De Corpore Christi", etc.). The House of Lancaster having chosen Carmelite friars for confessors, an office which included the duties of chaplain, almoner, and secretary and which frequently was rewarded with some small bishopric, Netter succeeded Stephen Patrington as confessor to Henry V and provincial of the Carmelites (1414), while other members of the order held similar posts at the courts of the dukes of York and of Clarence, of Cardinal Beaufort, etc. No political importance seems to have been attached to such positions.

In 1415 Netter was sent by the king to the Council of Constance, where the English nation, though small in numbers, asserted its influence. He must have interrupted his residence at Constance by one, if not several, visits to his province. At the conclusion of the council he, with William Clynt, doctor in Divinity, and two knights, was sent by the English king on an embassy to the King of Poland, the Grand Duke of Lithuania, and the Grand master of the Teutonic Knights. The pope was represented by two Italian bishops, and the emperor by the Archbishop of Milan. The object of the mission was to bring about a mutual understanding and prevent the failure of the papal army against the Hussites. It has been asserted that on this occasion Netter converted Vitort, Grand Duke of Lithuania, to Christianity, and was instrumental in his recognition as king and his subsequent coronation. Although all this is doubtful, it is possible that Netter did exercise some influence during his brief stay in eastern Europe, for he has been styled the Apostle of Lithuania; he also established several convents of his order in Prussia. He returned to England in the autumn of 1420, and devoted the remainder of his life to the government of his province and the composition of his principal work. Fragments of his correspondence lately published throw a light on his endeavours in the former capacity, showing him a strict reformer, yet kind and even tender.

Henry V having died in his arms, he appears to have acted as tutor (rather than confessor) to the infant King Henry VI, whose piety may be attributed, at least in part, to Netter's influence. He accompanied the young king to France in the spring of

1430, and died six months later in the odour of sanctity. Miracles having been wrought at his tomb, the question of the confirmation of his cult is at present (1910) before the Congregation of Rites. Of his numerous works only the "Doctrinale antiquitatum fidei ecclesiæ catholicæ" has permanent value. It is in three parts, the first of which might be termed "De vera religione", the second bears the title "De sacramentis adversus Wiclefistas" etc., and the last "De sacramentalibus". The first two were presented to the pope, who on 8 August, 1427, expressed his satisfaction, encouraging the author to continue his useful and learned undertaking, and communicating to him the text of the Bull condemning the errors of Wyclif "Dudum ab apostolorum". Nevertheless the work, owing to its bulk, would have fallen into oblivion had not some Carmelites, notably Ludovicus de Lyra and John Hottus, discovered it in the library of Paris and secured its publication (1523). It was reprinted at Paris (1532), Salamanca (1557), Venice (1571 and 1757). It is a complete apologia of Catholic dogma and ritual as against the attacks of the Wycliffites, and was largely drawn upon by the controversialists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

ZIMMERMAN, *Monumenta histor. Carmel.*, I (Lérins, 1907), 442 sqq.

BENEDICT ZIMMERMAN.

Neugart, TRUDPERT, Benedictine historian, b. at Villingen, Baden, 23 February, 1742; d. at St. Paul's Benedictine abbey, near Klagenfurt, Carinthia, Austria, 15 December, 1825. Of middle-class origin Neugart studied in the classical schools of the Benedictine Abbeys of St. George and St. Blasien, entered the order at the latter monastery in 1759, and was ordained priest in 1765; in 1767 he was appointed professor of Biblical languages at the University of Freiburg. In 1770, however, he returned to St. Blasien, where he professed theology. While engaged in this work he published a treatise on penance, "Doctrina de sacramento pœnitentiæ recte administrando" (St. Blasien, 1778). His abbot, Gerbert, had planned the publication of a Church history of Germany on a large scale (*Germania sacra*). In 1780 at his request Neugart began an elaborate research into the history of the Diocese of Constance. On Gerbert's death in 1793, Neugart declined the dignity of abbot but accepted the provostship of Krozingen, near Freiburg, so as to be able to devote himself entirely to historical studies. He published the original charters and documents for the history of the Diocese of Constance in a separate publication, "Codex diplomaticus Alemanniæ et Burgundiæ transjuranæ intra fines diœcesis Constantiensis" (I, St. Blasien, 1791; II, St. Blasien, 1795). With this as a basis he wrote at Krozingen the first instalment of his history of the Diocese of Constance "Episcopatus Constantiensis Alemannicus sub metropoli Moguntina" (part I, vol. I, to the year 1100, St. Blasien, 1803). Soon the abbey of St. Blasien was secularized. Notwithstanding Neugart's efforts for its preservation it was assigned to Baden, and absorbed with all its landed possessions. In 1807 Neugart went to Vienna to negotiate for the settlement of the expelled monks in Austria, and succeeded. The abbot and monks of St. Blasien were granted the Abbey of St. Paul, near Klagenfurt in the valley of the Lavant, suppressed by Joseph II. Here Neugart completed the second volume of his diocesan history extending to 1308, but it was not published until 1862. He then turned his attention to the history of Carinthia and of the Abbey of St. Paul, where he and his companions had found refuge. After his death there appeared his "Historia monasterii Ord. S. Benedicti ad S. Paulum in valle inferioris Carinthiæ Lavantina" (Klagenfurt, 1848, 1854). Several historical treatises and compilations are still in MS. Another work, "Libellus majores maternos Rudolphi I regis exhibens", was edited by Weber (Klagenfurt, 1850).

BADER, *Das ehemalige Kloster St. Blasien auf dem Schwarzwalde und seine Gelehrtenakademie* (Freiburg, 1874), 115–120; HURTER, *Nomenclator* (Innsbruck, 1895), 859 sq.

J. P. KIRSCH.

Neum (Latin *neuma*, *pneuma*, or *neupma*, from Greek πνεῦμα, a breath, or νεῦμα, a nod), a term in medieval music theory. It does not seem to have been used before the eleventh century. From that time it was generally taken in two senses, to denote, first, a kind of melody, second, a notational sign. Guido of Arezzo ("Micrologus", xv) takes it in a third sense, in which he seems to be singular, saying: "As in metrics there are letters and syllables, parts and feet, and verses, so in music there are tones, of which one, two, or three join to make a syllable; of these one or two make a neuma, that is a part of the melody; while one or several parts make a distinction (phrase), that is, a suitable place for breathing."

Applied to a melody, the term means a series of tones sung without words, generally on the last vowel of a text. The older name for such a melody is *iubilus*. Thus St. Jerome (In Psalm. xxxii, P. L., XXVI, 915) defines: "That is called *iubilus* which neither in words nor syllables nor letters nor in speech can utter or define how much man ought to praise God". Similarly St. Augustine says (Psalm xcix, P. L., XXXVII, 1272): "He who sings a *iubilus*, does not utter words, but the *iubilus* is a song of joy without words." And again (in Ps. xxxii, P. L., XXXVI, 283): "And for whom is this *iubilatio* more fitting than for the ineffable God?" Finally the following passage from St. Augustine's contemporary, Cassian ("De Cœnobiorum Inst.", II, ii, P. L., XLIX, 77) must remove any doubt as to the use of such *iubili* in the Liturgy. He says of certain monasteries that "they held there should be sung every night twenty or thirty psalms and those, too, prolonged by antiphon melodies, and the joining on of certain modulations."

The usual place of such neums is in responsorial singing (see PLAIN CHANT), especially at the end of the Alleluia which follows the Gradual of the Mass. In the later Middle Ages, however, from about the twelfth century onwards, the custom grew up of adding neums, definite formulæ, one for each mode, to the office antiphons, there being special rubrics in the liturgical books as to the days on which they should be sung or not sung. The more important use of the term is that in which it means the signs used in the notation of Gregorian Chant. Akin to this use is the one which applies it to the tones or groups of tones designated by the notational signs. Also in this sense the term cannot be traced farther back than the eleventh century. The names of the various signs, too, seem to date from about the same period. Previously the general name for the notation was usus. The names of the single signs varied with time and place. The tables of neums found in several MSS not only differ in the number of names, but also give different names for the same sign, or different signs for the same name. In this article we shall use the names as applied in the Preface to the Gradual recently issued from the Vatican printing establishment.

The neumatic notation of Plain Chant is first met with in MSS of the ninth century and, with slight modifications, is to be seen in liturgical books issued to-day. Whether its use goes much farther back, whether, in particular, St. Gregory the Great employed notation in his typical Antiphonarium, cannot be said with certainty. The fact that at the date of our earliest MSS. the insufficiency of the notation was felt, and various efforts were made to supply the defect, would seem to point to an antecedent development of considerable duration. On the other hand the fact that from the beginning we find several families of notation like those of St. Gall and Metz, which,

while agreeing in the main principles, show considerable divergence in matters of detail, would seem to suggest that at the time when these families started, only the fundamental idea had been conceived, while the full development of the whole system took place



Ill. I.—The Winchester Tropes (XI Century)
Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, No. 473
(reduced about one-third)

more or less independently at the various centres. Judging by the consideration mentioned first, we should have no difficulty in believing that St. Gregory used neumatic notation in his Antiphonary. In accordance with the second view, however, we should feel inclined to put the beginning of neumatic writing about the eighth century.

As to the origin of the neums students are now on the whole agreed that they are mainly derived from the accent marks of the grammarians. In that way, of course, they point back to Greece. From the fact, however, that some of the signs in the developed system look like signs in Byzantine notation, and that some of the names are Greek in origin, some investigators have concluded that the whole system was taken over from Greece. Recently J. Thibaut has defended this theory in a rather fanciful book, "Origine Byzantine de la Notation Neumatique de l'Eglise Latine". But the prevailing opinion is that the neumatic system is of Latin growth.

Accordingly the fundamental principle is that the rise and fall of the melody are expressed by the signs of the accentus acutus (/) and the accentus gravis (\ ). The acutus, being drawn upwards, from left to right, indicates a rise in the melody, a higher note; the gravis, being drawn downwards, a fall in the melody, a lower note. From the combination of these two signs there result various group signs: (1) ^, acutus and gravis, a higher note followed by a lower one, a descending group of two notes (clivis); (2) v, gravis and acutus, lower and higher notes (pes or podatus); (3) ~, acutus, gravis, acutus; a group of three notes of which the second is the lowest (porrectus); (4) ^, gravis, acutus, gravis; a group of three notes of which the second is the highest (torculus); and so on. In these combinations the elements generally preserve their original form pretty clearly, except that the angles are often rounded off, as indicated below. When used singly, the acutus, too, retained its shape fairly accurately and from its shape received the name virga (virgula). The gravis, however, was generally converted into a short horizontal line (—), or a dot (.), or something similar, and hence received the name of punctum. In this form it is also used in an ascending group of three or more notes (.·' , scandicus) and in a



Ill. II.—Codex 121 (X–XI Century), Einsiedeln

similar descending group (/·., climacus). More complicated combinations were designated as modifications of the simpler groups. The addition of a lower

Mus. Ex. 1

note to a group ending with a higher note was indicated by the adjective flexus, the addition of a higher note to a group ending with a lower note, by resupinus.

follows on the same syllable. An analysis of all the cases of liquescence occurring in the MS. Gradual 339 of St. Gall is made in the second volume of the "Paléographie Musicale" (pp. 41 sqq.), where the subject is treated very fully. This analysis shows that by far the largest number of cases (2450 out of 3504) occur when a vowel is followed by two or more consonants the first of which is one of the "liquids" (l, m, n, r) either within a word (like *sanctos*) or through the collocation of two words (as in *te*). A considerable number is found before an explosive dental at the end of a word followed by another word beginning with one or more consonants (317 before t, 48 before d). Forty-nine times it is found before a final s followed by another consonant (e. g. *nobis Domine*) and six times before *s* in Israhel; seventy-three times before g, thirty-two times before two consonants the second of which is j (e. g. *adjutor*), forty-six times before single m, thirty-four times before a single g followed by e or i. One hundred and fifty-nine times on the diphthong au, and two hundred and eighty-eight times before a single j (including one hundred and fifty-three cases on *alleluia*).

It is clear from what has been said, that this liquescence must be connected with the proper pronunciation of the consonants. But as to what it should mean in the rendering, authors are not agreed. Thus the preface to the Vatican Gradual says: "ipsa cogente syllabarum natura, vox de una ad alteram limpide transiens tunc 'liquescit'; ita ut in ore compressa 'non finiri videatur', et quasi dimidium suæ, non moræ, sed potestatis amittat". This is not easy to translate, but it would seem that the last tone of the liquescent neum should "lose one half, not of its length, but of its strength". The "Paléographie Musicale" on the other hand, says that in the exact pronunciation of certain combinations of consonants an obscure vowel sound enters between them, so that a word like *confundantur* would sound *confunedanetur* and that it is this after-sound which exerts its influence on the tone preceding the first consonant. It is not easy to see why this obscure vowel sound coming after the first consonant should influence the tone preceding it, nor why the consonants should change the dynamic character of the preceding vowel sound. Possibly the nature of the liquid consonants, l, m, n, r, which evidently have given the name to the liquescent neums, would give a more satisfactory explanation. It is well known that these consonants can be sung, that is be prolonged on a definite and varying pitch. It would seem, then, that when one of these consonants follows a vowel, then sometimes the last note on the vowel sound is smoothly fused into the consonantal sound, part of its time value being given to the singing of the liquid or semivocal consonant. This would conveniently apply to the first class of cases



Ill. III.—MS. 239 (IX–X Century), Laon

Thus even the clivis (more correctly clinis) was at an early period called virga flexa, and the torculus could be considered as a pes flexus. The sign ⩘ would be a porrectus flexus, the ⩛ a torculus resupinus, etc. Again the placing of several puncta before a sign is expressed by the term præpunctis, their addition after a sign subpinctis. In accordance with that a scandicus is a virga præpunctis; a climacus, a virga subpunctis; ✓·., pes subpunctis; ⩘·., scandicus subpunctis, or, also compunctis, the last-named adjective indicating the addition of punctis before and after.

A special modification of the neum form is that which is called liquescent or semivocal. It consists generally of a shortening, attenuating, or curling of the last stroke. It occurs only at the transition from one syllable to the next and there only in certain circumstances. It is never found when another neum

mentioned above, which comprise the large majority of all the cases. Also to the case of single m and j (or i), the latter partaking of the nature of the liquid consonants. It would further apply to the case of gn, if we suppose that that combination was pronounced ny,

Intr.
I.
Aude- ámus * omnes in Dó-mi-
no, di-em festum ce-lebrántes sub honó-
re Agathae Márty-ris: de cujus passi-ó-
ne gaudent Ange- li, et colláu- dant
Fí- li- um De- i.

Mus. Ex. 2

and to the case of final s, if that consonant was voiced, when it also could be sung. In the case of the diphthong au the liquescence would consist in the transition from the first vowel to the second. The remaining cases of double consonants should be explained by analogy, the liquescence consisting simply in the shortening of the vowel sound made for the purpose of distinct pronunciation of the group of consonants without loss of time. This explanation would have the further advantage of being in accordance with the practice of the best choirs that nowadays make a peculiar study of Plain Chant.

Some of the liquescent neums have special names.

Mus. Ex. 3

Thus the liquescent podatus is called epiphonus, the liquescent clivis, cephalicus, the liquescent climacus, ancus.

In addition to the neums which are derived from the accents and which form the groundwork of the neumatic system, there is another class which may be taken as indicating special effects. They have, as Wagner has pointed out, as a common feature, the hook form. In the first place we mention the strophicus, having the shape of a comma (,). When occurring singly, it is called apostropha, when doubled, distropha; when trebled, tristropha. The apostropha is generally found at the end of another neum, or followed by a distropha at a higher pitch; it is never used as a single note over a syllable. When added to a neum, it is generally represented in the later staff-notation manuscripts at the same pitch as the last note of that neum. But there is reason to believe that originally there was an interval smaller than a semitone between those two notes. The distropha and tristropha indicate a quick repetition of the same note, possibly again with a minute difference of pitch between the repeated notes.

Akin to the apostropha is the oriscus, having a shape somewhat like this : ϟ. Apostropha and oriscus are sometimes interchanged in different manuscripts. In a few instances the oriscus, however, is



Mus. Ex. 4

found as the single sign over a syllable. The quilisma is generally written as a number of hooks open to the right and joined together (,). It occurs invariably as the middle note in an ascending group and seems to indicate a glide of the voice, being accompanied by a sustaining of the note or group of notes preceding it. The salicus is a figure like the scandicus, but with the second note in the shape of a hook opening downwards ( ). It seems to indicate a prolongation of the middle note. Sometimes, in staff-notation manuscripts, the first two notes are given at the same pitch. Possibly here again there was a difference of less than a semitone between them. The pressus is a kind of combination of a virga with added oriscus and a punctum ( ), pressus minor, , pressus major). It is generally understood as equivalent to a clivis with the first note prolonged and rendered *sforzato*. Finally to be mentioned is the trigon, a combination of three puncta, the middle one being higher than the other two (.·.). From its shape it would seem to be a kind of torculus, but it is often transcribed with the first two notes at the same pitch, suggesting once more a minute interval not expressible in staff notation.

The illustrations which accompany this article are

reproduced, by kind permission of the editors, from the "Paléographie Musicale". Illustration I ("Pal. Mus.", III, pl. 179) represents the type of the Anglo-Saxon neums of the eleventh century. The piece is a trope for the Introit "In medio". The three portions



Ill. IV.—Mozarabic Liber Ordinum (A. D. 1052)
Library of St. Dominic, Silos

of the Introit itself are merely indicated by the cues *In Med.*, *Et impleb.*, and *Stola*. The signs for the single notes are the plain virga and the round punctum, the former on the last syllable of *iohannis*, the second and third syllables of *adimplens*, etc., the latter on the second syllable of *Gratia*, the second syllable of *Dei*, the first of *iohannis*, etc. In the podatus the gravis is a short horizontal stroke, the acutus a straight virga joining almost at a right angle; see third syllable of *Gratia*, third of *salutifere*, third of *dogmata*, etc. There is also a second form consisting of a disjointed punctum and virga, see third syllable of *Gloria* (last line on left page), first syllable of *xristus* (first line of right page), third syllable of *æternum* (fourth line). This is considered as indicating a long form of the podatus. The liquescent form (epiphonus) is marked by a rounding of the angle; see second syllable of *iohannis*, third syllable of *fluxerunt*. The clivis shows the curved angle, as on second syllable of *pectus*, second and fourth of *salutifere*. The liquescent form (cephalicus), somewhat shortened, is seen on the third syllable of *iohannem* (first line on right page). The torculus is seen on the first syllable of *adimplens*, first syllable of *docente* (fourth line), etc. On the first syllable of *celsa* we have the torculus liquescens, the last gravis being shortened. The porrectus is easily recognizable on the first syllable of *Stola*. A climacus occurs on the second syllable of *docente* (fourth line) being followed by an epiphonus; a pes subpunctis, on the last syllable of *salutifere*. The strophicus (on *med*) has here no distinct sign, but is written with the ordinary virga sign. The oriscus, however, is clearly marked. Thus we have a virga with oriscus (also called franculus) on the first syllable of *Gratia*, and the full pressus (virga, oriscus, and punctum) on the first syllable of *pectus*, the first of *fluxerunt*, etc. The quilisma is shown on the second syllable of *celsa*, where we first have a punctum, serving as the starting-point, then the triple curve of the quilisma itself, to which the virga stroke, representing the highest note, is attached. We have it again on the second syllable of *impleb.*, where a second virga follows, the whole figure representing the notes *f g a b♭*.

A less usual sign is found on the first syllable of *carus* (last line, right page). The quilisma there is followed by a climacus in which the three signs, acutus and two graves are joined together: ʃ̀ .



Ill. V.—Aquitanian Notation (XI Century)
Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Fonds latin, No. 1134

Illustration II ("Paléogr. Mus.", IV, pl. A) is from a MS. written in the monastery of Einsiedeln at the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century. It belongs to the St. Gall school of notation. The affinity of this school to the Anglo-Saxon is evident. There are, however, a number of peculiarities. First we find a greater variety of signs. Thus the virga appears in two forms, one slightly curved to the right and vanishing at the top, the other straighter and with a thickening at the top. This second variety arises, graphically, from its being drawn downwards, the pen spreading itself a little at the start of the stroke. For the rendering it indicates a longer form of the note. We find the first form on the first syllable of *Ostende*, the fifth of *misericordiam*, etc., the second on the second syllable of *Ostende* (first sign),

on the first syllable of *tuam* (second sign), etc. Similarly we have for the punctum, besides the dot form, that of a short horizontal line. This is also sometimes used for one of the puncta of the climacus (first syllable of *tuam*, third and sixth neums, etc.) and towards the end of the group neuma on *nobis* (fifth sign from the end) we see a trigon subpuncte, the last dot of the trigon and the added punctum being drawn out. The podatus appears in three forms; first with rounded corner, as on the third syllable of *Alleluia* (first sign); second with some pen pressure on the initial stroke and a fairly square angle, as on the fourth syllable of *Alleluia* (third sign); and third, with a more elaborate gravis, as in the final neuma of *nobis* (second last sign). The first may be considered as the normal form, the second marks a firmer rendering of the first note, and the third a decided leaning on it. The torculus appears in its plain form (second syllable of *Ostende*, fourth syllable of *misericordiam*) and with pen pressure on both graves ( ) marking a prolongation of the whole figure (first syllable of *tuum*, seventh sign). The two forms of the pressus, minor and major, are found in the final neuma of *Alleluia* (fourth last and last signs). Of liquescent signs we have a scandicus liquescens on the first syllable of *Alleluia*, a century (see "Pal. Mus.", IV, pl. 9; Wagner, "Einleitung", II, 114). The *litteræ significativæ* are of two classes, one referring to rhythm, the other referring to pitch. Of the former class we find in our illustration frequently the c (*celeriter*) and the t (*tenete*). At the beginning of the Offertory (last line of illustration) we find also the m (*mediocriter*) modifying the effect of the preceding c. Of the second class we find the e (*equaliter*) enjoining the same pitch between *domine* and *misericordiam* between the second and third syllables of *misericordiam* and between *tuam* and *et*. To give a clearer idea of the meaning of the neums in this illustration we subjoin the notation of the same piece according to the Vatican edition, pointing out only the few differences in the two readings. On the first syllable of "Alleluia" the Vatican edition omits the liquescence; similarly on the third syllable of that word and on the final syllable of "misericordiam". It may be mentioned in this connexion that a very frequent use of liquescence is characteristic of the St. Gall school. The strophici on *Alleluia* and *tuum* are given as ordinary puncta. Similarly the special sign for the pressus has disappeared and is replaced by a doubling of the first note. The first of these two notes of the same pitch is then sometimes combined with the pre-



ILL. VI.—GRADUAL AND TROPER OF ST-EVROULT (XII CENTURY)
Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, Fonds latin, No. 10508

distropha liquescens on the third, an epiphonus on the last syllable of *misericordiam*.

A second peculiarity of the St. Gall notation is the occasional addition of a little stroke to the neums, marking a prolongation of the affected note. The "Paléographie Musicale" (IV, pl. 17) has given the name episema to this little addition. Mention has already been made of the thickening of the head of the virga, which often amounts to a distinct stroke. Our illustration gives examples of a similar addition to the last note of the torculus (instead of), the last of the porrectus, the first and the second of the clivis. The episematic torculus is seen in the final neuma of *nobis* (before the first trigon). The first sign in the same neuma is also an episematic torculus followed by another long punctum. On the first syllable of *tuum* we have an episematic porrectus, followed by two puncta, while the plain porrectus appears on the first syllable of *domine* (third sign). The clivis with episema to the first note is found on the first syllable of *tuam* (first sign) and twice towards the end of the neuma on *tuum*. On the second syllable of *nobis*, after the torculus subpunctis already mentioned, we have a clivis with the episema attached to the second note, the clivis being preceded by two short puncta and followed by a long one.

Thirdly, we find as a peculiarity of this notation the addition of certain letters. These are often called "Romanian" letters, because a St. Gall writer of the eleventh century attributes their use to a singer named Romanus who, according to him, brought the chant from Rome to St. Gall towards the end of the eighth ceding neum. Thus at the end of the *Alleluia* neuma it joins the virga to form a clivis, and at the end of the neuma on *nobis* the podatus of the MS. is changed into a torculus. These things are in accordance with the general practice of the later Middle Ages. Towards the end of the neuma on *tuam* (where in the MS. the neums surmount the second syllable) the staff notation substitutes a pes subbipunctis for a virga and climacus—a mere graphic difference. Similarly on *da* a porrectus and virga are replaced by a clivis and podatus.

Illustration III, taken from a MS. of the ninth or the beginning of the tenth century in the library of Laon, which is in course of publication in the "Pal. Mus." (p. 28), shows the Metz notation. On the first two syllables of *Gaudeamus* we have the familiar punctum dot. On the third we recognize easily a podatus followed by a virga. But on the last we meet the most characteristic sign of this school, the punctum consisting of a short slanting line with a little hook added. Of the clivis form peculiar to this school our illustration contains no example; but on the second syllable of *festum* and the second and fourth of *celebrantes* we have the porrectus, which in its first two strokes contains the clivis. There are two forms of the torculus, one with sharp angles, on the first syllable of *domino*, the second of *honore* (where it is preceded by a punctum), etc.; the other rounded, on the third syllable of *honore* and the fourth of *passione*. Of liquescent neums we find the epiphonus on the second syllable of *diem* and the third of *celebrantes*, the cephalicus on the first of *omnes*, a pes subbipunctis liquescens

(the first punctum connected with the pes in the manner of a torculus and the second, liquescent, bent back to the left) on the second syllable of *collaudant* and a porrectus compunctis liquescens on the last syllable of *filium*. The oriscus is found after the podatus on it stands for *alte*. The idea of high pitch is expressed by the f occurring twice on *domino*. The first time it refers evidently to the rise of the melody to c, the second time it probably enjoins a b natural instead of b flat.

Ill. VII.—MS. 411 (241) (XIV Century)
Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris

agathæ and the quilisma, consisting of two hooks, on the second syllable of *domino*, the second of *angeli* and the first of *dei*, in each case a porrectus being joined to it.

Another peculiarity of this school is the frequent use of disjoint neums, all of which indicate a prolongation of the notes. Mention was made of a disjoint podatus in connexion with the first illustration. We find it here on *in* and the first syllable of *celebrantes*. A torculus of this kind is shown in the second syllable of *martyris*. The descending figures are indicated by the puncta placed perpendicularly. Thus we have a clivis on the second syllable of *omnes*, the second

The comparison with the reading of the Vaticana will show a close resemblance. We only notice that on *gaudent* and *angeli* the MS. adds a liquescent note to the podatus and porrectus subbipunctis, and on *celebrantes* has twice a porrectus for the strophic clivis, which suggests that the apostropha (oriscus) was sung slightly higher than the last note of the clivis, as mentioned above.

Illustration IV is taken from an eleventh-century MS. of Silos, written in the Mozarabic notation ("Pal. Mus.", I, pl. II) in order to show that even this is based on the same principles. The usual forms of virga, punctum, podatus, clivis, torculus, porrectus



Ill. VIII.—Gothic Neums (A. D. 1435)
Cathedral Library, Trier

(before the quilisma) and the third of *domino*, the third of *angeli* (where the lower one got attached to the l), etc.; a climacus on *angeli*, preceding the quilisma.

We note further the use of *literæ significativæ*. Thus we have the c used in the same sense as in the St. Gall school, on *agathæ*. Similarly a t appears at the bottom of the illustration under the word *meũ*. The a on Gaudeamus stands here for *augete* and is, therefore, synonymous with the t, whereas in St. Gall will be recognized easily. The other features will be explained with reference to the modern form of the Vatican Gradual. The piece occurs in the Roman Liturgy as Introit of the Saturday after the fourth Sunday of Lent. On the last syllable of *Sitientes* the MS. has a pes subbipunctis, with the puncta joined together, representing the same notes as the staff notation without the pressus. On the first syllable of *venite* the MS. has a clivis instead of the single note of the Roman version, on the second, the punctum and

torculus (placed one over the other) are only graphically different from the pes and clivis. On the first syllable of *equas* a tristopha takes the place of the trigon. On the second syllable of *dicit* the MS. omits the last note of the print. On the second syllable of *dominus* the disjoint punctum and clivis correspond to the conjoint torculus. The second figure on *non* is a liquescent torculus. It begins below with the gravis to which the acutus is attached in the usual manner, but the last, liquescent, gravis is represented by a curve to the left of the acutus. The remaining slight differences are like those already explained.

As has been sufficiently indicated, the neums merely marked the rise or fall of the melody. They gave, in themselves, no clear information as to the exact amount of rise and fall, in other words, they did not mark the intervals. A podatus, e. g., may indicate a second, a third, a fourth or a fifth without change in its form. This may now be accepted as an established fact. The various efforts made from time to time, most recently by Fleischer in his "Neumenstudien", to find interval signification in the neums, have failed completely. It is clear then, that at no time could the melody be read absolutely from the neumatic notation. Rather this served merely as an aid to memory. Nor did the choir sing from the notation. The MS. was only for the choir-master, or at most for the solo singer. The whole body of the Plain Chant melodies had to be committed to memory in the rehearsing room, and we know from contemporary writers that it took a singer several years to become acquainted with all the melodies. In the course of time, as oral tradition began to grow less reliable, a desire was felt to have also the amount of rise or fall fixed. Accordingly we find even at the date of our earliest MSS. the use of letters, added to the neums, to warn the singer here and there as to the intervals, as we have mentioned above. These indications, however, were again merely vague and could not finally satisfy. Various efforts which space forbids us to detail here, were then made to supplement the neumatic notation. All of them, however, were destined to disappear before the introduction of a new principle, which was to distinguish the higher or lower pitch of the tones by the higher or lower position of the notes, grading the distances between the notes in strict accordance with the intervals. Attempts in this direction can be noticed even in the class of MSS. which have been considered up to this. Our example of Metz notation shows pretty clearly an endeavour on the part of the scribe to place the notes according to pitch. The full, systematic carrying out of this idea is found in the tenth century, first in the Lombardic notation, shortly afterwards in the Aquitanian. Illustration V, taken from an eleventh-century Versiculary and Prosary from St. Martial in Limoges ("Pal. Mus.", II, pl. 86) belongs to the latter class, which is further characterized by the almost complete disjoining of the neums. There being no clef, the semitones cannot be found from the notation. But apart from that the intervals can be read without difficulty, it being kept in mind that notes placed perpendicularly should be read downwards, as in the Metz notation. A few remarks will suffice to point out the difference between the MS. and the reading of the Vaticana given above. On *palma* the MS. gives a liquescent note, on the first syllable of *adnunciandum* it has a podatus (a c, or d f, as this notation should be read a fifth lower) instead of a single note; in the last, a podatus instead of an epiphonus. The first group on *mane* is the same as in the Vaticana, the lowest mark being a mere blot. In the third group the MS. has a fourth (c g, or f c) instead of a third (b g). After the fifth group there is an omission of the whole passage which in our staff notation example is placed between the two little bars at the end of the second line. Such omissions are not uncommon, it being supposed that the singer knew frequently-occurring long neumata by heart. The omission is indicated in the MS. by the little perpendicular line. On the first syllable of *misericordiam*, the first two notes of the Vaticana are omitted. At the end of the line we observe the custos, indicating the pitch of the first note of the second line. On *tuam* there is again an omission of a whole group indicated as above. On *veritatem* the fourth dot is an accidental blot. At the end of the second *tuam* the MSS. has a third (f d) instead of a fourth (c g). The final neuma is left incomplete.

This procedure solved in principle the problem of diastematic (interval) notation. For greater convenience, however, scribes soon began to draw horizontal lines which helped to facilitate the correct placing and reading of the notes. It was the work of the Benedictine monk Guido of Arezzo (about 1000) to fix the use of these lines finally in such a way that adjacent lines mark the interval of a third, the intervening note being placed between the two lines. Letters were also affixed to the beginning of the staff to give the alphabetical name of one or several places on the staff and thus to indicate the position of the semitones. Soon c and f were used for this purpose by preference and out of them by a graphic transformation, our present C and F (bass) clefs evolved. Later the letter g was employed, which through the addition of an ornamental flourish developed into the modern violin clef. In the beginning, however, the f and c lines were run over with various colours, or if f fell into space, a coloured line was drawn between the e and g lines.

In the staff thus perfected the neums were written according to the forms that had been previously in use in the various localities, such modifications being introduced as were necessary to mark the exact position of the notes, notably the thickening of the head of the acutus. Illustration VI, taken from a twelfth-century Gradual of St. Evroult ("Pal. Mus.", III, pl. 194), shows the process clearly. It has four dry lines drawn on the parchment, of which the one for f was coloured red, that for c green. The other two lines have the clef letters a and e.

From the thirteenth century the notes began to be written larger, so that they might be read by a number of singers at the same time. The thickening of the strokes at the exact place the notes occupy also became more pronounced. Thus gradually in the Latin countries the type shown in the foregoing illustration evolved which is practically the one adopted in our modern chant books.

Illustration VII ("Pal. Mus.", III, pl. 207 B) is taken from a fourteenth-century plenary Missal belonging to Notre Dame in Paris. In the first line on the right-hand column the group a c b g has been written twice by mistake. Of interest is the disappearance of the quilisma at the end of the final neuma, also the substitution of c for b on *florebit* at the end of the group on *per* (which word is written a little too far to the left).

Illustration VIII ("Pal. Mus.", III, pl. 146) shows the peculiar type of notation which developed in Germany and is called *Hufnagelschrift* (horseshoe-nail writing). The illustration is from a Gradual written at Trier in 1435. There are five black lines, but the f line was coloured red. The illustration shows clearly that a second line was drawn over the first. In the third staff we find the g clef and the red f line drawn in the space between e and g. Melodically the frequent substitutes of c for b is remarkable on *justus*, twice on *florebit*, on *cedrus*, etc.). This is a peculiarity of the German tradition.

For the rhythmic signification of the neums see the article on PLAIN CHANT.

The principal work on the subject is the *Paléographie Musicale*, published in quarterly issues since 1889, first at Solesmes, afterwards at Tournai. An exhaustive list of the earlier literature is given in the preface to the first volume. Supplemental to this are

the publications of the *Plain Song and Mediæval Music Society* (London, since 1888). A good hand-book is WAGNER, *Neumenkunde*, second part of his *Einführung in die Gregorianischen Melodien* (Freiburg, 1905). Also, *Gregorian Melodies* by the Benedictines of Stanbrook (London, 1897); FLEISCHER, *Neumen-Studien*, part I (Leipzig, 1895); part II (Leipzig, 1897); part III (Berlin, 1904); MOLITOR, *Deutsche Choral-Wiegendrucke*, (Ratisbon, 1904); THIBAUT, *Origine Byzantine de la Notation Neumatique de l'Eglise Latine* (Paris, 1907). On Byzantine notation see also RIEMANN, *Die Byzantinische Notenschrift im 10. bis 13. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1909). On the rhythmical signification of the neums: MOCQUEREAU, *Le Nombre Musical Gregorian*, I (Tournai, 1908).

H. BEWERUNGE.

Neumann, JOHANN BALTHASAR, b. 1687 at Eger; d. 1753 at Würzburg, master of the rococo style and one of the greatest and most productive artists of the eighteenth century; distinguished as a decorator, but more so as an architect. He came from Eger to Würzburg as a cannon founder, and served chiefly with the French army. After he had travelled to perfect himself as an architect, he followed that profession in southern Germany and on the Rhine, entering into such successful competition with the French masters of the period that de Cotte and Boffrand, who judged his plans for the episcopal palace at Würzburg, afterwards eagerly laid claim to the authorship. While in the service of Prince-Bishop Franz von Schönborn (1719), Neumann laid the cornerstone of the palace (1720). It is ostentatious but habitable, a vast rectangle, 544 ft. by 169 ft., with five well laid out courts and three entrance gates ornamented with pilasters, columns, and balconies. The throne room with the splendid adjoining state apartments, and the court chapel, although not externally remarkable, excel all the rest in sumptuous splendour with an enormous outlay in material and skill. The baroque style of the edifice is here replaced by the most finished decorative rococo. The details are frequently of marvellous beauty; the arrangement, notwithstanding the overcrowding, is not inharmonious, although in combination it is bizarre and whimsical. The rococo artist obviously intends to produce not only picturesque effects, but a demonstration of his unrestricted power over material substances. The interior decorations for a palace built at Bruchsal for another Schönborn, Bishop of Speyer, are magnificent, though simpler. For a third Schönborn he built a castle at Coblenz which was likewise distinguished for immense, harmonious proportions and splendid arrangement. A palace in Werneck is also his work. He completed the designs for palaces in Vienna, Carlsruhe, etc. The cathedral of Speyer, destroyed by the French army, was restored by Neumann with a clever adaptation of the existing conditions. In the façade, which was later removed, he followed the prevailing taste in every detail. In the restoration of the west side of Mainz cathedral he was unsuccessful, and more so with his piecework on the cathedral of Würzburg. In addition to these restorations he built the Pilgrims' church at Vierzehnheiligen, and the collegiate church at Neresheim, both important buildings, with oval spires, vast areas, and stately proportions. They are in rococo style, which is no longer attributed entirely to him. Among his other works are the Dominican church at Würzburg, the family chapel of the Schönborns in the same place, and the church at Grösweinstein. He made numerous designs for parterres, buildings for practical purposes, and objects of handicraft. He was a product of his age, though he towered above it by reason of the unusual artistic talent with which nature had endowed him. More recent times have, within certain limits, justified his choice of style.

DOHME, *Gesch. der deutschen Baukunst* (Berlin, 1885); FORSTER, *Gesch. der deutschen Kunst*, III (Leipzig, 1855); KUHN, *Allg. Kunstgesch.* (New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, 1909).

G. GIETMANN.

Neumann, JOHN NEPOMUCENE, VENERABLE, fourth Bishop of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, U. S. A., b. at Prachatitz, Bohemia, 28 March, 1811, erroneously set down as Good Friday by his biographers; d. at Philadelphia, 5 January, 1860. From childhood he evinced signs of a vocation to the priesthood, and entered the seminary of Budweis in 1831. A profound theologian, thoroughly versed not only in all branches of sacred learning but in the natural sciences as well, particularly in botany, he spoke fluently many Slavic dialects and at least eight modern languages, besides being master of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. When Bishop of Philadelphia he learned Irish to help the Irish immigrants in his diocese. Finishing his course at the University of Prague with distinction in August, 1835, he returned to Budweis, his native diocese, for ordination. While at the seminary, the letters of Father Baraga, afterwards Bishop of Marquette, Michigan, written to the Leopold Missionary Society, inspired Neumann with the desire of consecrating himself to the American missions. Accordingly, while yet a seminarian he landed in America (2 June, 1836), was adopted, and (25 June, 1836) ordained by Bishop Dubois of New York, who sent him without delay to western New York, where he laboured for four years amid incredible hardships. In 1840 he entered the Redemptorist Congregation, and was the first of its members professed in America, 16 January, 1842. For three years Neumann was superior of the Redemptorists at Pittsburg, where he built the church of St. Philomena and by labours especially among the German-speaking people, won the gratitude and praise of Bishop O'Connor. In 1846 he was made vice-provincial of the Redemptorists in America, and in 1852 at the suggestion of Archbishop Kenrick of Baltimore Pius IX gave Father Neumann a command under obedience to accept the Bishopric of Philadelphia, to which he was consecrated by Archbishop Kenrick at St. Alphonsus, Baltimore, 28 March, 1852. In his solicitude for his flock he visited the larger congregations of his diocese every year and the smaller ones every two years, remaining several days in the country places, preaching, hearing confessions, confirming, visiting, and anointing the sick. He once walked twenty-five miles and back to confirm one boy.

VENERABLE JOHN NEPOMUCENE NEUMANN

Indefatigable in the cause of education, both ecclesiastical and secular, he raised the standard of study and discipline at the diocesan seminary of St. Charles Borromeo, and founded (1859) an ecclesiastical preparatory college, to this day a credit and a blessing to the great diocese of Philadelphia. One of his first acts was to provide Catholic schools. At his consecration (1852) there were but two parochial schools in Philadelphia; at his death eight years later, their number was nearly one hundred. The boys he entrusted to the Christian Brothers, and the girls to different sisterhoods: St. Joseph, Charity, Immaculate Heart of Mary, Notre Dame of Namur and Notre Dame of Munich. These last he helped to establish firmly in the United States, and befriended in many ways. He introduced the Sisters of the Holy Cross from France to take charge of an industrial school. At the advice of Pius IX he founded the Philadelphia branch of the Sisters of St. Francis, and he was also the staunch

friend of the Colored Oblate Sisters in Baltimore, whom by his tact and charity he saved from dissolution. In five years he erected fifty churches and completed the exterior of the cathedral. Conspicuous at the First Plenary Council of Baltimore (1852), he was one of the American bishops invited by Pius IX to Rome in 1854 for the definition of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. Noted for his devotion to the Most Blessed Sacrament, Neumann was the first American bishop to introduce the Forty Hours devotion into his diocese in 1853; he also inaugurated the practice now in vogue in many places of reciting the Litany of the Blessed Virgin and the Rosary before High Mass on Sundays and Holy Days. His remains lie interred in a vault before the altar in the lower chapel of St. Peter's Redemptorist church, Philadelphia. Neumann left no published works except two catechisms of Christian Doctrine, which received the approbation of the First Plenary Council of Baltimore, a Bible history, confraternity manuals, a Latin pamphlet on the Forty Hours, and Acts of the synods held by him every two years. His pastoral letters are remarkable for their solidity, beauty, and unction. On 15 December, 1896, he received the title of Venerable and the authorities of Rome have under consideration the acts of the Process of Beatification.

BERGER, *Leben und Wirken* (New York, 1883), tr. GRIMM (New York, 1884); MAGNIER, *Short Life* (St. Louis, 1897); CLARKE, *Lives of Deceased Bishops in U. S.*, II (New York, 1872), 431 sq.; SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in U S.*, IV (New York, 1892), 397 sq.; *Funeral Obsequies of Right Rev. John N. Neumann* (Philadelphia, 1860); *Ave Maria*, XXX, 181; *Berichte der Leopoldinen Stiftung*, XXV, 33; *Metropolitan*, I-VI; *New York Freeman's Journal* (7 Aug., 1852); *Pittsburg Catholic*, IX, 245; XVI, 264; *Catholic Herald*, XX, XXVI; *Catholic Mirror*, I, X; *The Catholic Church in the U. S. A.*, I (New York, 1908), 236–37; *Amer. Eccl. Review*, XVI, 393 sq., XXIII, 315 sq., XXXIII, 182 sq. (an unpublished letter and facsimile).

JOSEPH WISSEL.

Neumayr, FRANZ, preacher, writer on theological, controversial and ascetical subjects, and author of many dramas on sacred themes in Latin, b. at Munich, 17 January, 1697; d. at Augsburg, 1 May, 1765. He entered the Society of Jesus 3 October, 1712, and after his studies in the Society, taught rhetoric and belles lettres for ten years. He then for two years preached on the missions, when he was made director of the celebrated Latin sodality at Munich, a post which he filled with great credit for eleven years. From 1752 to 1763 he preached at the cathedral of Augsburg with extraordinary success. His controversial sermons, directed in a great part against the false teachings of the Lutherans, and in particular against the apostate monk Rothfischer, and Chladonium, were of a solidity of argument that baffled the efforts of his adversaries. Father Neumayr produced a surprising number of volumes: Latin plays for the use of his Latin sodality, which periodically staged such productions for the pleasure and edification of the literary men of Munich; sermons which he had delivered in the pulpit of Augsburg cathedral; works on asceticism, treatises on Rhetoric and Poetry, and some essays on moral theology in defence of the Jesuit system. Some of his Latin plays were republished in his two collections "Theatrum Asceticum" and "Theatrum Politicum". "Theatrum Asceticum, sive Meditationes Sacræ in Theatro Congregationis Latinæ de B. V. Mariæ, ab Angelo Salutatæ exhibitæ Monachi verno jejunii tempore ab anno 1739 usque ad annum 1747", 871 pp., Ingolstadt and Augsburg, 1747 (5 editions), contains dramatic renderings of such subjects as the conversion of St. Augustine, devotion to the B. V. Mary, the evil of sin, the fear of God, Divine Mercy and Love. "Theatrum Politicum sive Tragœdiæ ad commendationem Virtutis et Vitiorum detestationem, etc.", Augsburg and Ingolstadt, 1760, 518 pp., contains episodes from the lives of Eutropius, Papinianus, Anastasius, Dicorus, Tobias, and Sara, etc. One amusing title which occurs is "Processus jucidialis contra fures temporis". These plays, besides numerous others, were published also in separate booklets. On his ascetical writings probably the most famous and most valuable is the excellent little book "Idea Theologiæ Asceticæ, Scientiam Sanctorum exhibens", a posthumous work first published in Rome by Alexander Monaldi in 1839. It has gone through five editions in Latin and has been translated into various languages. The English edition bears the title: "The Science of the Spiritual Life." He wrote also several works in defence of Probabilism. Of his literary treatises the "Idea Rhetorices" deals with the precepts and use of Rhetoric; "Idea Poesis" is a similar volume on poetry and in the title he tells us the uses of the art, "Ad Ingeniorum Culturam, Animorum Oblectationem ac Morum Doctrinam"—ends which he had very well kept in mind in his own dramatic works. A tribute to Father Neumayr on the occasion of his jubilee in religion styles him: "The Champion of Faith and Good Morals, a Follower and Rival of the great Paul, the Hammer of the Heretics, Physician of Sinners and Oracle of the Just!" His works, as enumerated in Sommervogel, number 112 books and pamphlets.

SOMMERVOGEL, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, V, new edition; DE BACKER, *Bibliothèque des Ecrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus;* KNELLER in *Kirchenlex.*, s. v.

EDWARD F. GARESCHÉ.

Neusohl, DIOCESE OF (Hung. BESZTERCZEBÁNYA; Lat. NEOSOLIENSIS), founded in 1776 by Maria Theresa. Cardinal Peter Pazmány had already contemplated founding four new sees in order to relieve the Archdiocese of Gran; one of these was Neusohl, but this project was dropped in 1636. Instead of four sees, four Jesuit colleges were established in Kassa, Neusohl, Kossy, and Safron. After the suppression of the Jesuit Order the project of the new diocese was again taken up. On 7 December, 1775, Maria Theresa informed the cathedral chapter of Gran that it had been decided to establish a new see, and asked the chapter to state what revenues would be assigned to it. On 11 January, 1776, the new diocese was founded by royal decision, and on 13 March, the papal decree was made public. Baron Franz Berchtold was named the first bishop (1776–93), and in 1778–85 held the first canonical visitation. His efforts to benefit the diocese materially were unsuccessful, and the great fire of 1782, which destroyed the episcopal residence, had such a bad effect upon the see, that Joseph II contemplated giving it up, and planned the transfer of Berchtold to the See of Gran, but the bishop opposed the plan, as well as that of the union of the diocese with that of Székes or Roszsnyó. The seminary, lyceum and the four archdeaneries were founded in the time of Bishop Anton Mackay (1818–23). A diocesan synod was held at Neusohl 21 November, 1821, where the diocesan constitution was drawn up, which is valid to this day. Bishop Joseph Rudnyciuszky (1844–50) was persecuted by the Austrian Government on account of his political views, and on 20 August, 1846, was arrested and sentenced to six years' imprisonment, and deprived of his episcopal honours. He retracted in 1850, whereupon he was released from prison. Among the more recent bishops Arnold Tpolzi was distinguished. The present bishop is Wolfang Radnoi. Since 1835 the cathedral chapter possesses its own insignia, and is composed of six members; there are also six titular canons. The diocese has a provost, 112 parishes, and 371 chapels; there are 168 priests and 49 clerics, 2 monasteries and 2 nunneries. In 1902 the Catholic population numbered in all 223,779 souls.

Das Katolische Ungarn (*Catholic Hungary*) (Budapest, 1801); *Schematismus diœcesis Neosoliensis pro anno 1903.*

A. ALDÁSY.

Neutra (NITRIA; NYITRA), DIOCESE OF (NITRIENSIS), in Western Hungary, a suffragan of Gran. The

exact date of its foundation is unknown. Some attribute the foundation to Fridigit, wife of Rosemund, the Marconian chief, in the middle of the fourth century, but without any more evidence than the alleged foundation by Archbishop Wolf of Lorch. Nor is the see a direct continuation of one which existed in Svatopluk's time and was suffragan of Prag-Potesover; neither is it probable that the saintly King Stephen founded it. The see was probably founded in the time of King Coloman about 1105–07, although St. Ladislaus had it in contemplation, for a royal document still exists, in which he endows the church at Neutra with much property. The church, dedicated to St. Emmeram, was there in the lifetime of St. Stephen, and is supposed to have been endowed by Queen Gisela. Gervasius was the first bishop (1105–14), and was followed by Nicholas (1133). The successors of St. Ladislaus increased the revenues of the see to which the city of Neutra belonged from the middle of the thirteenth century. The cathedral chapter was in all probability established at the same time as the see; but until the seventeenth century very little is known about it. There were only nine canons in the seventeenth century, but the number was increased to ten in 1780. The see shared the fate of the country, the invasion of the Turks, the Hussites, internal quarrels, all of which wrought much mischief, especially the disastrous battle of Mohacs (1526). The see was in time deprived of its revenues which fell into the hands of the laity. Valentine Toorch first had possession of them, and then later Alexius Thurdó, after which the latter's brother, Bishop Franz Thurdó, acquired them, but later on became a Protestant. The Reformation found a foothold in Neutra, owing to the sympathy of certain noble families. Bishop Paul Bornemissos tried to restore the financial conditions of the see, but unsuccessfully; during the wars with the Turks the chapter was obliged to flee and only returned to Neutra in 1607. Bishop Franz Forzach was the first bishop to oppose the spread of the Reformation (1596–1607); his work was carried on by his successors, especially by the Jesuits, who since 1645 worked zealously for the re-establishment of the Catholic religion. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries religious orders settled in the diocese. The cathedral as it stands to-day was erected by Ladislaus Erdodyl (1796–36). Among the more famous bishops was August Roskovány (1859–92), famed as a theologian and canonist. Bishop Emmerich Bende has been bishop since 1893; his coadjutor with right of succession is Count William Batthyany. The see includes a part of the counties of Neutra and Trenescén, and is divided into 4 archdeaneries. There are 148 parishes, 237 priests, 194 of whom are parish priests; also 15 religious orders, numbering 145 members, of both sexes. In 1907 the Catholic population numbered 350,398. The cathedral chapter is composed of ten canons, and there are six titular canons, also 3 titular abbots.

Die Komitats und Stadts Ungarns. Komitat Nyitra (Budapest, s. d.); *Das Katholische Ungarn* (Budapest, 1901); *Schematismus diœcesis Nitriensis 1907;* PRAY, *Specimen Hierarchiæ Hungariæ,* I (Posen, 1776); *Memoria episcoporum Nitriensium* (Posen, 1835).

A. ÁLDÁSY.

Nevada, a Western state of the United States, bounded on the North by Oregon and Idaho, on the East by Utah and Arizona, and on the South and West by California. It lies between the latitudes of 35° (in its extreme southern point) and 42° north, and between the meridians of 114° and 120° longitude. The extreme length of the state from north to south is 483 miles, while its extreme breadth from east to west is 320 miles. The total area of the state of Nevada is 110,590 square miles.

CLIMATE.—The climate of Nevada is dry, pleasant, and healthful. Summers are, as a rule, very warm, except in the high mountainous districts, while the winters are generally long and sometimes severe. In late spring and early autumn there prevails a warm westerly wind which has often disastrous effects, as it is generally accompanied by sand storm. The mean temperature in January is 28°, while that of summer is 71°. The average rainfall throughout the year is ten inches, and the greater part of this precipitation comes between the months from December to May.

POPULATION.—The history of the population of Nevada since 1850 presents some of the most interesting figures in the United States Census records. From the time of the early settlements in 1850–60 to the years of the great mining developments in 1860–1880, the population rapidly increased from a few hundred pioneers to 60,000 people, while after 1885 (demonetization of silver) it declined until the end of the century, and from that time began to increase very rapidly. The figures showing the population of the state since 1860, according to U. S. Census Reports, are significant of these fluctuations: 1860, 6,857; 1870, 42,491; 1880, 62,226; 1890, 45,761; 1900, 42,335; 1910, 81,875.

SEAL OF NEVADA

MINERAL PRODUCTION.—The mineral production of Nevada consists chiefly of gold and silver. For the year 1908 the entire mineral production, consisting chiefly of gold, silver, and a little lead, was valued at $19,043,820, while in 1909 the gold production alone was valued at $15,908,400 and that of silver at $4,657,000, or a total production of $20,565,400 in gold and silver alone.

AGRICULTURE AND STOCK RAISING.—The agricultural products of Nevada for 1909 were valued thus: wheat, $1,074,000; oats, $1,165,000; barley, $228,000; potatoes, $459,000; hay, $5,187,000. From these figures it can be seen that the production of hay is an important one, being greater in 1909 than the entire production of silver. In stock raising the most important industry is that of sheep. In 1909 the entire number of sheep in the state was 1,585,000 and the wool clip amounted to 8,754,720 lbs. Cattle raising is also an important industry.

HISTORY.—The first European to visit what is now the State of Nevada, was, in all probability, the Franciscan Friar Francisco Gárces. Father Gárces started from Sonora, in northern Mexico, with Colonel Anza for California in 1775. In this famous journey, Gárces stopped at the junction of the Gila and Colorado Rivers, in order to explore the surrounding country and establish a mission. No settlements were made or mission founded, but from the account of Father Gárces' journey as given by Father Pedro Font, who accompanied Gárces and wrote a fairly complete history of their travels, it seems practically certain that they visited Nevada, which was then, and in fact until 1850–60, a nameless desert. The next to visit Nevada were also Franciscan missionaries. These were Fr. Atanasio Dominiquez and Fr. Silvestre Velez de Escalante, who on their journey to Monterey, California, turned to the East, crossed the Colorado River at the 37° parallel, crossed the extreme southern part of what is now Nevada, and proceeded to explore Utah. These friars also merely explored these regions and no settlements were made nor missions established. After these visits of the Franciscans it is very probable that the military expeditions

from New Mexico from time to time reached the Colorado River near Nevada, but we have no record of any expedition having actually crossed over into the territory in question. In 1825, however, Peter Skeen Ogden, an American trapper from the Columbia River in the North-West, accompanied by a few men, started to explore the country to the south-east and reached the river now known as the Humboldt River, in the present State of Nevada, which was in 1825 a nameless country, lying between California (which was then an indefinite stretch of country north of southern California) and New Mexico, which included in 1825, Arizona and parts of Utah and Colorado. All the above territories, with unsettled boundaries on the north and east, belonged to Mexico until the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in 1848, at the close of the Mexican War, when they were ceded to the United States. Long before these events, however, Utah and Nevada were settled by Americans and even provisional government established. After the explorations of Ogden and his companions, American adventurers, mostly trappers, went to Utah and Nevada, among whom was Kit Carson (then living in Taos, New Mexico), who in company with many others visited the country in 1831, 1833, 1844, 1845. In 1843–44, Fremont with Carson and Godey, conducted various explorations, largely hunting expeditions, into Nevada, and in 1844–45, Elisha Stevens, with a small party, among whom were two women, passed through Nevada on his journey from the Missouri River country to California. This was the first caravan to traverse all this stretch of territory. After the Mexican cession of 1848 and the discovery of gold in California, Nevada was frequently traversed by the gold seekers and other western pioneers on their way to California. Shortly after the signing of the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, the Mormons who had migrated westward and built the city of Salt Lake, established the State of Deseret, a commonwealth which was to include what is now Utah, Nevada, Arizona, parts of Colorado, Wyoming, Oregon, and California. These Mormons found it profitable business to meet the travellers on their way to California and furnish them provisions. In these trading expeditions they advanced south and west from Salt Lake City, and in 1849, they founded the first settlement in what is now Nevada, near the Carson River. In 1850, Congress organized the territories of Utah (what is now Utah and Nevada), New Mexico (what is now New Mexico and Arizona), and the State of California. The territory now comprised in the State of Nevada was organized as Carson County, Utah, under the political control, therefore, of the Mormons. Congress had fixed the western boundary of the Territory of Utah as the Sierra Nevada. The fact that the Sierra Nevada was continually kept in mind as the barrier between Utah and California, may have given an occasion to call the adjacent territory east of California, Nevada, though the name does not come into prominence until 1860. By 1856, the mines were being strongly developed and American immigration was rapidly settling Carson County. A political conflict between the Mormons and the Gentiles for the control of the governmental affairs of Carson County (which included practically all of what is now Nevada) lasted for several years. In 1865 the citizens of this county, mostly gentiles, petitioned the Government of the United States to be annexed to California or be organized as a separate territory. The Government gave little heed to these demands, and for five years the political struggle raged fiercely between the two factions. Congress at last put an end to these troubles, and in 1861 Carson County, Utah, was organized as the Territory of Nevada. James W. Nye was appointed as the first territorial governor. Three years later a constitutional convention was held, a State constitution adopted, and in 1864 Nevada was admitted as a State, and H. G. Blaisdel was elected the first governor. During the years 1865–85, the material developments in Nevada made rapid strides, though continually hampered by a heavy debt contracted since the early days of territorial legislatures.

Government.—Nevada was a part of the Territory of Utah from 1850 to 1861, a separate territory from 1861 to 1864, and organized as a State in 1864. The State constitution when first adopted granted numerous privileges to mining interests. While at first this seemed to be an incentive to the development of the rising mining industries, it soon proved to be unfair to the commonwealth at large. A long series of litigations, costly to both sides, ensued between the State and the mine owners, in view of the amendments to the constitution, which struck out all parts which gave special privileges to the mining industry. The State constitution after many amendments is now a safeguard to the State and to the rights of its citizens. At present, Nevada is represented in the United States Congress by two senators and one representative.

Education.—At the time of the admission of Nevada as a territory in 1861, there was no public-school system and there were no schools. The population of the territory was about 7000–8000 people, but there were only four or five small private schools. An attempt was made to organize a school system in 1861, but beyond the appointment of a superintendent of public instruction and the establishment of a few schools with little or no funds, practically nothing was done until 1864, when Nevada was organized as a State. The number of schools was then eighteen, and by 1865 there were thirty-seven, and the number of pupils was about 1000. At present, Nevada has a complete system of education, gradually developed, which begins with the primary school and ends with the State University. The educational affairs of the State are controlled and managed by a State Board of Education consisting of the State governor, the President of the University, and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The State is divided into five educational districts, each district being under the supervision and control of a deputy superintendent and there are no county superintendents. According to the law of the State all children between the ages of eight to fourteen years are compelled to attend school, but the law has never been rigidly enforced. At present (1908), there are in Nevada 17,583 children under twenty-one years of age, of whom thirty-eight are negroes and fifty Mongolians. Of all these, 6,733 attend the public schools and 595 attend private and denominational schools. The total number of schools in the State is 308 with 414 teachers. There are two Catholic schools with about 200 pupils and an orphan asylum under the care of religious.

The State University was opened in 1886. It is now located at Reno and has various departments of arts, literature, science. The teaching force consists of fifty-four professors, assistant professors, and instructors, and in 1909–10 the attendance was 220 students. The annual expenditures are at present about $200,000, some of this money being appropriated for building purposes. The State has also a mining school, located at Virginia City, with about thirty students.

Religion.—The first Catholic church to be built in Nevada was the one erected by Father Gallagher, at Genoa, in 1861. In 1862 the church was blown down and another built in its place. In 1864 Father Monteverde erected the first Catholic church at Austin, and in 1871 Father Merril built the first church at Reno. The efforts of these first zealous priests were the beginning of the history of Catholicism in Nevada. Nevada has at present no bishop and the State does not form a diocese. The eastern half of the State, east of the 117th meridian, including also Austin and the country bordering on the Reese River

to the West of the same meridian, belong ecclesiastically to the Diocese of Salt Lake, Province of San Francisco, while the territory west of the 117th meridian, with the exception of Austin and the country bordering on the Reese River, belong to the Diocese of Sacramento, of the same province. According to the Bureau of the United States Census (Bulletin No. 103, Religious Bodies, 1906) the Catholic population of Nevada was then 9,970, or 66% of the entire religious population of the State. The following are the principal denominations of the State and the church members in each: Catholics 9,970, or 66% of the total; Episcopalians 1,210, or 8%; Latter Day Saints 1,105, or 7%; Methodists 618, or 4%; Presbyterians 520, or 3½%; Baptists 316, or 2%.

Catholic Immigration.—Catholics have gone toNevada at different times, along with the general influx of population into the Western States from the Middle States in 1845–75. Since the very beginning of the history of the State, the Catholic Church has been an important factor in the upbuilding of the commonwealth and the welfare and education of the people. The difficulties encountered were not easy to overcome in the midst of an unsettled, careless, and often lawless community in the years 1850–70. After the establishments of the first Catholic churches in the new country by Fathers Gallagher, Monteverde, and Merril, came the great benefactor Father Monogue, who in 1863 established the pioneer benevolent organization of Nevada or the St. Vincent de Paul Benevolent Society. This was at a time when organizations of this kind were very much in need in the western countries, and the praiseworthy work of this society, the charities of which were extended to all, regardless of creed, cannot be too highly commended. Father Monogue also established in 1864, the Nevada orphan asylum, two Catholic schools, St. Mary's school for girls and St. Vincent's school for boys, and St. Mary's hospital, all under the care of Sisters.

Religious Polity.—The State constitution guarantees to all individuals absolute freedom of worship and toleration of religious sentiment. By statutory law, all amusements, business transactions, opening of saloons and gambling, are forbidden on Sundays, but the law has never been rigidly enforced. There is no law demanding a compulsory administration of a fixed form of oath, and a simple affirmation or negation suffices before the law. There are no statutory laws of any kind that forbid blasphemy or profanity. It is customary to open the Legislature, the school year at the State University and many of the public schools with prayer, but there are no laws either for or against such practices. By statutory law, however, religious instruction of any kind is absolutely forbidden in the public schools, and the public school funds cannot be used for sectarian purposes. Sunday, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, (Admission Day), Thanksgiving, and Christmas are designated by law as non-judicial days and are observed as legal holidays. There is no law recognizing religious holidays as such. No statutory law exists as regards the seal of confession, but it is presumed that the same is inviolable. Churches may be incorporated. All church property that is used only for church purposes is by law exempt from taxation, and malicious injury to churches or church property is by law punishable by fine or even imprisonment. The lawfully licensed clergy of all denominations is exempt from jury and military service. Marriage is recognized by law as a civil contract. It may be performed by any licensed minister or a civil judge. With the consent of the parents marriage may be contracted by a man and woman of the ages of eighteen and sixteen respectively, and without the parents' consent only at the ages of twenty-one and eighteen or over respectively. The parties contracting marriage must not be nearer kin than second cousins, or cousins in the second blood. The divorce laws of the State are very liberal. By the State law, divorces may be granted for impotency, adultery, desertion, infamy, cruelty, drunkenness, or neglect to provide.

BANCROFT, *History of Nevada, Colorado and Wyoming* (San Francisco, 1890); *Biennial report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction of Nevada* (Carson City, 1909); *Bureau of the Census of the United States: Bulletin No. 103, Religious Bodies* (Washington, 1906); CUTTING, *Compiled Laws of the State of Nevada, 1861–1900* (Carson City, 1900); *Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee and New York, 1910); *History of Nevada* (Oakland, 1881); *International Year Book* (New York, 1909); *Report of the United States Commissioner of Education* (Washington, 1908, 1909); *University of Nevada, Register for 1909–10* (Carson City, 1910).

AURELIO M. ESPINOSA.

Neve, titular see of Arabia, suffragan of Bostra. Two of its bishops are known: Petronius, who attended the Council of Ephesus in 431, and Jobius, who was present at that of Chalcedon in 451. Isaac, a third bishop, mentioned by Le Quien about 540 ("Oriens christ.", II, 864) was not a bishop of Neve but of Nineve, and lived at the end of the seventh century ("Echos d'Orient", IV, 11). The Diocese of Neve is noticed in the "Notitia episcopatuum" of Antioch in the sixth century ("Echos d'Orient", X, 145), and the city of Neve is referred to by George of Cyprus ("Descriptio orbis romani", ed. Gelzer, 54) in the next century. The "Revue biblique" published (III, 625) some Greek inscriptions from the locality. A large Mussulman village called Nawa, in the Hauran, now occupies the site of this former see and the tower of the ancient Christian church is still visible. Neve must not be confounded with Mount Nebo, situated about 94 miles south of the town.

S. VAILHÉ.

Nève, FELIX-JEAN-BAPTISTE-JOSEPH, orientalist and philologist, b. at Ath, Belgium, 13 June, 1816; d. at Louvain, 23 May, 1893. His parents were devout Catholics. Graduated with distinction from the Catholic college of Lille, Nève completed a course of academic studies at the University of Louvain, obtaining in 1838 the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy and Letters. His pronounced taste for classical and oriental languages led him to pursue higher studies under some of the most distinguished scholars of Europe, Professors Lassen of Bonn, Tiersch of Munich, and Burnouf of Paris. He became acquainted with many oriental scholars, some of them already famous, others destined like himself to win fame in after years. Among these were Muir, Wilson, A. Weber, Kuhn, Max Müller, and the distinguished orientalist and Catholic priest, Dr. Windischmann.

In 1841 Nève was appointed to the chair of Greek and Latin Literature in the University of Louvain, and while teaching the classics, gave a course of studies in the Sanskrit language and literature. This work he kept up with unsparing energy and marked success for thirty-six years, at the same time making known the results of his studies in books and in articles contributed to the "Journal Asiatique", "Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne", "Correspondant", and other periodicals. When in 1877 he was released from his arduous duties with the title of *professor emeritus*, his industry continued unabated, and for the next fifteen years a series of publications came from his pen. He was a member of the Asiatic Society of Paris, the Asiatic Society of London, the Royal Academy of Belgium, and was a Knight of the Order of Leopold.

To Nève belongs the honour of giving the first impetus to the cultivation of Sanskrit studies in Belgium. The most important of his numerous publications in this field are: (1) his translation of selected hymns from the Rig-Veda, "Études sur les hymnes du Rig-Veda, avec un choix d'hymnes traduits pour le premier fois en français" (Louvain, 1842); (2) his fine study of the ancient Brahmin cult of the Ribhanas, "Essai sur le mythe des Ribhanas . . . avec le texte sanskrit et la traduction française des hymnes

addressés a ces divinités" (Paris, 1847); (3) his translation of the Indian drama based on the story of the epic hero Rama, "Le dénouement de l'histoire de Rama. Outtara-Rama-Charita, drame de Bhavabhouti, traduit du sanskrit" (Brussels, 1880); (4) his collection of essays on the Vedanta philosophy and the epic and dramatic poetry of India, published under the title "Epoques littéraires de l'Inde" (Brussels, 1883).

Nève was also learned in the Armenian language and literature. A number of valuable translations and studies based on Armenian texts came from his pen. Among these may be mentioned: (1) the Armenian story of the Tatar invasion, "Exposé des guerres de Tamerlan et de Schah-Rokh dans l'Asie occidentale, d'après le chronique arménienne inédite de Thomas de Medzoph", published in "Mémoires de l'Académie Royale de Belgique" (1861); (2) the Armenian account of the exploits of Godfrey de Bouillon, "Les chefs belges de la première croisade d'après les historiens arméniens" (Brussels, 1859); (3) the valuable collection of studies on early Christian Armenian prayers and hymns entitled "L'Arménie chrétienne et sa littérature" (Louvain, 1886). Among the publications of Nève bearing on philology, a place of honour should be given to his account of the learned men who in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries laboured for the upbuilding of the University of Louvain, "La renaissance des lettres et l'essor de l'érudition ancienne en Belgique".

Cathedral of St-Cyr (XVI Century), Nevers

Lamy, *Nève* in *Annuaire de l'Académie Royale de Belgique* (1893); Lefebvre, *Nève* in *Annuaire de l'Université de Louvain* (1894); Willems, *Nève* in suppl. of *Journal de Bruxelles* (Aug., 1892).

Charles F. Aiken.

Nevers, Diocese of (Nivernum), includes the Department of Nièvre, in France. Suppressed by the Concordat of 1801 and united to the See of Autun, it was re-established in 1823 as suffragan of Sens and took over a part of the former Diocese of Autun and a part of the former Diocese of Auxerre (see Sens). The "Gallia Christiana" mentions as first Bishop of Nevers St. Eladius, restored to health in the reign of Clovis by St. Severinus, Abbot of St. Maurice. According to Duchesne the first authentic bishop is Tauricanus, present at the Council of Epaon in 517. A number of former bishops of Nevers are venerated as saints: St. Arey (Arigius) 549–52); St. Agricola (580–94); St. Jerome (800–16) who rebuilt in honour of the martyrs Quiricus and Julitta, the cathedral until then dedicated to Sts. Gervasius and Protasius. It is possible that in the seventh century three other saints occupied the See of Nevers: St. Diè (Deodatus), the same perhaps who died a hermit in the Vosges; St. Nectarius and St. Itier (Itherius). The following bishops of Nevers were notable: the future cardinal Pierre I Bertrandi (1320–22) who, in 1329–30, defended ecclesiastical immunities against the barons in the celebrated conferences of Paris and Vincennes presided over by Philip VI; Charles de Bourbon (1540–47) subsequently cardinal and whom the Leaguers wished to make King of France under the name of Charles X; Spifame (1548–58) who became a Calvinist in 1559, and was afterwards accused of forgery and beheaded at Geneva in 1556; the polemist Sorbin de Ste-Foi (1578–1606) a voluminous writer. Among the saints of this diocese must be mentioned: Sts. Paul, priest; Péreux and Pélerin, martyrs between 272 and 303; St. Paroze (Patritius), Abbot of Nevers in the sixth century; the hermit St. Franchy (Francovæcus); the priest St. Vincent of Magny in the ninth century; Blessed Nicholas Applaine, canon of the collegiate church of Prémery (fifteenth century) whose cassock Louis XI claimed as a relic. Claude Fauchet, constitutional Bishop of Calvados during the Revolution, was a native of the diocese.

In 1168, William IV, Count of Nevers, willed to the Bishop of Bethlehem in Palestine the small town of Pantenor near Clamecy, also the hospital at Clamecy founded by his father William III in 1147. In 1223, owing to the incursions of the Mussulmans in Palestine, the Bishop of Bethlehem settled at Clamecy, and exercised jurisdiction over the hospital and the faubourg of Pantenor; his successors were chosen by the counts, later by the dukes of Nevers, with the approval of the pope and the king. In 1413 Charles VI tried to obtain for the titular bishops of Bethlehem the privileges enjoyed by the other bishops of the realm, but the French clergy were opposed to this and the titular of Bethlehem was always considered a bishop *in partibus infidelium*. The assembly of the clergy of France in 1635 granted the bishops of Bethlehem an annual pension. Christopher d'Authier of Sisgau, founder of the Missionary Priests of the Congregation of the Blessed Sacrament and celebrated for his sermons to the galley-slaves of Marseilles was Bishop of Bethlehem 1651–63. The Abbey of La Charité sur Loire, founded in 1056, and known as the "eldest daughter" of Cluny, was inaugurated in 1106 by Pascal II; the celebrated Suger, then a simple cleric, has left an account of the ceremony. The Benedictine Abbey of Corbigny, founded under Charlemagne was occupied by the Huguenots in 1563, as a basis of operations. Bernadette Soubirous (see Lourdes, Notre-Dame de) died in the Visitandine Convent of Nevers, 12 December, 1878. The chief places of pilgrimage in the diocese are: Notre Dame de Pitié at St. Martin d'Heuille, dating from the fourteenth century; Notre Dame de Fauboulvin at Corancy, dating from 1590; Notre Dame du Morvan at Dun-sur-Grand Ry, dating from 1876. Prior to the enforcement of the law of 1901, the Diocese of Nevers counted Marists, Oblates of Mary Immaculate, Oratorians, and several orders of teaching brothers. Among the congregations for women which originated in the diocese must be mentioned: the Ursuline nuns, a teaching order founded in 1622 at Nevers by the Duke of Gonzaga and the Nevers aldermen; the Hospitallers, founded in 1639 at La Charité-sur-Loire by Sister Médard-Varlet; the great congregation of Sisters of Charity and Christian Instruction, founded in 1680, with mother-house at Nevers. At the beginning of the

twentieth century the religious congregations of the diocese had charge of 22 day nurseries, 5 orphanages for girls, 2 sewing rooms, 18 hospitals or asylums, 1 house of retreat, 1 home for incurables, 1 insane asylum, 2 religious houses for the care of the sick in their own homes. In 1908 the Diocese of Nevers had 313,-972 inhabitants, 95 parishes, and 272 succursal parishes.

Gallia Christiana, XII, *nova* (1770), 625–65; *Instrumenta*, 297–358; DUCHESNE, *Fastes Episcopaux*, II, 475; FISQUET, *France pontificale, Nevers* (Paris, 1866); POUSSEREAU, *Histoire des comtes et des ducs de Nevers* (Paris, 1897); DE SOULTRAIT, *Armorial de Nevers* (Paris, 1852); CROSNIER, *Hagiologie Nivernaise* (Nevers, 1858); IDEM, *Monographie de la cathédrale de Nevers, suivie de l'histoire des évêques de Nevers* (Paris, 1854).

GEORGES GOYAU.

Neville, EDMUND (*alias* SALES), a Jesuit, b. at Hopcut, Lancashire, 1605; d. in England, 18 July, 1847. Educated at St. Omer, he entered the English College, Rome, 29 June, 1621, where he distinguished himself in philosophy. He joined the Jesuits, 24 May, 1626; was stationed at Ghent, 1636, and sent on the London mission, 1637. He was professed, 3 August, 1640; served in the Oxford district, 1642, and in South Wales, 1645. Being a suspected priest he was seized under the Commonwealth but soon released. He wrote the "Palm of Christian Fortitude" (St. Omer, 1630), an account of the Japanese persecutions; a "Life of St. Augustine" and "Second Thoughts" both unprinted. (2) His uncle EDMUND NEVILLE (*alias* ELIJAH NELSON), probably the son of Sir John Neville of Leversedge, b. in Yorkshire about 1563; d. 1648, his death hastened by the treatment he received in prison. Ordained for the English mission, 12 April, 1608, he entered the Society, 1609. He is considered to have been the *de jure* seventh Earl of Northumberland. (3) Many members of the Scarisbrick family of Scarisbrick Hall, near Ormskirk, became Jesuits during the penal times and assumed the *alias* "Neville". Among them were EDWARD SCARISBRICK (Neville), b. 1639. Educated at St. Omer, he entered the Society at Watten, 7 September, 1660, and was stationed at Liège, 1671, and St. Omer, 1675. Sent to England, he was one of Oates's intended victims. James II appointed him royal chaplain. He was instructor of the Jesuit tertians at Ghent, 1693. He returned to Lancashire, where he died, 19 February, 1708–9. He wrote "Life of Lady Warner" (St. Omer, 1691); "Catholick Loyalty" (London, 1688); "Rules and Instructions for the Sodality of the Immaculate Conception", etc. (4) EDWARD NEVILLE (Scarisbrick), b. 1663; d. 15 November, 1735. He became a Jesuit, 1682; served on the Derbyshire mission, 1701, and after 1728 at Bushey Hall, Watford, Herts. (5) EDWARD NEVILLE (Scarisbrick), b. 1698; d. 7 July, 1778. He entered the Society, 7 September, 1728. Superior of the Derbyshire mission in 1764, he laboured also in Lancashire. (6) SIR EDWARD NEVILLE, son of Baron Bergavenny, a courtier of Henry VIII, took part in the war in France, and was made the king's standard bearer, 1531. He married Eleanor, daughter of Lord Windsor. Arrested 3 November, 1538, on the charge of conspiracy with the brother of Cardinal Pole, he was sent to the Tower, tried at Westminster, and beheaded for the faith, 8 December.

DE BACKER, *Bibl. des écrivains de la Comp. de Jésus*, II (1521); FOLEY, *Records of the English Province of the S.J.* (London, 1879–80), V, 347, 350–1; VI, 296, 406; VII, 686; OLIVER, *Collectanea S.J.*, 148; CAMM, *Lives of the English Martyrs*, I (London, 1904), 517 sqq.

A. A. MACERLEAN.

New Abbey.—The Abbey of Sweetheart, named New Abbey Pow, or New Abbey, in order to distinguish it from Dundrennan in the same county, is situated near the River Pow, in the parish of Loch Kenderloch, Kirkcudbrightshire, Diocese of Galloway, about eight miles from the town of Dumfries, Scotland. The title of Abbey of Sweetheart was given by the foundress of the abbey, Lady Devorgilla, daughter of Alan, Lord of Galloway, who erected the monastery in order to keep in it a casket of ivory and silver, in which was embalmed the heart of her husband, King John de Baliol. Sweetheart is the last in order of the Cistercian abbeys in Scotland. It was begun in 1275, being a daughter of Dundrennan, of the lineage of Clairvaux. Henry, the first abbot, built a magnificent church in the early English style. It measured 203 feet in length, with a central tower 92 feet high; it had a nave with aisles, transepts with chapels on their eastern sides, and a choir without aisles. The monastic buildings were in proportion, and were surrounded with a massive granite enclosing wall, from eight to ten feet high, large portions of which still remain. Very little is known of the old history of Sweetheart, except that the Maxwells, lords of Kirkconnel, whose castle was near by, and who were descendants of the Maxwell kings, were great benefactors of the place. The most celebrated superior of the abbey was Abbot Gilbert Broun, the last of the line. He continued to uphold the Catholic faith long after the Reformation, and was a powerful opponent of Protestantism. He was denounced several times on the charge of enticing to "papistrie" from 1578 to 1605; he was seized by his enemies in 1605 in spite of the resistance of the whole countryside, taken prisoner, and conveyed to Edinburgh, whence he was banished. He then became rector of the Scots College, Paris, where he died in 1612 at the age of eighty-four. The possessions of Sweetheart Abbey passed into the hands of Sir John Spottiswoode in 1624, and with them the title of Lord of New Abbey. The monastery soon became a mere quarry for those who wanted ready-cut material for building. The chapter, with the remains of the library over it, and a part of the church, are all that remain to-day.

HENRIQUEZ, *Menologium Cisterciense* (Antwerp, 1630); JONGELINUS, *Notitia Abbatiarum Ord. Cisterciensis* (Cologne, 1640); JANAUSCHEK, *Originum Cisterciensium tomus*, I (Vienna, 1877); BARRETT, *The Scottish Cistercians* (Edinburgh); REGIS, *S. M. de Neubotle; New Statistical Account of Scotland.*

EDMOND M. OBRECHT.

Newark, DIOCESE OF (NOVARCENSIS), created in 1853, suffragan of New York and comprising Hudson, Passaic, Bergen, Essex, Union, Morris, and Sussex counties in the State of New Jersey, U. S. A., an area of 1699 square miles. The diocese originally included the whole State, but the fourteen other counties were taken (15 July, 1881) to form the Diocese of Trenton. As early as 1672 the records show that there were Catholics at Woodbridge and at Elizabethtown, the capital of East Jersey, and the Jesuit Fathers Harvey and Gage, Governor Dongan's chaplains in New York, visited them. Other priests came at a later period. Several of these pioneers were Alsatians who had come over with Carteret to engage in the salt-making industry. William Douglass, elected from Bergen, was excluded from the first General Assembly held at Elizabethtown, 26 May, 1668, because he was a Catholic. Two years later he was arrested and banished to New England as a "troublesome person". The whole atmosphere of the colony was intensely anti-Catholic. The law of 1698 granted religious toleration in East Jersey, but "provided that this should not extend to any of the Romish religion the right to exercise their manner of worship contrary to the laws and statutes of England". In West Jersey, the pioneers were Quakers and more tolerant. It is claimed that John Tatham, appointed Governor of West Jersey in 1690, and the founder of its great pottery industry, was really an English Catholic whose name was John Gray. Father Robert Harding and Father Ferdinand Farmer (Steinmeyer) from the Jesuit community in Philadelphia, made long tours across the State in the eighteenth century ministering to the scattered groups of Cath-

olics at Mount Hope, Macopin, Basking Ridge, Trenton, Ringwood, and other places. The settlement at Macopin (now Echo Lake) was made by some German Catholics sometime before the Revolution and their descendants make up the parish to-day.

During the Revolution Washington's army brought many Catholics through the State. In the camp at Morristown the Spanish agent Don Juan de Miralles, died 28 April, 1780, and his funeral was conducted by Father Seraphin Bandol, chaplain of the French Minister, who came specially from Philadelphia to administer the last sacraments to the dying Spaniard. Washington and the other officers of the army attended the ceremony. When in the following May the remains were removed to Philadelphia, Congress attended the Requiem Mass in St. Mary's church. It was at Morristown in 1780, that the first official recognition of St. Patrick's Day is to be found in Washington's order book, still preserved there at his headquarters. Marbois, writing from Philadelphia, 25 March, 1785, gives the number of Catholics in New York and New Jersey as 1700; more than half of these were probably in New Jersey. There were many French refugees from the West Indies in Princeton, Elizabeth, and its vicinity, and Fathers Vianney, Tissorant, and Malou used to minister to them from St. Peter's, New York, in the early years of the last century. Mines, furnaces, glass works, and other industries started in various sections of the State, brought Catholic immigrants. The Augustinian Missionary, Father Philip Larisey, visited Paterson about 1821, and the first parish in the State, St. Francis, Trenton, was established in 1814. Newark's first church, St. John's, was opened in 1828, the pastor being the Rev. Gregory B. Pardow of New York, and the first trustees Patrick Murphy, John Sherlock, John Kelly, Christopher Rourke, Morris Fitzgerald, John Gillespie, and Patrick Mape. The first native of Newark to be ordained to the priesthood was Daniel G. Durning, son of Charles Durning, in whose house Mass used to be said before the first church was built. In 1820 Father Richard Bulger erected the first church in Paterson. In New Brunswick the first Mass was said by Rev. Dr. Power of New York in 1825, and the first church was opened by Rev. Joseph A. Schneller, 19 December, 1831. In Jersey City, originally called Paulus Hook, Mass was first said in 1830, and the first church opened by the Reverend Hugh Mohan in 1837. At Macopin the little band of German Catholics before mentioned had a church as early as 1829. Thus during the first half of the nineteenth century there was a slow but steady growth of the Faith all over the State, and as it was receiving a substantial share of the great inflow of Catholic immigrants, the Holy See deemed the time opportune to separate it from the Diocese of New York, and the See of Newark was erected. The Reverend James Roosevelt Bayley (q. v.), then secretary to Bishop Hughes of New York, was chosen the first Bishop of Newark, and consecrated 30 October, 1853. There were then between fifty and sixty thousand Catholics in his diocese, for the most part Irish and Germans.

In organizing the new diocese Bishop Bayley found he could count on only twenty-five priests. There were no diocesan institutions except small orphanages, and the people were poor and of little social influence. In the interest of Catholic education, one of his chief concerns, he founded the Madison Congregation of the Sisters of Charity (q. v.), and to supply the lack of funds for the work of new churches, he obtained assistance from the Association of the Propagation of the Faith of Lyons, France, and the Leopoldine Society of Vienna. Seton Hall College was opened by him in September, 1856, and everywhere the diocese responded to the energy of his zeal and practical effort. In ten years the churches increased to 67, the priests to 63, and a monastery of Benedictines and another of Passionists was established. The Sisters of Charity became a community of 87 members, conducting 17 different establishments. Other notable additions were 2 convents of Benedictine nuns, 2 of German Sisters of Notre Dame; 2 of Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis; a flourishing college, an academy for young ladies, a boarding school for boys, and parish schools attached to most of the churches, while the old wooden chapels had been replaced by buildings of brick and stone. "All this has been done", the bishop wrote, "in the midst of a population of emigrants, comparatively poor, without incurring a great debt!" In twelve years the Association of the Propagation of the Faith gave the diocese $26,600. This progress, too, was made in spite of much local narrowness and bigotry, the culmination of which on 5 November, 1854, resulted in a riot during which an anti-Catholic mob desecrated and sacked the little German church of St. Mary in Newark served by the Benedictine Father Nicholas Balleis. In this disturbance a Catholic was killed and several others wounded.

Bishop Bayley was promoted to the Archbishopric of Baltimore, 30 July, 1872, and his successor as second bishop of the see was the Right Reverend Michael Augustine Corrigan (q. v.) consecrated 4 May, 1873. He successfully overcame a number of complicated financial entanglements, and established a House of the Good Shepherd for girls 24 May, 1875, in Newark, a protectory for boys about the same time at Denville, and in June, 1880, in Newark a community of Dominican Nuns of the Perpetual Adoration, from Ouillins, France. On 8 and 9 May, 1878, an important synod was held, and in July, 1881, the Diocese of Trenton, which cut off a considerable portion of the Newark territory in the southern section, was established. On 1 October, 1880, Bishop Corrigan was made titular Archbishop of Petra and coadjutor of New York, and to succeed him as third Bishop of Newark, the Rev. Dr. Winand M. Wigger, then pastor at Madison, was chosen and consecrated 18 October 1881. Bishop Wigger was born of German parents in New York City, 9 December, 1841, and made his classical studies at St. Francis Xavier's College, New York. His theological course was followed at Seton Hall and at the college of Brignole-Sale, Genoa, Italy, where he was ordained priest 10 June, 1865. Following the example of his predecessors Bishop Wigger made the diocesan seminary one of the objects of his chief solicitude. In 1883 he removed the Catholic Protectory to Arlington and established the Sacred Heart Union to aid in its maintenance. The Fifth Diocesan Synod was held by him 17 November, 1886, at which strict regulations were enacted in regard to funerals and the attendance at parochial and public schools. On 11 June, 1899, he laid the cornerstone of a new cathedral church at Newark, and soon after was forced to go abroad in search of rest and health. On his return he took up his duties with zeal, but died of pneumonia, 5 January, 1901. The record of his administration shows a character entirely disinterested and unselfish united to a poverty truly apostolic.

The Vicar-General John J. O'Connor was the choice of the Holy See as fourth bishop, and was consecrated 25 July, 1901. Born at Newark, 11 June, 1855, he made his college course at Seton Hall. In 1873 he was sent to the American College at Rome where he spent four years. After another year at Louvain he was ordained priest 22 December, 1877, and on his return to Newark, was appointed professor at Seton Hall College where he became Director of the Seminary in which he remained for the following eighteen years. He was then named vicar-general and on 30 October, 1895, rector of St. Joseph's. Early in his administration he adopted measures for the completion of the new cathedral of the Sacred Heart, begun by Bishop Wigger, making this the special object of the golden jubilee of the diocese. At this it was shown that in

the brief space of fifty years, there had been an increase of tenfold in the number of churches and ninefold in population, with nearly 50,000 children attending 167 Catholic schools and institutions, and 396 priests attending the 416 churches and chapels throughout the State. Religious communities now represented in the diocese are, men: the Jesuits, Passionists, Benedictines, Carmelites, Dominicans, Franciscans, Salesians, Pious Society of the Missions, the Christian Brothers, Alexian Brothers, and Xaverian Brothers; women: Sisters of Charity (Newark), Sisters of St. Benedict, Sisters of Christian Charity, Sisters of St. Francis, Sisters of Charity (Gray Nuns), Dominican Sisters of the Perpetual Rosary, Sisters of St. Dominic, Sisters of St. Francis, Sisters of the Poor of St. Francis, Sisters of the Good Shepherd, Sisters of St. Joseph, School Sisters of Notre Dame, Sisters of St. Joseph of Peace, Little Sisters of the Poor, Felician Sisters, Sisters of the Sorrowful Mother, Pallotine Sisters of Charity, Missionary Sisters of the Sacred Heart, Daughters of Our Lady of Help, Franciscan Sisters of the Immaculate Conception, Baptistine Sisters.

Statistics (1910): Priests, 368 (regulars, 88); churches with resident priests, 162; missions with churches, 36; stations, 10; chapels, 82; seminary, 1, students, 42; students in Europe, 7; seminaries of religious, 3, students, 31; colleges and academies for boys, 6; academies for girls, 12; parish schools, 116, pupils, 52,600; orphan asylums, 12, inmates, 2400; industrial and reform schools, 4, inmates 450; protectory for boys, 1, inmates, 180; total young people under Catholic care, 56,000; hospitals, 10; houses for aged poor, 2; other charitable institutions, 8; Catholic population, 365,000.

FLYNN, *The Catholic Church in New Jersey* (Morristown, 1904); SHEA, *History of the Cath. Ch. in the U. S.* (New York, 1889–92); REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. of the Cath. Hierarchy in the U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898); BAYLEY, *A Brief Sketch of the Early Hist. of the Cath. Ch. on the Island of New York* (New York, 1853); GRIFFIN, *Catholics in the Am. Revolution*, I (Ridley Park, Pa., 1907); TANGUAY, *Documents relating to the Colonial History of New Jersey* (Newark, 1880); *History Cath. Ch. in Paterson, N. J.* (Paterson, 1883); *Hist. City of Elizabeth* (Elizabeth, 1899); *Freeman's Journal* and *Truth Teller* (New York) files; *The Catholic Directory* (1850–1910).

THOMAS F. MEEHAN.

Newbattle (NEUBOTLE, i. e. new dwelling), in the ancient Diocese of St. Andrews, about seven miles from Edinburgh, was founded about 1140, being the second of the six Cistercian Monasteries established by St. David, King of Scotland. Newbattle Abbey was a filiation of Melrose (itself a daughter of Clairvaux) and was situated, according to Cistercian usages, in a beautiful valley along the South Esk. Rudolph, its first abbot, a strict and severe observer of the rule, devoted himself energetically to the erection of proper buildings. The church, cruciform in shape, was two hundred and forty feet in length, and the other buildings in proportion; for the community numbered at one period as many as eighty monks and seventy lay-brothers. The abbey soon became prosperous, and famous for the regularity of its members, several of whom became well-known bishops. It was especially dear to the kings of Scotland, scarcely one of whom failed to visit it from time to time, and they were always its generous benefactors. One of the principal sources of income was the coal mines in its possession, for these monks were among the first, if not the first, coal miners in Scotland. The earliest mention of coal in Scotland is to be found in a charter of an Earl of Winchester, granting to them a coal mine. Newbattle suffered much from English incursions at various times, particularly in 1385, when the monastery and church were burned, and the religious either carried away, or forced to flee to other monasteries; it required forty years to repair these losses. A part of the monastery was again destroyed by the Earl of Hertford, but the destruction seems to have been chiefly confined to the church. At the time of the Protestant Reformation but few of the monks remained, and these were pensioned by the commendator, Mark Kerr, ancestor of the Lothian family, its present owners. The stones of the church were used to convert the monastic buildings into a secular house.

MANRIQUE, *Annales Cistercienses* (Lyons, 1642); DOBSWORTH AND DUGDALE, *Monasticon Anglicanum* (1661); REGIS, *S. M. de Neubotle; New Statistical Account of Scotland*, vol. I; BARRETT, *The Scottish Cistercians* (Edinburgh).

EDMOND M. OBRECHT.

New Brunswick. See CHATHAM, DIOCESE OF; SAINT JOHN, DIOCESE OF.

New Caledonia, VICARIATE APOSTOLIC OF.—New Caledonia, one of the largest islands of Oceania, lies about 900 miles east of Queensland, Australia, between 20° 10′ and 22° 16′ S. lat., and between 164° and 167° E. long. It is about 250 miles long by 30 broad, and has an area of 7650 square miles. It is a French colony, its principal dependencies being the Isle of Pines and Loyalty Islands (including Lifou, Mare, and Uvea). Its population, together with that of these dependencies, is estimated at 53,000 inhabitants (13,000 free; 11,000 of convict origin; 29,000 black). The coasts of New Caledonia are deeply indented, and the island is almost entirely surrounded by an immense madrepore reef, which now retires to some distance from and now approaches close to the shore, but regularly leaves a broad channel of water between itself and the island. This species of canal, in which the sea is always calm, greatly facilitates communication between the various settlements on the coast. The island is very mountainous, and about one half of its area is thus uncultivatable. The so-called central chain, which divides the island into an eastern and a western section, attains the height of over 5500 feet. The hills which fringe the coast, and at times rise sheer from the water, do not in general exceed the height of 600 feet. Between these lesser ranges stretch good-sized plains of great fertility, admirably watered by numerous streams which the natives skilfully utilize for purposes of irrigation. The streams of the same basin usually unite to form one river which is navigable for vessels of light draught for about a dozen miles from the coast. Unlike most intertropical regions, the island has no well-defined wet season, some years being very rainy and others characterized by prolonged droughts. The scenery is wonderfully beautiful and for salubrity of climate the island is almost unrivalled. The temperature rarely reaches the extremes of 96° by day during the hot season (December to March) and 56° by night during the cold (May to August). The administration has divided the island into three sections: the convict settlement, that reserved exclusively for the natives, and the remainder which is leased to colonists by the French Government. The chief agricultural products are coffee, maize, sugar, grapes, and pineapples, while efforts are being made at present to foster the cultivation of wheat, rubber, and cotton. The island also possesses valuable deposits of nickel, cobalt, chrome, and copper ores, all of which are being exploited chiefly by Australian miners. Discovered by Captain Cook in 1774, the island was occupied by the French in 1853, and on 2 Sept. 1863, a decree was passed authorizing the establishment of a convict settlement there. In May, 1864, the first criminals arrived, and between that date and 1896, an aggregate of about 22,000 were transported thither. As no convicts have been sent since 1896, the convict element of the population is rapidly diminishing. Nouméa is the chief town and the seat of government. It has an excellent harbour for the improvement of which various works are in course of execution. The colony is administered by a governor, assisted by a council consisting of various officials and two notables nominated by the governor. There is also an elective general council.

The ethnology of the natives, whose number is gradually decreasing, is somewhat uncertain, but they probably spring from a mixed Melanesian and Western Polynesian stock. Their height is above that of the average South Sea Islander; they are as a rule well built and quite erect; their colour varies from a very dark brown to a light complexion, and their hair is coarse and woolly. Cannibalism, which was generally practised on the island in former times, has disappeared in consequence of the strict measures taken by the administration. Although the men of the same tribe live together in the greatest harmony (such being in fact a leading dictate of their religious belief) intertribal wars have been always frequent, and have been in the past almost the sole occasion of cannibalism, as the flesh of a fellow tribesman is one of the most intelligible of their numerous and in very many cases peculiar taboos. The native religion is so closely intertwined with superstitions that distinction is rather difficult. The natives undoubtedly have a firm belief in a future life; the dead are supposed to live under the great mountain *Mu*, where the good are welcomed after death and where the general conditions bear some striking analogies to the Harmonic Hades. Ancestral worship is universally practised among the pagan natives, and there is a special class whose office it is to feed the deceased kinsmen, partly by consuming the food as their proxies and partly by exposing it for them in a taboo hut. The natives live together according to their tribes under chiefs, who exercise an extensive authority in purely native affairs. The food of the natives consists of yams, taros, sugar-cane, dried fish, and shell-fish. At various places on the island are held markets, at which the natives of the coast and of the mountains meet to exchange produce, dancing forming a regular feature of the transaction. Though excellent farmers, the natives are lazy.

New Caledonia was separated from Central Oceania and erected into a distinct vicariate Apostolic by decree of 2 July and Brief of 13 July, 1847. Besides the main island, the vicariate includes the Isle of Pines and the Belep and Loyalty Islands. The mission is entrusted to the Marist Fathers, who, besides ministering to the French settlers and convicts, have devoted themselves sedulously and with the greatest success to the conversion of the natives. According to the latest statistics the vicariate includes: 35,000 Catholics (11,500 natives); 48 missionary priests and 40 brothers of the Marist Congregation; 126 sisters; 61 catechists; 68 churches and several chapels; 45 schools with 1881 pupils; 1 orphanage with 50 inmates. The present vicar Apostolic, who is the fourth to fill the office, is Mgr. Chaurion, titular Bishop of Cariopolis.

Statesman's Year Book (London, 1910); *Missiones Apostolicæ* (Rome, 1907); GUILLEMAND, *Australasia*, II (London, 1894), 455–63, in *Compendium of Geography and Travel;* ATKINSON, *The Natives of New Caledonia* in *Folk-Lore*, XIV (London, 1903), 243–59.

THOMAS KENNEDY.

Newcastle. See HEXHAM AND NEWCASTLE, DIOCESE OF.

Newfoundland, a British colony of North America (area 42,734 square miles), bounded on the north by the Strait of Belle Isle, which separates it from its dependency Labrador (area 120,000 square miles), on the east and south by the Atlantic Ocean, and on the west by the Gulf of St. Lawrence, lies between 46° 35′ and 51° 40′ lat. N., and 52° 35′ and 59° 25′ long. W. It was the first portion of North America discovered by European voyagers. The Cabots sailed from Bristol in 1497, and on 24 June of that year, the festival of St. John the Baptist, they landed in the harbour to which they gave the name of St. John's, which it bears to the present day. The Cabots, like all the early navigators, had in view not only the discovery of new lands, and the increase of the power and wealth and territory of the mother country, but also the spread of the Gospel and the conversion of the heathens to the Christian Faith. Hence they brought with them priests and missionaries. Those who accompanied Cabot were Augustinians or "Black Friars". We may be sure that Mass was celebrated on these shores in 1497.

In the year 1500 the Portuguese under Gaspar de Cortereal took possession of the country and founded the settlement and Church of Placentia. In 1534 the French voyager, Jacques Cartier, visited the country, and explored the Gulf of St. Lawrence. He also had chaplains with him who celebrated Mass at Catalina in Newfoundland, and Brest, or Old Fort, on Labrador. In 1622 Lord Baltimore founded his colony of Ferryland. He brought out three Jesuit Fathers with him, and had Mass celebrated regularly, "and all other ceremonies of the Church of Rome were used in ample manner as 'tis used in Spain." Such was the complaint made against him to the Board of Trade by the Protestant clergyman, Mr. Stourton. In 1650 the French founded a church at Placentia on the site of the one abandoned by the Portuguese. But none of those attempts succeeded. The real foundation of the Catholic Church in Newfoundland is due to priests from Ireland, who came out towards the close of the eighteenth century.

The population of the country by the last census, taken in 1901, was 217,037. Of these the Catholics number 75,657, members of the Church of England 71,470, Methodists 60,700. The remainder belong to different denominations, viz. Presbyterians, Congregationalists, etc.

All denominations are equally recognized by the law, and there is no Established Church. In the early history of the country the Catholics were looked on as a proscribed class by the governors of the time, who were generally commanders of British war-ships. Priests were hunted and persecuted, people who harboured them, or permitted Mass to be celebrated in their houses were fined, imprisoned, and flogged, and their houses either burned or pulled down. In one unique case a house where Mass had been celebrated was towed into the sea and sunk. These acts were undoubtedly illegal, as there was no law in the statutes of the country penalizing the exercise of the Catholic Religion, but the penal laws of Ireland were supposed to be applicable to Newfoundland. However, the principle would not work both ways, and when Catholic Emancipation was granted to Ireland these same interpreters of the law held that the privileges of Emancipation did not apply to Newfoundland. During the whole course of his episcopate Bishop Fleming fought against these injustices and finally succeeded in obtaining full freedom for the Catholics.

In educational matters Catholics also enjoy every freedom. The denominational system is established by law. A sum is granted by Government amounting to about $1.13 *per caput* of the population, or $5.25 per pupil actually attending school. It is true this amount is small as compared with some of the Canadian Provinces, or States of the Union, but a large amount is paid by private individuals to Catholic colleges and convents which is not included in the above figures. The results compare most favorably with those of other countries. About thirty years ago a branch of the Irish Christian Brothers was introduced, an immediate impulse was given to education throughout the island, and it is now at a very high standard. The Brothers have charge of two very large schools in St. John's—St. Patrick's and Holy Cross schools. There are ten class-rooms, containing about a thousand boys. The Brothers also have charge of the college in which some three hundred boys are educated, sixty being boarders. Here are trained the pupil-teachers who will have charge of the public schools throughout the island. The college is affiliated to the Oxford Examining Board and the London University Board. A local council of higher education (non-denominational) looks after the local Examinations.

The Rhodes bequest gives three places for Newfoundland in perpetuity. They are all filled this year for the first time, and of the three occupants two are pupils of the College of St. Bonaventure. There are thirteen convents of Sisters of the Presentation Order in the country (9 in St. John's Diocese, 3 in Harbor Grace, and 1 in St. George's), and eight convents of the Sisters of Mercy (5 in St. John's, 2 in Harbor Grace, and 1 in St. George's). The Presentation Sisters have free schools, the nuns being paid out of the Government grant. The Sisters of Mercy have, besides free schools, a paying school and a boarding academy. The total number of children attending school is over 13,000. There are also two orphan asylums, or industrial schools, one under the Sisters of Mercy for girls, and one under the Christian Brothers for boys. These contain about 200 orphans, or one for every 375 of the Catholic population, which, considering that this is a maritime and fishing colony, and the losses at sea are abnormal, is not an excessive number.

The Catholic religion is not only holding its own, but advancing rapidly in Newfoundland. The most harmonious relations exist between the different denominations, which are only interrupted on occasions of public excitement, when persons aspiring to political position and honours do not scruple to stir up feelings of religious bigotry and theological hatred among the more simple-minded of the people. A great future is opening up for the country. Large industries are being started in the interior, the scene of the new developments being principally in the Dioceses of Harbor Grace and St. George's.

M. F. Howley.

New Granada. See Colombia, Republic of.

New Guinea, the second largest island and one of the least known countries of the world, lies immediately north of Australia, extending from the equator to about 12° S. lat. and from 130° 50′ to 154° 30′ E. long. It is 1490 miles in length, its maximum breadth is about 430 miles, and its total area some 310,000 sq. miles. Its population is placed at the purely conjectural figure of 875,000. An examination of the report of D'Abreu, who was long credited with the discovery of New Guinea (1511), shows that he only reached the eastern coast of Further India (Cambodia); whether José de Menzes (1526), Saavedra (1536), and Grijalva (1537) reached New Guinea is still uncertain. But there can be no doubt in the case of Jingo Ortiz de Retas (1545), who landed at the mouth of the St. Augustine (now the Kabenau) River, and took possession of the country in the name of the King of Spain. It was he who gave the island the name of Nueva Guinea. On Mercator's map of 1569 New Guinea and numerous places and islands on its northern coast are indicated. Luis de Torres (1606), whose name is commemorated in the strait separating New Guinea from Australia, was the first to circumnavigate the greater portion of the island. The voyages of Tasman (1643–44), Vuik (1653), and Kayto (1674) added greatly to our knowledge of the southern and eastern coasts, and in the eighteenth century, thanks to the efforts of Dutch, English, and French explorers (Schouten, Lemaire, Captain Cook, De Bougainville, etc.), the picture of the island began in some measure to approach the actuality. However, Captain William Dampier's map of the north-western portion of the island, while exhibiting a great advance beyond the preceding, shows how erroneous still were the views concerning the exact contour of the island. The rapid growth of European interest in Australia in the nineteenth century invested New Guinea with enhanced importance: voyages of exploration multiplied, although, owing to the warlike and cannibal character of the natives, landings were still few. It was only during the last decades of the century that active exploration of the island began. Numerous successful expeditions (MacGregor, Monckton, Strong, Berton, Beccari, and d'Albertis) have furnished us with a comparatively accurate knowledge of the coasts and of the south-eastern portion of the island. For the scanty knowledge we possess of the German territory we are indebted mainly to Dr. Schlechter (1907): the lofty mountain ranges, which hem in and render almost inaccessible the greater part of the German and especially of the Dutch section, the difficulty of travelling and transporting supplies, the character of the native tribes who regard the setting foot on their special territory as a hostile act, and the insalubrious climate, constitute for the explorer obstacles greater perhaps than any he has to encounter elsewhere in the world.

The northern coast of New Guinea is in general steep and regular, and possesses but few places of safe anchorage. The only great indentation here is the vast Geelvink Bay. The most important of the other inlets are Humboldt, Cornelis, and Astrolabe bays, Huan Gulf (all in German New Guinea), and Acland Bay (British). The coasts are lined with groups of islands which are mostly volcanic (some still actively) or otherwise flat and sandy. The chief groups on the north and east are the Schouten Islands (at the entrance to Geelvink Bay), the Admiralty Islands, and Bismarck Archipelago (of which New Pomerania is the largest island) off the German territory, and the D'Entrecasteaux Islands, the Bennett group, and the Louisiade Archipelago off British New Guinea. On the southern side of the island the sea—which on the northern is frequently too deep for safe anchorage—becomes shallow, and the precipitous rocks give place to wide plains. This is, as already stated, almost the sole easily accessible portion of New Guinea. To the west of Cape Buru in Dutch New Guinea high cliffs again skirt the coasts, and the groups of islands once more become numerous (Arru, Wessel, and Ké Islands, etc.). From the north-western portion of the island two great peninsulas, Onin and Berau, are almost severed—the latter by McCluer's Inlet, which very deeply indents the coast in an easterly direction.

Our knowledge of the great mountain ranges of New Guinea is still to a great extent hypothetical, and the calculation of their heights only approximate and subject to revision. Beginning with British New Guinea in the south-east, we find the country traversed by a continuous chain of which the successive members are the Stirling and Stanley ranges (Mount Albert, 14,400 feet), the Yule (Mt. Yule, 14,730 feet) and Albert Victor (13,120 feet) mountains, and the Sir Arthur Gordon (13,120 feet) and Victor Emmanuel (12,810 feet) ranges. This chain is continued in Dutch New Guinea by the Charles Louis range, which attains the height of about 16,000 feet (probably the greatest altitude in New Guinea). How the central chain continues in the western portion of the island is still unknown. The principal range in German New Guinea is the Bismarck Mountains (variously estimated between 14,000 and 16,000 feet in height). Between the central chain and the sea run numerous parallel ranges, mostly of a lower altitude. With few exceptions, the rivers flow through narrow and steep ravines until within a few miles from the coast, and assume, during the wet season, the character of violent torrents. As they form practically the sole means of access to immense areas of the island, the difficulties confronting the explorer will be readily understood. The most important rivers of the northern coasts are: the Amberno (still unexplored), which enters the sea by a vast delta at Point d'Urville; the Kaiserin Augusta (navigable by ocean steamers for 180 miles), which rises in the Charles Louis range and enters the Pacific at Cape della Torre; the Ottilien, which, after a course of great length, empties into the ocean near the last-mentioned; the Mambre, which discharges near the Anglo-German boundary. On the southern coast the principal rivers are the Purari or Queen's

Jubilee River (navigable by whale boat 120 miles) and the Fly (navigable by whale boat 600 miles), both of which discharge into the Gulf of Papua. No important river is known to exist in the western section of the island, which is of course still a *terra incognita*.

The climate of New Guinea is characterized in general by its great heat and humidity, and in the low-lying districts fever abounds. Although, generally speaking, the temperature seldom rises above 104° in the southern portion, it rarely falls below 86°. The climate is, however, tempered by the regular winds from the south-east and north-east, and at an altitude of 3000 feet above sea level is pleasantly cool. The annual rainfall varies from 30 to 130 inches along the coasts, rain falling more abundantly in the north and north-east than along the southern seaboard. The difficulties of the climate are aggravated by the mosquitoes and the leeches, which insinuate themselves through the most closely woven clothing and whose bite often occasions burning ulcers.

To the great uniformity seen in the geographical build of the island corresponds a general ethnical uniformity among its inhabitants (see, however, "Journal of the Royal Anthropological Society of Great Britain and Ireland", XXIX, London, 1909, pp. 246 sqq., 314 sqq.). In the case of a country so vast and still so little explored, we must confine ourselves to indicating the general characteristics of the inhabitants, passing over the local differences which manifest themselves in the native customs and mode of life. The Papuans, as they are called (the name is unknown to themselves), belong to the Melanian family: they are larger than the Malay, are dark brown or black in colour, have a smooth skin, narrow forehead, dark eyes, dolichocephalous skull, and prominent nose. Their black, naturally frizzled hair is usually artistically arranged. They wear a lavish number of bracelets (mostly of turtle-shell) on both upper and lower arms: these not only serve as a protection against arrows, but, according to their shape and colour, are employed by certain tribes as an outward token of mourning. Necklaces are also generally worn: they are usually made of rings of vegetable fibre or, in the case of the wealthier natives, of wild boar's teeth. The lower limbs are less usually adorned, except on festive occasions. Agriculture is as yet little developed; the natives depend for their sustenance mainly on their hunting (wild boar, opossum, crocodile, wild fowl), fishing, and the wild sago, which grows in the greatest abundance in the valleys and marshy lands and which is, according to the missionaries, largely responsible for the unprogressive character of the natives.

A comparatively high sense of justice exists among the native tribes, each community possessing its strictly defined hunting and fishing grounds and sage fields. Many of the tribes are celebrated for their skill in boat-building. Commerce is carried on between the maritime and inland tribes. The trading is not confined to mere exchange: wild boar's tusks, and in certain districts bracelets and stone hatchets are accepted in payment. Of the greatest value and universally recognized as a medium of exchange are the small glass pins and jewelry. These are generally believed to be the product of the old Indian glassworkers, and the natives instantly detect modern productions, which are little valued. While cannibalism still exists on the island, the members of the same tribe or community live together in the greatest peace. In general the strictest endogamy is practised, and there are certain well-defined degrees of relationship within which marriage is forbidden. The wife, for whom payment is almost always made to her relatives, attends not only to the household work, but also to the the rude agriculture practised: all observers testify to the kind manner in which wives are treated, and to the modesty and high moral character of the Papuan women in general. Though with no definite views concerning a deity, the Papuan believes in another self or soul, which deserts the body temporarily during sleep and finally after death. Disease and death never result from natural causes: they are always the result of evil spirits, acting either directly or through a poisoner. Against these evil influences talismans (mostly pieces of carved wood, crocodile teeth, etc.) are carried. The native weapons are the bow and arrow, knives of bamboo, stone clubs, spears, and hardwood shields and clubs.

New Guinea is divided politically into the Dutch, German, and English protectorates, the last two being known officially as Kaiserwilhelmsland and the Territory of Papua. In 1884 Great Britain proclaimed its protectorate over the south-eastern portion of the island, and in 1885, after Germany had annexed the north-eastern section, the delimitation of the territories of the two countries was effected by the Anglo-German treaty of that year, Holland retaining the portion of the island west of 141° E. long. The boundary line between the German and British sections runs from 5° S. lat. at the 141st meridian E. to 8° on the coast. The Anglo-Dutch Treaty of May, 1895, confirmed the western boundary. The area of the British territory is 90,540 sq. miles; its population about 500,000 natives and 1250 whites. Cocoa-nuts, rubber, sisal hemp, Mirva fibre, coffee, tea, and tobacco are cultivated. The forests contain valuable timbers (sandal-wood, etc.); gold is found in the Louisiade Archipelago, on the mainland, and on Woodlark Island. The four ports of entry are Port Moresby, Samarai, Daru, and Bonagai. The German territory has an area of about 70,000 sq. miles, and a population of 110,000 (?) natives and 391 foreigners (184 white). Its development is entrusted to the German New Guinea Company, but its administration is undertaken by the Imperial Government. The principal ports are Berlinhafen and Konstantinhafen. Areca and sago palms, bamboos, ebony, and other woods abound: coco-palms and caoutchouc are grown on the small area yet under cultivation. Gold has been recently discovered on the Bismarck Mountains. Dutch New Guinea has an area of 150,000 sq. miles; its population is estimated purely conjecturally at 262,000. Although it is considered by some authorities the richest part of the island, very little attempt has been made to develop it. Extensive coal-fields exist near the north-western coast. The principal settlement is Merauke. The fauna of New Guinea is very poor in mammals; only about seventy-five species are known, the most important being the wild boar, rat, mouse, bat, opossum, and crocodile. The avifauna is, on the other hand, both numerous and various, and includes among the five hundred known species many (such as the celebrated bird of paradise) which are peculiar to New Guinea and some other islands in this region.

Mission History.—On 1 July, 1885, the first Catholic priest, Father Verjus, set foot on Papuan soil. He devoted himself immediately to the care of the sick and the study of the native language, but was soon compelled to withdraw in consequence of the opposition of the Protestant missionaries and the pressure they brought to bear on the British authorities. A change of governors allowed the return of the Catholic missionaries, and on 1 May, 1889, British New Guinea was erected into a vicariate Apostolic and Father Navarre appointed vicar Apostolic. He introduced the Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Issoudun, who rendered valuable assistance by instructing the native girls, taking charge of the churches and chapels, and even founding stations in the interior. On 12 Sept., 1889, Father Verjus was named Bishop of Limyra and coadjutor to Mgr Navarre. The task of conversion is attended with great difficulty, as the adult native, though he shows no resentment to his religious customs being ridiculed, obstinately adheres

to them, even when they cause him excessive physical exertion. The latest statistics assign to the mission: 26 missionaries, 21 brothers, 38 sisters (all of the Sacred Heart of Issoudun), 15 catechists, 1500 Catholics, 7 stations with church and school, 2 orphanages, 28 schools with 1400 pupils. The Prefecture Apostolic of Dutch New Guinea was separated from the Vicariate Apostolic of Batavia on 22 December, 1902. Attended at first by the Jesuits, it was later entrusted to the Missionary Fathers of the Sacred Heart of Issoudun. The present prefect Apostolic is the Rev. Father Noyens (residence on the Island of Langur), appointed in January, 1903. The mission now contains 14 Fathers and 11 Brothers of the Sacred Heart; 7 Sisters of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart; 16 native catechists; 2911 Catholics; 210 catechumens; 4 churches with resident priest; 12 churches without residence; 12 sub-stations; 16 schools with 300 pupils. (For German New Guinea, see KAISERWILHELMSLAND.)

RYE, *Bibliography of New Guinea* in *Supplementary Papers, Royal Geogr. Soc.* (London, 1884); KRIEGER, etc., *N. G.* (6 vols., Berlin, 1889); MACGREGOR, *British N. G.* (London, 1897); THOMSON, *British N. G.* (London, 1892); *Geogr. Journal*, XXXII (London, 1908), 266 sqq., with excellent map of part of British territory; *Imperial Blue Book* (London); *Government Handbook of the Territory of Papua; Statist. Jahrb. für das deutsche Reich* (Berlin); *Nachrichten über Kaiser Wilhelm's Land* (Berlin); *Tijdschrift van het koninklijk institut voor taal-, land, en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië* ('s Gravenhage, 1855—); *Deutsche Rundschau für Geog. u. Statistik*, XXXII (Vienna, 1910), 433–42. Concerning the Catholic missions, see JULIEN, *Les missions de la Nouvelle-Guinée* (Issoudun, 1898); PIOLET, *Les missions cathol.*, IV, 369–95; *Annuaire pont. cathol.* (1910), 376.

THOMAS KENNEDY.

New Hampshire, the most northerly of the thirteen original states of the United States, lying between 70° 37′ and 72° 37′ west long., and between 42° 40′ and 45° 18′ 23″ north lat. It comprises an area of 9305 square miles, and according to the census of 1910, has a population of 430,572. New Hampshire is bounded on the south by Massachusetts, the dividing line beginning on the Atlantic shore at a point three miles north of the Merrimac; thence westerly, following the course of the river at the same distance to a point three miles north of Pawtucket Falls, thence westerly fifty-five miles to the western bank of the Connecticut; on the east by the Atlantic for about eighteen miles from said southern boundary to the middle of the mouth of Piscataqua harbour, thence by the State of Maine to the Canada line, the dividing line between Maine and New Hampshire beginning at the middle of the mouth of Piscataqua harbour, thence up the middle of the river to its most northerly head, thence north, two degrees west, to the Canada line; on the north by the Province of Quebec, the dividing line passing along the highlands that divide the rivers emptying into the St. Lawrence from those emptying into the sea; on the west by the Province of Quebec, southerly to the forty-fifth parallel of latitude, and by the State of Vermont, the line passing from the north-west head of the Connecticut river along the middle of that river to the forty-fifth parallel of north latitude (Treaty of 1783), and thence following the western bank of that river to the Massachusetts line. The south-west part of the Isles of Shoals, off the coast of New Hampshire, belongs to that state, the rest to Maine, the dividing line passing between Cedar and Smutty Nose Islands, Maine and Star Island, the most populous of the group in New Hampshire.

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS.—New Hampshire is a state of hills and mountains, sloping gradually from north to south. A range of hills runs through the state from the southern boundary nearly to its northern extremity, buttressed at uneven intervals, south of the White Mountains, by Mounts Monadnock, Kearsarge, and Cardigan; a little further north it spreads into the plateau of the White Mountains, some thirty miles long by forty-five wide, and from sixteen to eighteen hundred feet high. From this plateau arise some two hundred peaks in two groups: the White and Sandwich Mountains to the eastward, and the Franconia to the westward. This range divides the waters of the Androscoggin, the Saco, and the Merrimac rivers on the east from those of the Connecticut on the west. The White Mountain region is strikingly grand. Here Mount Washington (6290 feet) and Mounts Adams, Jefferson, Clay, Monroe, and others each rise nearly a mile in height. The fame of the beauty and sublimity of this region is world-wide and attracts countless visitors. In the south-eastern portion of the state, from the Merrimac valley to the sea, the land is lower and much of it fertile. Two-thirds of the largest cities and towns of the state are in this section. The climate is rugged and healthy, the air pure and bracing; the summers are short and changeable, but the autumn is generally delightful. The winters are very severe, though less so in the valleys of the Connecticut and Merrimac. Cold weather usually lasts eight months, with snow half that period.

SEAL OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

RESOURCES.—*Agriculture:* The soil of the state outside the mountain regions is well watered and fairly productive, and good crops are raised of the ordinary farm staples: hay, corn, oats, potatoes, etc., but the chief food supply comes from the west. *Industries:* By the last census (1900) the gross value of the manufactures in the state is placed at $123,610,904, the net value at $85,008,010. These manufactures are largely confined to the cities and leading towns, which contain 65.8 per cent. of the establishments, manufacture 79.2 per cent. of the value, and pay 81.4 per cent. of the wages. Among the chief manufactures are boots and shoes, about $23,500,000; leather goods, $23,000,000; lumber, $9,125,000; woollens, $7,700,000; paper and pulp, $7,125,000; machinery, cars, carriages, and furniture. *Minerals:* Chief among the mineral products is granite, of which there are valuable quarries at Concord, Hooksett, Mason, and other towns. Steatite or soapstone is also found in quantity at Francestown, Orford, and elsewhere; the quarry at Francestown being one of the most valuable in the Union. Graphite, mica, limestone, and slate are also found. *Commerce:* New Hampshire has but one seaport, Portsmouth, which has considerable coasting trade. The importation of foodstuffs and raw material, and the distribution of her vast volume of manufactures constitute an important interstate and domestic commerce, carried on chiefly by rail. Foreign importations come chiefly through Boston. The state is covered by a network of steam and electric railroads, connecting every city and town of any importance with the business centres.

EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.—The state has always carefully provided for education. Under the Constitution (Part II, art., 82), it is the duty of the legislature and magistrate to cherish the interests of literature, the sciences, and all seminaries and public schools; to encourage private and public institutions, rewards, and immunities for the promotion of arts, sciences, etc.; but no money raised by taxation shall ever be applied for the use of the schools or institutions of any religious denomination. The law directs that every child from eight to fourteen shall attend school at least twelve weeks each year. Practically every town is a

school district and may raise money by taxation for school purposes, and may, separately or uniting with other districts, establish a high school, or contract with academies in its vicinity for instruction of its scholars. The districts must meet at least once annually; oftener, if necessary. In the larger towns and cities the schools are graded and, liberally provided for, are in charge of local officials, elected by the people in every district, town, and ward, and known as School Committees. In the cities these form school-boards and appoint superintendents. All are under the general care of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, appointed by the governor. In 1908 there were 2127 public schools, with a membership of 54,472 pupils, under 2999 teachers, of whom 255 were men. Manual training is provided in Manchester, Concord, Portsmouth, Rochester, and Berlin.

Evening schools are maintained in three cities, attended by 365 pupils, of which 308 are male. In places of 4000 people and over, 796 children attend kindergartens. The New Hampshire School for the Feeble Minded, at Laconia, has 89 inmates, under 4 instructors. There were 58 public high schools, with 243 teachers (84 men), and 5250 pupils. The State Normal School at Plymouth (founded 1870) has 14 teachers and 180 pupils, with 350 children in the model schools. Another normal school is in prospect. The total revenue from taxation for the public schools (1906–7) was $1,293,013. Apart from Catholic schools, there are 24 secondary schools reported in 1908, with 167 teachers and 3235 pupils, over 900 of these being elementary. Among the private academies in the state, Phillips Exeter Academy deserves special mention. The New Hampshire College of Agriculture and the Mechanical Arts at Durham (founded 1867) is an excellent and liberally endowed state institution with 196 students (1908), 9 men and 13 women in general science; 48 men and 2 women in agriculture, and 124 men in engineering; professors and instructors, 31. Dartmouth College, at Hanover, (founded 1769) the chief university of the state, is an incorporated institution, not under state control. It has 69 professors in its collegiate department and 23 in its professional departments; 1102 collegiate students and 58 professional, including the Medical Department, the Thayer School of Civil Engineering, and the Amos Tuck School of Finance. St. Anselm's College, founded by the Benedictine Fathers in 1893 at the invitation of Bishop Bradley, is situated in Goffstown. The courses are collegiate, academic, and commercial, with 18 professors, 3 assistants, and 156 students. There is a fine state library at Concord and excellent libraries in all the cities. Every town of any importance either has its own library or is in easy reach of excellent library accommodations.

History.—*Civil.*—The first to settle in the limits of New Hampshire seems to have been David Thomson, a Scotchman, who in 1622 was granted 6000 acres and an island in New England (N. H. State Papers, XXV, 715). Forming a partnership with some Plymouth merchants, he came over in 1623 and settled south of the Piscataqua, calling the place Little Harbour. Nothing is known of this settlement, except that about three years afterwards Thomson moved to an island in Boston harbour which still bears his name. It is claimed with reason that at about the same time William and Edward Hilton settled a few miles further up the Piscataqua at what was called Hilton's Point or Northam, now Dover, though the formal grant of their patent was 1630 (Belknap, "Hist.", 8). Also, that all these men were sent by John Mason, Ferdinando Gorges, and a company of English merchants. In 1621, 1622, and 1629, Sir Ferdinando Gorges, an officer in the English navy, and Captain John Mason, a London merchant, afterward a naval officer and Governor of Newfoundland, both royal favourites, procured various grants of what is now New Hampshire and a great deal more, from the Plymouth Company, organized by James I "for the planting, ruling, and governing of New England", and apparently under some arrangement with Thomson and others interested, sent over some eighty men and women duly supplied and furnished, by whom settlements were made on both sides of the Piscataqua near its mouth. Building a house, called Mason Hall, they began salt works, calling the settlement Strawberry Bank; while at Newitchwannock, now South Berwick, Maine, they built a saw mill. Things went along passably well till Mason died in 1635, after which the houses and cattle were taken to satisfy the wages and claims of his servants. Neither he nor Gorges seem to have reaped any profit from their investment. The claims of the Mason heirs were a bone of contention till 1788, when a settlement was effected. On two different occasions they delivered the colony from Massachusetts's sway on account of the influence the claimants had first with Charles II in 1679 and again with William III in 1692.

The settlements spread slowly, the people coming chiefly from Hampshire County, where Mason had held a lucrative office under the crown and from which he had named the plantation "New Hampshire". In 1638 John Wheelwright, a preacher, who had been disfranchised and banished from Boston for his religious opinions, settled, with some adherents, at Squamscott Falls, as being outside the Massachusetts patent, calling the place Exeter, and here they organized a local government, creating three magistrates, the laws to be made by the townsmen in public assembly, with the assent of the magistrates. The settlements at Dover and Strawberry Bank (Portsmouth) soon followed the example of Exeter and established local self-government. It is important to note that Mason, Gorges, Thomson, the Hiltons, and the wealthy merchants associated with them, were devoted supporters of the Church of England. The powerful Massachusetts Bay Colony, then the very essence of intense Puritanism, soon turned its attention to the struggling Anglican colonies on its northern borders, which it determined to seize. Proceeding with consummate craft and skill, they laid out the town of Hampton, clearly within the Mason patent, and settled it with people from Norfolk (Belknap, 1, 38), over the Mason protest. They procured powerful Puritan friends, Lords Say and Brook, and others, to buy up the Hilton patent at a cost of £2150, and to send over large numbers of West of England Puritans and a minister who built and fortified a church on Dover Neck (Belknap, 1, 32). Jealousies, fears, and factions arose between the old settlers and the new comers. Then emissaries from the Bay appeared at the proper time on the Piscataqua (Fry, 37), "to understand the minds of the people and to prepare them", and their report was entirely satisfactory to their principals. They then (1641) got the purchasers of the Hilton patent to put it solemnly under the government of Massachuestts. And now, the time being ripe, and England too distracted with her own internal troubles to interfere, Massachusetts assumed jurisdiction over the New Hampshire settlements (October, 1641). Very soon after Puritans appeared among the settlers and obtained possession of the principal offices, dividing among themselves a goodly share of the common lands (Fry, 30). They silenced the Anglican minister at Portsmouth, seized the church, parsonage, and the fifty acres of glebe that had been granted that church by Governor Williams and the people, and in due time turned them over to a Puritan minister. Minister Wheelwright left Exeter and went to Maine.

For nearly one hundred years, or until the capture of Quebec by Wolfe and the subsequent surrender of Canada (1759–63), the development of New Hampshire was seriously impaired by the Indian wars, her territory being not only the borderland, but also in the

war-path of the Indians from Canada to the New England settlements. These wars seem to have been occasioned by the misdeeds, aggression, or treachery of the whites (Belknap, "Hist." I, 133, 242). There is no doubt that encroachments on their lands and fraud in trade gave sufficient grounds for a quarrel and kept up jealousy and fear (Belknap, I, 123). And the same writer gives the eastern settlers of New England but a poor character for religion and deems their conduct unattractive to the Indians (Hist., II, 47). Such would surely be the drowning by some rascals of the Saco chief Squando's babe; while the treachery of Major Waldron in 1676 in betraying them in time of peace in his own home, and consigning two hundred of them to slavery or death, was never forgotten nor forgiven (Belknap, I, 143), and brought untold horrors on the people till it was avenged in his blood on his own hearth-stone in the Indian attack on Dover in 1689. But through war or peace the population steadily increased. Estimated at between 3000 and 4000 in 1679, it was placed at 52,700 in 1767, and in 1775 at 82,000. The settlers, of course, were mainly English, but about 1719 a colony of one hundred families of Ulster Protestants came from Ireland to Massachusetts and after many trials a number of them settled on a tract in New Hampshire above Haverhill, known as Nutfield, where they established the towns of Londonderry and Derry; the rest settling in different parts of the country. This hardy and industrious element brought with it to New Hampshire the potato. After the capture of Quebec the settlements increased more rapidly, soon clashing in the west with New York's claims, till the boundary was settled by royal decree in 1764.

None of the thirteen colonies was better satisfied with British rule than New Hampshire. She had an extremely popular governor and had received fair treatment from the home government. It is true that patriots took alarm at the assumption of power to tax the people without their consent, and at the severity exercised towards the neighbouring sister colony; and took due precautions to consult for the common safety; also, that when the king and council prohibited the exportation of powder and military stores to America, the citizens, in December, 1774, quietly removed one hundred barrels of powder, the light cannon, small arms, and military stores from Fort William and Mary in Portsmouth harbour to more convenient places. The provincial convention, early in 1776, in forming a provisional government, publicly declared they had been happy under British rule and would rejoice if a reconciliation could be effected, but when they saw the home government persevere in its design of oppression, the Assembly at once (15 June, 1776) instructed its delegates at Philadelphia to join in declaring the thirteen colonies independent, and pledged their lives and fortunes thereto. This pledge was well redeemed through the war from Bunker Hill to Bennington and Yorktown, and New Hampshire's soldiers under Stark and Sullivan, Scammell and Cilley, and others, did their full part and more; while the hardy sailors of Portsmouth and its vicinity did gallant service in the navy under Paul Jones, whose ship, "The Ranger", was built and fitted out at that port. After careful consideration New Hampshire adopted the Constitution, 21 June, 1788, being the ninth state to do so; thus making the number required to give it effect. During the war of the Rebellion, notwithstanding considerable difference of party opinion, the state supported Lincoln and contributed its full share of men to the Union army and navy.

Ecclesiastical.—It was not eighty years from Henry VIII to Mason, and so it was that men imbued with the spirit of the English penal laws settled New Hampshire, whether of the Cavalier stripe, such as Mason, Gorges, and the Hiltons, or Puritan, such as Higgins, the Waldrons, and the Moodeys. In the book of the Puritan the word "toleration" was not written, or only mentioned to be denied and scoffed at by the gravest and most venerable of their teachers and upon the most solemn occasions. President Oakes calls toleration "The first born of all abominations" (Election Sermon, 1673), "Having its origin," says Shepherd, "with the devil" (Election Sermon, 1672). As Dr. Belknap sums it up, "Liberty of conscience and toleration were offensive terms and they who used them were supposed to be the enemies of religion and government" (Hist., 84). The rigidity with which this idea was carried out towards their brethren who differed with them is shown in the case of Roger Williams, and the people of Salem, who were disfranchised and their property rights withheld for remonstrating in favour of liberty of conscience; Williams escaping only by flight to Narragansett Bay; and in multitudes of other instances, as well as in their merciless persecution of the Quakers, extending to imprisonment, scourging, mutilation, and death; as witness their laws from 1656 to 1661, and the barbarities perpetrated under them. It was during Massachusetts' usurpation in New Hampshire, and probably by one of the parties she colonized on the Hilton Patent, the notorious Richard Waldron, that the three Quakers, Anna Coleman, Mary Tomkins, and Alice Ambrose were ordered to be whipped, like infamous criminals, from Dover through eleven towns, and to the disgrace of the colony, the sentence was executed as far as the Massachusetts line; where the victims were rescued and set free by some ruse of the Cavalier Doctor Barefoot, and some friends, as the story goes, Waldron's warrant running in Massachusetts also.

Such being their attitude towards their Protestant brethren, it is easy to understand why so few Catholics appear among the early settlers; especially as they were banned by the charter of the Plymouth Council, which excluded from New England all who had not taken the Oath of Supremacy. Catholics were denied the right of freemen under the Royal Commission of 1679, which required the Oath of Supremacy and this was endorsed by the General Assembly held at Portsmouth the following year; and in 1696 an odious and insulting test-oath was imposed on the people under pain of fine or imprisonment. The proscription of Catholics continued to disfigure the state constitution even after the adoption of the federal constitution. The State Constitutional Convention of 1791 refused to amend the constitution of 1784, by abolishing the religious test that excluded Catholics from the office of governor, councillor, state senator, and representative, the vote standing thirty yeas to fifty-one nays. It is significant that the names of those voting nay are not entered on the record (Journal, p. 52). The convention of 1876 abolished all religious disqualifications, and this was adopted by the people except as to one clause empowering towns, parishes, etc. to provide at their own expense for public, "Protestant" teachers of religion and morality. The convention of 1889 voted to abolish this distinction; but this vote also failed of ratification, and the discrimination still remains a blot on the fairest and first of all written American state constitutions.

First Catholic Missions.—In 1816 Rev. Virgil Barber, an Episcopal minister and principal of an Academy at Fairfield, N. Y., son of Rev. Daniel Barber of Claremont, N. H., observing a prayer-book in the hands of a Catholic servant, made inquiries which resulted in his giving up his school and pastorate and becoming a Catholic. Afterwards, by agreement between himself and his wife, they separated. He and his son entered the Jesuits, and Mrs. Barber and her four daughters entered convents. Father Barber was ordained in 1822 and sent to Claremont, where he built a small brick church and academy, still standing; and according to Bishop Fenwick in 1825 there were

about one hundred and fifty persons, almost all converts, attending it. The following year Father Barber was sent by Bishop Fenwick to visit the eastern part of the diocese and found one hundred Catholics in Dover, eager for a church. In 1828 Father Charles Ffrench was assigned to that mission, which extended from Dover to Eastport and Bangor. Father Ffrench built the church of St. Aloysius at Dover (dedicated 1836), the second Catholic church in the state. In 1833 Father Lee was appointed resident pastor, and the following year he was succeeded by Father Patrick Canovan. In 1835 the Catholic population of the state is given as 385; in 1842 it was placed at 1370, ministered to by Fathers Daly and Canovan. Then came the emigration from Ireland (1845). In Manchester, N. H., in 1848 there were five hundred Catholics, and Bishop Fitzpatrick sent thither Rev. William McDonald, a wise, far-seeing, zealous, and devoted priest. A church was soon built, the present church of St. Anne, rebuilt in 1852. In 1857 he built a convent near the church for the Sisters of Mercy, organized schools, using the basement of the church till he could build or purchase buildings. The influx of Irish Catholics continuing, in 1867 he built St. Joseph's church, now the cathedral. He secured eligible sites for a church, a school, and charitable purposes; an orphan asylum, a Home for Aged Women, and a fine brick school for girls. Emigration from Canada set in, which he duly cared for, as he spoke French, till in 1871 a Canadian priest, Rev. J. H. Chevalier, was sent to Manchester, where he built a fine church and developed a flourishing parish. Father McDonald died in 1885, greatly beloved, honoured, and lamented by his fellow citizens, irrespective of creed. A beautiful mortuary chapel was erected by Bishop Bradley over his remains. Meanwhile such men as the late Fathers O'Donnell and Millette of Nashua, Barry of Concord, Murphy of Dover, O'Callaghan of Portsmouth and other zealous priests built up fine parishes in the chief manufacturing centres.

In 1853 Maine and New Hampshire were created a diocese. Father David W. Bacon, consecrated bishop in 1855, died in 1874, and was succeeded (1875) by the Right Rev. J. A. Healy. In 1884 the state was made the Diocese of Manchester with Father Denis M. Bradley, then pastor of St. Joseph's, as its first bishop. Under Bishop Bradley, a man of great mental power and breadth of view, of quick perception and sound judgment, singularly sweet in disposition, an able administrator and utterly devoted to his calling, the progress of the diocese was almost incredible. The tide of French Canadian immigration to the manufacturing centres of the state now increased tremendously and the new bishop spared no pains to procure the best pastors to care for the ever-increasing flock. Two other magnificent brick churches for this element, St. Mary's and St. George's, with schools for each sex, and convents for the sisters, were built, together with all the usual parish institutions. In 1884 there were 45,000 Catholics in the state, with 27 churches, 5 convents, 40 priests, and 3000 children in the parochial schools. After nineteen years, there were 100,000 Catholics, 91 churches, 24 chapels, 36 stations, 107 priests, 12,000 children in the parochial schools, 4 hospitals, 4 homes for aged women. Bishop Bradley died 13 December, 1903, and was succeeded in 1904 by Bishop John B. Delaney, whose untimely death in June, 1906, cut short his administration. His successor is the present bishop, Right Rev. George Albert Guertin. The new prelate has evidently brought with him the same prudence, zeal, and administrative ability that marked his career as a priest, and his work thus far has already borne rich fruit. There are now in the diocese over 126,000 Catholics, with 118 secular priests, and 19 regulars; 99 churches, 24 chapels, and 34 stations; over 13,000 children in the parochial schools, 7 orphan asylums, caring for 718 orphans, 5 homes for working girls, with many other charitable institutions. No Catholic has yet held the office of Judge of the Supreme Court; recently a Catholic, Hon. John M. Mitchell of Concord, was appointed judge of the Superior Court of the State.

Religious Polity.—Freedom of worship is now recognized as "a natural and unalienable right" under the Constitution; and no one shall be molested in person or property for exercising the same as his conscience dictates, or for his sentiments or persuasion; or be compelled to pay to the support of another persuasion; and no subordination of one denomination to another shall ever be established by law (Bill of Rights, Art. 5). All work, business, and labour of one's secular calling to the disturbance of others on Sunday, except works of necessity and mercy, are forbidden under penalty of fine and imprisonment, and no person shall engage in any play, game or sport on that day (Gen. laws; Ch. 271). The form of oath of office prescribed in the Constitution is, "I do solemnly swear, etc.—so help me God." Or, in case of persons scrupulous of swearing; "This I do under the pains and penalties of perjury". The same forms are followed in respect to witnesses in the courts, but any other form may be used which the affiant professes to believe may be more binding on the conscience. Open denial of the existence of God, or wilful blasphemy of the name of God, Jesus Christ, or the Holy Ghost, cursing or reproaching His word contained in the Bible, are punishable with severe fine and sureties for good behaviour for a year. Profane cursing or swearing is punishable by fine of one dollar for first offence, and two dollars for subsequent offences. Opening the legislature by prayer is a matter of custom since 1745, though as early as 1680 the Assembly was opened by prayer. Christmas Day is recognized as a legal holiday. Under the Puritan regime whoever kept Christmas Day had to pay five pounds, over twenty-four dollars (Commissioners Rep. to King). The seal of confession is not recognized by law. No instances of its being attacked have arisen, and probably public opinion would frown down any such attempt.

Incorporation of Charities.—Apart from special incorporation by the legislature, easily obtainable, any five persons may associate themselves together and become a corporation for religious or charitable purposes, by filing articles of agreement with their town clerk, and the Secretary of State. The laws could not well be more liberal toward such societies. A religious society, though not incorporated, is a corporation in this state, for the purpose of holding and using donations or grants worth not more than $5000 a year. Any officers, such as trustees or deacons, of any church, if citizens, shall be deemed a corporation, to hold any grants or donations of the above value, either to them and their successors, to their church or to the poor. No religious society shall be dissolved, or its right to any property affected, by failure to hold its annual meeting, to choose its officers, or for any informality in electing or qualifying its officers, or for any defect in its records.

Taxation.—All "Houses of Public Worship" are exempt from taxation; also twenty-five hundred dollars of the value of parsonages owned by religious societies and occupied by their pastors; also school houses and "Seminaries of learning". Ordained ministers are exempt from jury duty, but not from military duty. The sale of liquor is regulated by a stringent high licence law, sale for sacramental purposes being expressly recognized and coming under a low licence fee, ten dollars.

Marriage and Divorce.—The age of consent, for females is thirteen, for males fourteen. Marriages to the degree of first cousins are incestuous and void, and the issue illegitimate. Marriages may be solemnized by a justice of the peace in his county, or by an ordained minister in good standing, resident in the

state; also by ministers out of the state, commissioned by the governor to be legally authorized officers. Children born before marriage and duly acknowledged thereafter are deemed legitimate. The legitimacy of the children is not to be affected by decree of divorce unless so expressed in the decree. If one of the parties thereto believed they were lawfully married and the marriage was consummated, it is valid, although before a *supposed* but not actual justice or minister, or under an informal or defective certificate of intention. The causes for legal divorce are impotency, adultery, extreme cruelty, conviction of crime entailing over a year's imprisonment; treatment seriously injuring health or reason, habitual drunkenness, refusal to cohabit or support for three years, refusal for six months, when conjoined with religious belief (Gen. Stat., Ch. 174). Where legal cause for divorce exists, all the objects of separation—non-access, non-interference with person and property, alimony, custody of children—can be obtained without a legal divorce, should the injured party so desire (Stat., 1909).

Prisons and Reformatories.—The rules of all prisons, houses of correction, or public charitable or reformatory institutions, shall provide for suitable religious instruction and ministration to the inmates. These are to have freedom of religious belief and worship, but may not interfere with proper discipline.

Wills and Testaments.—Every person of twenty-one years of age, and sound mind (married women included), may dispose of any right in property by will in writing, signed by the testator and subscribed in his presence by three credible witnesses. No seal is required. Husband or wife may waive the provisions of a will and take the share allowed them respectively by law.

Charitable Bequests.—These are governed by the principles of the common law. The courts will order them to be executed according to the true intent and will let no trust lapse for want of a trustee (2 N. H., 21–55; N. H., 463–470—36; N. H., 139).

The following is a rough estimate of the nationality of the Catholic population of the diocese:

French Canadians	66,200
Irish	52,250
Poles	5,000
Lithuanians	1,500
Ruthenians	750

As reported in 1906 the membership of the principal non-Catholic denominations is as follows:

Congregationalists	19,070
Methodists	12,529
Baptists	9,741
Free Baptists	6,210
Unitarians	3,629
Universalists	1,993
Advent Christians	1,608
Christians	1,303
Presbyterians	842

Chas. A. O'Connor.

New Hebrides, Vicariate Apostolic of, in Oceania, comprises the New Hebrides, with Banks and Torres, islands situated between 13° and 21° S. lat. and between 166° and 170° E. long. The total area is about 580 sq. miles. The indigenous population, which has decreased considerably, amounts to about 75,000; they are for the most part of an olive or brown complexion, varying in darkness. Their languages, which are very numerous, belong to the Malay stock and their religious worship has for its object the souls of the dead, but they also recognize a higher Being who is good. The white population is about 1000, nearly 650 of whom are French, and 300 English. The islands belong jointly to France and Great Britain under what is known as the "Condominium of the New Hebrides". They were discovered in 1606 by the Spaniards under Quiros, and were named Tierra Austral del S. Espiritu. In 1768 the French navigator, Bougainville, in sailing round the globe, came upon the same group and named them the Grandes Cyclades. Six years later, Cook discovered the islands and gave them their present name. According to the account of Quiros, the Franciscans, who acted as chaplains to his ships, celebrated Mass several times in a chapel built on the shore, and even held a procession of the Blessed Sacrament. Nevertheless, the islands had to wait long for the preaching of Catholic missionaries. Not until January, 1887, did four Marist priests, sent by Mgr Fraysse, Vicar Apostolic of New Caledonia, definitively establish here the first missions, and they did it amid great difficulties. The missions, however, developed rapidly, and in 1900, at the petition of Mgr. Fraysse, the New Hebrides were separated from his jurisdiction and made a prefecture Apostolic, under Père Douceré, of the Society of Mary. In 1904 this mission became a vicariate Apostolic, and Père Douceré, as vicar Apostolic, was consecrated titular Bishop of Terenuthis. His residence is at Port-Vila. The staff of the mission now comprises 26 priests and 3 lay brothers of the Lyons Society of Mary. Their labours are seconded by 16 religious women of the regular Third Order of Mary, and a certain number of native catechists. There are 20 missionary residences, besides numerous annexes. Each mission has its schools. Near the episcopal residence is established a training-school for native catechists. Religious instruction and education for white children are secured by two schools at Port-Vila: a school for boys, conducted by the Little Brothers of Mary; one for girls, under the sisters of the mission who also serve the hospital at Port-Vila and conduct at Mallicolo a *crèche* for little orphans. Conversions from paganism progress slowly, but continuously. The native Catholics, now numbering rather more than one thousand, are well instructed and faithful to their religious duties. There are about 600 white Catholics, and this number is increasing rapidly, both by births and by immigration.

P. Douceré.

Newhouse, Abbey of, near Brockelsby, Lincoln, the first Premonstratensian abbey in England, was founded in 1143 by Peter de Gousel, with the consent of his lord, Hugh de Bayeux, and the approbation of Alexander, Bishop of Lincoln, with a colony from Liegues Abbey near Calais, France, then under the rule of Abbot Henry. On their arrival in England the White Canons were hospitably received by William, Earl of Lincoln, who confirmed the donations made to Gelro, the first Abbot of Newhouse, by Peter de Gousel the founder, by Ralph de Halton, and Geoffrey de Tours. The abbey was built in honour of Our Lady and St. Martial, Bishop of Limoges. In time Newhouse became the parent house of eleven of the Premonstratensian houses in England. The seal of Newhouse represents an abbot at full length with his crozier and the inscription: *Sigill. conventus Sci Marcialis. Ep. Li. de Newhouse.* Of this abbey which was granted (30 Henry VIII) to Charles, Duke of Suffolk, parts only of the old foundations still remain. The names of twenty-six abbots are known, the last being Thomas Harpham, who was abbot from 1534 to the suppression of the abbey by Henry VIII. The following list gives in alphabetical order the names and the dates of foundations of the Premonstratensian, or Norbertine, abbeys, made from the Abbey of Newhouse and existing in England at the time of the Reformation: Alnwick, Northumberland, this was the first foundation made from Newhouse (1147); Barlings, near Lincoln (1154); Bileigh, near Maldon, Essex (1180); Coverham, Yorkshire (originally established at Swainby, 1190); Croxton, near Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire (1162); Dale, Derbyshire (1162); St.

Agatha's at Easby, near Richmond, Yorkshire (1152); Newbo, near Barrowby, Lincolnshire (1198); Sulby, Northamptonshire (originally established at Welford (1155).

DUGDALE, *Monasticon Anglicanum*, VI; *Collectanea Anglo-Præmonst.* in REDMEN, *Register*, ed. GASQUET (Royal Historical Society, 3rd series, VI, X, XII); GEUDENS, *A Sketch of the Premonstratensian Order and its houses in Great Britain and Ireland* (London, 1878); HUGO, *Annales Præmonstratenses* (Nancy, 1734).

F. M. GEUDENS.

New Jersey, one of the original thirteen states of the American Union. It ratified the Federal Constitution on 18 December, 1787, being preceded only by Delaware and Pennsylvania. The capital of the state is Trenton. The extreme length of New Jersey from north to south is 160 miles, its extreme breadth 70 miles, and its gross area 7815 square miles. It is situated between 38° 55′ 39″ and 41° 21′ 19″ N. lat., and between 73° 53′ 51″ and 75° 33′ 3″ W. long. It is bounded on the north by New York State, on the east by the Hudson River and the Atlantic Ocean, on the south by Delaware Bay, and on the west by the Delaware River. In 1910 the population was 2,537,167 (1,883,669 in 1900), the state being thus, notwithstanding its large mountainous and forest areas, more densely populated than the most fertile of the prairie states or the great manufacturing States of New York or Pennsylvania. New Jersey has, in proportion to its area, more miles of railway than any other state, the majority of the eastern trunk lines traversing it. Its farms yield a larger income in proportion to the area cultivated than the richest states of the Mississippi valley. In manufactures it ranks sixth in the Union.

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS.—Much of the northern half of New Jersey is mountainous, and much of its southern half is covered with forest. The state divides itself naturally into four belts, differing in age, in the nature of the underlying rocks, and in topography. The Appalachian belt, made up of the Kittatinny range and valley, forms the north-western part of the state. This ridge is due to tilted-up layers of hard rock, which have been able to resist the agents of waste, while the softer rocks were being slowly worn away to form the Kittatinny valley. The Kittatinny Mountains constitute the highest land in the state, and are clothed with forests; the valley, which is one of the most fertile parts of the state, is devoted to general farming and grazing. There are no large cities, and but little manufacturing, in this section. The Highland belt is the oldest part of the state, and is a portion of the very ancient mountain system of which the Blue Ridge Mountains are a worn-down remnant. The Highlands (generally less than 1500 feet high) are a region of lakes, forests, and picturesque valleys, but are not a productive farming section. Here, in ancient crystalline rocks, are found valuable beds of iron and of zinc ore, but there are no large cities and no extensive manufacturing. The Piedmont belt is a rolling plain from which rise abrupt ridges of hard trap-rock. The Palisades along the Hudson and the Orange or Watchung Mountains are the most prominent of these ridges. While the rocks of the Piedmont plain are mostly sandstone and shale, the trap-rocks are ancient lava sheets. This, the belt of dense population, many cities, great manufacturing activity, and generally productive soil, is by far the most wealthy part of the state. The northern part of New Jersey was covered by the ice sheet of the glacial period. As a result, there are many swamps, lakes, and waterfalls, a glacial soil with many boulders, and the terminal moraine formed by low rounded hills. These hills are composed of till, gravel, boulders, etc., brought together by the advancing ice sheet and piled up along its front. The coastal plain is the youngest, flattest, and largest of the four natural divisions of the state, of which it forms more than one half. It is composed of layer upon layer of sand, clay, gravel, and marl sediments, that were, in past ages, slowly deposited in the ocean waters along the coast, and afterwards into a low, sandy plain. The marl belt and a few other portions are alone fertile. More than half of the coastal plain is covered with pine forests and is thinly peopled. Outside of the larger cities, the raising of fruit and vegetables for the city markets and the manufacture of glass are the chief industries. The sea-coast is fringed with summer resorts.

CIVIL HISTORY.—The precise date of the first settlement in New Jersey is not known, though it is believed that the Danes or Norwegians, who crossed the Atlantic with the Dutch colonists, began a settlement at Bergen about 1624. Ten years previously an attempt had been made to form a settlement at Jersey City. In 1623 the Dutch West India Company sent out a ship under the command of Captain Cornelius Jacobse Mey. Entering Delaware Bay, he gave his name to its northern cape, and then, sailing up the river to Gloucester, built Fort Nassau, which may be considered the first permanent settlement of the state.

SEAL OF NEW JERSEY

In 1632 Charles I granted to Sir Edmund Plowden a vast tract of land embracing New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland, although he had previously granted Maryland to Lord Baltimore. In 1634 Plowden made a grant of ten thousand acres to Sir Thomas Danby on condition that he would settle one hundred planters on it, and would not permit "any to live thereon not believing or professing the three Christian creeds commonly called the Apostolical, Athanasian, and Nicene". In 1642 Plowden sailed up the Delaware River, which he named "The Charles", and founded at Salem City a settlement of seventy persons. The efforts of Thomas and George Plowden to assert their claims to the lands granted to their grandfather proved futile, the possessions having fallen into other hands after the latter had retired to Virginia during the Commonwealth. In 1606, prior to the grant of Charles I to Plowden, King James had granted a new patent for Virginia (ignoring that of Sir Walter Raleigh, dated 1584), in which was included the territory now known as the New England States, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. The possession of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and adjacent lands was subsequently claimed by the Dutch and Swedes. The former built Fort Nassau on the Delaware near Gloucester. Disputes as to the rightful possession of this territory continued until 12 March, 1664, when Charles II with royal disregard for previous patents, grants, and charters, deeded to his brother James, Duke of York, a vast tract embracing much of New England, New York, and all of what is now New Jersey. This was accompanied by active preparations to drive the Dutch from America, as their possession of New Jersey, if acquiesced in, would practically separate the New England Colonies from Virginia, Maryland, and the Carolinas. In the summer of 1664 armed vessels appeared in New York harbour, and after negotiations the Dutch surrendered.

In the meantime the Duke of York transferred to two favourites, Lord John Berkeley and Sir George Carteret, practically what is now the State of New Jersey by the following description: "All that tract of land adjacent to New England and lying and being to the westward of Long Island, bounded on the east part by the main sea and part by the Hudson River, and hath

upon the west, Delaware bay or river, and extendeth southward to the main ocean as far as Cape May, at the mouth of Delaware bay, and to the northward as far as the northernmost branch of said bay or river of Delaware, which is forty-one degrees and forty minutes of latitude, and worketh over thence in a straight line to Hudson river, which said tract of land is hereafter to be called by the name or names of Nova Cæsarea or New Jersey". This name was given in honour of Carteret's gallant defence of the Island of Jersey (*Cæsarea*), of which he was governor, during the parliamentary wars. This grant regarded the Dutch as intruders, and Berkeley and Carteret not only became rulers, but acquired the right to transfer the privilege to others. Measures were speedily devised for peopling and governing the country. The proprietors published a constitution, dated 10 February, 1664, by which the government of the province was to be exercised by a governor, council, and general assembly. The governor was to receive his appointment from the proprietors. On the same day that the instrument of government was signed, Philip Carteret, a brother of one of the proprietors, received a commission as Governor of New Jersey, and landed at Elizabeth in August, 1665. By granting a liberal form of government and extolling the advantages of their colony, so well located for agriculture, commerce, fishing, and mining, Carteret and Berkeley attracted settlers not only from England, but from Scotland, New England, and particularly from Long Island and Connecticut. These planters were largely Calvinists from Presbyterian and Congregational communities, and occupied mainly land in Newark, Elizabeth, and upon the north shore of Monmouth county. The valley of the Delaware remained unsettled. The Calvinists brought with them into East Jersey their distinctive views upon religious and civil matters.

The first Legislative Assembly met at Elizabethtown on 26 May, 1668. The session lasted four days, and was characterized by harmony and strict attention to the business for which the burgesses and representatives were summoned by Governor Carteret. It may be noticed that this assembly passed laws by which twelve distinct offences were made punishable with death. The assembly adjourned *sine die*, and seven years elapsed before another convened. The capture of New York by the Dutch, on 30 July, 1673, was followed by the subjection of the surrounding country, including the province of New Jersey. The whole of the territory, however, was restored to the English Crown by the Anglo-Dutch Treaty of 9 February, 1674. The second General Assembly began its sessions on 5 November, 1675. Laws were enacted concerning the proper military defence of the province, the institution of regular courts, and the assessment of taxes. A code of capital laws was also adopted, similar in its provisions to that passed in 1668. On 18 March, 1673, Lord Berkeley disposed of his right and interest in the province to John Fenwick and Edward Byllinge, members of the Society of Quakers, or Friends, for the sum of one thousand pounds. John Fenwick received the conveyance in trust for Edward Byllinge, and a dispute as to the terms having arisen, William Penn was called in as arbitrator. He gave one-tenth of the province and a considerable sum of money to Fenwick, the remainder of the territory being adjudged to Byllinge. In 1676 a division of the Carteret and Berkeley interests occurred. By the "Indenture Quintipartite", dated 1 July, 1676, the line of division was made to extend across the province from Little Egg Harbor to a point in the Delaware River in forty-one degrees N. lat. These divisions were known respectively as East and West Jersey, until the charters of both were surrendered, and the two portions included together under a royal government. After Berkeley's transfer the dominant influence in West Jersey was that of the Society of Friends. Salem was settled in 1675; Burlington, Gloucester, and Trenton about five years later, while within ten years the "shore" communities of Cape May and Tuckerton came into existence. The Society of Friends established in West Jersey a series of communities in which the life of the people was different from that of East Jersey. As East Jersey resembled New England in civil government, so West Jersey resembled Virginia. The political and social centres of the large plantations were the shire towns; slave-holding was common; a landed aristocracy was established; prominent families intermarried, and, under the advice of William Penn and his friends, good faith was kept with the Indians. Capital punishment was practically unknown, and disputes were frequently settled by arbitration.

Two elements of discord marked the genesis of East Jersey and West Jersey. One was external, and arose from the attitude of the Duke of York. As we have already noted, New Jersey was recaptured in 1673 by the Dutch, who held the colony until the early spring of 1674. A question arose as to the Duke of York's title after 1674; reconveyances were made, but in spite of past assurances the duke claimed the proprietary right of government. To that end Sir Edmund Andros was commissioned Governor of New Jersey, and a climax was reached in 1680 when the proprietary Governor of East Jersey was carried prisoner to New York. In 1681 the Crown recognized the justice of the proprietors' contention, and local government was re-established, but not before the seeds of disaffection were sown that bore fruit in the Revolutionary War. An internal disturbance was the contest between the Board of Proprietors and the small landowners. Both in East and West Jersey, Carteret and Berkeley and their assigns had transferred to wealthy combinations of capitalists (mostly non-resident) much of the broad acreage of the colonies. With the land went the right of selection of governors and of members of executive councils, which right Berkeley and Carteret derived from the Crown. This, with "quit-rent" agitation in East Jersey, led to much bitterness. Finally, disgusted with turmoil and recognizing the sentiments of revolt entertained by the people, the Boards of Proprietors surrendered to the Crown in 1702 their rights of government, retaining only their interest in the soil. East and West Jersey were now united and the two provinces became the royal colony of New Jersey. Queen Anne appointed Lord Cornbury, Governor of New York and New Jersey, but each continued to have a separate assembly. In 1738 New Jersey petitioned for a distinct administration, and Lewis Morris was appointed governor. The population was then about 40,000. The last royal governor was William Franklin, the natural son of Benjamin Franklin. The opening of the Revolution found New Jersey sentiment unevenly crystallized. Few, if any, favoured absolute independence. There were three elements. One, the Tory and conservative class and led by William Franklin, embraced nearly all the Episcopalians, a vast proportion of the non-combatant members of the Society of Friends, and some East Jersey Calvinists. Another element was composed of men of various shades of belief, some in favour of continual protest, others desirous of compromise. This included at the outbreak of the struggle most of the Calvinists, some few Quakers of the younger generation, and the Irish and Scotch. The third party drew its support from a few bold, aggressive spirits of influence, whose following included men who believed that war for independence would benefit their fortunes. The part played in the Revolution by New Jersey has been frequently told. Events succeeded rapidly after Trenton and Princeton; Monmouth and Red Bank are ever-memorable, while the raids at Salem, Springfield, Elizabeth, in the valley of the Hackensack, and the winter at Morris-

town are a part of national history. Lying between New York and Philadelphia, its soil was a theatre where the drama of war was always presented. At no time was the Tory element suppressed, finding its expression in open hostility, or in the barbaric cruelties of the "Pine Robbers" of Monmouth, Burlington, Gloucester, and Salem counties. Though under suspicion, the Society of Friends was neutral, for conscience' sake, remaining faithful to the teachings of its creed. The close of the struggle found the people of New Jersey jubilant and not disposed to relinquish their sovereignty. The Articles of Confederation were weak and had become a byword and a jest. There was much state pride and much aristocratic feeling among the old families who continued to dominate state politics.

Ecclesiastical History.—Early Missionary Efforts.—The comparative liberality of the proprietary rule of Berkeley and Carteret, especially in religious matters, attracted some Catholic settlers to New Jersey. As early as 1672 we find Fathers Harvey and Gage visiting both Woodbridge and Elizabethtown (then the capital of New Jersey) for the purpose of ministering to the Catholics in those places. Robert Vanquellen, a native of Caen, France, and a Catholic, lived at Woodbridge, and was surveyor general of that section of New Jersey in 1669 and 1670. Catholics were, however, regarded with some suspicion and considerable bigotry at times manifested itself. A Catholic by the name of William Douglass, when elected a representative from Bergen County, was excluded, because of his religious convictions, from the General Assembly of 1668. In 1691 the New York Assembly passed the first anti-Catholic enactment, which was followed by laws strongly opposed to Catholics and their beliefs both in New York and New Jersey. Lord Cornbury, when appointed governor in 1701, was instructed by Queen Anne to permit liberty of conscience to all persons except "papists".

The first Catholics in New Jersey were probably those who availed themselves of the grant made by Charles I in 1632 to Sir Edmund Plowden, and of Plowden's conveyance in 1634 to Thomas Danby. In this way a Catholic settlement was founded near Salem. The fine clay found at Woodbridge attracted some Catholics to that place as early as 1672. The ship "Philip", which is said to have brought Carteret to America, also transported several French Catholics, who were skilled as salt makers, to New Jersey. The records show Hugh Dunn and John and James Kelly in Woodbridge in 1672. In 1741 some fanatics, unable to bear the toleration which the Catholics were enjoying in the province, endeavoured to arouse ill-feeling against them by accusing them of complicity in the "Negro Plot". In the persecution thus aroused Father John Ury, a Catholic priest (see Flynn, op. cit. in bibliography, pp. 21–2), who had exercised unostentatiously his sacred ministry in New Jersey, and had been engaged for about twelve months in teaching at Burlington, was put to death in New York City, the real cause being the violent hostility of the rabble towards the Catholic name and priesthood. Father Robert Harding arrived in Philadelphia from England in August, 1749, when the City of Brotherly Love contained only 2000 homes. He laboured in New Jersey from 1762 until his death in 1772, at the age of seventy years. Father Ferdinand Farmer, whose family name was Steenmeyer (q. v.), may be considered the true missionary of New Jersey.

In "First Catholics in New Jersey", in 1744, Father Theodore Schneider, a distinguished Jesuit, professor of philosophy and theology in Europe, visited New Jersey and celebrated Mass at the iron furnaces there. Having some skill in medicine, he was accustomed to cure the body as well as the soul; and travelling about under the name of Doctor Schneider he obtained access to places whither he could not otherwise have gone without great personal danger. Sometimes, however, his real character was discovered, and several times he was shot at in New Jersey. He used to carry in his missionary excursions a manuscript copy of the Roman Missal, carefully written in his own hand. He died on 11 July, 1764. Patrick Colvin seems to have been the only Catholic resident in Trenton in 1776. He was interested in the cause of the patriots, and helped to furnish the boats used to transport General Washington's army across the Delaware on 25 December, 1776. Captain Michael Kearney, a Catholic, lived near Whippany in Morris County on his large estate, consisting of about one thousand acres, known as "The Irish Lott". The inscription on his tomb bears witness to his genial hospitality of disposition, and to his having served as a captain in the British Navy. He died at the age of seventy-eight years, six months, and twenty-eight days on 5 April, 1797. Molly Pitcher (*née* McCauley), who acquired fame at the Battle of Monmouth, was a Catholic girl. One Pierre Malou, who had been a general in the Belgian Army, was a resident of Princeton from 1795 to 1799; he purchased five hundred acres of land in Cherry Valley; subsequently he sailed for Europe in order to bring his wife and two sons to New Jersey. On the return voyage his wife died. He returned to Europe, became a lay brother of the Society of Jesus; afterwards he studied theology, and was later raised to the priesthood, came to America again and was stationed in Madison. Father Pierre Malou died at New York on 13 October, 1827, and is buried under St. Peter's Church in Barclay Street.

When Bishop John Carroll returned from England he received Father John Rossiter, an Augustinian, into his diocese in 1790. On 27 May, 1799, the Augustinians were given permission to establish convents of their order in the United States. They established missions in New Jersey at Cape May and at Trenton in 1803 and 1805, and at Paterson a little later. St. John's parish at Trenton, now the parish of the Sacred Heart, was the first parish established in New Jersey (1799). St. Joseph's Church in Philadelphia was the first parish church for the Catholics of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York. The Father Harding above referred to was pastor of this parish, and is said to have been the first priest to have visited New Jersey prior to 1762. St. John's Church in Newark was built in 1828, and the first pastor was Rev. Gregory Bryan Pardow. Father Pardow was born in England in 1804, and in 1829 was named as first pastor of the first Catholic parish founded in Newark. During and after the terrible famine in Ireland about 1848 a great number of Irish Catholics came to New Jersey. About this time Father Bernard J. McQuaid (q. v.) began his missionary career in New Jersey. He became pastor at Madison in 1848, and had missions at Morristown, Dover, Mendham, Basking Ridge, and Springfield. His parish extended from Madison to the banks of the Delaware, including Morris, Somerset, Warren, and Sussex Counties, besides Short Hills in Essex and Springfield in Union. He opened the first Catholic school in New Jersey at Madison; built the Church of the Assumption at Morristown; St. Joseph's at Mendham; and St. Rose's at Springfield, now removed to Short Hills. He became rector of St. Patrick's pro-cathedral at Newark in 1853, upon the arrival of the Bulls from Rome appointing James Roosevelt Bayley, first Bishop of Newark; he built Seton Hall College and was its first president, and brought the Sisters of Charity into the Diocese of Newark.

Dioceses and Catholic Population.—The State of New Jersey is divided ecclesiastically into the Dioceses of Newark and Trenton, which are treated in separate articles. The total Catholic population of the state is about 500,000.

Legislation on Matters Directly Affecting Religion.—The First Constitution of the State of New Jersey, adopted at the Provincial Congress held at Burlington on 2 July, 1776, was a makeshift war measure, and provided that all state officers of prominence should be elected by a legislature chosen by voters possessing property qualifications. While this instrument provided "that no person shall ever, within this colony, be deprived of the inestimable privilege of worshiping Almighty God in a manner agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience; nor under any pretense whatever be compelled to attend any place of worship, contrary to his own faith and judgment"; and while it also provided "that there shall be no establishment of any one religious sect in this province in preference to another", yet it discriminated by implication against Catholics for public office in the following language: "that no Protestant inhabitant of this colony shall be denied the enjoyment of any civil right merely on account of his religious principles, but that all persons professing a belief in the faith of any Protestant sect, who shall demean themselves peaceably under the government, as hereby established, shall be capable of being elected into any office of profit or trust, or being a member of either branch of the Legislature, and shall fully and freely enjoy every privilege and immunity enjoyed by others their fellow-subjects". The Constitution agreed upon in convention at Trenton in 1844, and ratified by the people at an election held on 13 August, 1844, guarantees absolute freedom of worship, and further provides that "no religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust; and no person shall be denied the enjoyment of any civil right merely on account of his religious principles." In it there is no discrimination in favour of Protestants as in the earlier instrument.

The statutes of the state prohibit all worldly employment or business, except works of necessity or charity, on Sunday. Oaths are administered to all witnesses in courts of justice either by the ceremony of the uplifted hand or on the Bible, except where one declares himself, for conscientious reasons, to be scrupulous concerning the taking of an oath, in which case his solemn affirmation or declaration is accepted. Blasphemy and profanity are prohibited by statute and punishable by fine, while perjury is punished by fine and imprisonment, besides disqualification afterwards on the part of the person convicted to give evidence in any court of justice. The sessions of the Legislature are, through custom, opened by prayer. Catholic clergymen have frequently officiated in both houses on such occasions. The legal holidays in New Jersey are New Year's Day; Lincoln's Birthday, 12 February; Washington's Birthday, 22 February; Good Friday; Memorial Day, also known as Decoration Day, 30 May; Independence Day, 4 July; 12 October, known as Columbus Day; the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, or Election Day; Thanksgiving Day, which is fixed by the governor's proclamation; and Christmas Day. There is no statutory provision recognizing the seal of the confessional, but no attempt to compel an answer to a question which would involve a breach of the sacramental seal has ever been known in the history of New Jersey jurisprudence.

Legislation on Matters Affecting Religious Work.—In 1875 a liberal statute was enacted, which has since then been supplemented and amended, whereby parochial corporations can be created through the filing with the county clerk of a certificate of incorporation signed by the Roman Catholic bishop of the diocese concerned, the vicar-general (or, in case of the vacancy of either of those offices, the administrator of the diocese for the time being), and two lay members of the church or congregation. Religious societies organized under this act may acquire, purchase, and hold lands, legacies, donations, and other personal property to an amount not exceeding $3000 a year (exclusive of the church edifices, school-houses, and parsonages, and the lands whereon the same are erected), and burying-places. The religious corporation may grant and dispose of its real and personal property; but all proceedings, orders, and acts must be those of a majority of the corporation, and not of a less number, and to be valid must receive the sanction of the bishop. Under an Act of the Legislature approved on 11 April, 1908, any Roman Catholic diocese may become a corporation, and be able unlimitedly to acquire and hold real and personal property. The legal corporate title of the Newark diocese is "The Roman Catholic Diocese of Newark"; that of the Trenton Diocese is "The Diocese of Trenton". Church property is exempt from taxation; parsonages owned by religious corporations, and the land whereon they stand, are exempt to an amount not exceeding $5000.

Marriage and Divorce.—A revision of the statutes relating to marriage, enacted in 1910, empowers the following officers to perform marriages between such persons as may lawfully enter into the matrimonial relation: the chief justice and each justice of the supreme court, the chancellor and each vice-chancellor, and each judge of the court of common pleas and justice of the peace, recorder and police justice, and mayor of a city, and every "stated and ordained minister of the gospel"; and "every religious society, institution or organization in this State may join together in marriage such persons as are members of the said society, or when one of such persons is a member of such society, according to the rules and customs of the society, institution or organization to which they or either of them belong". The same act renders absolutely void any marriage within the following prohibited degrees of relationship: "A man shall not marry any of his ancestors or descendants, or his sister, or the daughter of his brother or sister, or the sister of his father or mother, whether such collateral kindred be of the whole or half blood. A woman shall not marry any of her ancestors or descendants, or her brother, or the son of her brother or sister, or the brother of her father or mother, whether such collateral kindred be of the whole or half blood". Since 1 July, 1910, it is necessary for persons intending to be married to obtain first a marriage licence and deliver the same to the clergyman, magistrate, or person who is to officiate, before the proposed marriage can be lawfully performed; but, if the marriage is to be performed by or before any religious society, institution, or organization, the licence shall be delivered to the said religious society, institution, or organization, or any officer thereof. In Chaper 274 of the Laws of 1910, which makes such licences necessary, it is provided that "nothing in this act contained shall be deemed or taken to render any common law or other marriage, otherwise lawful, invalid by reason of the failure to take out a licence as is herein provided".

With certain limitations, decrees of nullity of marriage may be rendered in all cases, when (1) either of the parties has another wife or husband living at the time of a second or other marriage, (2) the parties are within the degrees prohibited by law, (3) the parties, or either of them, are at the time of marriage physically and incurably impotent, (4) the parties, or either of them, were, at the time of the marriage incapable of consenting thereto, and the marriage has not been subsequently ratified, (5) at the suit of the wife, when she was under the age of sixteen years at the time of the marriage, unless such marriage be confirmed by her after arriving at such age; (6) at the suit of the husband, when he was under the age of eighteen at the time of the marriage, unless such marriage be confirmed by him after arriving at such age. The decree of nullity of marriage does not render illegitimate the

issue of any marriage so dissolved, except where the marriage is dissolved because either of the parties had another wife or husband living at the time of a second or other marriage. Such marriage shall be deemed void from the beginning, and the issue thereof shall be illegitimate. The grounds for absolute divorce are: (1) adultery; (2) wilful, continued, and obstinate desertion for the term of two years. Divorces *a mensa et thoro* may be decreed for (1) adultery; (2) wilful, continued, and obstinate desertion for the term of two years; (3) extreme cruelty in either of the parties. In all cases of divorce *a mensa et thoro*, the court may decree a separation for ever thereafter, or for a limited time, with a provision that, in case of a reconciliation at any time thereafter, the parties may apply for a revocation or suspension of the decree, and upon such application the Court shall make such order.

Wills.—All persons of sound mind and of the age of twenty-one years are legally competent to dispose of property by will. No specific form of words is necessary in a will, but the testator must state in the document that it is his will; and it must be signed, and declared or published, by the testator as his will in the presence of at least two subscribing witnesses. The witnesses must sign in the presence of the testator, and in the presence of each other. A codicil to a will must be made and executed with the same requirements as a will, regarding declaration of its character, signature, and witnesses. Unwritten or nuncupative wills are legal under some rare circumstances, as in cases of sudden dangerous sickness or accident, in the presence of at least three competent witnesses, and at the request of the person about to die. Devises and bequests may be validly made for charitable and religious purposes and to religious societies.

Cemeteries.—The parochial corporation statute enables church corporations to hold title to "burying places", and the Diocesan Corporation Act of 1908 makes the diocesan corporation "capable unlimitedly" of acquiring and holding "leases, legacies, devises, moneys, donations, goods and chattels of all kinds, church edifices, school houses, college buildings, seminaries, parsonages, Sisters' houses, hospitals, orphan asylums, reformatories and all other kinds of religious, ecclesiastical, educational and charitable institutions, and the lands whereon the same are, or may be erected, and cemeteries or burying places and any lands, tenements and hereditaments suitable for any or all of said purposes, in any place or places in any such diocese; and the same, or any part thereof, to lease, sell, grant, demise, alien and dispose of; . . . to exercise any corporate powers necessary and proper to the carrying out of the above enumerated powers, and to the carrying out of the purposes of such corporation and its institutions."

Education.—A single little Dutch school in Bergen (now Jersey City) in 1662 marked the beginning of the free public school system in New Jersey. That was almost two hundred and fifty years ago and since that time the schools have increased gradually in number and size until, according to the New Jersey School Report of 1909, there are now 2052 public schools in New Jersey, with a total seating capacity of 426,719. The total value of the school property is estimated at $33,900,466.00. There are 11,235 teachers employed, of which 1250 are men and 9985 are women. These receive an average yearly salary of $718.40. For the school year 1908–9 the current expenses of the schools amounted to $11,583,201; the cost of permanent improvements was $4,996,887, and the special appropriations equalled $647,253. These amounted to a total appropriation of $17,227,331. The total enrollment of pupils for the same year was 424,534. The state superintendent, at the head of the state department of public instruction, exercises a general supervision over the public school system of the state. He is appointed by the governor, as also is the state board of education, which consists of two members from each congressional district. The county superintendents of schools are appointed by the state board of education. This board also exercises supervision over the different state educational institutions, such for example as the normal schools. Each of the many school districts, into which the state is divided, has its own school or schools, controlled by the officers, whom the voters of the district elect. In the cities and large towns there are superintendents or supervising principals and school-boards, appointed by the mayor.

New Jersey has two state normal schools—one at Trenton and one at Montclair. The school at Trenton was established in 1855 by an Act of the Legislature, and has in connexion with it the State Model School. The Montclair State Normal School was formally opened on 28 September, 1908. The increasing demand for professionally trained teachers, and the inability of the State Normal School at Trenton to meet it, had made another normal school necessary. At Beverly is the Farnum School, a preparatory school associated with the State Normal School; at Trenton is the State School for Deaf Mutes; at Bordentown the Manual Training and Industrial School for Colored Youths; and connected with Rutgers College is the State Agricultural College. The principal institutions for higher education in New Jersey are Princeton University at Princeton (founded 1746); Stevens Institute of Technology at Hoboken; Rutgers College at New Brunswick (chartered as Queens College, 1766); Bordentown Female College at Bordentown; Saint Peter's College, Jersey City; Saint Benedict's College, Newark; Seton Hall College, South Orange (founded 1856). The three last-mentioned are Catholic institutions. (For full statistics concerning the Catholic schools, see the articles on the Dioceses of Newark and Trenton.)

Sitgraves, *Manual of Legislative Practice* (Trenton, 1836); *Revision of New Jersey* (Trenton, 1877); *Supplement to the Revision of N. J.* (Trenton, 1886); *General Statutes of N. J.* (Trenton, 1895); Fitzgerald, *Legislative Manual* (Trenton, 1886–1910); *Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the State Board of Agriculture* (Trenton, 1909); *Geological Survey of N. J. The Clays and Clay Industry of N. J.* (Trenton, 1903); Meeker, *New Jersey* (Elizabeth, 1906); Whitehead, *Contributions of the Early History of Perth Amboy and Adjoining Country* (New York, 1856); Flynn, *The Catholic Church in N. J.* (Morristown, 1904); Sypher and Apgar, *Hist. of N. J.* (Philadelphia, 1870); *Proceedings of the N. J. Historical Society* (Newark, 1867–1900); Zwierlein, *Religion in New Netherland* (Rochester, 1910); *Archives of the State of N. J.* (Newark, 1880—); Mulford, *Civil and Political Hist. of N. J.* (Philadelphia, 1851); Smith, *Hist. of the Colony of Nova Cæsarea or N. J.* (Burlington, New Jersey, 1765); Tanner, *Province of N. J., 1664–1738* (New York, 1908); Lee, *New Jersey* (New York, 1902); Raum, *Hist. of N. J.* (Philadelphia, 1877).

William J. Kearns.

Newman, John Henry (1801–1890), Cardinal-Deacon of St. George in Velabro, divine, philosopher, man of letters, leader of the Tractarian Movement, and the most illustrious of English converts to the Church, b. in the City of London, 21 Feb., 1801, the eldest of six children, three boys and three girls; d. at Edgbaston, Birmingham, 11 Aug., 1890. Over his descent there has been some discussion as regards the paternal side. His father was John Newman, a banker, his mother Jemima Fourdrinier, of a Huguenot family settled in London as engravers and paper-makers. It is stated that the name was at one time spelt Newmann; it is certain that many Jews, English or foreign, have borne it; and the suggestion has been thrown out that to his Hebrew affinities the cardinal owed, not only his cast of features, but some of his decided characteristics—e. g., his remarkable skill in music and mathematics, his dislike of metaphysical speculations, his grasp of the concrete, and his nervous temperament. But no documentary evidence has been found to confirm the suggestion. His French pedigree is undoubted. It accounts for the religious training, a modified Calvinism, which he received at his mother's knees; and perhaps it helped towards the

"lucid concision" of his phrase when dealing with abstruse subjects. His brother Francis William, also a writer, but wanting in literary charm, turned from the English Church to Deism; Charles Robert, the second son, was very erratic, and professed Atheism. One sister, Mary, died young; Jemima has a place in the cardinal's biography during the crisis of his Anglican career; and to a daughter of Harriet, Anne Mozley, we are indebted for his "Letters and Correspondence" down to 1845, which contains a sequel from his own hand to the "Apologia".

A classic from the day it was completed, the "Apologia" will ever be the chief authority for Newman's early thoughts, and for his judgment on the great religious revival known as the Oxford Movement, of which he was the guide, the philosopher, and the martyr. His immense correspondence, the larger portion of which still awaits publication, cannot essentially change our estimate of one who, though subtile to a degree bordering on refinement, was also impulsive and open with his friends, as well as bold in his confidences to the public. From all that is thus known of him we may infer that Newman's greatness consisted in the union of originality, amounting to genius of the first rank, with a deep spiritual temper, the whole manifesting itself in language of perfect poise and rhythm, in energy such as often has created sects or Churches, and in a personality no less winning than sensitive. Among the literary stars of his time Newman is distinguished by the pure Christian radiance that shines in his life and writings. He is the one Englishman of that era who upheld the ancient creed with a knowledge that only theologians possess, a Shakespearean force of style, and a fervour worthy of the saints. It is this unique combination that raises him above lay preachers *de vanitate mundi* like Thackeray, and which gives him a place apart from Tennyson and Browning. In comparison with him Keble is a light of the sixth magnitude, Pusey but a devout professor, Liddon a less eloquent Lacordaire. Newman occupies in the nineteenth century a position recalling that of Bishop Butler in the eighteenth. As Butler was the Christian champion against Deism, so Newman is the Catholic apologist in an epoch of Agnosticism, and amid theories of evolution. He is, moreover, a poet, and his "Dream of Gerontius" far excels the meditative verse of modern singers by its happy shadowing forth in symbol and dramatic scenes of the world behind the veil.

He was brought up from a child to take great delight in reading the Bible; but he had no formed religious convictions until he was fifteen. He used to wish the Arabian tales were true; his mind ran on unknown influences; he thought life possibly a dream, himself an angel, and that his fellow-angels might be deceiving him with the semblance of a material world. He was "very superstitious", and would cross himself on going into the dark. At fifteen he underwent "conversion", though not quite as Evangelicals practise it; from works of the school of Calvin he gained definite dogmatic ideas; and he rested "in the thought of two and two only absolute and luminously self-evident beings, myself and my Creator". In other words, personality became the primal truth in his philosophy; not matter, law, reason, or the experience of the senses. Henceforth, Newman was a Christian mystic, and such he remained. From the writings of Thomas Scott of Aston Sandford, "to whom, humanly speaking", he says, "I almost owe my soul", he learned the doctrine of the Trinity, supporting each verse of the Athanasian Creed with texts from Scripture. Scott's aphorisms were constantly on his lips for years, "Holiness rather than peace", and "Growth the only evidence of life". Law's "Serious Call" had on the youth a Catholic or ascetic influence; he was born to be a missionary; thought it God's will that he should lead a single life; was enamoured of quotations from the Fathers given in Milner's "Church History", and, reading Newton on the Prophecies, felt convinced that the pope was Antichrist. He had been at school at Ealing near London from the age of seven. Always thoughtful, shy, and affectionate, he took no part in boys' games, began to exercise his pen early, read the Waverley Novels, imitated Gibbon and Johnson, matriculated at Trinity College, Oxford, Dec., 1816, and in 1818 won a scholarship of £60 tenable for nine years. In 1819 his father's bank suspended payment, but soon discharged its liabilities in full. Working too hard for his degree, Newman broke down, and gained in 1821 only third-class honours. But his powers could not be hidden. Oriel was then first in reputation and intellect among the Oxford Colleges, and of Oriel he was elected a fellow, 12 April, 1822. He ever felt this to be "the turning point in his life, and of all days most memorable".

In 1821 he had given up the intention of studying for the Bar, and resolved to take orders. As tutor of Oriel, he considered that he had a cure of souls; he was ordained on 13 June, 1824; and at Pusey's suggestion became curate of St. Clement's, Oxford, where he spent two years in parochial activity. And here the views in which he had been brought up disappointed him; "Calvinism was not a key to the phenomena of human nature as they occur in the world." It would not work. He wrote articles on Cicero, etc., and his first "Essay on Miracles", which takes a strictly Protestant attitude, to the prejudice of those alleged outside Scripture. But he also fell under the influence of Whateley, afterwards Anglican Archbishop of Dublin, who, in 1825, made him his vice-principal at St. Mary's Hall. Whateley stimulated him by discussion, taught him the notion of Christianity as a social and sovereign organism distinct from the State, but led him in the direction of "liberal" ideas and nominalistic logic. To Whateley's once famous book on that subject Newman contributed. From Hawkins, whom his casting vote made Provost of Oriel, he gained the Catholic doctrines of tradition and baptismal regeneration, as well as a certain precision of terms which, long afterwards, gave rise to Kingsley's misunderstanding of Newman's methods in writing. By another Oxford clergyman he was taught to believe in the Apostolic succession. And Butler's "Analogy", read in 1823, made an era in his religious opinions. It is probably not too much to say that this deep and searching book became Newman's guide in life, and gave rise not only to the "Essay on Development" but to the "Grammar of Assent". In particular it offered a reflective account of ethics and conscience which confirmed his earliest beliefs in a lawgiver and judge intimately present to the soul. On another line it suggested the sacramental system, or the "Economy", of which the Alexandrians Clement and St. Athanasius are exponents. To sum up, at this formative period the sources whence Newman derived his principles as well as his doctrines were Anglican and Greek, not Roman or German. His Calvinism dropped away; in time he withdrew from the Bible Society. He was growing fiercely anti-Erastian; and Whateley saw the elements of a fresh party in the Church gathering round one whom Oriel had chosen for his intellectual promise, but whom Oxford was to know as a critic and antagonist of the "March of Mind".

His college in 1828 made him Vicar of St. Mary's (which was also the university church), and in its pulpit he delivered the "Parochial Sermons", without eloquence or gesture, for he had no popular gifts, but with a thrilling earnestness and a knowledge of human nature seldom equalled. When published, it was said of them that they "beat all other sermons out of the market as Scott's tales beat all other stories". They were not controversial; and there is little in them to which Catholic theology would object. Their chas-

tened style, fertility of illustration, and short sharp energy, have lost nothing by age. In tone they are severe and often melancholy, as if the utterance of an isolated spirit. Though gracious and even tender-hearted, Newman's peculiar temper included deep reserve. He had not in his composition, as he says, a grain of conviviality. He was always the Oxford scholar, no democrat, suspicious of popular movements; but keenly interested in political studies as bearing on the fortunes of the Church. This disposition was intensified by his friendship with Keble, whose "Christian Year" came out in 1827, and with R. Hurrell Froude, a man of impetuous thought and self-denying practice. In 1832 he quarrelled with Dr. Hawkins, who would not endure the pastoral idea which Newman cherished of his college work. He resigned his tutorship, went on a long voyage round the Mediterranean with Froude, and came back to Oxford, where on 14 July, 1833, Keble preached the Assize sermon on "National Apostasy". That day, the anniversary of the French Revolution, gave birth to the Oxford Movement.

Newman's voyage to the coasts of North Africa, Italy, Western Greece, and Sicily (Dec., 1832–July, 1833) was a romantic episode, of which his diaries have preserved the incidents and the colour. In Rome he saw Wiseman at the English College; the city, as mother of religion to his native land, laid a spell on him never more to be undone. He felt called to some high mission; and when fever took him at Leonforte in Sicily (where he was wandering alone) he cried out, "I shall not die, I have not sinned against the light." Off Cape Ortegal, 11 Dec., 1832, he had composed the first of a series of poems, condensed, passionate, and original, which prophesied that the Church would yet reign as in her youth. Becalmed in the Straits of Bonifacio, he sought guidance through the tender verses, "Lead, Kindly Light", deservedly treasured by all the English-speaking races. They have been called the marching song of the Tractarian host. But during the earlier stages of that journey it was not clear, even to the leader himself, in what direction they were moving—away from the Revolution, certainly. Reform was in the air: ten Irish bishoprics had been suppressed; disestablishment might not be far off. There was need of resistance to the enemies without, and of a second, but a Catholic, reformation within. The primitive Church must somehow be restored in England.

Others met in committee and sent up an address to Canterbury; Newman began the "Tracts for the Times", as he tells us with a smile, "out of his own head". To him Achilles always seemed more than the host of the Achæans. He took his motto from the Iliad: "They shall know the difference now." Achilles went down into battle, fought for eight years, won victory upon victory, but was defeated by his own weapons when "Tract 90" appeared, and retired to his tent at Littlemore, a broken champion. Nevertheless, he had done a lasting work, greater than Laud's and likely to overthrow Cranmer's in the end. He had resuscitated the Fathers, brought into relief the sacramental system, paved the way for an astonishing revival of long-forgotten ritual, and given the clergy a hold upon thousands at the moment when Erastian principles were on the eve of triumph. "It was soon after 1830", says Pattison grimly, "that the Tracts desolated Oxford life." Newman's position was designated the Via Media. The English Church, he maintained, lay at an equal distance from Rome and Geneva. It was Catholic in origin and doctrine; it anathematized as heresies the peculiar tenets whether of Calvin or Luther; it could not but protest against "Roman corruptions", which were excrescences on primitive truth. Hence England stood by the Fathers, whose teaching the Prayer Book handed down; it appealed to antiquity, and its norm was the undivided Church. "Charles", said Newman, "is the king, Laud the prelate, Oxford the sacred city, of this principle." Patristic study became the order of the day. Newman's first volume, "The Arians of the Fourth Century", is an undigested, but valuable and characteristic, treatise, wholly Alexandrian in tone, dealing with creeds and sects on the lines of the "Economy". As a history it fails; the manner is confused, the style a contrast to his later intensity and directness of expression. But as a thinker Newman never travelled much beyond the "Arians" (published 1833). It implies a mystic philosophy controlled by Christian dogma, as the Church expounds it.

In the "Apologia" we find this key to his mental development dropped by Newman, not undesignedly. "I understood", he says, ". . . that the exterior world, physical and historical, was but the manifestation to our senses of realities greater than itself. Nature was a parable, Scripture was an allegory; pagan literature, philosophy, and mythology, properly understood, were but a preparation for the Gospel. The Greek poets and sages were in a sense prophets." There had been a "dispensation" of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews. Both had outwardly come to nought; from and through each had the evangelical doctrine been made manifest. Thus room was granted for the anticipation of deeper disclosures, of truths still under the veil of the letter. Holy Church "will remain after all but a symbol of those heavenly facts which fill eternity. Her mysteries are but the expression in human language of truths to which the human mind is unequal" ("Apol.", ed. 1895, p. 27). Such was the teaching that "came like music" to his inward ear, from Athens and Alexandria. Newman's life was devoted, first, to applying this magnificent scheme to the Church of England; and then, when it would not suit those insular dimensions, to the Church of the centre, to Rome. But its wide implications even this far-glancing vision did not take in. However, it substituted a dynamic and progressive principle in Christianity for one merely static. But the Anglican position was supposed to rely on Vincent of Lerins's *Quod ubique*, admitting of no real developments; its divines urged against Bossuet the "variations" of Catholicism. From 1833 to 1839 the Tractarian leader held this line of defence without a misgiving. Suddenly it gave way, and the Via Media disappeared.

Meanwhile, Oxford was shaken like Medicean Florence by a new Savonarola, who made disciples on every hand; who stirred up sleepy Conservatives when Hampden, a commonplace don, subjected Christian verities to the dissolving influence of Nominalism; and who multiplied books and lectures dealing with all religious parties at once. "The Prophetic Office" was a formal apology of the Laudian type; the obscure, but often beautiful, "Treatise on Justification" made an effort "to show that there is little difference but what is verbal in the various views, found whether among Catholic or Protestant divines" on this subject. Döllinger called it "the greatest masterpiece in theology that England had produced in a hundred years", and it contains the true answer to Puritanism. The "University Sermons", profound as their theme, aimed at determining the powers and limits of reason, the methods of revelation, the possibilities of a real theology. Newman wrote so much that his hand almost failed him. Among a crowd of admirers only one perhaps, Hurrell Froude, could meet him in thought on fairly equal terms, and Froude passed away at Dartington in 1836. The pioneer went his road alone. He made a bad party-leader, being liable to sudden gusts and personal resolutions which ended in catastrophe. But from 1839, when he reigned at Oxford without a rival, he was already faltering. In his own language, he had seen a ghost—the shadow of Rome overclouding his Anglican compromise.



JOHN HENRY CARDINAL NEWMAN

PAINTING BY W. W. OULESS—ETCHING BY P.-A. RAJON

Two names are associated with a change so momentous—Wiseman and Ward. The "Apologia" does full justice to Wiseman; it scarcely mentions Ward (see OXFORD MOVEMENT). Those who were looking on might have predicted a collision between the Tractarians and Protestant England, which had forgotten the Caroline divines. This came about on occasion of "Tract 90"—in itself the least interesting of all Newman's publications. The tract was intended to keep stragglers from Rome by distinguishing the corruptions against which the Thirty-Nine Articles were directed, from the doctrines of Trent which they did not assail. A furious and universal agitation broke out in consequence (Feb., 1841). Newman was denounced as a traitor, a Guy Fawkes at Oxford; the University intervened with academic maladroitness and called the tract "an evasion". Dr. Bagot, Bishop of Oxford, mildly censured it, but required that the tracts should cease. For three years condemnations from the bench of bishops were scattered broadcast. To a mind constituted like Newman's, imbued with Ignatian ideas of episcopacy, and unwilling to perceive that they did not avail in the English Establishment, this was an *ex cathedra* judgment against him. He stopped the tracts, resigned his editorship of "The British Critic", by and by gave up St. Mary's, and retired at Littlemore into lay communion. Nothing is clearer than that, if he had held on quietly, he would have won the day. "Tract 90" does not go so far as many Anglican attempts at reconciliation have gone since. The bishops did not dream of coercing him into submission. But he had lost faith in himself. Reading church history, he saw that the Via Media was no new thing. It had been the refuge of the Semiarians, without whom Arianism could never have flourished. It made the fortune of the Monophysites, thanks to whom the Church of Alexandria had sunk into heresy and fallen a prey to Mohammed's legions. The analogy which Newman had observed with dismay was enforced from another side by Wiseman, writing on the Donatists in "The Dublin Review". Wiseman quoted St. Augustine, "Securus judicat orbis terrarum", which may be interpreted "Catholic consent is the judge of controversy". Not antiquity studied in books, not the bare succession of bishops, but the living Church now broke upon him as alone peremptory and infallible. It ever had been so; it must be so still. Nicæa, Ephesus, and Chalcedon thus bore witness to Rome. Add to this the grotesque affair of the Jerusalem bishopric, the fruit of an alliance with Lutheran Prussia, and the Anglican theory was disproved by facts.

From 1841 Newman was on his death-bed as regarded the Anglican Church. He and some friends lived together at Littlemore in monastic seclusion, under a hard rule which did not improve his delicate health. In February, 1843, he retracted in a local newspaper his severe language towards Rome; in September he resigned his living. With immense labour he composed the "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine", in which the apparent variations of dogma, formerly objected by him against the Catholic Church, were explained on a theory of evolution, curiously anticipating on certain points the great work of Darwin. It has many most original passages, but remains a fragment. On 9 Oct., 1845, during a period of excited action at Oxford, Newman was received into the Church by Father Dominic, an Italian Passionist, three days after Renan had broken with Saint-Sulpice and Catholicism. The event, although long in prospect, irritated and distressed his countrymen, who did not forgive it until many years had gone by. Its importance was felt; its causes were not known. Hence an estrangement which only the exquisite candour of Newman's self-delineation in the "Apologia" could entirely heal.

His conversion divides a life of almost ninety years into equal parts—the first more dramatic and its perspective ascertained; the second as yet imperfectly told, but spent for a quarter of a century *sub luce maligna*, under suspicion from one side or another, his plans thwarted, his motives misconstrued. Called by Wiseman to Oscott, near Birmingham, in 1846, he proceeded in October to Rome, and was there ordained by Cardinal Fransoni. The pope approved of his scheme for establishing in England the Oratory of St. Philip Neri; in 1847 he came back, and, besides setting up the London house, took mission work in Birmingham. Thence he moved out to Edgbaston, where the community still resides. A large school was added in 1859. The spacious Renaissance church, consecrated in 1909, is a memorial of the forty years during which Newman made his home in that place. After his "Sermons to Mixed Congregations", which exceed in vigour and irony all others published by him, the Oratorian recluse did not strive to gain a footing in the capital of the Midlands. He always felt "paucorum hominum sum"; his charm was not for the multitude. As a Catholic he began enthusiastically. His "Lectures on Anglican Difficulties" were heard in London by large audiences; "Loss and Gain", though not much of a story, abounds in happy strokes and personal touches; "Callista" recalls his voyage in the Mediterranean by many delightful pages; the sermon at the Synod of Oscott entitled "The second Spring" has a rare and delicate beauty. It is said that Macaulay knew it by heart. "When Newman made up his mind to join the Church of Rome", observes R. H. Hutton, "his genius bloomed out with a force and freedom such as it never displayed in the Anglican communion." And again, "In irony, in humour, in eloquence, in imaginative force, the writings of the later and, as we may call it, emancipated portion of his career far surpass the writings of his theological apprenticeship." But English Catholic literature also gained a persuasive voice and a classic dignity of which hitherto there had been no example.

His own secession, preceded by that of Ward (amid conflicts of the angriest kind at Oxford), and followed by many others, had alarmed Englishmen. In 1850 came the "Papal Aggression", by which the country was divided into Catholic sees, and a Roman cardinal announced from the Flaminian Gate his commission to "govern" Westminster. The nation went mad with excitement. Newman delivered in the Corn Exchange, Birmingham, his "Lectures on the Position of Catholics" (he was seldom felicitous in titles of books), and, to George Eliot's amazement, they revealed him as a master of humorous, almost too lively sketches, witty and scornful of the great Protestant tradition. An apostate Italian priest, Achilli, was haranguing against the Church. Prompted by Wiseman, the Oratorian gave particulars of this man's infamous career, and Achilli brought a charge of libel. Newman, at enormous expense, collected evidence which fully justified the accusations he had made. But a no-popery jury convicted him. He was fined £100; on appeal, the verdict was quashed; and "The Times" admitted that a miscarriage of justice had taken place when Newman was declared guilty. Catholics all the world over came to his relief. His thanks are on record in the dedication of his Dublin "Lectures". But he always remembered that to Wiseman's haste and carelessness he owed this trial.

There was much more trouble awaiting him. The years from 1851 to 1870 brought disaster to a series of noble projects in which he aimed at serving religion and culture. In Ireland the bishops had been compelled, after rejecting the "Godless" colleges in 1847, to undertake a university of their own. Neither men nor ideas were forthcoming; the State would not sanction degrees conferred by a private body; nevertheless, an attempt could be made; and Newman was appointed rector, November, 1851. Three years passed

as in a dream; in 1854 he took the oaths. But he had, in 1852, addressed Ireland on the "Idea of a University" with such a largeness and liberality of view as Oxford, if we may believe Pattison, had never taught him. The "Lectures" end abruptly; they gave him less satisfaction than any other of his works; yet, in conjunction with his brilliant short papers in the "University Magazine", and academic dissertations to the various "Schools", they exhibit a range of thought, an urbanity of style, and a pregnant wit, such as no living professor could have rivalled. They are the best defence of Catholic educational theories in any language; a critic perhaps would describe them as the Via Media between an obscurantism which tramples on the rights of knowledge and a Free-Thought which will not hear of the rights of revelation. Incidentally, they defended the teaching of the classics against a French Puritan clique led by the Abbé Gaume. This was pretty much all that Newman achieved during the seven years of his "Campaign in Ireland". Only a few native or English students attended the house in St. Stephen's Green. The bishops were divided, and Archbishop MacHale opposed a severe *non possumus* to the rector's plans. In administration difficulties sprang up; and though Newman won the friendship of Archbishop Cullen and Bishop Moriarty, he was not always treated with due regard. The status of titular bishop had been promised him; for reasons which he never learnt, the promise fell through. His feeling towards Ireland was warm and generous; but in Nov., 1858, he retired from the rectorship. Its labours and anxieties had told upon him. Another large enterprise, to which Cardinal Wiseman invited him only to balk his efforts, was likewise a failure—the revision of the English Catholic Bible. Newman had selected a company of revisors and had begun to accumulate materials, but some small publishers' interests were pleaded on the other side, and Wiseman, whose intentions were good, but evanescent, allowed them to wreck this unique opportunity.

During the interval between 1854 and 1860 Newman had passed from the convert's golden fervours into a state which resembled criticism of prevailing methods in church government and education. His friends included some of a type known to history as "Liberal Catholics". Of Montalembert and Lacordaire he wrote in 1864: "In their general line of thought and conduct I enthusiastically concur and consider them to be before their age." He speaks of "the unselfish aims, the thwarted projects, the unrequited toils, the grand and tender resignation of Lacordaire". That moving description might be applied to Newman himself. He was intent on the problems of the time and not alarmed at Darwin's "Origin of Species". He had been made aware by German scholars, like Acton, of the views entertained at Munich; and he was keenly sensitive to the difference between North and South in debatable questions of policy or discipline. He looked beyond the immediate future; in a lecture at Dublin on "A Form of Infidelity of the Day" he seems to have anticipated what is now termed "Modernism", condemning it as the ruin of dogma. It is distressing to imagine what Newman's horror would have been, had his intuition availed to tell him that, in little more than half a century, a "form of infidelity" so much like what he predicted would claim him as its originator; on the other hand, he would surely have taken comfort, could he also have foreseen that the soundness of his faith was to be so vindicated as it has been by Bishop O'Dwyer, of Limerick, and above all, the vindication so approved and confirmed as it is in Pius X's letter of 10 March, 1908, to that bishop. In another lecture, on "Christianity and Scientific Investigation", he provides for a concordat which would spare the world a second case of Galileo. He held that Christian theology was a deductive science, but physics and the like were inductive; therefore collision between them need not, and in fact did not really occur. He resisted in principle the notion that historical evidence could do away with the necessity of faith as regarded creeds and definitions. He deprecated the intrusion of amateurs into divinity; but he was anxious that laymen should take their part in the movement of intellect. This led him to encourage J. M. Capes in founding the "Rambler", and H. Wilberforce in editing the "Weekly Register". But likewise it brought him face to face with a strong reaction from the earlier liberal policy of Pius IX. This new movement, powerful especially in France, was eagerly taken up by Ward and Manning, who now influenced Wiseman as he sank under a fatal disease. Their quarrel with J. H. N. (as he was familiarly called) did not break out in open war; but much embittered correspondence is left which proves that, while no point of faith divided the parties, their dissensions threw back English Catholic education for thirty years.

These misunderstandings turned on three topics:—the "scientific" history which was cultivated by the "Rambler", with Newman's partial concurrence; the proposed oratory at Oxford; and the temporal power, then at the crisis of its fate. Newman's editorship of the "Rambler", accepted, on request of Wiseman, by way of compromise, lasted only two months (May–July, 1859). His article, "On Consulting the Laity in Matters of Doctrine", was denounced at Rome by Bishop Brown of Newport and Menevia. Leave was given for an Oratorian house at Oxford, provided Newman did not go thither himself, which defeated the whole plan. A sharp review of Manning's "Lectures on the Temporal Power" was attributed to Newman, who neither wrote nor inspired it; and these two illustrious Catholics were never friends again. Newman foresaw the total loss of the temporal power; his fears were justified; but prevision and the politics of the day could not well be united. Of all Christians then living this great genius had the deepest insight into the future; but to his own generation he became as Jeremiah announcing the fall of Jerusalem. Despondency was his prevailing mood when, in January, 1864, from an unexpected quarter, the chance of his life was given him.

Charles Kingsley, a bold, picturesque, but fiercely anti-Catholic writer, dealing, in "Macmillan's Magazine", with J. A. Froude's "History of England," let fall the remark that "Truth, for its own sake, had never been a virtue with the Roman clergy. Father Newman informs us that it need not, and on the whole ought not to be; that cunning is the weapon which heaven has given to the Saints wherewith to withstand the brute male force of the wicked world which marries and is given in marriage. Whether his notion be doctrinally correct or not, it is at least historically so." These assertions had no foundation whatever in fact. Newman demanded proof; a correspondence ensued in which Kingsley referred to one of the Oxford Anglican sermons generally; he withdrew his charge in terms that left its injustice unreproved; and thus he brought on himself, in the pamphlet which his adversary published, one of the most cutting replies, ironical and pitiless, known to literature. He returned to the assault. "What then does Dr. Newman mean?" was his question. The answer came in the shape of an "Apologia pro Vita sua", which, while pulverizing enemies of the Kingsley stamp, lifted Newman to a height above all his detractors, and added a unique specimen of religious autobiography to our language. Issued in seven parts, between 21 April and 2 June, 1864, the original work was a marvel of swift and cogent writing. Materials in expectation of some such opportunity had been collecting since 1862. But the duel which led up to an account of Newman's most intimate feelings exhibited sword-play the like of which can be scarcely found outside Pascal's "Provincial

Letters" and Lessing's "Anti-Goeze". It annihilated the opponent and his charge. Not that Newman cherished a personal animosity against Kingsley, whom he had never met. His tone was determined by a sense of what he owed to his own honour and the Catholic priesthood. "Away with you, Mr. Kingsley, and fly into space", were his parting words to a man whose real gifts did not serve him in this wild encounter. Then the old Tractarian hero told the story of his life. He looked upon it with the eye of an artist, with self-knowledge like that of Hamlet, with candour, and pathos, and awe; for he felt a guiding power throughout which had brought him home. The handling was unaffected, the portraits of Oxford celebrities true and yet kind; the drama which ended in his renunciation of place and power at St. Mary's moved on with a tragic interest. His brief prologues are among the jewels of English prose. A word from St. Augustine converted him, and its poignant effects could not be surpassed in the "Confessions" of the saint himself. The soliloquy, as we may term it, which describes Newman's attitude since 1845, presents in a lofty view his apology, which is not a surrender, to those Catholics who mistrusted him. Though he never would discuss the primary problems of Theism *ex professo*, he has dwelt on the apparent chaos of history, goodness defeated and mortal efforts futile, with a piercing eloquence which reminds us of some lament in Æschylus. He met Kingsley's accusations of double-dealing proudly and in detail. But by the time he reached them, Englishmen—who had read the successive chapters with breathless admiration—were completely brought round. No finer triumph of talent in the service of conscience has been put on record. From that day the Catholic religion may date its reentrance into the national literature. Instead of arid polemics and technical arguments, a living soul had revealed in its journey towards the old faith wherein lay the charm that drew it on. Reality became more fascinating than romance; the problem which staggered Protestants and modern minds—how to reconcile individual genius with tradition, private judgment with authority—was resolved in Newman's great example.

Amid acclamations from Catholics, echoing the "aves vehement" of the world outside, he turned to the philosophy which would justify his action. He began the "Grammar of Assent". Still, Manning, now archbishop, Talbot, chamberlain of Pius IX, Ward, editor of the "Dublin Review", were not to be pacified. Manning thought he was transplanting the "Oxford tone into the Church"; Talbot described him as "the most dangerous man in England"; Ward used even harder terms. In 1867 an attack by a Roman correspondent on Newman led to a counter-move, when two hundred distinguished laymen told him, "Every blow that touches you inflicts a wound upon the Catholic Church in this country." His discriminating answer on the cultus of Our Lady to Pusey's "Eirenicon" had been taken ill in some quarters. One of his Oratorians, H. I. D. Ryder, was bold enough to cross swords with the editor of the "Dublin", who inflicted on friend and foe views concerning the extent of papal infallibility which the Roman authorities did not sanction; and Newman rejoiced in the assault. In 1870 the "Grammer" was published. But its appearance, coinciding with the Vatican Council, roused less attention than the author's suspected dislike for the aims and conduct of the majority at Rome. Years before he had proclaimed his belief in the infallible pope. His "Cathedra Sempiterna" rivals in fervour and excels in genuine rhetoric the passage with which de Maistre concluded his "Du Pape", which became a text for "ultramontane" apologetics. Yet he shrank from the perils which hung over men less stable than himself, should the definition be carried. He would have healed the breach between Rome and Munich. Under these impressions he sent to his bishop, W. B. Ullathorne, a confidential letter in which he branded, not the Fathers of the Council, but the journalists and other partisans outside who were abounding in violent language, as "an insolent and aggressive faction". The letter was surreptitiously made public; a heated controversy ensued; but Newman took no further part in the conciliar proceedings. Of course he accepted the dogmatic definitions; and in 1874 he defended the Church against Gladstone's charge that "Vaticanism" was equivalent to the latest fashions in religion (see his "Letter to the Duke of Norfolk".).

Newman's demeanour towards authority was ever one of submission; but, as he wrote to Phillips de Lisle in 1848, "it is no new thing with me to feel little sympathy with parties, or extreme opinions of any kind." In recommending the Creed he would employ "a wise and gentle minimism", not extenuating what was true but setting down nought in malice. The "Grammar of Assent" illustrates and defends this method, in which human nature is not left out of account. It is curiously Baconian, for it eschews abstractions and metaphysics, being directed to the problem of concrete affirmation, its motives in fact, and its relation to the personality of the individual. This hitherto unexplored province of apologetics lay dark, while the objective reasons for assent had engrossed attention; we might term it the casuistry of belief. Newman brought to the solution a profound acquaintance with the human heart, which was his own; a resolve to stand by experience; and a subtilty of expression corresponding to his fine analysis. He believed in "implicit" logic, varied and converging proofs, indirect demonstration (*ex impossibili* or *ex absurdo*); assent, in short, in not a mechanical echo of the syllogism but a vital act, distinct and determined. The will, sacrificed in many schools to formal intellect, recovers its power; genius and common sense are justified. Not that pure logic loses its rights, or truth is merely "that which each man troweth"; but the moral being furnishes an indispensable premise to arguments bearing on life, and all that is meant by a "pious disposition" towards faith is marvellously drawn out. As a sequel and crown to the "Development" this often touching volume (which reminds us of Pascal) completes the author's philosophy. Some portions of it he is said to have written ten times, the last chapter many times more. Yet that chapter is already in part antiquated. The general description, however, of concrete assent appears likely to survive all objections. How far it bears on Kant's "Practical Reason" or the philosophy of the will as developed by Schopenhauer, has yet to be considered. But we must not torture it into the "pragmatism" of a later day. As Newman held by dogma in revelation, so he would never have denied that the mind enjoys a vision of truth founded on reality. He was a mystic, not a sceptic. To him the reason by which men guided themselves was "implicit" rather than "explicit", but reason nevertheless. Abstractions do not exist; but the world is a fact; our own personality cannot be called in question; the will is a true cause; and God reveals Himself in conscience. Apologetics, to be persuasive, should address the individual; for real assents, however multiplied, are each single and *sui generis*. Even a universal creed becomes in this way a private acquisition. As the "Development" affords a counterpart to Bossuet's "Variations", so the "Grammar" may be said to have reduced the "personal equation" in controversy to a working hypothesis, whereas in Protestant hands it had served the purposes of anarchy.

For twenty years Newman lay under imputations at Rome, which misconstrued his teaching and his character. This, which has been called the ostracism of a saintly genius, undoubtedly was due to his former friends, Ward and Manning. In February, 1878,

Pius IX died; and, by a strange conjuncture, in that same month Newman returned to Oxford as Honorary Fellow of Trinity College, "dear to him from undergraduate days". The event provoked Catholics to emulation. Moreover, the new pope, Leo XIII, had also lived in exile from the Curia since 1846, and the Virgilian sentiment, "Haud ignara mali", would come home to him. The Duke of Norfolk and other English peers approached Cardinal Manning, who submitted their strong representation to the Holy See. Pope Leo, it is alleged, was already considering how he might distinguish the aged Oratorian. He intimated, accordingly, in February, 1879, his intention of bestowing on Newman the cardinal's hat. The message affected him to tears, and he exclaimed that the cloud was lifted from him forever. By singular ill-fortune, Manning understood certain delicate phrases in Newman's reply as declining the purple; he allowed that statement to appear in "The Times", much to everyone's confusion. However, the end was come. After a hazardous journey, and in broken health, Newman arrived in Rome. He was created Cardinal-Deacon of the Title of St. George, on 12 May, 1879. His *biglietto* speech, equal to the occasion in grace and wisdom, declared that he had been the life-long enemy of Liberalism, or "the doctrine that there is no truth in religion, but that one creed is as good as another", and that Christianity is "but a sentiment and a taste, not an objective fact, not miraculous".

Hitherto, in modern times, no simple priest, without duties in the Roman Curia, had been raised to the Sacred College. Newman's elevation, hailed by the English nation and by Catholics everywhere with unexampled enthusiasm, was rightly compared to that of Bessarion after the Council of Florence. It broke down the wall of partition between Rome and England. To the many addresses which poured in upon him the cardinal replied with such point and felicity as often made his words gems of literature. He had revised all his writings, the last of which dealt somewhat tentatively with Scripture problems. Now his hand would serve him no more, but his mind kept its clearness always. In "The Dream of Gerontius" (1865), which had been nearly a lost masterpiece, he anticipated his dying hours, threw into concentrated, almost Dantean, verse and imagery his own beliefs as suggested by the Offices of Requiem, and looked forward to his final pilgrimage, "alone to the Alone". Death came with little suffering, on 11 Aug., 1890. His funeral was a great public event. He lies in the same grave with Ambrose St. John, whom he called his "life under God for thirty-two years". His device as cardinal, taken from St. Francis de Sales, was *Cor ad cor loquitur* (Heart speaketh to heart); it reveals the secret of his eloquence, unaffected, graceful, tender, and penetrating. On his epitaph we read: *Ex umbris et imaginibus in veritatem* (From shadows and symbols into the truth); it is the doctrine of the Economy, which goes back to Plato's "Republic" (bk. VII), and which passed thence by way of Christian Alexandria into the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas, the poetry of the Florentine, and the schools of Oxford. John Henry Newman thus continues in modern literature the Catholic tradition of East and West, sealing it with a martyr's faith and suffering, steadfast in loyalty to the truth, while discerning with a prophet's vision the task of the future.

As a writer of English prose Newman stands for the perfect embodiment of Oxford, deriving from Cicero the lucid and leisurely art of exposition, from the Greek tragedians a thoughtful refinement, from the Fathers a preference for personal above scientific teaching, from Shakespeare, Hooker, and that older school the use of idiom at its best. He refused to acquire German; he was unacquainted with Goethe as with Hegel; he took some principles from Coleridge, perhaps indirectly; and, on the whole, he never went beyond Aristotle in his general views of education. From the Puritan narrowness of his first twenty years he was delivered when he came to know the Church as essential to Christianity. Then he enlarged that conception till it became Catholic and Roman, an historical idea realized. He made no attempt, however, to widen the Oxford basis of learning, dated 1830, which remained his position, despite continual reading and study. The Scholastic theology, except on its Alexandrian side, he left untouched; there is none of it in his "Lectures", none in the "Grammar of Assent". He wrote forcibly against the shallow enlightenment of Brougham; he printed no word concerning Darwin, or Huxley, or even Colenso. He lamented the fall of Döllinger; but he could not acquiesce in the German idea by which, as it was in fact applied, the private judgment of historians overruled the Church's dogmas. Conscience to him was the inward revelation of God, Catholicism the outward and objective. This twofold force he opposed to the agnostic, the rationalist, the mere worldling. But he seems to have thought men premature who undertook a positive reconciliation between faith and science, or who attempted by a vaster synthesis to heal the modern conflicts with Rome. He left that duty to a later generation; and, though by the principle of development and the philosophy of concrete assent providing room for it, he did not contribute towards its fulfilment in detail.. He will perhaps be known hereafter as the Catholic Bishop Butler, who extended the "Analogy" drawn from experience to the historical Church, proving it thus to be in agreement with the nature of things, however greatly transcending the visible scheme by its message, institutions, and purpose, which are alike supernatural.

The best authorities on Newman are his own writings: *Collected Works* (36 vols., popular ed., London, 1895); *My Campaign in Ireland* (London, 1896); *Meditations and Devotions* (London, 1895); *Addresses and Replies* (London, 1905) (the last three posthumous, ed. by NEVILLE); *Letters and Correspondence* (to 1845), ed. ANNE MOZLEY (London, 1891). See also monographs by HUTTON (London, 1891); BARRY (London, 1904); BRÉMOND (Paris, 1907); LILLY in *Dict. of Nat. Biography*, s. v.; and consult: WILFRID WARD, *W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement* (London, 1889); IDEM, *Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman* (London, 1897); PURCELL, *Life of Cardinal Manning* (London, 1895); DE LISLE AND PURCELL, *Life and Times of Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle* (London, 1900); GASQUET, *Lord Acton and his Circle* (London, 1906); with caution T. MOZLEY, *Reminiscences of Oriel* (London, 1882). See also bibliography under OXFORD MOVEMENT.

WILLIAM BARRY.

I

J. J. Little & Ives Co.
New York—Printers.
J. F. Tapley Co.
New York—Binders.